

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 9 January 2018 commencing at 4:30 pm

Present:

Chair	Councillor P W Awford
Vice Chair	Councillor R E Allen

and Councillors:

G J Bocking, K J Cromwell, J E Day, D T Foyle, P A Godwin, T A Spencer, P E Stokes, M G Sztymiak, H A E Turbyfield and M J Williams

OS.57 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 57.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was advised to those present.
- 57.2 The Chair welcomed James Saunders, Early Help Partnership Manager, and Hannah Oakshott, Families First Plus Keyworker, to the meeting and indicated that they were representing Families First Plus which was due to be discussed at Agenda Item 7 – Gloucestershire Families First Update. He also welcomed Jack James, Aston Project Co-Ordinator, and Kym Harrison, Anti-Social Behaviour Youth Diversion Worker, who would be giving a presentation at Agenda Item 8 – Aston Project and Great Expectations.

OS.58 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

- 58.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R M Hatton, H C McLain and P D Surman. There were no substitutions for the meeting.

OS.59 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 59.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct which was adopted by the Council on 26 June 2012 and took effect from 1 July 2012.
- 59.2 There were no declarations made on this occasion.

OS.60 MINUTES

- 60.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2017, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

OS.61 CONSIDERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

- 61.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages

No. 13-15. Members were asked to determine whether there were any questions for the relevant Lead Members and what support the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could give to the work contained within the plan.

61.2 It was

RESOLVED That the Executive Committee Forward Plan be **NOTED**.

OS.62 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2017/18

62.1 Attention was drawn to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2017/18, circulated at Pages No. 16-20, which Members were asked to consider.

62.2 The Chief Executive indicated that most Members would be aware of the serious disruption to water supplies to a large part of the borough which had occurred on 15 and 16 December 2017. 10,000 homes had been affected and there had been considerable disruption for businesses on a significant weekend in the run-up to Christmas. Given the extent and seriousness of the event, as well as the fact that this had closely followed another event affecting the Mythe Waterworks, he had spoken with the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee about the possibility of undertaking a scrutiny review to assess the response to the event and the impacts. The review could potentially involve calling in a number of witnesses and it would be a sizeable piece of work for both Officers and Members; however, the outcome would be a series of agreed recommendations for the various agencies concerned to ensure that any issues identified were rectified in future. He stressed that there would be a review of the event by the agencies involved in any case but, given the impact on residents and businesses within the borough, it was felt that it would also be appropriate for the Council to ask questions if Members were supportive of undertaking a separate scrutiny review. If the review itself was to be conducted in public, he suggested that it would be appropriate for the Committee to meet informally as a Working Group to scope the extent of the review, agree the process that would be followed and set the timescale for the work; alternatively, a smaller Working Group comprising a few Members of the Committee could be set-up for that purpose. He confirmed that he had spoken with the Managing Director of Severn Trent Water Authority who was happy to take part and to make staff available from Severn Trent. He had also written to the Chief Constable of Gloucestershire Constabulary and the Chief Fire Officer from Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service in terms of the emergency response and both had indicated that they would make staff available via the resilience team that had dealt with the emergency.

62.3 A Member welcomed the review and indicated that it was something he had been intending to raise in his role as a County Councillor depending on the outcome of the debriefing which was due to take place at the end of January. The Chief Executive confirmed that there was a 'wash-up' meeting taking place shortly and he felt that the timing would work well in terms of feeding into the scrutiny review. He explained that the water outage had not been declared as a major incident and therefore Severn Trent had been in control of the response; had it been declared a major incident, the civil authorities would have taken control. In light of this, and given that only Tewkesbury Borough had been affected, it made sense for Tewkesbury Borough Council to lead the scrutiny review and for the County Council to participate. The Member pointed out there had been other similar

incidents within Gloucestershire including a recent water supply outage in Cheltenham. A Member questioned whether the Flood Risk Management Group should undertake the review but was advised that this was not within its remit and

it was important not to confuse this particular issue with flood risk.

