

OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE

30 May 2017 2016 at 6.00 p.m.

Present: - Councillors Dingemans (Chairman – except for Minute 26), English (Vice-Chairman – took the Chair for Minute 26) Mrs Bence, Blampied, Edwards, Elkins, Hughes, Mrs Oakley, Oliver-Redgate, Mrs Rapnik, Miss Rhodes, Dr Walsh, Warren and Wheal.

Councillors Bence, Bower, Mrs Brown, Charles, Clayden, Haymes and Wensley were also present for all or part of the meeting.

[Note: The following Councillors were absent from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business: Councillor Miss Rhodes – Minute 21 to Minute 24 (part); Councillor Mrs Rapnik – Minute 21 to 26 (Part); and Councillor Dr Walsh - Minute 29 (Part) to Minute 30].

21. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed Members and Officers to the meeting and members of the public. He especially welcomed new Members on the Committee to their first meeting in this new Municipal Year.

22. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Hitchins and Oliver-Redgate.

23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Monitoring Officer has advised Members of interim arrangements to follow when making declarations of interest. They have been advised that for the reasons explained below, they should make their declarations on the same basis as the former Code of Conduct using the descriptions of Personal and Prejudicial Interests.

Overview Select
Committee – 30.05.17

Reasons

- The Council has adopted the Government’s example for a new local code of conduct, but new policies and procedures relating to the new local code are yet to be considered and adopted.
- Members have not yet been trained on the provisions on the new local code of conduct.
- The definition of Pecuniary Interests is narrower than the definition of Prejudicial Interests, so by declaring a matter as a Prejudicial Interest, that will cover the requirement to declare a Pecuniary Interest in the same matter.

Where a Member declares a “Prejudicial Interest”, this will, in the interests of clarity for the public, be recorded in the minutes as a Prejudicial and Pecuniary Interest.

There were no Declarations of Interest made.

24. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 21 March 2017 were approved by the Committee as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

Minute 513 [Engineering Services Annual Review]

The fifth line down of this paragraph referred to ‘implication’ dates – this needed to be changed to read ‘implementation’ dates.

Minute 516 [Feedback from the Meetings of the West Sussex County Council’s Health and Adult Social Care Committee (HASC) held on 19 January and 8 March 2017]

There were inaccuracies in this Minute in relation to the verbal update provided from the meeting of HASC held on 8 March 2017 in relation to Paragraph 4 stating that the Coastal Commissioning Group (CCG), the Mental Health Trust and the Western Sussex Hospital Trust were also in ‘special measures’.

This needed to be changed to reflect that that it was the Brighton Sussex University Hospital that was in ‘special measures’ not the Western Sussex Hospital Trust.

25. START TIMES

The Committee

RESOLVED

That its start times for meetings during 2017/2018 be 6.00 pm.

26. WALBERTON PARISH COUNCIL PETITION – LOCAL GREEN SPACE, TUPPERS FIELD

The Chairman confirmed that he would stand down from chairing the meeting for this item but would remain in the meeting as this Petition related to an area of land that was in his Ward and as he had been involved in some of the activities surrounding the Petition.

Councillor English then took over as Chairman and Councillor Mrs Bence acted as Vice-Chairman.

Councillor English then introduced this item confirming that Walberton Parish Council had submitted a Petition requesting that Arun District Council designate a site known as Tupperts Field as an area of Local Green Space (LGS).

Councillor Mrs Oakley raised a procedural point outlining her concern that there was no opportunity for the Petition Organiser to speak or be asked questions at this meeting. It was her view that this was wrong and that as a Scrutiny Committee this needed to be looked at and addressed. She therefore proposed the following recommendation to the Constitution Working Party which read:

“The Council’s Petition Scheme be reviewed, in particular the approach to Petitions brought before the Overview Select Committee and the rights of the Petition Organiser to speak and be questioned and that a report be submitted to the Committee in due course”.

Councillor English seconded this recommendation.

A question was raised by Councillor Dr Walsh asking if the meeting could suspend meeting procedure rules to allow the Petition Organiser to speak at this meeting.

