



Minutes of the meeting of the **Overview & Scrutiny Committee** held Virtually on Tuesday 30 June 2020 at 9.30 am

**Members Present:** Mr A Moss (Chairman), Mr K Hughes (Vice-Chairman), Mrs C Apel, Mrs T Bangert, Mr G Barrett, Mr A Dignum, Mrs N Graves, Mr D Palmer, Mr C Page, Mr H Potter and Mrs S Sharp

**Members not present:** None

**Officers present:** Ms P Bushby (Divisional Manager for Communities), Mrs V McKay (Divisional Manager for Growth), Mrs T Murphy (Divisional Manager for Place), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place) and Mr J Mildred (Divisional Manager for Corporate Services)

1 **Chairman's Announcements**

2 **Minutes**

**RESOLVED**

That the minutes for the meeting held on 21 January 2020 be approved as a correct record.

3 **Urgent Items**

There were no public questions.

4 **Declarations of Interests**

Mrs Apel declared personal interest as a trustee of Stonepillow.

5 **Public Question Time**

Public Questions were asked and answered as follows:

*(a) Mr G Hibberd asked the following question:*

I put the following question to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding the Covid Recovery Plan meeting on 30th June:

I note that Chichester District council is preparing a Covid-19 recovery plan as outlined in your agenda today. I am extremely worried that the plan has no mention of a Green recovery, no mention of preventing further pandemics and a reversion back to business-as-usual.

Just this week the Climate Change Committee released a report showing that our government is failing on its own embarrassingly unambitious targets of reaching net zero by 2050 and is ignoring the issue of carbon equity whereby we actually need to reach net zero by 2030. They have said that government needs to start preparing for a world where we reach 4 degrees of global heating, which will lead to millions if not billions of human lives lost and irreversible ecological collapse.

I realise that this is the District Council and not the national government, but this recovery plan is equally as embarrassing and utterly out-of-touch as our national plan. We cannot leave everything to national government whilst ignoring our own duties and obligations as a district council to encourage businesses and people to take drastic action to avert the biggest disaster human kind will ever know.

There is no mention of renewable energy, there is no mention of reducing pollution, reducing cars on our roads, reducing air travel, improving renewably powered public transport and walking and cycling routes. There is no mention of a transition to a wholly plant-based, localised and organic agriculture and food system. There is no mention of large-scale retrofitting of boilers and insulation in houses. There is no mention of the ecological crisis and our need to not only reduce biodiversity loss, but actively reverse it.

There is no mention of massively reducing our production and consumption of meat, dairy and eggs to reduce future risks of pandemics. Both the Centre for Disease Control and WHO have warned that our out-of-control consumption of animal products is providing the perfect petri dish for novel zoonotic diseases like Covid-19. We have seen it before with swine flu (from pigs), bird flu (from chickens), mad cow (from cows), MERS, SARS, AIDS and now Covid-19. If we don't actively transition away from animal agriculture, Covid-19 will not be our last pandemic.

There is no hero coming to save us. We need change right now and it needs to start not just at national level, but at personal, family, neighbourhood, town and district level. I urge this District Council to act now.

*Response:*

The District Council is fully aware that “we can use this opportunity to support and move forward the Green Agenda”, as the main report puts it (para 4.7). The Recovery Plan is a short-term, highly focussed plan to avoid and mitigate serious economic impacts that would themselves hinder or delay much needed actions to address the climate emergency. It does not attempt to repeat or list out the many actions already planned by the authority and contained in several existing Action Plans. However those plans are specifically identified as continued priorities: The Local Plan Review, the full Climate Change Action Plan, the Revised Air Quality Action Plan, the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, and the Green Staff Travel Plan. Those pressing issues listed in the question that fall within the remit of the Council are mentioned frequently and addressed directly in these plans.

Mr Hibbard responded to the Chairman's response.

The Chairman advised that Mr Hibbard would have the opportunity of listening to the debate when the Committee discussed the Covid 19 Recovery Plan and Future Services Framework and hopefully be more heartened at the end of it about the concern others have regarding the economy.

