

# **KENNET DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD** **to be held on Tuesday, 6<sup>th</sup> December 2005**

### **REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES**

#### **PROPOSED SCHEME OF WORK FOR TOURISM REVIEW**

##### **1. Introduction**

The purpose of this report is to map out a process for the review of the tourism service by a working party appointed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

##### **2. Financial, Legal and Manpower Implications**

There are no financial, legal or staffing implications arising from the report.

##### **3. Availability of Resources**

The first part of the review should concentrate on establishing a clear understanding of the resources used in providing the service, staffing, buildings, publicity material and so on. This would focus initially on the situation in Kennet, but would also give weight to benchmarking information from other authorities in order to place Kennet in a context that allows judgments to be made about the scale and cost of resources employed in the service.

##### **4. Effective Use of Resources**

The second part of the review would examine how available resources are deployed, in terms of marketing content and distribution, focus, location and so on, again in comparison with other local authorities. This part of the review will allow judgments to be made on whether the sort of thing we do makes best use of the available resources.

##### **5. Partnership, Duplication and Integration – External**

This part of the review would focus on how Kennet's tourism activity fits into the wider tourism marketing world. This will allow judgements to be made concerning such issues as; whether there is any duplication of effort that could be avoided; whether there is greater scope for partnership working; the

degree to which Kennet's efforts are integrated with the efforts of others; or indeed, whether any of these issues are particularly relevant to the marketing of Kennet as a tourism destination.

## **6. Qualitative Assessments**

The review should tackle the, admittedly difficult and somewhat subjective, assessment of the quality of the tourism offer that the Council provides. This part of the review will necessitate the gathering of material provided by other local authorities against which comparative judgements can be made.

## **7. Analysis of Kennet as a Tourist Destination**

The review could usefully tackle the issue of what there is within Kennet that is most likely to attract visitors, and with that in mind, to judge whether the marketing offer from Kennet and other tourism providers reflects those judgements on what will or should attract people to the area.

## **8. The Role of the Tourism Industry**

This part of the review would consist of a critical review of what the industry itself is doing to attract visitors to the Kennet area, especially to those attractions identified at (7) above as being critical to the development of the industry. This should allow judgements to be made on how well the industry is complimenting the work done by Kennet, and whether this aspect of tourism needs further attention and development. This part of the review would not just be concerned with marketing efforts, but also with wider issues such as visitor facilities provided.

## **9. Outputs and Outcomes**

The review needs to come to a view on what performance indicators need to be developed that will allow informed judgements to be made on how well the Council is doing in terms of increasing tourism activity in Kennet. This would go beyond the simple measurement of outputs such as number of visitors to the web site or TICs, and embrace such issues as bed-space occupancy rates for tourism purposes.

## **10. The Review Team**

A member team needs to be allocated to the review at the meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Management Board on 6<sup>th</sup> December. My preference would be for a five person member team to try ensure a good spread of views, localities and interests. The member team would be supported by an officer

team including the Director of Resources, the Tourism Development Manager and a member of the Policy Team.

## **11. Timetable**

The amount of work involved in the sort of review proposed above is significant, and the timetable for delivery of the review needs to reflect that, but it is suggested that the target should be to complete the review by the end of December 2006.

## **5. Conclusions and Recommendations**

The sort of review proposed in this paper would seek to answer the questions:

- are we using the appropriate level of resources, in the right way that integrates with and does not duplicate the work of others?
- is the quality of the service good, and does it focus effort on the main things that should be attractive to visitors?
- does the tourism industry complement the work of Kennet and vice versa?
- how well are we doing in terms of attracting visitors to the area?

It is therefore **RECOMMENDED THAT a working party be set up to review the tourism service in the way outlined in this report.**

Director of Resources