Overview Select
Committee – 30.05.17

The Group Head of Council Advice and Monitoring Officer provided some advisory information. She confirmed that the petition scheme being worked to for this meeting had been agreed and adopted by Full Council. As the petition contained fewer than 1500 signatories the procedure was to present this for consideration at an Overview Select Committee meeting and not to Full Council. It was advised that, unlike Full Council, the petition organiser would not be able to make a presentation to the Committee, however, they could submit suggested questions. The procedure for this meeting had been discussed with the Chairman in preparing the report. Councillors were advised that supporting changing the arrangements for this meeting would not allow any other persons who might wish to speak against the Petition taking part and so would be unfair towards anyone else who might hold a different perspective. The Committee therefore agreed to stick to the procedure as set out in the report.

The Chairman then invited the Group Head of Planning to present his report. He reconfirmed that the submitted petition requested the Council to designate a Local Green Space at Tupper's Fields, Walberton. The stated justification for this request had been set out at Paragraph 4.1 of the report.

The Group Head of Planning outlined that subsequent submissions by the petition organiser had stated that they considered the decision statement on the Neighbourhood Plan to be illegitimate and that it should be altered.

Members were advised that it needed to be stated that the decision notice on the Neighbourhood Plan was issued in accordance with the Council's Constitution and, because it has been issued, there was no mechanism for re-visiting that decision. This point also related to the majority of the questions raised by the petition organiser.

Paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) confirmed that LGS designations should only be brought forward as part of a Plan – in Arun that meant the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plans. The process for designating LGS was set out within Policy OSR DM1 of the emerging Local Plan. This clearly stated that LGS designations would be brought forward through Neighbourhood Plans in the District. This policy had been agreed by Full Council in November 2014.

No LGS's were contained within the emerging Local Plan. Every single LGS in the District was a result of a designation within a Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, the point was made that the Committee was not able to agree to a designation at this stage, it could only agree to a designation within a Plan and there were therefore two options should Members agree to the petition. These were to:

1. Ask Full Council to agree to include such a designation in the Local Plan. As Members were aware, the Plan was at a very advanced stage and currently in mid-examination. A significant amount of resources had been directed at getting the Local Plan to this stage and it had only been agreed by a Special Meeting of the Council on 22 March 2017. Including a designation on this site would mean that progress on the Plan would have to be delayed because new evidence would have to be gathered to try to support a designation, this would need to be consulted upon before it would be examined. There would be significant risks and costs associated with this course of action.
2. The petition organiser had suggested that the Council ‘indicate its support’ for an LGS within a new Neighbourhood Plan. Although the Committee was able to do this, it was outlined that there would be a certain sense of irony in the request in that it would be doing precisely the thing that Walberton Parish Councillors had accused Arun of doing over recent years which was pre-determining a process that had yet to be completed. A new Neighbourhood Plan would need to be prepared on new evidence and following consultation and to support an LGS at this stage would be premature and would mean that any evidence gathering and consultation would be meaningless.

As already stated, the decision notice issued by Arun on the Neighbourhood Plan could not be revisited. The decision notice was issued in September 2016. In October 2016, new regulations came into force that allowed Neighbourhood Plan Groups to ask the Secretary of State to intervene in instances where the recommendations of the examiner were not accepted. The Parish Council accepted the decision notice in November 2016 and chose not ask the Secretary of State to intervene. Having accepted the decision notice and not sought to challenge it, it was not now possible and would be deemed unreasonable to now re-consider it as, as Members were being asked to do.

The Group Head of Planning confirmed that Arun had been consistent with its advice and views on the merits of the LGS designation and had considered the strict tests contained within the NPPF at Paragraph 3.5 of the report. The tests all had to be met and it was not sufficient to seek an LGS designation to simply protect it from development. It was for these reasons that the decision notice did not accept the proposed designations – to do so would have resulted in an unacceptable level of risk to the Council as a result of inevitable legal challenges that were very unlikely to succeed.

Overview Select
Committee – 30.05.17

In summary, Members were informed that Officer advice was that designation of an LGS within a Plan was not appropriate at this stage as it did not follow the established process within the District; it would result in further delays, costs and risk to the Local Plan or it would be premature and pre-determine a future Neighbourhood Plan.

The Chairman then invited debate on the Petition. This started with Officers being asked on what basis had they refused to go on the advice provided by the Independent Examiner who had declared that this should be a green space. Why had the Council gone against his recommendations?

The Group Head of Planning responded stating that it had been set out in the correspondence sent to the Neighbourhood Plan Group that Tuppens Field had not met the requirements in place to be designated an area of LGS. It had not met the three tests set out at Paragraph 3.5 of the report and could not be proved to be demonstrably special to the local community or an extensive tract of land. The Council had looked at all of the characteristics of the land and legal advice provided and had taken its decision in accordance with the Council’s Constitution at the time.

In reviewing the response provided, Councillor Wheal confirmed that he could not accept this advice and he outlined that he was concerned that the Council was going against legal opinion. The Group Head of Planning informed Members that the Council was not being asked to look at this decision again as it had been taken 8 months ago, the Parish Council had been advised of this fact. What needed to be mentioned was that the rules had changed which had allowed the Parish Council, if they wished, to go to the Secretary of State to challenge the decision. They had decided to not take this action.

Councillor Dingemans then spoke against the recommendations contained within the report and he referred Members back to October 2015, when the Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessments (HELAA), stated that Tuppens Field was not suitable for development. The Neighbourhood Plan Inspector had stated in his report that Arun had recommended that four sites proposed in the neighbourhood plan for local green space did not meet the criteria in place. The Independent Examiner had not agreed and had stated that Tuppens Field was valued by the community; was close to the heart of the village and would be a buffer between development and the golf course. As such, the area should be an area of green space and had met 3 tests laid down in the NPPF. Councillor Dingemans, having thoroughly reported on the process that had taken place in respect of the proposals for a Local Green Space at Tupper Field, then proposed an amendment which was

to put forward two recommendations replacing recommendations (1) and (2) in the report to read as follows:

- (1) The Council to accept the principles of the recommendation of the Independent Inspector, Mr Edward Cousins, to designate Tuppens Field, Walberton as a Local Green Space; and
- (2) Tuppens Field, Walberton no longer be considered suitable for development and to be considered for potential as a Local Green Space when Walberton’s Neighbourhood Plan is reviewed.

Councillor Wheal seconded this amendment.

The Chairman then invited debate on this amendment. This saw general support for it because some Members felt that the words of the Independent Examiner had been ignored or misrepresented. Members confirmed that they felt satisfied with the Examiner’s view that 2 out of the 3 tests needed had been demonstrated supporting designation. Members asked if the amendments could move forward without delaying the Local Plan. It was the view of some Members that this was a time when Councillors should put their common sense cap on rather than sticking to regulations. Comments were made that the questions put forward by the Petition Organiser had not been adequately answered by Officers in the report and had not responded to the wishes of the public.

Having heard from other Councillors who were in support of Councillor Dingeman’s amendment, Officers were asked what extra costs and delays to the Local Plan would be involved if the Committee chose to agree to the amendments and what the implications might be. If the amendment was accepted, would it predetermine the planning process? Questions were also asked if this might set a precedent and that other Parish Councils might follow suit.

Some Members of the Committee stated that they could not avoid the feeling that Officers were dissuading Members to support the Petition as they had a desperate desire to put the Local Plan through as soon as possible. Although Members sympathised with Officers, they felt that as Councillors they had to consider the views of residents, which were overwhelming in the village, and given the recommendations of the Inspector, the amendments from Councillor Dingemans were imminently sensible, and should be accepted provided that they did not affect the Local Plan overall.

Overview Select
Committee – 30.05.17

The point was made by one Councillor that developers were being contacted by the Council over development on land. This caused concern and Officers were asked to respond to this and why Walberton Parish Council had chosen not to approach the Secretary of State and why a number of other Parish Councils had tried and had been unsuccessful to adopt areas of Local Green Space within their Neighbourhood Plans.

The Director of Place outlined that there was no evidence of Officers doing any wrong doing and that if there was then this would be a matter for the Council’s Monitoring Officer to deal with. In relation to the definition of an extensive tract of land, it was explained that guidance was not specific and so it was very difficult to draw conclusions overall based on such varying views and so each case was treated on its own merit.

In terms of what the implications would be for the Council’s Local Plan, if the Committee chose to accept the amendments, the Director of Place outlined that as a Council, the role of the Local Plan Sub-Committee was to determine matters in relation to planning policy and so Members might wish this matter or any recommendations to be considered by this Sub-Committee instead of recommendations being forwarded directly to Full Council. In terms of inviting developers to submit planning applications, he reminded Members of the resolutions made by the Local Plan Sub-Committee and then Full Council which was for the Council to address its 5 year land supply by inviting planning applications for the areas outlined in the plan as allocations and sites outlined as deliverable in various planning policy documents. This did not mean that if a planning application was submitted in the future, that it would be automatically approved or refused as each application had to be looked at and considered on its own merit. This was the role and function of the Development Control Committee who would form a view if an application should be supported or not. In terms of other areas, and the point made that this could prompt other Parish Councils to submit petitions, ultimately whatever Members decided, this would set the benchmark for what other areas might wish to do.

In terms of the implications for the Council’s Local Plan, looking at Recommendation (1), Members would be agreeing to a set of principles therefore should any planning application be received and was not subject to tests/material consideration, it would appear very low down on the scale in terms of their resolution – this was not the same as going through process of allocating it as local green space. With Recommendation (2) the only document where there was any reference to Tuppens Field was the HELAA document – exploring what might be deliverable in terms of sites and could only be determined through submission of a planning application which the Development Control Committee would have to consider, if received. In terms

of Walberton’s Neighbourhood Plan Review, a timeframe of around 18 months to 2 years was estimated as the quickest time period that this could be done.

In fully considering the revised recommendations, the Committee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL – That

(1) The Council accepts the principles of the recommendation of the Independent Inspector, Mr Edward Cousins, to designate Tuppens Field, Walberton as a Local Green Space;

(2) Tuppens Field, Walberton no longer be considered suitable for development and to be considered for potential as a Local Green Space when Walberton’s Neighbourhood Plan is reviewed; and

(3) the Council’s Petition Scheme be reviewed, in particular the approach to Petitions brought before the Overview Select Committee and the rights of the Petition Organiser to speak and be questioned and that a report be submitted to the Committee in due course

27. LEISURE OPERATING CONTRACT – YEAR ONE REPORT

The Group Head of Community Wellbeing introduced representatives from Freedom Leisure to the meeting. These were:

Carrie Reynolds – Community Development Manager
Andrew Smith – Area Manager
Matt Hunt - Operations Director
Ivan Horsfall Turner – Managing Director

The Committee was advised that this report provided an overview of the first year of the leisure operating contract for 2016/17. Representatives from Freedom Leisure were then invited to present their Annual Performance Review. This had been circulated to the meeting.

The Area Manager reported on:

Overview Select
Committee – 30.05.17

- the background to the Contract in that it had commenced on 1 April 2016 for a 10 year period covering the Arun Leisure Centre; Littlehampton Swimming & Sports Centre; Bersted Park Community Centre; and the Windmill Entertainment Centre
- How the Contract delivered a Community Development Programme
- The headline successes achieved over the first year, covering membership growth; revised staffing structures; and significant investment into existing facilities
- New programmes and activities including free swimming for over 75's; swim only memberships; free swimming for serving military personnel; free use for looked after children; and how work had progressed with the Arun Wellbeing and Think Family team to deliver fitness and nutritional courses. Updates were also provided on the junior summer fitness challenge; an increased range of activity classes; the Les Mills Fitness Classes; ASA Swimming Lessons Programmes; active Sussex Workplace Challenge; sportivate and school sports premium programmes; and the increased number of cardiac rehabilitation classes at Bersted Park.
- Updates were provided on investments on new gym equipment at the Arun Leisure Centre; the investment to improve the café and reception and fitness changing areas at the Arun Leisure Centre; general building improvements at the Windmill entrance; how the Council had invested in works to the pool tiling and pool surround; and investment into energy conservation projects.
- Finally, Members were informed about a range of other schemes that would benefit residents of the District, as well as the involvement of Freedom Leisure in the design team for the new leisure centre that would be opening in 2019.
- Looking ahead, Members were reassured that Freedom Leisure would continue to improve the financial performance of all the facilities that they managed; would develop new initiatives and programmes to increase participation from all segments of the community; would increase community presence and would continue to work with local partners to provide targeted outreach programmes.

Members then asked a range of questions on the presentation that they had just received. These have been summarised below:

- Praise was given for keeping the Windmill Theatre going, though a comment was made that cinema ticket prices were quite high. Freedom Leisure was asked if they could look, in the future, at reducing ticket prices.
- Why had no investment been made in bowling greens. It was explained that bowling greens formed part of the Greenspace Contract now. It was outlined that Freedom Leisure was working with the Bowls Alliance to enhance the provision of this sport to residents.
- The enhancements made to the Arun Leisure Centre were applauded in terms of the gym improvements; changing areas; and the healthy food menu in the cafe.
- The Committee stated that it was full of praise in terms of how the Contract had been managed over the past year. Many improvements could be seen. Freedom Leisure was asked if it could consider offering free swimming to veterans as well as serving military personnel. Looking at the investments made in energy conservation in relation to the new Littlehampton Leisure Centre, was there an option to retro fit photovoltaic cells or heat pumps as these were in the original specification but had then been removed on cost grounds. It was confirmed that photovoltaic cells could be retrofitted and that combined heat and power plant would be a provision when tenders were submitted. Heat pumps were not part of energy plan for the building and would be difficult to retrofit. In respect of solar glare and solar gain, a consultant had been engaged by the architect to review the design of the glass façade of the pool hall and it was not intended to cover the glass with film to block natural light and views.
- Could a swimming lane be made available for serious swimmers over the lunchtime periods on Saturdays and Sundays as such lanes had been replaced by children’s inflatable toys. It was confirmed that liaison would take place with the Manager of the Centre to ensure that at least one swimming lane would be made available to serious swimmers on the days and times discussed.
- Members were pleased to hear about Freedom Leisure’s involvement with schools and were asked if they could do more work with secondary schools to encourage outdoor activities for students. It was explained that the Contract with Freedom Leisure did not cover setting school’s curriculums. As such, they had no control over stipulating that physical education had to overrun the importance of students achieving grades in the three core subjects.

Overview Select
Committee – 30.05.17

- The work being undertaken on the prevention of falls for elderly residents was applauded and had Freedom considered consulting with Parish Councils who could promote the scheme to their residents. It was confirmed that Parish newsletters and Arun Times were used to advertise a variety of initiatives to assist those in need in the District.
- The Arun Active Community Framework document, supplied with the report, was applauded and seen as an excellent document promoting health activity in the District. Freedom Leisure was asked if they had seen any increase in price structuring over the past year. It was confirmed that prices had increased on 1 April 2017 by 3% but that prices were set sensitively to meet the needs of the target groups that they worked with. For example, if anyone was in receipt of free school meals then they would qualify for a discounted rate. Freedom stated that it was addressing different levels of memberships as this and the issues of pricing was something they wanted to get right. They needed to balance proper sensible commercial pricing and were focusing resources on delivering priorities.
- Questions were asked about the full-life offer and the focus for older people especially as loneliness was a real problem for the elderly in the District. The schemes in place and being progressed were explained.
- With the Dual Use Officer Group, why did membership not include a Councillor? It was explained that the Dual Use Agreement, drawn up a long time ago, had been revised in September 2016 to streamline meetings to make the delivery model more appropriate to the current operating structure of the Arun Leisure Centre.
- On the Officer report, how well had the outcomes and measures for 2016-17 gone? Freedom Leisure had stated this in the 2016/17 statistics which would establish a baseline for future comparison. Any that were incomplete were not run or available in 2016/17 and were new for 2017/18.
- A further question was asked about non-councillor membership of the Dual Use Officer Group as it was felt that the appropriate Cabinet Member should attend such meetings. It was explained that as regular briefing meetings took place with that Cabinet Member this was not seen as a necessary requirement.

Having thanked representatives and Officers for attending the meeting and for the useful updates provided,

The Committee then

RESOLVED – That

- (1) the report be noted; and
- (2) the progress in setting up the Dual Use Officer Group at the Arun Leisure Centre be noted.

28. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS AND UPDATES

Councillor Warren asked the following questions:

To the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, in relation to the Daisyfields camp site, was the Council looking to do something else to this site and what if any approaches had the Council had on this site?

Councillor Mrs Brown responded and stated that as part of an ongoing review of its assets, the Council would be reviewing options for the future use of the site to ensure it got sensible returns from its assets. A report would be presented to Cabinet in due course for a decision on its future and this would include market testing data which had been sought.

To the Cabinet Member for Technical Services, Councillor Haymes, on the 12 month litter and dog fouling contract – could the Committee please receive updates?

Councillor Haymes responded stating that the Council had undertaken an update on the litter/dog fouling enforcement pilot to the Environment & Leisure Working Group and would be reporting back to this meeting’s December meeting.

Councillor Mrs Rapnik asked if a review of enforcement for car parking could be undertaken as she felt that some of the rules were extremely elastic and she wanted to know more about the rules in place for parking on pavements near schools. She also had concern that there was a severe lack of enforcement staff.

Councillor Haymes outlined that he would respond to this question in writing. Following further discussion, it was agreed that this was a matter more appropriately to be dealt with by the Joint Arun Eastern Committee’s Highways and Transport Group.

