



***Work Plan Study
on Review of
Allotments***

**Report by the
Environmental Scrutiny Panel**

June 2014 - February 2015

Chair's Commentary/Foreword

In July 2014 the Environmental Scrutiny Panel decided to undertake this study, initially our main aim was to focus on the current level of provision and reducing the waiting list. However as the study progressed we discovered that the subject was more complex and diverse than we originally anticipated.

We undertook visits to several allotment sites in Preston and during our visits the panel spoke to the site reps who outlined issues and problems relating to the sights. The panel also heard information and evidence from other allotment representatives and Council Officers who were invited to our meetings. Moreover we looked at provision for new community allotments and recognised the importance of community food growing, and as outlined in the report some of our suggestions were implemented during the study.

I hope that you find this report informative and its findings useful.

On behalf of the Environmental Scrutiny Panel, I would like to thank the Officers involved for their assistance and all outside bodies that took part.

Councillor N Pomfret
Chair of the Environmental Scrutiny Panel



Contents

Section	Page
Foreword by Chair of Panel	2
1. Introduction.....	4
2. Membership of the Panel	5
3. Deliberations	6
4. Findings and Conclusions	15
5. Recommendations to Cabinet	16

Appendix A - Scoping Document

Review of Allotment Provision

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This topic was suggested to the Environmental Scrutiny Panel as a review which the Panel could undertake as a work plan study following the identified need for Members to evaluate the current provision and potential ways to cope with future demand.
- 1.2 The Panel's deliberations were conducted over the course of three/four?? meetings held in July, October and November 2014/ and January 2015???. Additionally, the Panel undertook a site visit as part of the study details below. This involved detailed information gathering, presentations and interviews held with the following key attendees.

Preston City Council Officers –

Adrian Phillips, Deputy Director (Environment)
Matt Kelly, Head of Parks and Open Spaces
Martin Putsey, Principal Planning Officer
Steve Smith, Senior Allotments Officer

External attendees –

Mr Pond – Site Rep Frenchwood Allotments
Mr Green – Site Rep Penwortham West Allotments
Mr Duffy – Site Rep Deepdale Allotments (Serpentine 1)

In addition to the above the Panel received contributions from:

Site Rep Haslam Park
Site Rep Deepdale Allotments

Also the Environmental Scrutiny Panel conducted a site visit to Haslam Park and Deepdale allotments.

2. Membership

2.1 The Panel was chaired by Councillor Nick Pomfret, the full membership being:-

(Photos to be inserted later)

Councillor Pomfret

Councillor Mrs Crompton

Councillor Mrs Atkins

Councillor Mrs Brown

Councillor Crowe

Councillor Darby

Councillor Davies

Councillor Faruki

Councillor Y Patel

Councillor Seddon

Councillor Mrs Smith

Councillor Mrs Whittam

3. Deliberations

- 3.1 The Scrutiny Panel met on a number of occasions to gather information/evidence, interview witnesses and discuss findings.
- 3.2 A summary is given below of the information produced at each meeting. Full detailed minutes can be found by referring to the links included:-

17 July 2014

Parks and Allotments

The Deputy Director (Environment), Mr Adrian Phillips and Mr Matthew Kelly, Head of Parks and Horticultural Services presented the scope of the Work Plan Study on the review of allotments. Mr Phillips outlined the timetable for the review which would include a site visit in September.

Mr Kelly gave a presentation on allotments. He outlined the areas to be covered by the review which include:-

- Fees and charges
- Current level of provision
- Management of the waiting list
- Community Food Growing Strategy
- Innovative ways of increasing provision
- Managing future demand for allotments

The Panel were informed that historically allotments were underused, however over a period of number of years the demand has increased to a peak of over a four year waiting list. Also due to budget pressures there had been increase in charges. Mr Kelly outlined the various legislations relating to allotments these included:-

- Public Health Act 1875
- Allotments Act 1925
- Allotments Act 1950
- Unfair Terms in Consumer Contract Regulations 1999
- Local Plan Policy

The Scrutiny Panel were told that the Authority managed 8 sites and there was one self-managed site in Frenchwood, these sites totalled 598 plots. Maps indicating the locations of the allotments were shown to the Panel these also gave an indication of the size of each of the sites.