*(b) Ms J Towers asked the following questions:*

1. In the summary of proposed actions to support recovery for the Housing and Construction industry there are many which advantage developers quite significantly, such as fast track applications and a change in the collection of CIL monies. Given that there are many developers, hovering in the wings, waiting for July 15<sup>th</sup> before they submit planning applications how can we be sure that this will not be at the expense of local infrastructure, environment and excess development The Interim Policy Statement has not been tested in law and will be rigorously challenged by developers. For those areas, like Chidham and Hambrook, who still do not know the allocation of housing this could be devastating.

Will CDC expedite the distribution of housing so areas like Chidham and Hambrook can proceed with site selection and reduce the risk of having to take excess housing?

Have Chichester joined with other Sussex Councils call to Government to suspend housing land supply requirement and the suspension of the five year land supply to avoid a surge of speculative applications?

2. As you state 'Leisure providers play an important role in ensuring the mental and physical wellbeing and social connectedness of local communities. Engagement in leisure activities also contributes strongly to mental wellbeing, by allowing people to be active and to connect with others'.

Venues and public buildings have been out of use since the beginning of the pandemic and unlikely to open any time soon. Fitness providers have struggled to keep their businesses going. One way has been to use public spaces and parks. Yet rather than support this enterprise as with other businesses you are charging punitive license fees. Will you reverse this decision so that those contributing to the physical well being and healthy lifestyles of residents can continue?

*Response*

1. The Council is seeking to bring forward a decision on the likely distribution of housing at the earliest opportunity to enable parish councils with proposed strategic allocations to finalise their draft neighbourhood plans. Significant additional work is being undertaken to address issues raised in the previous local plan consultation and parish councils will be kept informed.

Chichester has, with other Sussex Councils written to Government to ask for help to re-establish housing supply in an orderly and sustainable way, including

changes to the 5 year land supply arrangements to acknowledge the lost supply during lockdown and to avoid a surge of speculative applications.

Any changes to the timetable for developers to provide CIL funding and S106 obligations will likely reflect the pace at which the development industry is progressing. It is therefore unlikely that development would proceed ahead of vital infrastructure requirements.

2. The District Council has always provided licenses for commercial activities to operate in our parks to ensure the safety of local people and visitors who use these spaces. Through the licensing process, we can check the qualifications, insurance and risk assessments of the businesses.

Since the lockdown we had been approached by a number of new businesses wishing to use our parks and therefore we added the application process on our website to make it easier for the information to be found.

The licences are offered on a monthly basis, which means that businesses have more flexibility and are not tied to paying for a long licence, as we believe many will return to alternative venues once the lockdown allows.

Leisure providers do play an important role in ensuring the mental and physical wellbeing and social connectedness of local communities. Engagement in leisure activities also contributes strongly to mental wellbeing, by allowing people to be active and to connect with others. We are therefore working closely with leisure providers during this period to assist this where possible.

We actively encourage the use of our parks for people to keep fit and healthy, and to relax and enjoy. It's really important that everyone can access outdoor areas, particularly at the moment, and the licensing process means that everyone has safe access to the parks while fitness classes and training sessions are taking place.

Mrs Towers responded to the Chairman's response.

The Chairman requested that the Planning Team provide Mrs Towers with updates as soon as they were able to in relation to a decision on the likely distribution of housing.

*(c) Cllr Polly Gaskin asked the following question:*

Why there is no mention of 'sustainable and environmentally responsible' building/development in CDC's position paper 'Planning, health and environmental protection' (Appendix X) under Planning.

Why there is an emphasis on 'how the council can streamline and support the application process so as not to present a barrier to development' and 'inviting developers to intensify and speed up development ... suitable for more intensive development ... to introduce fast-track planning services ...'

CDC have declared a climate emergency and employed a climate emergency officer to draw up a strategy to ensure that Chichester District is 'climate neutral' by 2030.

Building and development over the next ten years are integral to meeting this stated policy, the ideals of CDC set out under 'Planning' fly in the face of this policy. Why?