62.4 The Head of Democratic Services explained that it would be difficult for Members to participate fully in the review, ultimately to be undertaken in public, if they had not been involved in the Working Group discussions so it was her suggestion that the whole Committee meet as a Working Group to agree the Terms of Reference, receive detailed briefings and prepare questions in order for all Members to be able to participate in the public scrutiny with an equal knowledge base. A Member indicated that he fully supported scrutiny of the water outage and shared the view that the Working Group should include all Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Chief Executive clarified that it was not necessary to set a date for the review at this stage; however, when the time came, he suggested that a special meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be called for this purpose. The Chair questioned whether it would be possible for the draft Terms of Reference to be brought back to the next meeting of the Committee and the Chief Executive suggested that the Committee could meet as a Working Group prior to that.

62.5 A Member noted that the Risk Management Strategy Review and the Absence Management Policy Review had been in the pending items section of the Work Programme since June 2016 and she felt that it was necessary to bring those items forward. The Head of Corporate Services advised that it was intended to run a workshop for the Committee on the Absence Management Policy during February and a date would be discussed with the Chair in due course. In terms of the Risk Management Strategy, training was being arranged for Members in order to put together the new risk register and this would also be imminent.

62.6 It was

- RESOLVED**
1. That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2017/18 be **NOTED**.
 2. That the Terms of Reference for a scrutiny review of the water supply outage be brought back to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and that the Committee meet as a Working Group prior to that meeting.

OS.63 GLOUCESTERSHIRE FAMILIES FIRST UPDATE

63.1 The Community Development Officer indicated that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had received a number of reports on the Gloucestershire Families First project over the years and James Saunders, Early Help Partnership Manager, and Hannah Oakshott, Family First Plus Keyworker, had attended the meeting to give an update on the work that was being undertaken and how things had changed for this approach to become 'business as usual'.

63.2 The following key points were raised during the presentation:

- Recap – Families First was the local name for the national Troubled Families programme; originally a three year programme (from 2012) aimed at turning around the lives of an estimated 120,000 troubled families in the country, 900 in Gloucestershire and 90 in Tewkesbury Borough; original criteria – an adult on out of work benefit, children not attending school, family members involved in crime and antisocial behaviour, high costs to the public purse, and local discretion to include other issues e.g. mental health, drug and alcohol misuse, domestic abuse.
- Aim – To get children back into school; reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour; put adults on a path back to work; bring down the public services currently spent on them; and, over time, change the way services are delivered

- redesigning them for the longer term.
- Evaluation – Education, employment and training – improvements in school exclusion, school behavioural problems, attendance at alternative provision, and adults in employment; crime and antisocial behaviour – improvements in youth offending, Police call-outs and domestic abuse incidents; health – improvements in adult mental health and young people using alcohol/drugs; 85% of families say they have made progress since being involved with Families First.
- Expansion – Five year programme from 2015/16 with funding for the first year; additional 3,000 families for Gloucestershire; getting to a much wider group of families with multiple problems; greater flexibility to decide which families to work with but must prioritise highest need; payment by results based on ‘sustained and significant progress’.
- New Criteria – Parents and children involved in crime or anti-social behaviour; children not attending school; children who need help; adults out of work or at risk of financial exclusion and young people at risk of worklessness; families affected by domestic violence and abuse; parents and children with a range of health problems.
- Business as Usual – Developing early help and targeted support; bringing together Targeted Support teams and Families First to create Families First Plus; development of Early Help Hub; Tewkesbury was the pilot nationally for this work.
- Working in Tewkesbury – Locality Partnership Group - health, education, Police, probation, Council services, housing, mental health, domestic abuse, substance misuse, Department for Work and Pensions, voluntary and community sector representation; Early Help Hub Allocations – provide advice, information, support and targeted support e.g. family support, community support.
- What is Early Help? - *“Early Help means providing support as soon as a problem emerges, at any point in a child’s life, from the foundation years through to the teenage years”* – Working Together to Safeguard Children, Department for Education, March 2015.
- Why Do Early Help? – Spend less on reactive and specialist services by getting involved with families and providing support before they need them.
- Early Help Partnership – Partners: Families First Plus, Tewkesbury Borough Council, Police, schools and education, Department for Work and Pensions, housing providers, social care, health, Private Voluntary and Independent (PVI) sector, Gloucestershire Domestic Abuse Support Service (GDASS), Gloucestershire Fire Service.
- Role of Families First Plus – Advice – every Tewkesbury Borough school has an allocated Early Help Co-Ordinator; support – training and modelling best practice; information – signposting to services; targeted family support – whole family working linked to Troubled Families Outcomes Plan; evidence-based parenting programme – now being delivered in Tewkesbury Borough.
- Gloucestershire’s Graduated Pathway – Assess, Do, Plan. Implemented with support from the Early Help Co-Ordinator; my profile – universal services; my plan – support to meet additional needs; statutory assessment and planning – including education, Health and Care Plan, Child in Need Plan and Child in Care Plan; “my assessment my plan” – integrated assessment and planning to

meet additional needs.

