

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Minutes of a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 13 December 2017 in the Council Chamber, North Norfolk District Council, Holt Road, Cromer at 9.30 am.

Members Present:

Committee: Cllr K Ward (Chairman)

Cllr S Bütikofer
Cllr J English
Cllr V Gay
Cllr S Hester
Cllr M Knowles

Cllr N Lloyd
Cllr R Reynolds
Cllr E Seward
Mr B Smith

Officers in Attendance: The Corporate Director (SB), the Monitoring Officer, the Head of Finance and Asset Management, the Head of Economic & Community Development, the Estates and Asset Strategy Manager, the Communications and PR Manager, the Concerto Support Officer, the Democratic Services Manager and the Democratic Services Officer.

Members in Attendance: Cllr J Rest, Cllr N Pearce, Cllr G Perry-Warnes, Cllr S Arnold, Cllr A Fitch-Tillett, Cllr R Price, Cllr T FitzPatrick and Cllr J Oliver

Also in Attendance: Estelle Hook and Gemma Clark, Norfolk Coast Partnership (for item 10)

82. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr B McGoun, Cllr N Smith and Cllr G Williams.

83. SUBSTITUTES

Mr N Lloyd for Mrs B McGoun.

84. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were received.

85. MINUTES

The minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 08 November 2017 were

accepted as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

Matters Arising

Minute 74: the Committee had recommended that Council received confirmation from the police that commitment to keep in contact with local communities was continued. To date this confirmation had not been received. The Democratic Services Manager would follow it up.

86. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

87. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To be taken, if necessary, at the appropriate item on the Agenda.

88. PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None

89. CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY A MEMBER

No matters had been referred in advance, but some issues had been referred from the Planning Policy and Built Heritage Working Party on 11 December 2017:

Local Plan – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Norfolk County Council's role in flood management included responsibility for surface water. It was understood that they were 2 – 3 years behind with this work, which had a knock-on effect for NNDC. The Chairman observed that this posed a risk to the Local Plan. Members requested that relevant officers should come to Overview and Scrutiny to give an update. Mrs S Arnold, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Planning Policy, said that it was right that questions were asked for the protection of our residents.

Mrs A Fitch-Tillett informed the Committee that flood maps still could not be uploaded. Norfolk County Council was the lead local authority on flooding but NNDC, as the Planning authority, needed to be up to date regarding flooding issues. The Head of Business Transformation and IT would be coming to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in January. He would be asked to include an update on the issue of uploading interactive maps onto the system, and if extra resources were required. The Local Plan went out to consultation in 2018 and it was essential that all necessary maps were uploaded.

RESOLVED:

- a) To invite Norfolk County Council to attend Overview and Scrutiny to give an update on surface water flooding.**
- b) To ask the Head of Business Transformation and IT to give an update on progress in uploading maps onto the system.**

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

None

91. PRESENTATION – NORFOLK COASTAL PARTNERSHIP

The presentation had been requested by the Committee following the retirement of Tim Venes as manager and was made by Estelle Hook and Gemma Clark.

- a) The role of the Norfolk Coastal Partnership was to look after the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) along the coast. An AONB enjoyed a level of protection equivalent to that of a National Park. However, the Norfolk Coastal Partnership was not a statutory consultee for planning applications. They could, however, provide advice.
- b) The Norfolk Coastal Partnership comprised local authorities, environmental organisations and other related organisations.
- c) The Partnership was set up in 1991. The main funding came from DEFRA. NNDC contributed £14,000 per annum. The Partnership delivered statutory duties on behalf of local authorities.
- d) The Norfolk Coastal Partnership disseminated information and delivered projects such as the Glaven Eel Project. It also sourced external funding for projects and had a sustainable development fund for communities.
- e) Tim Venes had retired as manager earlier in the year. There were now 6 team members (4.6 FTE).
- f) The Partnership's aims to protect the local distinctive character of North Norfolk fitted in well with NNDC's Local Plan.
- g) The Partnership was currently working on neighbourhood plans. Gemma Clark was doing some work at NNDC writing some of the Local Plan.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Ms V Gay asked how a body became a statutory consultee. It was explained that this was defined by national Planning legislation and was not something that could be changed locally. Planning officers did, however, pass applications to the Partnership for advice. To a further question from Ms Gay about providing advice out of the area, it was explained that there was not a rigid barrier but that advice did tend to be restricted to the AONB.
- b) Mrs S Arnold (Portfolio Holder for Planning and Planning Policy) thanked the Partnership for the presentation and for excellent advice.
- c) In response to a question from Mr S Hester about the difference between national Parks and AONBs, it was explained that National Parks had a different remit – access and education – and bigger budgets. They were also the Planning authority for the park. In response to a further question from Mr Hester, it was explained that the Partnership found it necessary to source external funding for some projects.
- d) The Corporate Director (SB) said that the Partnership was very important to North