Overview Select
Committee – 30.05.17

Councillor English asked if the Committee could have a report reviewing the Council's assets. The Group Head of Council Advice and Monitoring Officer alerted Members to the Committee's Work Programme, a separate item for this meeting, and stated that Councillor English' request for a review on Concessions had been responded to with the Committee considering this in March 2018. As he had not requested this review to look beyond this, this latest request would need to be raised with the appropriate Officer to consider if there was adequate Officer resource to accommodate this.

Councillor Dingemans asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Mrs Brown, and a question regarding the Local Plan and what was happening to Mid Sussex District Council and did this Council have a contingency plan if the same thing were to happen at Arun – this was if the Council was asked to consider increased housing numbers?

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Charles, responded to this question. He stated that, no, there was not a contingency plan in place. The Director Place explained that the Council had had to put forward 13 sites and that these were all detailed in the Local Plan. The Council did not have any sites that it did not have evidence for not currently in the local plan and so if the Inspector asked the Council to consider more, then it would be necessary for it to replay out the last 18 months or so of evidence gathering. The Director of Place stated that he did not believe that this would happen as the Council had met its required need and had made a contribution under the Duty to Co-operate scheme.

Councillor Dingemans stated that in the Council's Local Plan it talked about the Arundel by pass and he asked did this mean that nothing would be developed at Ford until it had been announced what was happening with Arundel bypass.

The Director of Place confirmed that the Ford allocation had not been dedicated on the basis that the Arundel by-pass would come first. So, if this did not happen first, this did not mean that development would not occur.

The Cabinet Member for Residential, Councillor Bence, updated the Committee on housing matters. He stated that in terms of the 33 houses proposed, the Council would be receiving the keys for the first 5 on 26 June and then for the remainder at the end of August. At Glenlogie, the 2 houses would be completed at the end of August 2017. At Wick, all of the issues in relation to highways which had caused delay had now been rectified and work had commenced. To add to this good news, the Council's Fraud Officer had brought back 15 houses through various investigations. Through the Council's Right to Buy scheme, a further 10 properties would be available for use by the

end of this month. Finally, Councillor Bence encouraged Members to attend meetings of Cabinet over the next few months as it would be looking at the HRA Business Plan which was close to completion and would announce more exciting news for the Council.

The Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing, Councillor Clayden, updated the Committee on the collapsed sewer pipe at the Littlehampton Swimming and Sports Centre. He announced that Southern Water Services had affected a localised repair to the large diameter sewer in the access road which had enabled a return to normal in regard to sewage flows and the removal of over-pumping and the use of tankers to deal with flows. There remained, however, a doubt over the integrity of the adjacent pipework which would require Southern Water to undertake further investigations and potential repairs. The Council continued to liaise closely with Southern Water to ensure that combined works in the area caused minimal disruption to the new centre enabling works.

29. FEEDBACK FROM THE MEETING OF THE SUSSEX POLICE AND CRIME PANEL HELD ON 7 APRIL 2017

The Committee received and noted the feedback report circulated at the meeting following the meeting of the Sussex Police and Crime Panel held on 7 April 2017.

30. WORK PROGRAMME 2017/2018

The Group Head of Council Advice and Monitoring Officer reminded Members that at the last meeting of the Committee, a draft version of the Committee’s Work Programme had been circulated for discussion and to allow further work to take place to finalise it for tonight’s meeting. She reminded Members that the Council’s Constitution required it to report annually on its future work programme to Full Council.

Earlier in the meeting, the Committee had agreed that it would like to receive a report back on a review of the Council’s Petitions scheme and so she would consult with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman in terms of when this could be accommodated. Members were advised that they would receive reports on Data Protection at its next meeting on 25 July 2017 and so the Special Meeting of the Committee on 22 June 2017 had now been cancelled.

Overview Select
Committee – 30.05.17

In discussing the work programme, a review of how Section 106 monies were spent was requested. The Head of Council Advice and Monitoring Officer stated that the Committee Manager would liaise with the Director of Place to determine when would be an appropriate time for this to be placed within the work programme.

The need to not lose sight of joint scrutiny between the Audit & Governance and this Committee was raised as there were times when joint scrutiny on some subjects was important.

The Committee then

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL – That

- (1) the Overview Select Committee's work programme for 2017/18 be approved; and
- (2) the Chairman and Vice-Chairman continue to monitor any changes needed to the work programme and report these to the Committee as required.

(The meeting concluded at 8.27 pm)