- Family Support Worker Case Study – Family relocated due to ex ‘grooming’ – he received a custodial sentence; presented as homeless, mental health issues, victim of domestic abuse, out of education; multi-agency approach with Families First Plus, Tewkesbury Borough Council, Severn Vale Housing Society, education, health, InfoBuzz and GDASS.

63.3 A Member noted that 85% had reported making progress since their involvement with the programme and he questioned what had been done to address the remaining 15%. The Community Development Officer explained that this was data from the first phase of the project so it was a question of understanding the issues; the expansion of the programme had fed into partnership working. The Early Help Partnership Manager indicated that they continued to seek views from the families they were working with and these were fed back centrally in order to continue to develop the service going forward. A Member queried whether any current data was available and was informed that there was a successful outcome for 82 families within Tewkesbury Borough in the last year; the target was for 700 families across the county to evidence substantial improvement i.e. three months after the intervention they were still reporting that they were in a better place and there had been no referrals, and Tewkesbury had surpassed its own target by achieving 102%. In response to a Member query around getting people into employment, the Early Help Partnership Manager explained that two social workers from the Department for Work and Pensions worked with Families First Plus and were able to evidence this once the person had been in employment for six months. He indicated that the data sets across the county needed some work and it was hoped to make better use of the case management system to tease out this information over the next 12 months.

63.4 The Chair thanked the representatives for their presentation. He noted that the work done by Families First Plus was now very much “business as usual” and he sought Members’ views as to whether it was necessary for the Committee to continue to receive an annual update. The Community Development Officer pointed out that Families First Plus was within the remit of the County Council and Tewkesbury Borough Council had no direct involvement. The Chief Executive reiterated how successful the programme had been within the borough which was no doubt due, in part, to the co-location of the various partners within the Public Services Centre. A Member expressed the view that this was something which all Members should be aware of, rather than just the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and the Chief Executive suggested that a Member Update could be circulated on an annual basis, if appropriate. It was subsequently

RESOLVED

1. That the Gloucestershire Families First Update be **NOTED**.
2. That the Gloucestershire Families First Update be removed from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme on the basis that the work undertaken was now “business as usual” and information should instead be reported as a Member Update on an annual basis, if appropriate.

OS.64 ASTON PROJECT AND GREAT EXPECTATIONS

64.1 The Head of Community Services advised that Jack James had been working for the Council as the Aston Project Co-Ordinator for the last five months. The post was funded by the Police and Crime Commissioner’s Office and Jack worked closely with the Anti-Social Behaviour Youth Diversion Worker within the

Community Services team. He would be giving a presentation on the Aston Project and the next stage, Great Expectations.

64.2

The following key points were raised during the presentation:

- Aston Project (1) – Named after PC Lynn Aston who sadly lost her battle with cancer in April 2011; launched in Cheltenham in September 2011 building on the duty to identify vulnerable children at risk of causing anti-social behaviour; provides community-based activities linked to their interests; earn time banking credits to spend on reward activities; engage at an early point whilst the pathway can still be changed.
- Aston Project (2) – Caseloads: Cheltenham – 37, Gloucester – 26, Newent – 19, Tewkesbury – 13; Tewkesbury was a pilot introduced in November 2017 for children in Prior's Park and all had been engaging on a regular basis; approximately 630 had engaged since the project launched; approximately 150 had engaged in the last 12 months; 45 volunteers had registered with the project since October 2015; a total of over 500 hours had been contributed so far; 24 volunteers were currently considered active (15 active and 9 in process); the Tewkesbury Aston Project launch would be in February 2018.
- Aston Project (3) – Volunteers - Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checked; considered as Gloucestershire Police volunteers; make a real difference to the lives of young people; actively trying to recruit volunteers; looking at long-term sustainability.
- Aston Project (4) – Referral process – referrals currently made via the Gloucestershire Police website, the Aston Project would have its own website from February; prevention and intervention – reducing future harm amongst young people; young people are referred on the following basis "I am concerned about where this young person is going to end up..."
- Great Expectations (1) – Launched in April 2013 in Gloucester; response to gang problem; national move towards emphasis on longer term prevention and intervention; step-up from the Aston Project; referrals on the same basis as the Aston Project, allocations meeting to decide which they should subscribe to; three tiers to Great Expectations; Tier 1 (pre- offending/arrest) Prevention – custody experience involving a mock arrest (the young person is not told it is mock); Tier 2 (early offending) Intervention – court and prison experience; Tier 3 (pre-custodial offending) Intervention – Great Expectations seven week programme.
- Great Expectations (2) – Programme delivered to approximately 115 young people in the last six months; mentoring caseload currently 28 young people (five/six per mentor); four mentors, including two females, volunteers; gain a qualification, induction programme, quarterly training – rehabilitation; one senior mentor.
- Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) (1) – "*A complex set of related childhood experiences that include abuse, neglect and growing up with household dysfunction*"; research has shown strong relationships between ACEs and: adoption of health-risk behaviours (e.g. drug/alcohol abuse, self-harm, smoking, high-risk sexual behaviour), increased risk of violence or victimisation (including domestic abuse), presence of adult diseases and

conditions (heart disease, cancer, chronic lung disease, skeletal fractures, liver disease, severe obesity), mental health conditions (including suicidal and depressive disorders), higher levels of involvement in the criminal justice system, homelessness and early death.

- Adverse Childhood Experiences (2) – 10 ACEs: sexual abuse by someone five years older than the individual; emotional abuse by parent/caregiver; physical abuse by parent/caregiver; emotional neglect by parent/caregiver; physical neglect by parent/caregiver; loss/abandonment of or by parent (death/separation); witness abuse in the household; drug/alcohol abuse in the household; mental illness in the household; parent/caregiver incarcerated – someone experiencing four or more of these is six times more likely to offend.
- Adverse Childhood Experiences (3) – Preventing ACEs in future generations could reduce levels of: heroin/crack cocaine use (lifetime) by 66%; incarceration (lifetime) by 65%; violence perpetration (past year) by 60%; violence victimisation (past year) by 57%; cannabis use (lifetime) by 42%; unintended teenage pregnancy by 41%; high-risk drinking (current) by 35%; early sex (before age 16) by 31%; smoking tobacco or e-cigarettes (current) by 24%; poor diet (current, less than two fruit and vegetable portions daily) by 16%.
- If you refer to us – Referral form (ACEs); gather information from Police and partners; allocate to Aston Project or Tier 1, 2 or 3 of Great Expectations and update the person who made the referral; meet with the young person and update the referrer; positively engage with the young person as part of the Aston Project and/or Great Expectations.
- Coverage – Great Expectations – countywide; Aston Project – Gloucester, Cheltenham, Newent, Tewkesbury and looking to start a Stroud branch via the Police; single referral process.

64.3 A Member noted that funding for the Aston Project was currently for 18 months and he questioned what was being done to ensure that it could continue beyond that period. The Aston Project Co-Ordinator confirmed that he was looking at long-term sustainability and charitable status was one option. He intended to compile a report on the cost-benefits over the coming months. The Member indicated that he had noted a difference in Prior's Park since the introduction of the Aston Project pilot and he thanked the Aston Project Co-Ordinator for his hard work. Another Member questioned whether the Aston Project was reliant on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Commissioner remaining in office. The Aston Project Co-Ordinator indicated that, if and when a new Police and Crime Commissioner was elected, he hoped that they would see the benefit of the project which had now been running for a number of years. Unfortunately it was difficult to quantify the success of the project; clearly there was an impact on the young person's life but there were no statistics to show the benefit of the Aston Project. Notwithstanding this, he was confident that a strong case could be made to retain the project. A Member went on to suggest that it may be beneficial for Members to visit SkillZONE, Gloucestershire's safety education centre. The Chief Executive

indicated that it could be difficult to arrange a visit to the centre as it had a very active programme; however, it was an interesting location for raising awareness of issues around crime and safety and he would be happy to look into this following the meeting.