Norfolk but that there were a number of issues regarding moving forward. There were 40 AONB partnerships which did not have the status of National Park authorities and were not statutory Planning consultees. There was some tension between national policies and our Local Plan and delivery. The work of the Partnership in North Norfolk was undermined because the boundaries weren't clearly defined. This led to potential for confusion regarding judgment of developments. It was important that the aspirations of NNDC were in line with those of the Partnership or there was a risk of market economies undermining the AONB. There was a tension between development and the Norfolk Coast Management Plan which could lead to a risk over time that the character of the area changed if it wasn't allowed to evolve in a sustainable way, e.g. housing for local people. Challenges included changes in development applications and demands for sustainable energy. How were we maximising the opportunities of external funding and public funds? There was also an issue regarding perception in that the Partnership operated from Fakenham.

- e) Mrs S Arnold asked if the government should be lobbied to make the Norfolk Coastal Partnership a statutory consultee. The Acting Manager agreed that this would ensure that the Partnership was automatically notified of all applications as well as raising the importance of its comments.
- f) Responding to the Corporate Director (SB) the Acting Manager said:
- Although the Partnership was not a statutory consultee for Planning it did, however, deliver statutory duties for NNDC.
 - Although development sometimes crept into the AONB, the Partnership had to treat the whole Area as equal when responding to Planning applications.
 - Alignment: the Partnership worked closely with all the Local Authorities in the Area. The Action Plan was put together by the whole Partnership, as an entity.
 - Affordable housing: local housing was supported by the Partnership and was part of the Action Plan. This was one of the reason why Neighbourhood Plans were supported.
 - The Partnership encouraged characteristic settlement patterns and building materials.
 - The Partnership was working with sustainable energy developers and was considering making application for some of their funds.
 - Office location: other sites had been considered but the Fakenham office represented good value for money.
- g) Mr R Price, Portfolio Holder for Housing, welcomed the Partnership's support for Affordable Housing. He asked when the gap between Sea Palling and Mundesley had last been reviewed. The Acting Manager replied that the area had been designated in 1968. The gap was because of the new Bacton Gas Terminal which was going to be built. In response to a question from Mr Price about the gap being revisited, the Acting Manager suggested that the Committee should ask the government to look again at all boundaries on the eastern side of Norfolk.
- h) The Chairman asked who would be the statutory consultee for the AONB if not the Norfolk Coastal Partnership. The Corporate Director (SB) said that it was Natural

England and Historic England but that they didn't have the same powers regarding AONBs. The Government could not make changes unless they considered all 40 AONBs. It was necessary to be practical.

- i) Mrs A Fitch-Tillett referred to an issue regarding changing the boundary around Hunstanton. The Acting Manager explained that Natural England owned boundary reviews, were very resistant, and had a long list of requests for review.
- j) The Democratic Services Manager would circulate the slides to Members and circulate them in the Members' Information Bulletin.

RESOLVED

To refer issues raised in the presentation to the Planning Policy and Built Heritage Working Party.

92. FEES & CHARGES 2018/19

The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that the report recommended the fees and charges for 2018/19 that would come into effect from April 2018. The fees and charges as recommended would be used to inform the income budgets for the 2018/19 budget. Approval for the fees ahead of presenting the detailed budgets would allow for implementation of changes where applicable and also informed the 2018/19 budgets. It would also enable bills for chalet charges, licences for caravan and chalet parks etc to be sent out in a timely manner. Consideration was being given to installing individual meters to chalets so that the actual usage, rather than a set fee, could be charged. However, these were not yet in place.