In respect of the allotments budget the Panel was informed that the current provision was £57,000 which was split as follows:-

- £21K Ground Maintenance

- £17K Admin/Management – equating to one and a half day a week of the Park Ranger time and two days of admin
- £4K skips – this had been significantly reduced from previous years
- £9K Water
- £6K improvements/repairs – in the main only covers damage repairs

The allotment rents generate an income of £29,000 and £28,000 is subsidised by the authority. Following the increase in demand the pricing policy was revised to try and reduce the size of large plots and to incentivise regular plots. The Panel were given details of the change in pricing over the past six years. The current charge for a large plot was £85.00 and a regular size plot cost £37.00. There were concessions for retired pensioners, the disabled and those on job seekers so long as they were Preston residents.

The Panel was informed that since 2009 lettable plots had gradually increased from 533 to 598. In 2010 the waiting for an allotment was 349 and it is currently down to 214 which is a two year waiting list. Currently there are 63 vacant plots and there are 317 large plots. The target was to bring down the waiting list to one year in 2015.

In order to manage future demands there was an annual review of the waiting list which entailed writing to those on the list to confirm they were still interested in having a plot. Starter plots in conjunction with Community Food Growing Programmes scheme were plots being offered for people new to allotments to try it out before committing to a full plot and realising it is not what they expected. There were changes to the billing period and continuation of splitting large plots when possible. Notice to Quit (NTQ) system is in operation, introduction of one plot per household, expansion of existing site and opportunities through planning were all being considered to help manage future demands.

Mr Phillips, Mr Kelly and Mr Steven Smith, Senior Park Ranger/Allotment Officer, all then answered Members questions and concerns on the following:-

- In respect of provision the Panel was informed although it was statutory to make allotment provisions there was no specified land allocation defined in statute.
- There were concerns raised in respect of increase in charges and Members had received backlash as a result of the increases.
- It was confirmed that the self-managed site in Frenchwood had their own waiting list which was managed by themselves. The Frenchwood plots cost less than the plots managed by Preston City Council.
- There were concerns raised about dividing up too many large plots making them difficult to let. The Panel was told that a number of large plots could not be sub-divided due to their shape, angles and plot issues.
- The average large plot was 250sqm and a regular plot was 125sqm.
- There were no concessions on large plots.
- In response to a question the Panel was informed that there was no priority on the waiting list however a Preston resident was given priority over a non-Prestonian.
- There was no right to inherit a plot following the death of a family member. There were legal issues in relation to this which could be considered as part of the review.

- Expansion of existing sites was an option however it would be very costly to do.
- Important that people with skills that can be used on allotments are not restricted or put off by the process and similarly interested people who have little idea of what it involves need to be given sufficient information to ensure they are aware of the commitment required.
- The process of the appointment of a site representative was outlined to the Panel. The site reps were given a free plot and £75 allowance, it was acknowledged that they did a huge amount of work for what they received in return and it was agreed that they did a very important job.



Planning and Allotments

Martin Putsey, Principal Planning Officer, City Council Planning Department, gave an overview of how planning policy in relation to allotments. The Panel was informed that there was no mention of allotments in the

National Planning Policy Framework. However the Open Spaces and Community Facilities and government guidance on planning and technical support makes provisions for allotments along with the drive to promote healthier food access.

At a local level the City Council's own planning policy the Core Strategy promotes allotments and community food growing in its Health Policy (CS 23). There was also provision within Policy HS3 in the emerging Local Plan setting out the standard for new green space or green infrastructure provision in new housing developments. New developments are required to make provision equivalent to 0.17ha per 1000 population. Generally, Preston's allotments were assessed as being of high quality and high value on reflection of social and health benefits and amenity.

The Supplementary Planning Document on Open Spaces gives details about how to assess the impact of a new development on allotments provision and how to translate this into a commuted sum. Traditionally contributions towards off-site provisions have been dealt with through the Section 106 planning obligation system. However, that has now changed with the advent of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which took effect last September.

In recent new development the Authority's Planning Department in conjunction with Parks continues to negotiate new allotment provision on larger sites where on-site provision is possible. Recent examples include:

- Cottam Hall – 1.46ha
- Former Spar Depot, Blackpool Road – approximately 6 plots

4 September 2014

Site Visit

The Environmental Scrutiny Panel undertook a site visit to two allotment sites in Preston. The first site visited by the Panel was a site on Haslam Park which was managed by the City Council. During the visit the Panel spoke to the site representative who outlined issues and problems relating to the site. It was acknowledged that there were budget constraints which had meant that the allotments had become difficult to maintain and manage.