*Response*

Protecting the environment during the Recovery Plan period is key priority for the District Council and is stated as such in paragraph 6.3 of the main report. Within the specific action plan on pages 65-68 of the agenda pack, Actions 2, 3, 4 and 6 are there to ensure we do all we can as a Council to make the application processes efficient and effective, but none of those actions require or imply a lessening of policy requirements or sustainability standards. The timely adoption of the Interim Guidance Statement on Housing Delivery (action 1) is an important response in directing development towards sustainable locations and it maintains and strengthens policy requirements for “sustainable and environmentally responsible” development. In the medium term the review of the local plan (actions 5 and 16) will be the mechanism for delivering step change in sustainability standards. This was the case before the Covid-19 pandemic and is reflected in the timescales and the detailed actions within the Council’s Climate Change Action Plan, which itself remains a priority for the Council (action 17).

Cllr Polly Gaskin responded to the Chairman’s response.

*(d) Mr R Evans asked the following question:*

In relation to Agenda Item 7 (COVID-19 Recovery Plan) and to Agenda Item 11 (Review of CSP report)

There have been repeated incidents of serious anti-social behaviour (drunkenness, drug-taking, noise, litter, vandalism, urinating on private property, theft) on Quay Meadow, Bosham since the relaxation of the lockdown. Together with a total disregard for social distancing. The police have been called repeatedly.

Through our elected representatives we have suggested to CDC the creation of a Public Space Protection Order for Quay Meadow but for the moment that proposal has not been taken forward

We understand that there have been similar problems in many other recreational areas in the Chichester area. And we are aware that, as Bournemouth and Brighton demonstrate, it is a problem experienced nationally.

The anti-social behaviour is making life increasingly intolerable in Bosham. Local families and younger children are discouraged from using the Meadow – which is a key open space. We understand that residents in a number other communities in the Chichester area are having a similar experience.

How does CDC plan to work with other services (particularly the police and National Trust) to support Bosham and the other local communities affected by anti-social behaviour? And how quickly?

From: Fiona Macfarlane, Douglas MacGregor and Richard Evans  
On behalf of adversely affected Bosham residents

*Response:*

The Council is very aware of the issues of Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) particularly around a number of coastal areas in the district including Bosham Quay. A co-ordinated approach is already being taken with Sussex Police, ourselves and other partners including the National Trust. Regular patrols by Sussex Police, Community wardens (where they exist) Litter Enforcement and Parking Enforcement are being undertaken and targeted on days when the weather is forecast to be good as we know these days are more likely to result in more visitors to the areas.

In relation to Bosham Quay meadow in addition to regular Police patrols we have also liaised with National Trust staff to mitigate some of the issues around littering. We were made aware local people were clearing the area early in the morning and it is hoped the measures being proposed around large wheelie bins and more frequent collections will reduce the problem. We have in consultation with Sussex Police considered the application of a Public Spaces Protection Order. Before any PSPO can be applied for it must meet a number of tests around the behaviour being continuing in nature, unacceptable and be detrimental to the local community. As this area rarely came up as a concern before lockdown it might be prudent to continue the current response and monitor any changes in behaviour as lockdown eases further. Any improvement in behaviour may make it difficult to prove the problem is persistent or will be continuing in nature. A PSPO is not a quick fix and the consultation period would be at least 6 weeks and there are legal costs involved and agencies would need to consider who was best placed to enforce as it would be relatively ineffective without consistent enforcement.

Mr Evans responded to the Chairman's reply. He asked for an urgent meeting to be set up with Sussex Police, the District Council, the National Trust and representatives from the local community.

Mrs Bushby advised that since the response to the public question had been prepared, Sussex Police had advised that they were looking to set up a local action team to include all the representatives requested by Mr Evans. To look at the communities proposals, the powers available and the joint responsibilities the agencies had.

**6 Co-option - Verbal report**

Mr Bennett introduced this verbal report concerning the adoption of Mr Johnson to the Committee.