64.4 The Chair thanked the Aston Project Co-Ordinator for his informative presentation and it was

RESOLVED That the Aston Project and Great Expectations presentation be
NOTED.

OS.65 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT PLAN

- 65.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Development Services, circulated at Pages No. 21-46, which proposed the introduction of a Planning Enforcement Plan. Members were asked to consider the draft Plan and recommend it to the Executive Committee for approval for public consultation.
- 65.2 The Head of Development Services advised that the National Planning Policy Framework stated that local planning authorities should consider publishing a local enforcement plan setting out how they would monitor the implementation of planning permissions, investigate alleged cases of unauthorised development and take action where it was appropriate to do so. A Planning Enforcement Plan had been drafted, setting out the Council's proposed approach to delivering the service. It was a customer facing document providing clear and succinct 'Plain English' information about planning enforcement and setting out the level of service that customers could expect to receive.
- 65.3 The Senior Planning and Enforcement Officer explained that he had been brought into the role to undertake a number of initiatives, starting with a review of the Council's Planning Enforcement service and, over the last few months, that work had focused on the development of the draft Planning Enforcement Plan. This area of work was very contentious and difficult, not just for Officers but also for Members, and the review had identified a number of areas for improvement, set out at Paragraph 1.3 of the report, including the need for a structured framework within which all decisions were made; the need to focus on monitoring of conditions and, where planning permission had been given, ensuring that planning permission was being implemented correctly; making better use of IT in order to assist with record keeping e.g. an electronic planning register had been introduced to replace the old paper one; adopting available legislation and looking at opportunities around enforcement, including direct action for Planning Officers to resolve breaches; and, raising the profile of the service amongst Officers, Members and the public to communicate the message that unauthorised development would be addressed in order to act as a deterrent. The Planning Enforcement Plan addressed the need for a more formal structure for enforcement and would be used by Officers as a manual on how to approach enforcement in order to embed this into day-to-day working. He went on to advise that the Planning Enforcement Plan was intended to be informative so that the public could find out what they could and could not do and how to appeal decisions etc.; this was covered in Sections 1-3 and 8-9 of the plan. Sections 4-6 focused on how to report a suspected breach and the Council's priorities for action, including unauthorised breaches of conditions. The plan also set out, at Sections 5, 7 and 12, the customer service standards which people could expect from the Council, whether they were the subject of the breach or the person reporting it. The powers available to the Council, and its commitment to action, were included in Section 10 of the plan and Section 11 gave details of where people could find out more information about the progress of cases and how to comment on the operation of the service. Following consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, it was intended to take the draft Planning Enforcement Plan to the Executive Committee with a view to approving it for a six week consultation period. During that time, Officers would consult with Parish Councils and would publicise the plan in the local press; any comments received would be considered and the plan would be amended as appropriate. The final draft of the plan would then be reported back to the Executive Committee for adoption.
- 65.4 During the discussion which ensued, a Member drew attention to Page No. 45 which set out the intention to bring a report to the Planning Committee on a

monthly basis identifying those matters where formal enforcement action had been taken, with an update on progress, as well as outlining general performance. He welcomed the introduction of this report as there was currently a lack of information once breaches had initially been reported which wasted a lot of time as interested parties were unaware of what was being done. Another Member felt that the plan was very timely as he found a lot of aspects of planning enforcement to be unsatisfactory. He raised concern that the plan made no reference to the role of Members or how enquiries from Members were handled. He indicated that he had submitted a complaint in October 2017 but had not been given any updates since that time. The Head of Development Services recognised that there were currently some issues within enforcement and regular updates should be something which happened as a matter of courtesy. She explained that Officers were currently working on a case management system which would ensure that each enquiry was allocated to a responsible Officer who would be required to follow a particular structure which included reporting back where appropriate. Although this was not detailed in the plan, she provided assurance that it was a key factor behind the scenes. A Member queried how long it took to resolve a suspected breach and was advised that, whilst this was dependent on the individual circumstances, the majority of cases could be expected to be addressed within a few weeks. The Senior Planning and Enforcement Officer explained that people were given time to submit a retrospective application in order to address a breach; if that was not forthcoming, consideration would be given as to what action could be taken. Another Member indicated that members of the public often came to him to discuss breaches as they did not get an answer from the Planning department. The Head of Development Services provided assurance that the management of cases would be more strictly controlled in future which should help to prevent this. In addition, it was noted that Page No. 33 of the plan set out that the Council aimed to acknowledge all enquiries within 48 hours of receipt and to name the assigned Officer who would be undertaking the investigation so they would have a point of contact going forward.