There were a number of plots that were vacant or not maintained which resulted in overgrowth and the sites becoming an eyesore. Some people who occupy plots do not give the allotments the required time and attention which leads to the plots becoming overgrown and problematic. Some plots were occupied by organisations such as Integrate who use them for Community projects. Small beds were offered to the community for people to try their hand at growing food and plants. A number of families had taken up the opportunity and were continuing to benefit from the experience. These small beds allowed people interested in allotments to try it out before committing to a full plot and realising it was not what they had expected.

It was reported that the adverse and wet weather conditions had had an impact on allotments and had resulted in some plots becoming unlettable. Some plots were flooded and would require a lot of work to bring them back into use. There were also issues relating to overgrown trees which also had an impact on the plots being let. Issues relating to maintenance of hedges and pathways were raised but it was acknowledged that due to budget constraints these could not be trimmed as often as they had been done previously. Lack of good gardeners was also identified as a problem and it was suggested that a lot of people were taking on more than they had bargained for. It was confirmed that security was not a problem at the site.

The Panel then visited an allotment site at Blackpool Road, Deepdale. They were shown round the site by the site representative who informed the Members about the issues and problems at the site. It was acknowledged that the site was well managed and in the main the plots were well maintained. There were a few plots which were a problem as tenants were not giving sufficient time and attention required. There was support and assistance available to tenants from the site representative. This site had an Association which worked in partnership with the Council and had been successful in bidding for funding which paid for a cabin on the site. Tenancy was fairly full at the site and was popular.

23 October 2014

The Environmental Scrutiny Panel received information and evidence from representatives of three allotment sites in Preston in respect of the Work Plan study on the review of Allotment Provision.



Frenchwood Allotments – Self –Managed Site

Mr Pond representing the Frenchwood Allotments Association attended the meeting to provide information to the Panel in respect of the Frenchwood site and its operation as a self-managed site. The Panel was informed that Mr Pond had been involved at the site since 2003 and had been the Association's Secretary for the last six years. He acknowledged that as with other sites Frenchwood also had difficulties with tenants and it was the long-term tenants who were more difficult than others. The main difficulties arise when rent is increased and tenants question the increases. The rent for a plot was £60 and there were concessions for pensioners and disabled. There had been increase in rent due to concessions. It was reported that there were difficulties in getting tenants to keep pathways clear and maintained.



The Panel was told that currently, out of 109 plots, there were 15 vacant at the Frenchwood site. The plots were vacant due to their location and

positions within the site such as on a slope which meant these sites were unattractive to potential tenants. Another problem on the site was the lack of toilet facilities and the Association did not have enough funds to enable them to provide this. Funding was been applied for from other sources with assistance and advice from Preston City Council officers as the Authority were the land owners and had to be informed of any such activity.

It was acknowledged that the site was well managed and had a strong active Association. It was felt that being self-managed was good for this site but Mr Pond could not say if self-management was the way to go for other allotment sites within the City currently managed by the Council. Each site would need to consider the merits individually but the key was to have a strong active association with people who will work hard and commit to making it a success.

In respect of management of the waiting list it was reported that although the site had its own waiting list which included people who had been referred to the site by the Council the list was managed by discretion. Potential tenants were vetted and people recommended by other good tenants were treated favourably.

Penwortham West – Council Managed Site

Mr D Green a site representative from the Penwortham West allotment site was in attendance to address the Panel. The site had 177 plots of which 12 were vacant and only 20 on their waiting list. It was reported that the new waiting list management system being operated by the Council was working well and helping reduce the numbers on the list. The Panel was informed that Penwortham West also had problems with people on waiting list not responding when plots become vacant.

It was reported that the main issue at the Penwortham West site was that tenants failed to keep pathways clear. Due to economic climates and cuts the Authority were not able to do jobs they previously did. The Panel was told that site representatives at the Penwortham allotment site would like it to be compulsory for all tenants to join the National Association as some funds were then put back into the local association who were then able to carry out maintenance work on their sites. Another problem was plots being left overgrown as a result they were unattractive to prospective tenants. It was suggested that all tenants should be required to pay a deposit which would be returned to them if and when the tenancy came to an end subject to the site being vacated to a reasonable standard. It was pointed out that for this to happen there were issues relating to holding deposits which would need to be looked at through the legal process.

Deepdale Allotment Site (Serpentine 1) – Council Managed

Mr M Duffy addressed the Panel in respect of the allotment review. He reported that the main problem on the site was trees, in particular over grown trees on neighbouring land which were deemed to be dangerous and a cause for concern. Another major problem was Japanese Knotweed which was causing a lot of concern and was spreading rapidly.

The Panel were informed that similar to other allotment sites tenants did complain when rents were increased however there were only 5 vacant plots out of a total of 80 on the site.

The site representatives then responded to Members questions and concerns on the following:-

- How long had the vacant plots been unused?
- Possibility of renting the vacant plots to the neighbouring High School in Frenchwood. It was reported that the school had previously rented a plot but did very little on it and then gave it up.
- Self-management was available to all allotment sites if they can meet the criteria, but none of the sites could be forced to become self-managed.
- A question relating to insurance cover was answered and the Panel was informed that each tenant had to arrange liability cover for their plots but members of the National Association were automatically covered. All pathways were covered by the Council's insurance policy.

- The management of the waiting list at Frenchwood was questioned as it was felt that the process did not seem fair. In response the Panel was informed that it was often the case that when those who were on the waiting list were contacted they did not attend arranged meeting to view the plots or were no longer interested. It was pointed out by officers that there had been no complaints about how the waiting list was being managed.
- Representatives of the Penwortham West and Serpentine 1 allotment sites did not feel that self-management was the way forward for their sites at the present time.
- The treatment work for the Japanese Knotweed was discussed but it was highlighted that it was very expensive.

The Panel were told that the potentially dangerous trees on neighbouring land at Serpentine 1 allotment site was being dealt with through the Council's Tree Officer.

27 November 2014

The Panel continued with their Work Plan Study on the Review of Allotment provision.

Update

Mr Smith, Allotment Officer/Senior Park Ranger gave an update on matters that had been raised at the previous meeting. He informed the Panel that further discussions had taken place with representatives of the Penwortham West allotment site and it had been agreed that the future servicing of their newly purchased mowers would be undertaken by the Council following the initial warranty period. And the Authority would also provide fuel for the machines, it was reported that the Association was very pleased with this.

In relation to dangerous trees on Serpentine 1 allotment site the Panel was told that a letter had been sent to the proprietor of the property with the potential dangerous tree and also to the Bowling Green owners regarding trees on their land. It was also reported a meeting had been arranged to deal with problematic tenants and also a programme had been proposed for the treatment of the Japanese Knotweed in 2015 on the site.

The Panel were informed that advanced talks had taken place with the Probation Service in respect of the use of the Community Payback Scheme (CPS) to assist with allotment work. There were some issues to be dealt with but the aim was to use the scheme to clear plots on various sites and get them to a re-lettable state. A number of plots had been deserted by tenants and had become overgrown and the clearing of these would require a lot of additional resources.

It was proposed that top ten people on the waiting list for each site should be offered a walk through and be given a tour of the sites they are interested in and then they could be given further information on the commitment required so that it would enhance their understanding of allotments.

It was reported that the site representative for the Penwortham East site had stepped down and another one would need to be elected. There had been a number of issues on the site including theft by way of foraging. Theft and damage had also occurred on other sites and it was demoralising for site representatives and the associations. The Panel was told that the toilet facility issue on the Frenchwood site was still under review.

Community Food Growing



The Panel was informed that approximately 5 years ago the Council signed up to a Community Food Growing (CFG) strategy driven by the NHS involving the Wildlife Trust. The strategy had a target of 20 CFG areas to be started within the city and there was a dedicated officer from the Wildlife Trust to manage initiatives and projects. The funding for this post came to an end and as a result a number of these CFG areas were not being used or managed. Those CFG areas on Council land then had to be managed by the Authority. Funding for Groups using the CFG areas was always a problem as once funding ended the Groups either moved on or in most cases folded and these areas were left unused and derelict.

Currently there were CFG areas in various sites across the city including eight beds at Haslam Allotment site and on the Deepdale site. It was reported that these were not used much and there was a high turnover in people taking them on. They took a lot of time administrating and were difficult to manage. It was suggested that the CFG areas on allotment sites should be turned back into allotment plots as there was a higher demand for allotment plots rather than CFG beds. This would also assist in reducing the waiting list.

It was acknowledged that the Waverley Park and Frenchwood CFG areas were highly successful and were good examples of how they should be. The Panel was informed that the Waverley Park CFG area was well managed by a local group, they ran a number of events and was open to all. The problems arise when there is a lack of volunteers to manage these areas. It was reported that there were plans to turn the Ashton Park bowling green into a CFG area, and it was felt that with the appropriate management and set up it could be a success.

It was clarified that only those CFG areas which were underused and difficult to manage, in particular those on allotment sites should be returned to allotment plots. Those sites that are well managed and used should continue as CFG areas such as the one on Waverley Park. However, it was also highlighted that the Authority continues to encourage the use of the CFG areas through various charities, groups and community projects and also through promotion of these sites.

New Sites

Mr Phillips informed the Panel about the new plots on the former James Hall site secured through the planning process. It was suggested that the Authority may wish to take a different approach to letting these plots out. It was an opportunity to

promote allotments and a possible idea was to have a competition or alternatively run a promotional campaign. It was stressed that the plots cannot go to complete novices as these were new plots and there could be a high demand for them. It would help if there was an experienced person renting a plot on the site who could help the others with theirs.

The Panel was asked to consider proposals and recommendations in respect of future allotment sites to be secured from developers. In terms of management of these sites it was important that there were not too many small sites spread across the city which would impact on the Council's resources. It was suggested that it may be better if developers were asked to contribute towards the maintenance of existing sites, which may actually suit them. The Members were informed that the Parks Department provided independent advice to the Planning Department when they are dealing with contributions towards open spaces including allotment provisions.

Officers then responded to Members questions and concerns in respect of the following:-

- Although the Authority did not make any budget savings through the additional support to be provided to the Penwortham West allotment site in relation to the servicing of their mowers, there was a saving through the work that the site Association continued to undertake which would otherwise have to be done by the Council.
- The use of Princes Trust and other such organisations to clear derelict plots was suggested. The Panel was informed that on occasion such groups were more problematic than a solution they caused nuisance for other tenants and this lead to tension.
- CFG areas should continue to be promoted and encouraged as far as possible.
- It was acknowledged that some CFG areas were a success whereas others were not and these needed to be bought back in use by returning them to allotment plots.
- It was stated lack of enthusiasm and dedication contributed to some of the CFG areas being underused and left derelict.
- It was suggested that Section 106 money should be secured to contribute towards bringing back into use unlettable plots on current allotment sites.
- There were concerns raised in relation to the length of time it was taking to sort out the allotment plots on the former James Hall site.
- When allotment sites were secured through the Planning process it was felt that there should be sustainability built into the agreements with the developer.
- It was important to send a message out, in particular to developers that allotments were important to the Council and they should be considered by developers during the planning process.

4. Findings and Conclusions

1. The Authority's allotment budget is £57k which covered ground maintenance, admin, management, skips, improvement and repair.
2. Large plots currently cost £85.00 and a regular size plot costs £37.00 per annum.
3. There were 598 lettable plots under the authority's management.
4. Currently the waiting list was one year.
5. New system in place to manage the waiting list in operation.
6. Average plot size was 250sqm for a large plot and 125sqm for a regular plot.
7. Prestonians were given priority on the waiting list.
8. Allotment provisions are being sought through contributions from development through planning undertakings such as C.I.C.
9. Six plots allocated at former Spar Depot through the planning process.
10. Prospective allotment tenants need educating in what to expect as many find it difficult to commit the required time to their plots.
11. Abandoned plots left in unfit state to re-let which also included rubbish left by tenants who were no longer interested, problems of asbestos, tools and equipment left, and overgrown and unmanageable plots.
12. Some sites had functional associations set up which helped manage the sites better than those without an association.
13. Frenchwood was the only self-managed site in Preston.
14. On all sites difficulties arise when rents are raised.
15. Frenchwood waiting list managed by their own Association.
16. There were difficulties in getting these on top of the waiting lists to attend arranged viewings and the take up through this process was slow.
17. National Association membership was available to all allotment tenants and these were benefits to joining such as insurance cover ect. Allotment Association difficulties, which covered insurance, lack of affiliated tenant members, on-going maintenance of pathways, fuel cost, machinery servicing/repairs and support with risk assessments.
18. The number of plots that remain unlettable due to poor drainage, invasive weeds, asbestos trees.
19. Community Food Growing (CFG) projects, these have had mixed success, funding for an officer at the Wildlife Trust had ended, some gardens could be returned to allotment plots which were in demand and limited support available for CFG schemes.
20. Residents outside the Preston boundary wanting plots on Penwortham East/West allotment sites, matters relating to priority on waiting list, number of requests, subsidised plots and non-responding Preston residents.
21. New plots at the former James Hall site to be added to Preston wide waiting list or it was successful to try a new method to promote the allotments looking at priority for residents living close to the site, sustainability including pollution and also experience hand on the new site.