**RECOMMENDED**

That Council co-opt Cllr Tim Johnson to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in a non-voting capacity for the remainder of the 2020/21 Committee Cycle.

## 7 Covid-19 Recovery Plan and Future Services Framework

Mrs Shepherd introduced this item and outlined the report. The future impact of Covid 19 was uncertain, but there were likely to be long term implications for businesses, the community and for the Council. The report focused on both the Council's immediate need for recovery, as set out in the four recovery plans and the longer term recovery in the form of a Future Services Framework template, which would determine the types and levels of services to be provided from 2022-23. The Corporate Governance and Audit Committee would consider the financial impact, later in the week, and recommend to Cabinet and Council what it considered was a prudent financial position for the Council to take. How quickly the Council eliminated its budget deficit and the additional amount of resources to be allocated to the recovery process was a decision for members.

Mr Ward addressed the Committee regarding the financial impact of Covid 19 on the Council's income streams and the proposed use of reserves. The proposals were reasonable and balanced, and protected frontline services as far as possible until the full impact on the Council's finances was known. Doing nothing to address the situation was not an option, as it would only run down the Council's finances

Mrs Lintill, Leader of the Council, was invited to address the Committee. She fully supported the proposals put forward by Mrs Shepherd and Mr Ward.

Mrs Bangert read out the comments of a resident in her Ward.

Mr Hughes read out the comments of four residents, and business owners at St James Industrial Estate in his Ward.

Mr Brown observing the meeting was invited to address the Committee. He raised concerns regarding the relaxation of development control and member oversight of the planning process.

Members of the Committee went through the thematic work streams in turn and during the course of a wide-ranging discussion made a number of comments and officers provided further information as follows:

### *Community & Housing Recovery*

- The Council was looking at the potential to adjust its affordable housing requirement. It was part of the Local Plan review process and the degree to which it could happen needed to be informed by the evidence, which would inform an appropriate outcome for members to determine where priorities lay. Affordable housing within the Council's control would be looked at as part of the Affordable Housing Task and Finish Group's role.
- The Council was working closely with Stonepillow to create pathways for rough sleepers, which as could be seen from the action plan, was a priority. Following the publication of the report, the Government had announced additional funding to extend stays for rough sleepers. Further details were awaited.
- Concern was expressed that there was not enough mention about the need to ensure there was external consultation about the process, particularly with community groups.

- Mrs O'Kelly, observing the meeting, was invited to address the Committee concerning the overall approach. The green agenda should be joined up and included throughout the Recovery Action Plan as an overarching theme and provided examples.

### *Economic Recovery*

- Miss Barrie, observing the meeting, addressed the Committee and advised that the Economy Recovery Plan should be bold and focused on rebuilding the local economy, enhancing community equality and create a sustainable future based on equality and opportunity.
- Officers responded to concerns that the Recovery Plan did not have a thread through it to encourage the young, and engage the College and University. A recovery group had been set up with key partners, including Chichester College, University of Chichester, and this Council to look at a recovery plan for the wider area. The University had invested in a major science facility at its Bognor Regis campus with future schemes in place for the Chichester campus. Work was taking place with the Local Enterprise Partnership and Coastal West Sussex Sub-Group concerning skills and innovation.
- Broadband provision was a key priority both in the Chichester City and the rural areas.
- It had previously been made clear to members that environmental issues were a "golden thread" running through all Council policies and plans and were at the forefront of officers' minds.
- Mr Hughes agreed not to table his amendment concerning infrastructure projects on the understanding that this matter would be taken as a high level decision and today's discussion was not going into the details of them now.

### *Planning, Health and Environmental Protection Recovery*

- Mr Evans, observing the meeting, addressed the Committee concerning mental health provision.

### *Organisational Recovery*

- The impact of staff working at home was being proactively managed.

### *Future Services Framework*

- Commercialisation of the Council was a key objective in the Council's Corporate Plan and a principle that ran through the Future Services Framework.