- 65.5 A Member went on to raise concern that the document itself did not include any target dates for implementation and he questioned how delivery would be monitored. He drew attention to Page No. 27 of the plan which referred to the commitment to planning enforcement set out in the National Planning Policy Reference Panel but pointed out that the plan later stated that it was a discretionary service. In response, the Head of Development Services explained that it was important to demonstrate that the Council was committed to enforcement and took breaches seriously; notwithstanding this, it should be borne in mind that planning enforcement was a discretionary service. Officers would look at breaches and take action where possible but the legal tools and powers available were often limited. Another Member indicated that he would like to see more targets and figures within the plan, for example, the number of cases, how many were resolved and how quickly, in order to see some specific aims for improvement. The Head of Development Services advised that it was intended to cover this in the monthly report to Planning Committee where cases could also be discussed in more detail if appropriate. The Member clarified that he was thinking more about general targets in order to take the process forward, rather than specific cases. The Chief Executive advised that the plan was intended to be a user guide for customers, written in a Plain English format. Whilst he took the point about monitoring, performance criteria would not normally be included in a public-facing document, other than what was already included within the plan. He suggested that the performance criteria could be identified and pulled into a separate document as the Planning Committee would be responsible for monitoring performance once the plan was in place.
- 65.6 A Member questioned whether it was possible to notify Members of any breaches within their areas and the Head of Development Services indicated that this should

already be happening and she undertook to check this following the meeting. The Deputy Chief Executive explained that it was intended to provide a lot more opportunities to 'self-serve', not just within planning enforcement, but across a range of Council services. This was not a swift process but it was felt that Members would benefit significantly from being able to check on particular cases themselves to see what progress was being made as and when they required the information.

- 65.7 A Member noted that Page No. 28 of the plan stated that the document should be used as a guide only and suggested seeking independent advice. He did not understand why people were being directed to seek independent advice if the Council was going to enforce against a breach. The Chief Executive reminded Members that the Planning Enforcement Plan had been written for the customer. He clarified that it might be appropriate for someone who had potentially committed a breach to seek their own advice - as the enforcing body, the Council was not able to give independent advice - and this was who that statement was aimed at rather than someone being complained of. He accepted that the wording could be amended to make this clearer.
- 65.8 In response to a query as to whether there were adequate resources to deliver the plan and deal with the concerns that had been raised, the Head of Development Services explained that the planning service had been reviewed as part of the wider development services improvement plan. In an ideal world, there would be a monitoring and compliance officer whose sole job was to ensure that planning permissions were being implemented correctly and to identify any breaches; unfortunately, she did not know of any local authorities which had that luxury and therefore consideration needed to be given as to how to deliver the best possible service within existing resources. It would be very important to work closely with Building Control Officers who were the "eyes and ears on the street" and to direct resources in the most effective and efficient way.
- 65.9 In response to a query regarding how the plan would be progressed, the Head of Democratic Services advised that the plan had been brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration and it would now go forward to the Executive Committee with the comments that had been made. The Executive Committee would decide whether it agreed with those comments and if any changes needed to be made to the plan prior to consultation. When the plan was adopted, the Planning Committee would receive monthly monitoring reports on performance; however, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee may wish to scrutinise its effectiveness once it had been in place for a period of time. In response to a question regarding the role of the Audit Committee, clarification was provided that planning was not within the remit of the Audit Committee; however, an internal audit may help to give assurance that the plan was operating effectively, should that be considered necessary in the future. In order to ensure that a review process was in place, it would be included in the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme following a 12 month period of operation. At that time, should Members feel an audit was a more appropriate way forward this could be raised in the normal consideration of the Committee Work Programme.
- 65.10 Having considered the information provided and views expressed, it was
- RESOLVED** That it be **RECOMMENDED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** that the draft Planning Enforcement Plan be **APPROVED** for public consultation, subject to the comments raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee being addressed.

The meeting closed at 6:40 pm