

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday, 9 November 2022 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

Committee Members Present: Mr N Dixon (Chairman) Mr S Penfold (Vice-Chairman)

Ms L Withington Mr H Blathwayt
Mr P Heinrich Dr V Holliday
Mr N Housden Mrs E Spagnola
Mr C Cushing Mr P Fisher

Members also attending: Mr T Adams (Observer) Mr A Brown (Observer)

Mrs A Fitch-Tillett (Observer) Mrs W Fredericks (Observer)
Mr N Lloyd (Observer) Mr J Rest (Observer)

Officers in Attendance: Democratic Services and Governance Officer - Scrutiny (DSGOS), Chief Executive (CE), Group Accountant (GA), Director for Place & Climate Change (DFPCC), Coastal Manager (CMN), Director for Communities (DFC), Environmental Services Manager (ESM) and Head of Coastal Management (HCPE)

Also in attendance: Serco Contracts Manager (SCM)

70 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr S Bütikofer and Cllr A Varley.

71 SUBSTITUTES

Cllr J Toye.

72 PUBLIC QUESTIONS & STATEMENTS

None received.

73 MINUTES

Minutes of the meetings held on 28th September and 12th October 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

74 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None received.

75 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

76 PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None received.

77 CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY A MEMBER

None received.

78 RESPONSES OF THE COUNCIL OR THE CABINET TO THE COMMITTEE'S REPORTS OR RECOMMENDATIONS

The DSGOS informed Members that he was in the process of arranging a meeting with the Leader and Cllr V Holliday to discuss the potential inclusion of further contextual information within performance reports.

79 WASTE CONTRACT: SERCO BRIEFING - TARGET OPERATING MODEL & GAP ANALYSIS UPDATE

The DFC introduced the report and informed Members that Serco were now several collection cycles into the new operating model and whilst performance had begun to improve, frustration remained around the rate of improvement. He added that repeated issues seen at Ward level needed to be bottomed-out to resolve ongoing issues for residents. The SCM reported that Serco was in week nine of the twelve week changeover period, with North Norfolk's changeover being the largest of the tripartite agreement. He added that collection crews had previously operated on an east or west basis, but this had changed to a near and far model, so most crews had new areas to learn, leading to some missed collections in new areas. It was noted that crew members had been mixed to ensure a base level of knowledge across the District, whilst six additional vehicles had been brought-in on a temporary basis to catch-up missed collections with agency crews. The SCM noted that it had been difficult to recruit drivers, which had impacted collections, though a full support crew was now in place with staff working overtime to ensure that bins were collected.

Questions and Discussion

- i. The Chairman sought an explanation for missed collections from Serco, to be followed by comment from NNDC officers. The SCM replied that the primary issue was the scale of the change, with over ninety percent of collection days changing, which had caused some residents to put their bins out on incorrect days. He added that drivers had also had to learn new routes as a result of the near and far model, and it could take several weeks for drivers to fully adapt, but maps had been shared with drivers to address problem areas. The DFC agreed that changes to collections had been significant, and it was accepted that there would be a settling-in period. He added that whilst the change would allow Serco to be more efficient, it did come with a degree of unfamiliarity for the drivers and crews. It was noted that there had also been national issues such as driver shortages, which had affected all sectors dependent on HGV drivers that Serco could not fully mitigate. The DFC noted that changeover plans were also based on the premise that everything would go as planned, but this could not account for unforeseen circumstances such as vehicle breakdowns, accidents or significant crew sickness, which would all have an impact on collections. He added that these issues had begun to be addressed with additional agency drivers and temporary vehicles, but there was more to be done.
- ii. The Chairman asked with the benefit of hindsight, what might have been done differently in the lead-up to the transition. The DFC replied that Serco

had undertaken a significant preparatory work and whilst the vast majority of residents had their bins collected successfully, all efforts were being made to ensure the service ran effectively as soon as possible. He added that it should be noted that some issues were not Serco specific, and that they were working within the constraints of a local government contract, that would not permit highly competitive salary offers for drivers. The SCM noted that driver salaries had risen by over thirty percent since taking on the contract, and this had been a significant challenge for Serco.