### *Governance*

- Mrs Lintill was invited to address the Committee. The informal Recovery Teams were not task and finish groups and most actions were operational. They would enable a wider involvement of members to act as advisors to assist Cabinet members. No decisions had been made on the final membership. She assured the Committee that the recovery teams would ask the more detailed questions, such as the future use of East Pallant House etc. Advisors role would be expected to ask the views of the wider council membership so as to be as inclusive as possible. Membership would have a geographical balance. Mrs Lintill was thanked for her inclusive approach.

Mr Johnson, observing the meeting, made a proposal which the Chairman agreed to table on his behalf, concerning the headings 'Working from Home and ICT' and 'Use of East Pallant House' on pages 69 and 70. However, Mrs Shepherd informed Mr Johnson that this proposal was too detailed at this stage. The recommendation in the report included looking at the Council's office accommodation, which would take into consideration impacts on staff, members and the community. Members were assured that the office accommodation options appraisal and terms of reference



would be brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration. No vote was taken.

Mr Ward confirmed it was the Council's intention to include the green agenda as part of the procurement criteria. With regard to the actions in the report, Mrs Shepherd stated that a number of the actions were officer delegated powers. However, policy decisions were ultimately made by members through the appropriate committee route.

Mrs Shepherd stated that the Council had a close working relationship with the employee unions and reference to the implications for staff were included in the report at page 21. Following an email sent to the Committee from Unison Chichester Branch, Mr Mildred advised that the Union was currently being updated on an informal frequent basis. Formal consultation was taking place with the Joint Employee Consultative Panel, to ensure staff were consulted and able to make recommendations at every stage of the recovery process.

Mrs Shepherd confirmed that a number of the suggestions put forward by members were too specific at this stage and many of which were already being dealt with. She assured members that they would have the opportunity to influence those areas of concern, which would be picked up in the Recovery Action plans.

Mrs Sharp proposed an amendment to paragraph 3.1 (a) of the recommendation: that the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee note the serious impact Covid 19 has had on our communities, residents' health, well-being and livelihoods and on the Council's finances. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee believe that the Covid 19 Recovery plan should be green, clean and focused on tackling the climate emergency. The best way to do this is by listening to and consulting with residents and businesses. On being put to a vote this motion was not carried.

Mr Dignum proposed an amendment to paragraph 3.1 (b) of the recommendation: that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

- 1) Supports the development of the Covid 19 Recovery Action Plans for the four thematic areas as set out in appendices 1-4;
- 2) Supports the policy options as set out in paragraph 6.4;
- 3) Endorses the future services framework as set out in appendix 5;
- 4) Endorses the governance arrangements as set out in appendix 6. On being put to a vote this motion was carried.

Mr Dignum proposed an amendment to paragraph 3.1(c) of the recommendation: that the progress on the recovery Action Plans and Future Services Framework be reported to the Committee every 3 months instead of every 6 months. On being put to a vote this motion was carried.

Mr Hughes proposed additional text to the Community and Housing section: that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has agreed the terms of reference for the Local Housing Delivery Task and Finish Group. The group in question is looking into the viability of the council setting up an arms-length housing company. Given the likelihood of an increased need for affordable housing in the district, this group must be adequately resourced and prioritised. On being put to a vote this motion was not carried.

## **RESOLVED**

- 1) That the serious impact Covid 19 has had on the Council's finances be noted and taken into account when considering this report; and
- 2) That progress on the Recovery Action Plans and Future Services Framework be reported to the Committee every 3 months.

## **RECOMMENDED TO CABINET**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

- 1) Supports the development of the Covid 19 Recovery Action Plans for the four thematic areas as set out in appendices 1-4;
- 2) Supports the policy options as set out in paragraph 6.4;
- 3) Endorses the future services framework as set out in appendix 5; and
- 4) Endorses the governance arrangements as set out in appendix 6.

The Committee adjourned for a lunchbreak from 12.30pm until 1.00pm.

## **8 Vision Review and The High Street Recovery and Transformation**

Mrs Hotchkiss outlined the report. Mrs Murphy and Mrs McKay were also in attendance.