Increases in fees were in line with inflation but some had been set by central government or were calculated on a cost recovery basis, e.g. Land Charges and Building Control.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Referring to chalet charges, Mr E Seward observed that there had been previous concern about the take-up of chalets. He asked if any chalets had been hard to let or if there had been a significant turnover. The Head of Finance and Asset Management replied that the concern had been about increasing beach hut charges. This was the third year of increased charges but there was still a significant waiting list for beach huts. Moving forward, a fundamental review of chalets would be carried out.
- b) Mr Seward expressed concern that garden bin fees were set separately under delegated powers and asked how Members could make input. The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that the delegated powers were because of commercial sensitivity and gave officers more flexibility. He would provide a written response regarding the garden bin service and Member input.
- c) Responding to a further question from Mr Seward, the Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that the increase in charges to sports clubs was because of a reduction in funding from Sport England. There had been consultation with users about the price increases.
- d) Mrs S Bütikofer asked why the charges had not been listed. The Head of Finance and

Asset Management said that this was an omission and would be added to the report which would go to Full Council.

- e) Mrs Bütikofer asked a question about the charge of £20 for changing the registration number on a car park season ticket disc. The Head of Finance and Asset Management said that this was to offset the administration charge. It was hoped in the future to find a smarter way to manage the scheme so that the discs did not need to be reissued. Mrs Bütikofer asked that the charge be added to the list. Mrs G Perry-Warnes expressed concern that the charge was too expensive.
- f) The Chairman asked a question about the abolition of the annual parking permit for Holt Country Park. The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that normal permits could still be used.
- g) The Chairman asked a further question regarding the reduction in the mobile homes charge. The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that this was related to the Mobile Homes Act and was a licensing issue. He would provide a more detailed response to Members.
- h) In response to a question from Mr N Lloyd regarding charges for Sports Clubs and Hubs, the Head of Finance and Asset Management said the column needed to be completed. The spreadsheet had been compiled before the charges were set. He would ensure that the figures were added so that it was clear to Full Council.

RESOLVED

To support the recommendation to Full Council:

- 1. The fees and charges from 1 April 2018 as included in Appendix A.**
- 2. That Delegated Authority be given to the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and relevant Heads of Service, to agree those fees and charges not included within Appendix A as required as outlined within the report**

93. MANAGING PERFORMANCE Q2 2017/18

The report was introduced by Mr T FitzPatrick, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Policy and Governance.

The report was a second quarter progress report of the performance of the Council. More specifically it reported on the delivery of the Annual Action Plan 2017/18 and progress against targets. It gave an overview, identified any issues that might affect delivery of the plan, the action being taken to address these issues and proposed any further action needed that required Cabinet approval.

The majority of the 71 activities were on track or ahead of plan (63) and six activities had been completed successfully. One had some problems and one had been cancelled. The 71 activities reported on were 63 from the Annual Action Plan 2017/18 and eight activities from the Annual Action Plan 2016/17 that were not completed last year. Performance was being closely monitored, particularly for the activities where issues or problems had been identified. Of the 24 performance indicators where a target had been set 21 were on, above or close to target and three below target. The delivery of the Annual Action Plan was

progressing according to plan. However, there were a few performance issues in achieving targets and improvement. The issues involved, and action being taken in each case, were detailed in the report.

Questions and Discussion

- a) **Jobs and the Local Economy:** Mr E Seward asked why the New Anglia Economic Strategy was being claimed as an achievement when Cabinet previously saw it as a work in progress. Mr FitzPatrick explained that Cabinet had been instrumental in getting the District included in the Strategy and had made progress on the original draft. However, there was more work to be done, e.g. mobile phone infrastructure. Mr Seward expressed concern that Local Economic Partnerships could be a hidden area for most elected Members. He requested a briefing and an update in the Members' Information Bulletin. The Corporate Director (SB) said that significant changes had been achieved in the Strategy's drafting process, including reference to the Albert Bartlett plant and other opportunities in North Norfolk. There would also be a meeting in the future about doubling production at Linda McCartney and moving other businesses into the Fakenham plant. This would reduce job loss by half. Hain Daniels had met with representatives from Planning and Environmental Health to discuss possible necessary configuration of the factory. Bi-annual meetings with the Chief Executive of the LEP had also begun to ensure that the voice of North Norfolk was heard. Mr T FitzPatrick said that all Members should be able to see the Action Plan about delivery through LEPs and recommended signing up for the newsletter. Mr Seward expressed concern about democratic deficit.
- b) **Supporting Fishing and Agriculture:** Mr S Hester agreed that Fishing and Agriculture were important to the District but asked that support should also be extended to equestrian centres. Mr T FitzPatrick asked Mr Hester to provide a list of such establishments so that consideration could be given to supporting them.
- c) **Mrs S Bütikofer** asked for an update on Garden Bins. Mr R Price replied that a written update had been provided. He had been number 84 on the waiting list but had received his bin. He commended the Garden Bin website for its efficiency.
- d) **Health and Wellbeing (04A02):** in response to a question about helping rural communities combat fuel poverty, Mr T FitzPatrick said that a lot of parishes ran buying schemes which worked well, but that it was something that could be discussed further. He would ask the Portfolio Holder to look at the topic. Mr R Price said that there were various websites for oil purchase and that the Council should ensure that people were aware of the information. Mrs S Bütikofer said that the information needed to be distributed, especially for the elderly, but that it was important to avoid duplication. Mr T FitzPatrick said that this was an opportunity for the Council to ensure that Parish Councils had schemes in place. Mr S Hester suggested a section on the NNDC website with links to the relevant organisations. Mr R Reynolds reminded the Committee that Mr J Lee had done work on fuel poverty and purchase 3 years ago.
- e) **Mr N Lloyd** asked a question about recycling rates. The Corporate Director (SB) replied that recycling rates had peaked. The aim was now to maximise the quality by lack of contamination. In future there could be consideration of food waste recycling, but it might not be affordable. The Communications and PR Manager said that recycling for 2016/2017 had been 41.9%. This was 1% up on the previous year. Mr T FitzPatrick said that the recycling service was being run as economically as possible for the people of

North Norfolk but that a high level of contamination resulted in the rejection of the entire load. The Council was focussing on education – putting the right things in the right bin. There would also be the Christmas challenge of wrapping paper that wasn't recyclable. Ms V Gay expressed concern that England had fallen in the international recycling tables and was not continuing to improve.

- f) In response to a question from Mr S Hester regarding encouraging businesses to recycle, Mr T FitzPatrick explained that although the Council educated local businesses, commercial waste and recycling was a separate issue and didn't appear in the figures that Members were considering today.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

94. ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN & SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

The report, which had been requested by the Committee, had come for pre-scrutiny and would go to Cabinet in February as part of the budget setting process.

Introducing the report, the Corporate Director (SB) explained that the Council had recognised the need to be more commercial in the use of its assets. Because of this, Gleeds had been appointed. They had made recommendations and a workstream had been progressed. There would be a £2.2m financial gap in 4 years' time. It was essential that the Council maximised its land and property holdings. Some were investment units, and some were leased and earned income.

Options included using some resources to generate income beyond traditional expectations, investing locally or investing in property portfolios. However, the latter had an element of risk. Moving forward, there were choices for the authority about selling or disposing of some of its assets and seeking to acquire assets that would allow delivery of the Corporate Plan and generation of income, e.g. North Walsham Precinct and opportunities in other town centres. This would require a change in the Council's constitutional position. It would give the Council community responsibility as landlords and aid economic development.

The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that CIPFA set regulations. They had recently provided updated guidance on the Capital Strategy and had recommended that it should be reviewed and updated annually, along with the Asset Management Plan, at the same time as budget setting. There had been fundamental changes to the old Strategy which had been written some years ago.

The Estates and Asset Strategy Manager explained that the Asset Management Plan was an overarching plan covering 5 years. It was a strategic document with the assets split into 4 sections. The document set out the strategic direction of the Council's land and property portfolio and provided a framework within which the Council managed its land and property assets. The document highlighted key achievements, the strategic direction, the portfolio and local, regional and national influences and considered the financial issues, risks and resources required.

Other documents in the suite:

- The Commercial Property Strategy set out how the Council grew and managed its commercial property portfolio. This document provided a framework through which the Council would be able to effectively manage its land and property portfolio on a commercial basis and sits underneath the Council's Corporate Plan and the Annual Action Plan.
- The Acquisition Policy set out why, when and how the Council acquired land and property assets. This document provided a framework through which the Council would be able to effectively manage its land and property portfolio commercially.
- The Disposal Policy set out how the Council disposed of its land and property assets. This document provided a framework to enable the Council to effectively manage its land and property asset portfolio

Presentation on Concessions

The presentation was made by the Concerto Support Officer who had produced it as part of a management development programme. It provided a sound business proposal.

- a) A concession is a licence to trade from a public open space owned by the Council
- b) Benefits:
 - Provision for locals as well as tourists.
 - Concessions can be attractions in their own right, leading to greater footfall, e.g. Bucket List at Paul's Lane, Overstrand.
 - Increase in income from Business Rates and car parks.
- c) Risks, and measures taken to prevent them:
 - Poor response – need to monitor our marketing strategy.
 - Council reputation: need to assess businesses applying for concessions, and terms should be included in the licence to mitigate negative aspects.
 - Unlicensed concessions: licensed operators supplied with a badge and parking teams to enforce those without a licence.
- d) Progress:
 - 24 potential sites identified, mostly on coastal assets.
 - Improved marketing strategies.
 - Application process simplified.
 - Assessment of applications.
- e) Income: in 2016 concessions raised £16,000 from 5 pitches. In 2017, £30,000 was raised from 10 pitches.
- f) Other opportunities included pop-up shops, event concessions and themed events.

g) Next steps:

- Evaluation of applications in January 2018.
- Grant licences for March.
- Identify improvements for next season.
- Explore opportunities.

Gleeds recommendations (Corporate Director (SB))

- a) Sale of Highfield Road, Fakenham: this had been through local consultation. Cabinet resolved to retain the asset and use it as a pay and display car park. The Car Park order has gone through and work is being done on the surface.
- b) Wells Beach Road toilets: this facility was dated, struggled to meet demand and was no longer fit for purpose. A working group had been meeting with Wells Town Council since June, with a final meeting scheduled for 10 January 2018. There was commercial interest in a new scheme but significant local opposition. The scheme has since been redesigned with 2 storeys (retail/office on ground, holiday apartments on upper storey).
- c) Grove Lane Depot site at Holt: this had been recommended for residential development. The Estates and Asset Strategy Manager had explored the investment but returns were considered to be relatively modest and would require taking out some reserves. Interest had since been expressed by a commercial developer which would give a greater return.
- d) Cadogan Road Car Park (hotel): this had not been progressed because of strong local opposition.
- e) Gleeds had been asked to advise on a potential development at Catfield, and for advice on providing more modern facilities and converting units currently in use as public conveniences into holiday lets.

Questions and Discussion

a) Mr E Seward asked 3 questions:

- Assets of community value: the Corporate Director (SB) explained that there were approximately 25 sites which communities valued and had asked to be protected, should they cease to operate. Assets of community value could be registered as such. There were opportunities to acquire such assets if criteria were fulfilled. The Head of Finance and Asset Management said that CAMRA was campaigning to protect local village pubs. If an asset was listed, it remained on a website for 5 years and was taken into consideration for a 6 months moratorium to enable the community to acquire the funds to buy it. This was not usually enough time for a community to raise the sum required. The Asset of Community Value designation would potentially restrict the owner from changing the use of the building and this would lower the valuation.
- Surplus land: this referred mostly to surveyors' allotments across the District. They had no development or commercial value but placed a burden of responsibility on the Council.

- Area Review of North Walsham: this referred to a review by Norfolk County Council in respect of Older Care. NNDC could only serve as a facilitator and, as Planning authority, seek to influence. NNDC would like to see a better library in the town and a Job Centre.
- b) Mrs S Bütikofer asked 4 questions:
- Are we sure that Gleeds is the right partner for us? The Corporate Director (SB) said that their advice was sound and provided on a good basis but that sometimes community opposition had resulted in modifying proposals or not taking them forward. Mrs Bütikofer asked about other companies but was advised that a tender process had been undertaken and Gleeds had been preferred. Our capacity had been extended by using Gleeds.
 - Other sites for beach huts: it was explained that all areas along the coast were being reviewed. There were some areas where people had suggested beach hut provision and others that weren't suitable.
 - P.136, temporary accommodation: this referred to land sold to Broadland Housing.
 - Mrs Bütikofer was assured that the report would go to Full Council.
- c) Ms V Gay asked 3 questions:
- Was it incumbent on the local community to request Asset of Community Value designation or could the Council do it? The Estates and Asset Strategy Manager explained that it would be the responsibility of the Parish Council. To a question about banks being included in the scheme, the Monitoring Officer replied that they were, if they met the criteria.
 - Proposed changes to the Constitution: the Monitoring Officer explained that proposed changes would have to be debated by the Constitution Working Party. Most decisions (acquisitions and disposals) would be executive, under delegated powers, in circumstances where quick decisions were required. The Constitution Working Party would discuss how this was embedded in the Constitution. The Corporate Director (SB) said that constitutional changes would be part of the Acquisitions Policy. It had been suggested that a local capital property fund should be established. It was proposed that this would be a fund that could be invested locally, with checks and balances put in place, e.g. contact with local Members. The fund would give flexibility for quick action. The alternative would be for the Council to establish a property company but this would allow no transparent feedback to the organisation. Work had been done regarding forming a property company but there were no compelling reasons for doing so. The fund would be within the capital reserve.
 - Identification of potential opportunities? This was part of the Property Team's remit.
- d) The Chairman asked that, before the report went to Full Council, it should be expanded and amended to reflect these checks and balances, and the full process should be clearly illustrated.
- e) Mr E Seward expressed concern about delegated power which he saw as a democratic deficit. He proposed the following recommendation which was resolved by the Committee: "That Overview and Scrutiny Committee receive a further report on the

governance arrangements for matters concerning the acquisition and disposal of assets that creates a better balance between the need for commercial sensitivity and, at the same time, the need, as part of the democratic process, for appropriate Member involvement in this area.”

- f) Mr S Hester supported the Concessions presentation but asked for further information about the pop-up concessions and an update after the review of the 24 pitches.
- g) Mr E Seward said, with reference to St Nicholas Precinct, North Walsham, that when assets were transferred to the community there might be little or no return to the authority. He asked if more work needed to be done on this in the Capital Strategy. As a public authority we had a responsibility to provide services but that didn't always produce an income. He asked that this should be reflected in the Capital Strategy.
- h) Mrs J Oliver, the Portfolio Holder, said that when concessions were being considered, possibilities would be shared with Local Members. In response to Mr Seward, she agreed that the Council needed to focus on the long term, not purely on cash return. She hoped that all councillors and parties would sign up to this. Consensus was helpful to officers.
- i) The Chairman said that it was necessary to optimise, not necessarily always maximise. Consideration also needed to be given to the increasing older population of the District and the implications for the appropriate asset portfolio.
- j) The Corporate Director (SB) explained that when the Council assumed responsibility for the precinct at North Walsham, there had not been a wider strategy. Had investment been expanded into units in that precinct, the Council would have had control and could have raised some income. He recommended that, with this in mind, the Strategy should be strengthened.
- k) The Monitoring Officer said that the Strategy was not just about investing for economic return but investing in local communities. It would require courage, e.g. North Walsham, but the Council needed to show commitment to local communities.
- l) Mr S Hester said that if the strategy was about investing in local communities then it would have been a better approach to buy the house adjacent to the Itteringham Community shop for a local couple to live in rather than as a holiday let. The Monitoring Officer replied that the village was keen to generate income and felt that it could support their business. Also, it was a very large house and more suited to holiday lets.

RESOLVED

- 1. That Overview and Scrutiny Committee receive a further report on the governance arrangements for matters concerning the acquisition and disposal of assets that creates a better balance between the need for commercial sensitivity and, at the same time, the need, as part of the democratic process, for appropriate Member involvement in this area.**
- 2. That the revised Asset Management Plan comes back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in February 2018 before going to Council for approval**

To recommend to Cabinet:

That the Asset Management Plan reflects the changes discussed, striking a balance between commercialisation and public service.

95. THE CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

The Democratic Services Manager updated Members on changes to the Cabinet Work Programme.

RESOLVED

To note the Cabinet Work Programme.

96. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND UPDATE

The Democratic Services Manager advised Members that the Head of Planning was in attendance to respond to any queries regarding the report on planning which was due to come to the next meeting of the committee. The Committee had previously agreed that they would like to cover the following issues:

- A broad overview covering any recent changes to the planning team, including the planning policy team
- Progress with the local plan and whether planned timescales were being achieved
- To receive an update on the enforcement / monitoring of planning conditions.
- That the Housing Strategy scheduled to come to the committee at the same time should include information of how this sat within the context of the local plan.

The Head of Planning said that due to resource issues within the Planning Policy team, the best approach would be to bring a broad overview of the planning service, including an update on staff changes and a summary of how the Housing Strategy and Local Plan were linked. She advised that an update on enforcement issues would be covered by a separate report to the committee in February. The timescale for the Local Plan would be discussed at the next meeting of Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party.

Members agreed to the approach outlined above.

RESOLVED

To note the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme.

The meeting ended at 1.15 pm

Chairman