- iii. Cllr S Penfold asked why crews had been swapped from East to West if they were familiar with existing areas. The SCM replied that this was a result of the near and far model, with second trips local to the waste tip to improve efficiency. Cllr S Penfold noted that graphs showing pre and post go live missed collections used a different scale and suggested that these should be the same. He added that additional agency staff, vehicles and collection crew had been brought in for the twelve week transition period, and asked if there was scope to extend this if issues persisted. The SCM replied that he had discussed the potential to extend this period, and additional staff would stay on if required with Serco expected to cover any additional costs.
- iv. Cllr W Fredericks raised the possibility of industrial action and asked whether this was a concern. The DFC replied that most sectors had been going through pay negotiations as a result of the current economic climate, and industrial relations were a matter for Serco to address rather than the Council.
- v. Cllr E Spagnola noted that she had spoken to crews who had suggested that staff morale, retainment and mental health was an issue, and asked what support was offered to maintain staff wellbeing. The DFC replied that the question related to Serco labour relations, and whilst any major change would cause a degree of unsettlement amongst staff, it remained a matter for Serco to consider. The SCM stated that local teams were very supportive of staff and took time to speak to crews every day, with mental health taken seriously throughout the company and support services in place, where required.
- vi. Cllr N Housden asked whether Serco had a strategy in place to recruit and retain drivers through the Christmas period, as it was likely that many would be tempted away by increased supermarket pay offers. He sought clarification of whether managers were familiar with new collection routes, as drivers had suggested that they did not assist collections. It was suggested that putting managers and senior staff on collections would be beneficial for understanding the difficulties collections crews faced. The SCM replied that he had been in post for four weeks, but had previously worked on a different contract where he had regularly gone out with crews to assist with collections. He added that all managers were encouraged to do this and would be again in the future, with managers using additional vehicles to collect missed bins and better understand the difficulties faced by collection crews. On Christmas cover, it was suggested that magnetic advertisements for drivers should be placed on vehicles to promote recruitment. The SCM replied that Serco were constantly recruiting for drivers and he would consider whether this form of advertisement could be implemented. The DFC added that he expected less drivers would be inclined to leave this year, as supermarket and haulage contracts were short term over the Christmas period, or required working unsociable hours.

- vii. Cllr V Holliday thanked collection crews for their work, then referred to repeat missed collections and asked whether this was represented in the data, and whether the additional carbon emissions generated by collecting missed bins had been considered. The SCM replied that he could retrieve data on repeat missed collections and the time taken to resolve, and noted that the carbon footprint of collections was tracked and had been higher during the changeover period, but the overall expectation was that it would see a reduction.
- viii. Cllr P Heinrich suggested that overall crews appeared to be doing a good job, and asked how many missed collections could be attributed to Serco issues, as opposed to residents putting their bins out on incorrect days. The SCM replied that it would be difficult to separate information on the root causes of missed collections, as exceptions were raised where bins had not been placed out for collection, but these were still counted as missed bins. Cllr P Heinrich asked whether changes to Christmas collections had been advertised, to which the ESM replied that Christmas collection dates had been included in recent leaflets delivered by Serco, though a further reminder of Christmas collections and general collection information had been considered. He added that with regard to missed collections, Serco had been more flexible with exceptions as a result of the changeover, which made it difficult to differentiate between missed collections caused by Serco or residents. Cllr P Heinrich noted that collection rates in the past week had fallen to 93% which was not satisfactory, and asked for clarification of the target completion rate, and how this would be achieved. The SCM replied that the target completion rate was 100%, and noted that the 93% figure included garden waste, whereas residual and recycling waste collections rates were better. He added that in terms of improving completion rates, additional resources were being used on the same day to seek to bring completion rates up to 100% within two weeks. The DFC reminded Members that the NNDC website did have an option to check your collection day. He added that Members should also note that the successful garden waste collection service had not been subject to any changes, though it was likely that this would be considered in the new year.
- ix. Cllr J Toye suggested that the number of missed collections should be placed in context of the total number collected, and asked whether completion rate percentages related solely to the number of bins collected on a given day, or whether the figure included previously missed collections. He added that customer service responses had been raised at a previous meeting and asked whether these issues had been resolved. The DFC replied that he hoped that as the number of missed collections reduced, the level of detail reported would become less relevant. He added that with regards to missed collections, these were categorised as bins not collected on the correct day, however from a residents perspective, many of these were collected the following day, which did not present a significant issue. The ESM noted that there were approximately 70k bin collections per week, with 55k households and 12k trade waste collections. With regard to call centre responses, the DFC replied that a reduction in the number of calls received suggested that improvements were being made, and complaint handling officers had met with Serco and work was planned to improve this process.
- x. Cllr L Withington sought clarification on whether missed collections data

included every bin not collected on the correct day, to which the SCM replied that the final graph in the supplied data provided information on bins not collected on the correct day, whilst missed collections data included all reported missed collections. He added that he had included both sets of data to compare between the two, with the caveat that some bins not collected on the correct day may have been reported by residents on the same day, in which case it would appear in both data sets. Cllr L Withington noted that she had been in regular contact with officers regarding repeat missed collections, and asked whether there would be a review of rounds if particular locations were difficult to reach. The DFC replied that primarily, Serco should be allowed time for the TOM to settle into normal operating procedure, and if issues persisted, then routes could be reviewed to make adjustments. He added that round optimisation software did not account for difference in street furniture or minor layout differences, and as a result some small adjustments could be expected to simplify collection routes.

- xi. Cllr P Fisher stated that he represented Wells which had a high number of assisted collections, where it appeared that bins were not being returned to the correct location. He added that this had caused issues between residents and collection crews and asked if the matter could be rectified. The SCM replied that he would look in to the issue, and noted that for business rated properties such as holiday homes, assisted collections were not available as there was a pull and return scheme in place, and similarly assisted collections were not offered for vacant domestic rated second homes. He encouraged any issues to be reported to Serco so that they could be rectified as soon as possible.
- xii. Cllr H Blathwayt referred to a neighbouring authority's Binfluencer app, which could give real-time updates on bin collections and asked whether this had been considered for North Norfolk. The ESM replied that he had been contacted by the app developer, and had heard evidence of it being active in at least one Norfolk District, though it did not appear to offer any additional information than was already available on the Council's mobile optimised website. He added that there were potential benefits with phone reminders being available through the app, but there were no immediate plans for introduction in North Norfolk.
- xiii. Cllr S Penfold noted that residents often contacted him with issues, likely as they had not been able to get the required information elsewhere, and asked officers if they could be mindful of providing the same level of service and information to residents as Members.
- xiv. The Chairman referred to outstanding questions and asked whether officers were happy with the remedial actions being taken to address issues, and whether they were they satisfied with evidence that these measures were working. The DFC replied that whilst he was satisfied with the remedial actions being taken, these actions and issues were influenced by matters beyond the Council's control. He added that it was clear that Serco were working very hard to resolve issues, and in terms of the overall trend, service delivery was improving, though at a slower pace than desired. It was noted that there would be a seasonal impact on collections, with weather conditions having an impact on garden waste. The Chairman asked when collections performance could be expected to return to normal levels, to which the DFC replied that it was expected within the next two to four weeks.

- xv. The Chairman referred to the gap analysis and asked what progress had been made on meeting the contractual requirements. The DFC replied that the number of outstanding issues had been substantially reduced, with the first page of information showing agreed items pending implementation in green, whilst yellow items were subject to further discussion to ensure delivery. It was noted that the second page of items were outstanding items yet to be agreed, which in some cases may no longer be appropriate for delivery. The DFC stated that overall there had been reasonable progress analysis and work would continue to achieve full compliance with the contract by the end of 2023.
- xvi. Cllr N Housden asked whether Serco felt they were having to compromise with the terms of the waste contract, to which the SCM replied that he did not feel compromised, but the contract was agreed under different circumstances pre-Covid and pre-Brexit, which made some aspects more difficult to deliver. He added that as a result, Serco were in constant communication with the consortium to agree steps or concessions to move forward with delivery of the contract. The DFC noted that some circumstances could not be foreseen during development of the contract, and some compromise had to be expected to reach consensus between the Council and Serco to deliver outcomes.
- xvii. Cllr A Brown referred to in-cab systems and their ability to help support collection crews, and asked whether these were in all vehicles, and whether it supported all collections including residual, recycling and garden waste. The SCM replied that the software was used in all vehicles, though mobile phone reception was a challenge to ensure the system remained up to date throughout collections. He added that the system was used to report missed collections, and efforts were being made to improve the system to a point that it could direct collection crews to avoid missed collections. The DFC referred to an audio beep listed within the contractual requirements intended to alert crews to incoming messages, and noted that this remained outstanding.
- xviii. Cllr N Lloyd – Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services stated that he met regularly with Serco and despite concerns there had been a significant effort to resolve issues related to the changeover. He added that whilst 200 missed collections of 70k remained an unacceptable number, it was a very low percentage and the vast majority of residents had their waste collected without issue. It was noted that he was not yet satisfied with the level of service being provided, but he was satisfied with efforts to address issues and return to the pre-changeover level of service.
- xix. It was suggested that an update in the new year would be required, to which the DFC noted that the Christmas period would skew data as a result of changes to collection days. It was suggested that waiting until February would allow more time for adequate data to be prepared after the Christmas period.

RESOLVED

1. To note the briefing.

ACTIONS

1. To request that the next waste update be added to the Work Programme for February 2023.

80 COASTAL PARTNERSHIP EAST - UPDATE REPORT

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett – Portfolio Holder for Coast introduced the report and informed Members that Coastal Management was a primary outward facing service of the Council, with the coast being a key economic driver that presented some of the most significant risks to the District.

Questions and Discussion

- i. The HCPE gave a presentation on the strategic aims of CPE and noted that significant work had taken place to address climate change, coastal erosion and flooding in the past five years, with many areas at high risk from rising sea levels and other climate change impacts. She added that responding to this would involve adaptation, alternative approaches to coastal management and further innovation that CPE were focused on delivering. It was noted that the skills and resources of CPE were shared across East Suffolk, Great Yarmouth and North Norfolk District Councils, with a joint business plan to address the Council's responsibilities and a wider aim to develop a climate resilient coast. The HCPE outlined the governance structure of CPE with two Councillors from each Council, alongside an operational officer group, and a wider team structure covering engineering, funding, resilience and special projects, amongst others. She added that CPE were also worked with several other groups including the National Coastal Group Network, the East Anglian Flood and Coastal Committee, and the LGA's Coastal Special Interest Group to share knowledge and learn from others across the Country. It was noted that officers would also attended Select Committee meetings in Westminster to ensure that coastal adaptation remained a priority on the national political agenda. The HCPE reported that CPE had a £200m funding programme to cover the next ten years, with £500k per year spent on maintaining existing defences. She added that as significant erosion continued, emergency works and temporary defence barriers would remain a key part of CPE's work, with an aim to transition from reactive to planned work to protect the coast.
- ii. Cllr H Blathwayt referred to the most vulnerable part of the coast between Cart Gap and Winterton that was managed by the Environment Agency (EA), and asked whether officers were satisfied that their work, communication and funding to defend this area was satisfactory. The CMN replied that as a risk management authority, NNDC had responsibility for erosion areas that extended to Cart Gap, with flanking flood risk areas covered by the EA. He added that EA were a highly capable body for coastal management, and the area referred to was part of the Broadland Futures Initiative, which meant that it was subject to regular monitoring under Hold the Line Policy, and was in good hands with the EA.
- iii. Cllr J Toye noted that many organisations were involved in coastal management and asked if this was too complex, and whether this delayed matters such as minor repairs. The HCPE replied that there had to be a lead authority, and whilst an alternative such as a national authority could be considered, the local level of understanding was not available at a national level, and as a result local bodies remained best placed to tackle the issues.

She added that collaboration with multiple bodies did make the process more complicated, but it was necessary to ensure that all bases were covered when undertaking projects to achieve the best outcomes. It was noted that partnership funding had created more opportunities for all bodies, but projects had to be aligned with funding timescales that was sometimes difficult to achieve. The CMN referred to repairs and maintenance and noted that this work was locally funded, and CPE had a good track record of ensuring that issues were repaired quickly.

- iv. Cllr C Cushing asked whether all areas of the coast could be realistically defended, or whether managed decline was more realistic. The CMN replied that following the events of 1953, there had been plans to surround the North Norfolk coast in a ring of concrete, however it was fortunate that this had not been built as all schemes had to be environmentally acceptable, technically viable and economically feasible. He added that such a project would have had a significant impact on the natural environment, with a loss of natural sediment from cliffs, which would have starved and lowered beaches, requiring more defences. It was suggested that coastal defence was a balancing act, and CPE made considerable efforts to ensure that defended and undefended areas were treated equitably.
- v. Cllr V Holliday suggested that whilst EA were highly capable, their communication could be improved and asked whether it was possible for CPE to help with this. The HCPE replied that through the Resilient Coast funding, CPE had gained additional resource with one role linked to the Broadland Futures Initiative that would improve understanding and influence of EA projects, which would enable more detailed updates to be provided to Members going forward.
- vi. Cllr S Penfold referred to non-human populations and asked for an explanation of CPE's relationship with wildlife bodies. The HCPE replied that at a strategic level CPE worked together with wildlife bodies on shoreline management plans and policies, and also maintained contact on upcoming projects to ensure that their views and priorities were taken into account. She added that the local nature recovery plans were being discussed to ensure that biodiversity and natural capital were taken into account. It was noted that coastal erosion had a significant impact on biodiversity, and CPE were careful to understand the value of this so that contributions could be sought to ensure its preservation.
- vii. Cllr A Brown noted that PPBHWP would soon consider the Coastal Adaptation planning document, which would feed into and support the work of CPE.
- viii. It was suggested that future annual updates should be considered following the May elections.

RESOLVED

1. To receive and note the update.

81 PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS 2021-22

Cllr T Adams – Council Leader introduced the report and informed Members that it would ordinarily form part of the outturn report, in-line with CIPFA best practice.

Questions and Discussion

- i. The recommendation was proposed by Cllr P Fisher and seconded by Cllr H Blathwayt.

RESOLVED

- 1. To recommend to Full Council that the out-turn position in respect of the 2021-22 Prudential Indicators are approved**

82 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2022/23 - PERIOD 6

Cllr T Adams – Council Leader introduced the report and informed Members that there were noticeable differences from the previous budget monitoring report, with the impact of inflation clearly having an effect on the Council's finances. He added that Members should note the impact of the staff pay award and energy price inflation, in addition to leisure centre, property and plant running costs. It was noted that despite these increases, the Council was in a better financial position than many, but work was needed to reduce cost pressures, with further inflation expected. Cllr T Adams stated that the Council remained committed to existing services, and whilst other authorities had reduced services, it was fortunate that the new more efficient Reef facility cost substantially less to run than its predecessor.

Questions and Discussion

- i. The Chairman asked if the forecasted overspend was identified as a key risk on the corporate risk register, to which the CE replied that the Council's financial position was identified within the register and would be considered by GRAC in December. He added that he would consider whether the risk needed to be increased, with more focus placed on mitigation measures such as a review of vacant posts.
- ii. Cllr J Toye referred to borrowing interest and noted that whilst a strong investment position continued to outweigh borrowing costs, he asked how long this could be sustained. The GA replied that this had been forecast to March 2023, but beyond that time investments and borrowing would be reconsidered as part of the budget setting process.
- iii. Cllr V Holliday referred to mitigation measures and noted that reviewing service plans had not be prioritised, which she expected would be important to address the forecasted overspend. The CE replied that the Pandemic response had been prioritised over other actions, and whilst the Council was now operating in a different context, this would be considered as part of the upcoming budget setting process.
- iv. Cllr C Cushing reiterated that with the financial position deteriorating from a moderate surplus to an overspend, he was concerned that actions were not being taken to address efficiencies that would help balance the budget in the year ahead. Cllr T Adams replied that he did not feel that the Council was inefficient, but with a new S151 Officer being appointed, balancing the budget would be an absolute priority. He added that Government had to be asked what actions they would take to help alleviate the additional pressures caused by inflation.

- v. It was confirmed, following a question from Cllr N Housden that the staff pay award accounted for approximately £500k of staff inflation, and despite a two percent increase being expected, the agreed pay offer was just over five percent across the local government sector.
- vi. The Chairman suggested that given the concerns raised, it may be prudent to amend the third recommendation to suggest that the forecasted overspend be added to the corporate risk register to be considered by GRAC at its December meeting.
- vii. The recommendations were proposed by Cllr N Dixon and seconded by Cllr N Housden.

RESOLVED

- 1. To note the contents of the report and the current budget monitoring position.**
- 2. To recommend to Council that any outturn deficit is funded from a contribution from the use of the General Reserve.**
- 3. To recommend that the in-year forecast overspend be reflected in the Corporate Risk Register, that its RAG rating be reviewed by GRAC at its December 22 meeting, and that regular updates be provided to Members on the measures being taken to mitigate and reduce the current forecast deficit to achieve a balanced budget outturn for FY22/23.**

83 NORTH NORFOLK CORPORATE PLAN - REVIEW OF DELIVERY FEBRUARY 2020 - OCTOBER 2022 & AGREEMENT OF PRIORITY OBJECTIVES FOR THE PERIOD TO MAY 2023

Cllr T Adams – Council Leader introduced the report and informed Members that he was very proud of the work achieved by officers across the Council, following a significant reprioritisation in response to the Pandemic. Despite this, he added that the Council had still achieved a number of priorities set-out within the Corporate Plan, and this report would outline which actions would be given priority in the lead up to the 2023 local elections.

Questions and Discussion

- i. Cllr J Toye referred to red RAG status items within the report such as the Growth Sites Delivery Strategy, and asked whether this would still be delivered. He added that a proposal to develop a procedure and guidance note for registered social landlords was also outstanding, and asked if this would be progressed. Cllr T Adams replied that the Economic Growth Strategy was expected to come forward for consideration in December, but he would need to seek clarification on the other action.
- ii. Cllr C Cushing stated that he was concerned that developing an economic strategy so late in the Council term would not be effective, and noted that the delay was difficult to justify. He added that KPIs for boosting business sustainability and growth did not appear within the Corporate Plan and asked why this was the case. Cllr T Adams replied that the Council had been granted an award for its efforts supporting businesses throughout the pandemic and noted that a more detailed response regarding the KPIs could

be supplied in writing.

- iii. The Chairman noted that it was unfortunate that this far into the Council term there was still not an Economic Growth Strategy in place to support the formation of the Local Plan and wider economy. He added that this was not a criticism of the reprioritisation, as this had been a necessary step during the Pandemic to provide vital support to businesses. It was suggested that it would have been prudent to enhance resources so that a strategy could have been brought forward at an earlier stage. The CE replied that whilst it would be appropriate for the Portfolio Holder to provide a written response on the preparation of an Economic Growth Strategy, discussions had taken place as to whether the Strategy would come to the Committee for pre-scrutiny in December, though this was yet to be confirmed. He added that the DFPC had stated that the Economic Growth Strategy was not critical as an evidence-base for development of the Local Plan, as this would be based on separate evidence prepared by the BE Group on land supply for existing and future business growth. The CE suggested that economic growth in the District's predominantly tourism-based economy relied on business support rather than land use, and the strategy was therefore not considered a prerequisite to the development and finalisation of the Local Plan.
- iv. Cllr J Toye noted that he had recently discussed support for rural businesses with the local MP, and whilst the Economic Development Team were small, they were very proactive in supporting businesses, but he was unsure whether they would have the capacity to bring plans forward at the current time. The Chairman replied that he recognised the size of the Team and the importance of supporting local businesses, but noted that it was right to question whether there was adequate resource to achieve the priorities set-out within the Corporate Plan.
- v. The recommendation was proposed by Cllr P Heinrich and seconded by Cllr H Blathwayt.

RESOLVED

- 1. To review and comment on the progress made against the original and revised Delivery Plan objectives and those objectives where focus will be directed over the period to May 2023**

84 THE CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

The DSGOS noted that there were a number of items expected in December including an updated RIPA Policy, though there were no substantive changes expected and it was therefore not expected to be reviewed by the Committee. He added that the potential for the Economic Growth Strategy to come forward in December had been raised, and he had made enquiries as to whether this could come for pre-scrutiny in advance of consideration by Cabinet, though a response remained outstanding. It was noted that the Cost of Living Summit had also taken place, and it was possible that actions were expected in the coming months, which the Committee may want to consider.

RESOLVED

To note the Cabinet Work Programme.

85 OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND UPDATE

- i. Cllr N Housden noted that he was still awaiting a written response from officers regarding the NWHAZ contingency funds, and asked that this be shared in advance of the next meeting. The DSGOS replied that he had chased a response but was yet to receive the information, though it would be shared accordingly once available.
- ii. The DSGOS informed Members that the Car Parking Usage report was expected in December, alongside the Fees and Charges report. He added that the Enforcement Update was expected, alongside the Beach Huts and Chalets Monitoring, and performance reports, which meant that December could be a busy agenda.
- iii. The CE referred to a request made by the Committee for an end of project review of the Reef Leisure Centre, and noted that there had been some confusion over when this report could be expected. He added that the report would cover the delivery of the project, various decisions taken throughout the Pandemic such as the early demolition of the old Splash facility. It was noted that whilst a completion report could have happened sooner, there were retention funds held until twelve months after completion which had to be agreed, and assessing occupancy levels could now be included in a single report. The CE stated that the report was due to be completed before Christmas and would be presented to the Committee at its January meeting, having been prepared by a new officer with no preconceptions of the project.

RESOLVED

To note the Work Programme.

86 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The meeting ended at 1.00 pm.

Chairman