Mr Bell, Cabinet member for Growth, Place and Regeneration was invited to address the Committee in support of the proposal. He advised that he was in agreement to the inclusion of a representative from the Chichester Traders Market to sit on the Chichester High Street Group, as suggested by Mrs Sharp during the discussion of the previous item.

The Committee discussed the visions for Chichester, Midhurst, Petworth, Selsey and East Wittering and Bracklesham in turn and officers responded to members' questions and comments:

- With regard to student involvement they not specifically referenced but the College and University were represented on the Chichester Vision Steering Group. Mrs Hotchkiss advised that there was no student representation on the High Street Recovery Group, but this was something that could be considered if required.
- The Chairman referred to a paper received from Midhurst Vision concerning 'Lets shape our future' previously circulated to members and read out an email he had received since.
- Mrs O'Kelly, observing the meeting was invited to address the Committee. She provided her comments on the report and an update on the Midhurst Vision. Mrs Hotchkiss agreed to let each Vision have details of the names of the partners against their feedback.
- Mr Johnson observing the meeting was invited to address the Committee. He wished to propose an amendment to recommendation 2.4, which the Chairman agreed to table on Mr Johnson's behalf as follows:
  - 1) That support for the High Street recovery and transformation in Midhurst and Petworth is coordinated through the existing Vision Groups/Town/Parish Councils; and

- 2) The support for the Peninsula will be coordinated by a group with similar Officer support to Chichester, but lead by a Member without Cabinet or similar responsibilities who can be perceived as having a singular focus. The resident population is nearly the same, but is greatly swollen by tourism. The A27 issues mean that it would be preferable if the four significant shopping areas (East Wittering, Bracklesham, High Street, Selsey & East Beach, Selsey) were used, providing they can collectively provide the vibrancy, appeal and diversity to encourage this.

However, during discussion of the proposal members agreed that the parishes affected should be consulted to seek their views on the proposal before a decision was taken and their response brought back to the Committee at a later stage.

On behalf of the Committee, Mr Potter commended officers on the work undertaken.

Later in the meeting it was confirmed that Mr Palmer would be the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's representative on the Chichester High Street Group.

## **RECOMMENDED TO CABINET**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends:

- 1) That the Vision work continues to be supported as set out in section 5.1;
- 2) That the Cabinet Member for Property, Growth and Regeneration leads the High Street Group for the City as a sub group of the Chichester Vision, engaging and involving partners, the Chichester BID and high street retailers as set out in section 5.1 to support the recovery and transformation of the High Streets;
- 3) That Cllr Palmer sits on the Chichester High Street Group to assist in the delivery of the High Street recovery and transformation; and
- 4) That support for the High Street recovery and transformation in Midhurst, Petworth, Selsey and East wittering and Bracklesham is coordinated through the existing Vision Groups/ Town/Parish Councils.

## **9 Asset Transfer Policy**

Mrs McKay introduced this item.

Mrs McKay responded to a question concerning how the Council determined the use of land holdings in a commercial fashion. Work on an asset realisation project to provide a detailed analysis of the Council's current land ownership was currently on hold, but would be resumed once officers had been released from Covid 19 work. The work included analysis of current usage, potential use and whether there were any special opportunities attached.

Mrs Purnell, observing the meeting, was invited to address the Committee. With regard to land that was not commercially viable, she informed the Committee of the "Tiny Forests" carbon capture scheme.

## **RESOLVED**

That the information on the Council's disposals policy and the supporting legislation be noted.

**10 Review of Planning Operations and setting up a Task and Finish Group - Verbal report**

Mr Dignum introduced this item, identified by members at their meeting in March 2020 as an area the Committee would like to look at.

He advised that before Covid 19 concern was expressed that the planning management function had too much focus on development control; the rigour in which planning contraventions were enforced; and the amount of time it took to complete the compulsory purchase of the Tangmere Strategic Development site. He was pleased to see that a move to development facilitation had been taken on board by Mr Frost and the Development Management Team. He suggested that the matter be kept under review and if members were happy with the change of focus towards facilitating development, as part of the Covid 19 recovery plan that would be a good outcome.