5. Recommendations to Cabinet

1. All new tenants to attend a compulsory training session before being offered a plot.
2. Introduce probation period in first twelve months with fast track eviction (yellow/red card system).
3. Explore opportunity with partner organisations to assist with the supervised clearing of plots to support new tenants.
4. New tenants to pay a deposit upon signing of tenancy agreement to cover cost of clearing plot. Deposit will be returned if plot is in acceptable condition when the agreement ends.
5. Feasibility study to be carried out to establish the cost of improving unlettable plots. Officers to seek funding opportunities to bring plots back into use.
6. All tenants to become a member of the NSALG as a compulsory part of the tenancy agreement (currently £2.50 per year).
7. Carry out the review of the support needed by each association to ensure continued added value. Officers to provide additional support where resources allow.
8. Residents of South Ribble to be allocated plots on Penwortham sites if they reach the top of the waiting list (with a non-subsidised price to be set by the Executive Member).
9. Residents living close to the new allotment site on the former James Hall site to be given priority on waiting list as a trial.
10. Officers to review CFG projects with partners to ensure that limited Council resources are targeted on sustainable projects.

Corporate Management Team Response

In general CMT welcomes the Work Plan Study on Review of Allotments.

Note - a number of the recommendations are in the process of implementation by the service.

There are a number of specific comments:

Rec 6: All tenants to become a member of the NSALG (National Society of Leisure and Allotment Gardens) as a compulsory part of the tenancy agreement (currently £2.50 per year).

It is understood that the most effective means of implementing this recommendation is to include the cost within the rental payment from the next standard billing period, 1st January 2016 or as soon as practicable for any new leases. This would result in an increase in rents of currently £2.50 pa plus any inflation increase that may be agreed by the Executive Member. The Executive Member would need to agree the resulting change in fees at the appropriate time.

Rec 8: Residents of South Ribble to be allocated plots on Penwortham sites if they reach the top of the waiting list (with a non-subsidised price to be set by the Executive Member).

The suggestion of introducing a charge to new tenants of Penwortham Holme allotments who reside in South Ribble that is not subsidised by this council has been discussed with the council's legal services team who advise that we are able to do this on the basis that the charge would be 'reasonable'. An initial calculation indicates that the non-subsidised rental charge would be in the region of an additional £30 per year.

Rec 9: Residents living close to the new allotment site on the former James Hall site to be given priority on waiting list as a trial.

Given that this is an entirely new site with no existing waiting list. It is proposed to advertise the allotments with letting criteria to be based upon criteria including proximity of the home address of the applicant to the allotment site.

SUGGESTED SCOPING

SCRUTINY REVIEW – Allotment Provision

1.	<u>Scrutiny Chair:</u> Councillor Nick Pomfret	<u>Contact Details</u>
2.	<u>Scrutiny Support Officer:</u> Zuber Bapu	Ex. 6834
3.	<u>Departmental Link Officer:</u> Matt Kelly Head of Parks and Horticulture	Ext. 3623

1. **Which of our Corporate Priorities does this topic address?**
Your Neighbourhood
Your Future
2. **What are the overall aims and objectives in doing this work?**
Review the current provision of the allotment service including;
 - Fees and charges
 - Current level of provision
 - Management of the waiting list
 - Community Food Growing Strategy
 - Innovative ways of increasing provision
 - Managing future demand for allotments
3. **Possible outputs/outcomes to this review are:-**
Review current management and administration of the allotment service

Provide recommendations for managing demand for allotments and how the service can be more cost effective for the Council.
4. **What specific value can Scrutiny add to this work area?**
Member evaluation of current provision and potential ways to cope with future demand.
5. **Duration of the Review?**
4 months (3 meetings)

6. **What category does the review fall into**

Policy Review & Policy Development

7. **What information do we need to undertake the Scrutiny Review**

Briefing notes provided by officers outlining current resources, level of provision, level of demand and surrounding issues.

8. **Who can provide us with relevant evidence?**

What areas do we want them to cover when they give evidence

Preston CC Parks & Horticulture Service

Current issues relating to management, allotment provision and demand.

PCC Planning Officers

Options for future provision and developer contributions

Lancashire Wildlife Trust

Update on the Incredible Edible/Community Food Growing project

NHS Community Food Growing team

Update on the Community Food Growing Strategy

Allotment site secretaries

Issues relating to on-site management of plot holders

9. **What processes can we use to feed into the review (site visits/observations, face to face questioning, telephone surveys, written questionnaires etc?)**

- Face to face interviews
- Site visit and/or presentation
- Surveys of provision and policies of other authorities.

10. **Diversity – How will we address the diversity standards in order to uphold the Council’s Single Equality Scheme?**

Any draft recommendations will have an equalities impact assessment.