Mr Frost concurred that the suggestions put forward were reasonable. There were a number of measures in the Covid 19 recovery plan that he and Mr Whitty, Development Management Divisional Manager planned to assess and improve on the effectiveness and efficiency of the way each Team in Development Management worked. He agreed to report back to the Committee at its September 2020 meeting.

**RESOLVED**

That the verbal report be noted and a further report be brought back to the Committee for consideration at its meeting on 15 September 2020.

**11 Community Safety Review Task and Finish Group - Final report**

Mr Sutton, Chairman of the Community Safety Task and Finish Group (TFG) presented the report. The TFG was satisfied that the required level of scrutiny had been achieved. The TFG would like to invite Police Crime Commissioner, Katy Bourne, to attend a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. He informed the Committee that the Council was fortunate to have Mrs Bushby as the lead officer for community safety, who was highly regarded by all involved in the Community Safety TFG and by Sussex Police.

The committee made the following comments and received answers to questions, including the following:

- The Chairman thanked the Communities Team for all the additional work they were undertaking to assist the community during the Covid 19 pandemic.
- With regard to the visible presence of the police community support officers (PCSOs), they were no longer allocated to a specific patrol area. Details were given of planned multi agency community action days in the Witterings. The Council would work with the PCSOs, the local Police Sargent, Foreshores, Car Parking Services and Litter to ensure.

- The Chairman said that it was up to members to be proactive and liaise with the PCSOs to show them the problem areas. He encouraged members to provide feedback to Mrs Bushby advising where the challenges in their wards were.

The Committee thanked Mrs Bushby for her work. The Committee also thanked Mr Sutton for his report and wished him all the best in his new role as Cabinet member for Housing, Communications, Licensing and Events.

## **RESOLVED**

- 1) That the required level of scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) has been achieved; and
- 2) That the performance of the CSP is good and that evidence of effective partnership working in the District had been demonstrated.

### **12 Affordable Housing Task and Finish Group Update - Verbal report**

Mrs Rudziak introduced this verbal report. Unfortunately it had not been possible to progress the Affordable Housing Task and Finish Group, to look at the viability of setting up a local housing company to deliver affordable housing, as the lead officer, Mr Weston, had been redeployed during the Covid 19 pandemic. However, during this time information was circulated about how the Council dealt with affordable housing in the District and some research information to the TFG. With regard to the financial and legal advice required, this would be undertaken by Mrs Belenger and Mr Bennett respectively, and Mrs Belenger would be the lead officer for the TFG moving forward.

Mr Hughes, Chairman of the Task and Finish Group, considered that it would be useful for the TFG to still have access to Mr Western for his housing knowledge. To assist the TFG external advice would be needed from other council's that had also set up a local housing company. Mrs Graves would fill the current vacancy on the TFG. He would contact the officers involved to arrange a meeting of the TFG. A follow up on progress would be reported to the next Committee meeting.

The verbal update was noted.

### **13 Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2019-20 Annual Report and 2020-21 Work programme**

The Chairman introduced the report.

## **RESOLVED**

- 1) That the Committee's 2018-2019 Annual Report be agreed.
- 2) That the Committee's 2019-2020 Work Programme be agreed.

## **RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's 2018-2019 Annual Report be noted.

14 **Forward Plan**

The Committee considered the Forward Plan for the period 1 July 2020 to 31 October 2020.

It was noted that due to the Covid 19 pandemic the Business Routing Panel would have a second meeting during November 2020.

With regard to the Community Safety Partnership members agreed that the Task and Finish Group would in future meet as an exception, rather than as a standing item, only if the Council had any issues.

15 **Late Items**

There were no urgent items.

16 **Closing Remarks**

The Committee thanked the Chairman for the way he had handled today's meeting.

The Chairman thanked the members for their curtesy and attention, as well as the officers for all the work they had done in the current difficult circumstances.

The meeting ended at 2.20 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date: