

Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview Committee held at the Hub, Mareham Road, Horncastle, Lincolnshire LN9 6PH on Tuesday, 3rd September, 2024 at 10.00 am.

PRESENT

Councillor Fiona M. Martin, M.B.E. (Chairman)  
Councillor Carleen Dickinson (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors Dick Edginton, Stephen Evans, Neil Jones, Jill Makinson-Sanders and Robert Watson.

Councillor James Knowles attended the Meeting as an Observer.

GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillor Craig                   - Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for  
Leyland                               Corporate Affairs

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Sarah Cocker                   - Community Safety Partnership Officer (virtual)  
Jon Challen                   - Safer Communities Service Manager  
James Gilbert               - Assistant Director - Corporate  
Rebecca James               - Scrutiny and Policy Officer  
Phil Perry                   - Assistant Director - Leisure and Culture  
Lydia Rusling               - Assistant Director - Economic Growth  
Laura Allen                   - Democratic Services Officer

**34. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

Apologies were received from Councillors Alex Hall, Danny Brookes and Claire Arnold.

**35. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS (IF ANY):**

At this point in the Meeting, Members were invited to declare any relevant interests.

Declarations were made as follows:

Councillor Robert Watson requested it be noted that in relation to Agenda Item 8 he was a Council appointed representative as a Board Member of Magna Vitae.

**36. MINUTES:**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 July 2024 were agreed as a correct record.

### 37. ACTIONS:

Members noted that the following Actions were now complete.

#### Actions from the Meeting held on 23 July 2024

Action No. 23(a), 23(c), 25 and 28 – completed.

#### Actions from the Meeting held on 29 November 2022

Action No. 16(a) – completed.

Comments were received as follows:

Action No. 23 (a) – 'To request a greater level of detail on work force issues in reference to the Performance Monitoring Report under the 'Corporate' heading' from the Meeting held on 23rd July 2024, page 19 of the Agenda refers.

A Member queried whether Councillor Kirk was the correct portfolio holder responsible for workforce matters. In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate confirmed to Members that Councillor Craig Leyland was the relevant portfolio holder.

Action No. 23 (b) – 'To request an update on the role and duties of the Volunteer Co-Ordinator and to invite them to a future meeting of the Committee.' from the Meeting held on 23rd July 2024, page 19 of the Agenda refers.

A Member expressed dissatisfaction with the update that further information was being provided to the January 2025 meeting. In response, the Chairman informed the Committee that a job description for the role of Volunteer Co-Ordinator had been circulated to Members prior to the Meeting and that attempts had been made to receive an update sooner (a copy is attached at Appendix A to the Minutes).

In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate confirmed that a further request would be made for an update to be provided at the October 2024 Meeting.

Action No. 28 – 'In reference to Section 106 Agreements: a) To request clarification on East Lindsey being allocated the lowest multiplier as part of the NHS formula and receiving the lowest payment in Lincolnshire per dwelling compared to other districts.' from the Meeting held on 23rd July 2024, pages 19 and 20 of the Agenda refer.

A Member disagreed with the explanation provided and did not accept the reasoning that East Lindsey district had been allocated the lowest multiplier compared to other areas such as Boston Borough. In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate confirmed that greater level of detail would be obtained and brought back to the Committee.

In reference to Appendix A2 and the ELDC weblink for Section 106 obligations and infrastructure Funding Statement, a Member expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of benefit to the coastal strip which was observed from examining the list of areas that had received S106 agreements.

A Member further queried whether caravan sites were utilising Section 106 agreements to benefit the community and local infrastructure.

In response, Councillor Leyland as Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Corporate Affairs informed Members that Councillor Tom Ashton was the relevant Portfolio Holder and that the issues raised were critical in relation to the upcoming review of the Local Plan. Councillor Leyland further advised Members that provision of housing within 35% flood risk areas was non-existent because of the Local Plan and that the Environment Agency did not support development in flood risk areas which the Council had continued to challenge.

Councillor Leyland advised Members that the review of the Local Plan would present the opportunity to drive housing into the coastal areas and that timing of the Local Plan review was critical in relation to the Environment Agency's review of sea defences and long-term strategies.

In conclusion, Councillor Leyland stated that he would liaise with Councillor Tom Ashton as Portfolio Holder for Planning on Members becoming more involved in reviewing the Local Plan and that the Committee's comments would be taken forward.

A Member further queried the likelihood of the Environment Agency changing its view on the provision of housing in flood risk areas and the lack of forward planning and strategy to reinvigorate the coast and update flood defences.

The Chairman informed Members that the Committee would be able to highlight these issues to the Portfolio Holder for Planning at the next meeting.

Action No. 103 – 'Clarification to be provided on a timeline for appraising additional conservation areas' from the Meeting held on 16th April 2024, pages 20 of the Agenda refers.

A Member expressed dissatisfaction with the rate of progression for appraising conservation areas. In response, the Chairman confirmed that an update was being provided at the next Meeting by the Portfolio Holder for Planning.

Action No. 23 (a) – 'To request an update on the recruitment process for the Local Partnership Group and Theme Groups and the measures taken to ensure that local businesses and groups have local representation' from the Meeting held on 23rd July 2024, pages 19 of the Agenda refers.

In reference to Appendix A1, a Member expressed dissatisfaction that there was no Councillor representation on the Theme Groups and queried who was responsible for appointing Members to the group, page 23 and 24 of the Agenda refer.

In response, Lydia Rusling, Assistant Director - Economic Growth advised Members that the UKSPF was currently managed by Saul Farrell and that government requirements had been to utilise the existing structures from Town Boards from 2022. The Assistant Director – Economic Growth further highlighted the background leading to the formation of theme groups and informed Members that confirmation would be obtained that the approach to selecting representation was inclusive across the whole of East Lindsey district.

### **38. CRIME AND DISORDER REPORT:**

Jon Challen, Safer Communities Service Manager and Sarah Cocker, Community Safety Partnership Officer (virtual) were in attendance to present Members with the Crime and Disorder Report, pages 27 to 114 of the Agenda refer.

The report provided an overview of the work currently being undertaken by the Safer Lincolnshire Partnership at County level, the South & East Lincolnshire Community Safety Partnership (SELCSP) at a local level, along with information on CCTV across the partnership and Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) enforcement activity in East Lindsey. The report recommended that the contents were noted, and additional areas of focus were considered for inclusion in future reports.

Members were invited for their comments and questions.

- A Member spoke in support of the report and commented that the frequent use of acronyms was not easily deciphered by a layperson.
- A Member commented that strategies played out differently on the ground and emphasised the importance of ensuring that strategies worked.
- A Member further highlighted concerns with streetlighting in Louth town centre and queried whether it was being addressed to reduce crime.
- In reference to White Ribbon Day and 16 days of Action in relation to the Safety of Women & Girls, a Member expressed disappointment that the Council was not working more closely with EDAN Lincs, a charity providing support and assistance to anyone suffering or fleeing from Domestic Abuse in Lincolnshire.
- A Member further highlighted concern for the lack of recognition for violence against Men and Boys.

- The Chairman commented that Louth was one of the few towns that still benefited from PCSOs.
- The Safer Communities Service Manager advised Members that all risks would be managed as part of the strategy and that the Community Safety Partnership Officer had assisted in ensuring that the action plan was up to date for identifying and informing on priorities. The Safer Communities Service Manager further advised Members that the approach aimed to ensure that the strategy was working and reflected what the Council was trying to deliver locally in comparison to the Safer Lincolnshire Partnership which operated at a different strategic level across the whole of Lincolnshire.
- In reference to the Pride in Place and Purple Flag aspirations campaign, a Member queried the level of work being undertaken in relation to the community payback scheme and whether community payback initiatives could be directed towards assisting with local issues such as clearing sand on the promenade in Mablethorpe, page 31 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Safer Communities Service Manager informed Members that a presentation was delivered 18 months ago at the Community Safety Partnership by the lead officer for that area and that requests for assistance could be considered. The Safer Communities Service Manager further advised Members that the community payback scheme was very active within the county and that an update on the level of activity would be requested.
- A Member praised the work of the community payback scheme and provided an example of the schemes work at Louth cemetery and further highlighted that policy and procedural restrictions were holding back more widespread utilisation of the schemes assistance.
- In reference to the Community Rangers in Boston town centre, a Member spoke in support of the initiative and queried whether they were a substitute for policeman and whether the amount of work undertaken by the Council from their own expenditure was being used to compensate for a poor police budget. In response, the Safer Communities Service Manager highlighted to Members the ways in which the role of Community Rangers differed to the role of the police.

The Safer Communities Service Manager confirmed to Members that an update would be requested from Superintendent Lee St Quinton to clarify the police's position on concerns about local policing and the effects following the removal of PCSOs.

The Safer Communities Service Manager further advised Members of the significant increase in environmental crime in recent years and informed Members that the Council had been required to step in where other agencies had been unauthorised to do so.

- In reference to the project for SELCSP sponsorship of the match ball at Boston Utd on 23rd December 2023, a Member commented that a message on a ball was not easily observed and queried whether other opportunities for advertising had been considered such as community safety banners which had wider visibility, page 50 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Safer Communities Service Manager assured Members that in addition to ball sponsorship, announcements were made at the football ground as part of the sponsorship deal which would reach an audience of approximately 2500-3000 people. The Safer Communities Service Manager further advised Members that following the Committee's comments, additional avenues for different forms of advertising would be explored.
- A Member queried whether special constabulary was involved in the development of strategies. In response, the Safer Communities Service Manager confirmed there was no involvement by special constabularies in the strategies due to the use of police officers being an operational matter which was the responsibility of the Chief Constable. The Safer Communities Service Manager further assured Members that the Partnership was kept informed of increased police presence in relation to specific events or protests, were updated on police structures and invited onto recruitment panels.
- A Member further commented that the presence of special police on the streets was non-existent.
- The Community Safety Partnership Officer referenced an earlier point in relation to the White Ribbon Day and 16 days of Action Campaign and assured Members that EDAN Lincs was promoted as part of the campaign and moving forward more support would be given to local support agencies. In response, the Chairman commented on the benefit of further information being provided on EDAN Lincs.

No further comments or questions were received.

The Chairman extended her thanks to the Safer Communities Service Manager and Community Safety Partnership Officer for their attendance.

Following which it was,

RESOLVED:

- That the content of the report be noted.
- That areas of focus to be included in future reports be considered by Members.

*N.B. The Safer Communities Service Manager and Community Safety Partnership Officer left the Meeting at 10.43am.*

### **39. EAST LINDSEY INVESTMENT FUND:**

The Chairman welcomed Lydia Rusling, Assistant Director – Economic Growth to provide Members with an update on the East Lindsey Investment Fund.

Members received a presentation that detailed the Partnership’s Growth and Prosperity Plan, an overview of East Lindsey’s Investment Fund Programme including themes, principles and a framework for the fund and next steps for the future (a copy is attached at Appendix B to the Minutes).

Councillor Leyland as Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Corporate Affairs advised Members that the Council was in a unique financial position to support investment and was working collectively to deliver the funding whilst recognising the need for extra capacity. Councillor Leyland concluded by emphasising the potential the funding had for transforming communities and shaping East Lindsey over the next 10 to 15 years.

Members were invited to put their comments and questions forward.

- The Chairman highlighted that maintenance was a big issue which needed to be addressed and referenced Horncastle as an example where the assumption was that Town and Parish Councils who had limited resources would take on maintenance responsibilities after the scheme had ended. In response, the Assistant Director – Economic Growth advised Members that the investment which had come through the capital funding including the UKSPF was not centred solely around delivery of the £10 million investment fund and included funding for a continuation of maintenance. The Assistant Director – Economic Growth confirmed that the concerns regarding maintenance would be more strongly highlighted in the report following the Committee’s comments.
- A Member further commented on maintenance, stating that the Council had not always highlighted outstanding maintenance of its assets such as the Sutton on Sea Colonnade and queried whether an annual asset survey could be undertaken alongside a schedule of repairs to ensure that maintenance risks were monitored and acted upon before failure occurred.
- Members proceeded to discuss the importance of volunteers in relation to maintenance issues and that an update from the volunteer co-ordinator at the next Meeting would address any concerns.

- A Member expressed disappointment that market towns had not been highlighted more in the presentation and commented that a clear strategy was needed to bring in more funding to market towns and increase what they had to offer.
- A Member requested access to a paper presentation to enable other councillors and volunteers to become more involved. In response, the Assistant Director – Economic Growth confirmed that a copy of the presentation would be provided to Members following the meeting and that a subsequent report would be made available for the Executive Board.
- A Member spoke in support of the presentation and the intention to support volunteers and appreciated those who offered their time to volunteer for the benefit of the Council's success.
- A Member further commented that £10 million was a good amount of funding that would replace the EU funding that was previously received along the coast and wished to see the Outstanding Area of Natural Beauty remain and be preserved.
- A Member expressed concerns with improving shop fronts in town centres and commented that funds should be invested into converting shops into homes rather than improving shop fronts in areas where shopping had moved online. In response, a Member commented that high street retail was expected to make a comeback and that businesses should be supported to both maintain physical shop fronts and operate online.
- A Member further commented on the lack of transport in rural areas and queried whether funds could be invested into improving communications and transport. In response, a Member commented that transport was the responsibility of Lincolnshire County Council.
- Councillor Leyland as Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Corporate Affairs advised Members that the debate had been very informative and that the opportunity for funding would not occur again and acknowledged the concerns about maintenance.
- Councillor Leyland concluded on Members' comments and advised the Committee that many communities had benefited from the UKSPF and that the offer needed to be delivered across the district as it provided an exciting opportunity for transformation.
- A Member commented that greater support from the County Council and the Highways Authority would provide increased advantages where schemes had previously been prevented from moving forward. In response, the Assistant Director – Economic Growth confirmed that the principles of the Council's growth and prosperity plan was for working in partnership and that there were further opportunities to engage with the County Council.



- A Member queried the availability of the market towns report and obtaining access to a list of Place Managers. In response, the Assistant Director – Economic Growth confirmed that the report and a structure chart would be made available.

No further comments or questions were received. The Chairman thanked the Assistant Director – Economic Growth for attending the meeting and providing an informative update.

*N.B. The Assistant Director – Economic Growth left the Meeting at 11.26am.*

#### **40. HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR LINCOLNSHIRE - UPDATE:**

The Chairman advised Members that the Health Scrutiny Committee (HSC) for Lincolnshire had not met since July, therefore there was no briefing paper to consider.

The Chairman invited Councillor Jill Makinson-Sanders, the Outside Body Appointee to the HSC to update Members on any issues that had arisen since that time.

Members noted that the next Meeting of the HSC was on Wednesday 11 September 2024.

#### **41. UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY AND POLICY PANELS INCLUDING QUALITY CHECKING OF FINAL REPORTS:**

##### **(a) Joint Scrutiny of the scope and proposed arrangements for a Sub-Regional Leisure Facilities Operator Contract:**

Rebecca James, Scrutiny and Policy Officer introduced the final draft report from the joint Scrutiny Task and Finish Group on the 'Joint Scrutiny of the scope and proposed arrangements for a Sub-Regional Leisure Facilities Operator Contract', pages 115 to 134 of the Agenda refer.

In response, Phil Perry, Assistant Director – Leisure and Culture assured Members that the report had highlighted that a comprehensive review of the process had been undertaken by the Task Group.

Members were invited to put their comments and questions forward.

- A Member commented that feedback had been received that Task Group attendance was poor and that there were concerns with the decision-making process.
- A Member further queried the decision-making responsibility of the Executive Board and voiced concerns that the final decision on the contract was not the responsibility of the Full Council. In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate confirmed to Members that the

decision was an executive function and within the budget framework for the Executive Board to approve a contract of this value.

- Members expressed further dissatisfaction that the Executive Board held the final decision. In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate further advised Members that the Executive Board were permitted to spend more than £500,000 if the request for funds was part of the approved budget framework.
- Phil Perry, Assistant Director – Leisure and Culture drew Members attention to Appendix 1 and Appendix 3 of the report and reminded Members of the benefits of working in Partnership. It was highlighted that ELDC was still a sovereign authority, and that each Council across the Partnership was responsible for its own decision making and scrutiny functions, pages 119 to 134 of the Agenda refer.
- A Member queried what would occur in the situation where one of the three Partnership Councils did not agree. In response, the Assistant Director – Leisure and Culture informed Members that decisions would need to be taken and depended on the circumstances at each stage.
- In reference to the decision for the Regional Leisure Facilities Operator Contract being Partnership wide and where options to prepare for different decisions at one or more Councils was considered, a Member queried a previous understanding that each Council was responsible for its own decisions and that the decision would be presented to Full Council, page 121 of the Agenda refers.
- A Member further referenced the Constitution in that all procurement procedures must deliver the most economically advantageous contribution and expressed concern with the implications of selecting the cheapest option.
- A Member expressed dissatisfaction with the process for awarding contracts which could result in a loss of benefits for residents. In response, the Chairman advised Members that the potential issues being raised were expected when going out to tender for any contract.

The Scrutiny and Policy Officer advised Members that the procurement process was a framework and that the awarding of contracts by the Executive Board was part of the framework when decisions were not able to be delegated to officers.

Members were further referred to the statement on the Council's Financial Procedural Rules which stated that if the additional budget request was greater than £500k this would require Full Council approval, page 122 of the Agenda refers.

The Scrutiny and Policy Officer provided further clarification to Members that the Executive Board was not making the final decision and was only being consulted on the report.

In response, the Assistant Director – Leisure and Culture provided Members with assurances that the decision to award contracts was not price driven and was based on a balance between quality, price and corporate priorities which was not intended to disadvantage any tender.

- The Chairman and Scrutiny and Policy Officer further clarified to Members that attendance for the Task and Finish Group was well attended.
- A Member expressed further dissatisfaction with the awarding of contracts being the sole responsibility of the Executive Board and commented that the Constitution needed to be amended.

The Chairman thanked the Scrutiny and Policy Officer and Assistant Director – Leisure and Culture for their report.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED:

- That the draft report on the 'Joint Scrutiny of the scope and proposed arrangements for a Sub-Regional Leisure Facilities Operator Contract' be noted and the associated recommendations agreed.

*N.B. The Assistant Director – Leisure and Culture left the Meeting at 11.47am.*

**(b) Scrutiny Panel Update - Review of the Carbon Reduction Plan and associated carbon reduction activity at ELDC:**

Rebecca James, Scrutiny and Policy Officer referred Members to the briefing paper, pages 135 to 136 of the Agenda refer.

Members were advised that that the panel had met four times to date with further meetings planned in September 2024. The meeting planner has been updated to reflect key issues which needed further investigation and review and future meetings would explore how different service areas (car parks, buildings, vehicles) within ELDC considered Carbon Reduction within various processes.

Members were further advised that a final report was expected to be presented at the November 2024 Overview Committee Meeting.

Members were invited to put their comments and questions forward.

- A Member queried whether scrutiny panel reports were the responsibility of the Chairman to produce and present to the Committee. In response, the Chairman confirmed to Members that there were no specific requirements for a Chairman to write their own report and that it was an individual choice.
- The Chairman queried whether there was a Terms of Reference for Chairmen of scrutiny groups. In response, the Scrutiny and Policy Officer reiterated that there was no specific requirement for a Chairman to write reports and that the Committee could make a request for the Chairman of each panel to write their own report. In response, the Chairman commented that scrutiny panel Chairmen was welcomed to attend and present their reports to the Committee.
- A Member further queried the percentage of Chairmen that did not write the reports themselves. In response, the Scrutiny and Policy Officer advised Members that there was a variation in the number of Chairmen who wrote their own reports and that an exact figure could not be provided.

The Chairman further advised Members that training for scrutiny panel chairs would be reconsidered moving forward.

No further comments or questions were received.

**(c) Scrutiny Panel Update - Project Management Analysis:**

Rebecca James, Scrutiny and Policy Officer referred Members to the briefing paper, pages 137 to 138 of the Agenda refer.

Members were informed that the topic of Project Management Analysis had been advertised in the Members' Point Brief, both before and after the election and that to date, only 2 members had come forward.

Members were further advised that the Committee were required to decide whether to re-advertise for additional Members or whether to choose another topic from the scrutiny panel work programme or to return the topic as a future Agenda item.

Further to a discussion, Members agreed that a discussion would be undertaken with the author of the topic prior to a decision being made by the Committee.

**(d) Scrutiny Panel Update - Annual Joint Scrutiny of the South & East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership 2024:**

Rebecca James, Scrutiny and Policy Officer referred Members to the briefing paper, pages 141 to 142 of the Agenda refer.

Members were informed that the annual scrutiny of the Partnership would commence on 8th September 2024 and aimed to gain assurance that the Partnership was on track to deliver its aims, that results were being achieved in key areas and to identify relevant objectives and areas of focus for the coming year.

The Scrutiny and Policy officer further advised Members that an anonymous survey being undertaken had provided useful comments and feedback and Members were still being encouraged to submit their responses.

#### **42. SCOPING OF SCRUTINY AND POLICY TOPICS:**

The Chairman referred Members to the draft project scoping templates 'To explore effective development opportunities and support for Members' and 'Review of support for Towns and Parishes across East Lindsey', pages 143 to 146 of the Agenda refer.

Members were invited for their comments and questions.

*To explore effective development opportunities and support for Members.*

The Scrutiny and Policy Officer informed Members of new information that the formation of a Member development group had previously been agreed as part of the Annual Delivery Plan and that Members were now being asked to examine the remit of the group rather than agreeing to its formation.

- The Chairman queried whether the Member development group could commence immediately. In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate advised Members that work was being undertaken on the formation of the group and that the group was intended to be in place by the end of September 2024.
- The Chairman commented that the Committee would like further input on the remit of the Member development group.
- A Member queried whether there were any officer roles that still existed similar to a Member Development Officer.

The Assistant Director – Corporate advised Members that the piece of work had been influenced by work undertaken at Boston Borough and South Holland Councils and that the Member development group would be a piece of learning that could be shared across the Partnership.

Further to discussion, Members agreed to accept the scope for 'To explore effective development opportunities and support for Members' which would be utilised for the Member Development Group.

*Review of support for Towns and Parishes across East Lindsey.*

The Chairman commented that the topic was particularly relevant for examining maintenance issues that had been highlighted in an earlier Agenda item. The Chairman further emphasised the issues where town and parish councils had limited resources to take on additional maintenance responsibilities.

Further to discussion, Members agreed to accept to the scope for the 'Review of support for Town and Parishes across East Lindsey'.

#### **43. PERFORMANCE AND GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK Q1 2024/25:**

James Gilbert, Assistant Director - Corporate presented Members with the Performance and Governance Framework - Quarter 1 (Q1) Monitoring Report 2024/25 (as at the end of June 2024), pages 147 to 196 of the Agenda refer.

Members attention was drawn to the Q1 performance targets (Appendix 1), the performance trends (Appendix 2) and Q1 risks (Appendix 3).

Members were invited to put their comments and questions forward.

- In reference to the Strategic Risks for the Local Plan with a risk score of Medium, a Member commented that risk of non-completion should be considered as High when there were risks of the Local Plan not being completed in time and when there were issues with staffing levels and lack of support from the Environment Agency, page 149 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate confirmed to Members that the risk profiles would be reviewed in consideration of the Committee's comments.
- In reference to the Strategic Risk for External Communications with a risk score of Medium, a Member was dissatisfied with the effectiveness of internal communications for ensuring that Members were kept informed and commented that the risk was perceived as High, page 150 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Chairman acknowledged that Members continued to experience communication issues of what was occurring within their wards and that the issues needed further reinforcement.

The Assistant Director – Corporate advised Members that a protocol had been agreed for specific issues to be raised with each Assistant Director and that Members were encouraged to provide examples of issues with communication.

- In reference to East Lindsey Q1 performance under the heading of Environment, a Member queried who was responsible for grading streets and whether grade B litter included out of town streets and also what the procedures were for reporting, page 160 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate confirmed that an update on the methodology of grading litter and the reporting mechanisms would be made available to Members.

- In reference to the Healthy Lives KPI for 'Percentage of cases opened at homelessness prevention stage', a Member highlighted that percentages were not good indicators of the number of people who were affected by homelessness, page 158 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate confirmed that the measures of reporting would be examined.
- A Member commented on issues observed in Louth with homeless people sleeping in shop doorways.
- In reference to Environment KPI's for Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs), a Member commented on the lack of inclusion of data on dog fouling which was a significant problem on the coast, p178 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate confirmed that a request would be made for specific data on dog fouling.
- In reference to Efficiency and Effectiveness KPI's for percentage of corporate complaints responded to within corporately set timescales, a Member commented on issues with lack of responsiveness from officers to emails sent and the benefit of an acknowledgement email from the Council to confirm that comments or concerns were being dealt with. In response, the Assistant Director – Corporate confirmed that the Committees comments would be noted.
- In relation to the percentage of carparking income received against agreed annual budget, a Member queried whether the carparking income was set at the correct level and what factors influenced the red status, page 163 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Chairman advised Members that it was assumed to be accurate as the budget had been agreed and added that weather influences could not be predicted. The Assistant Director – Corporate further assured Members that fluctuation was expected.
- In reference to Kingfisher Caravan Park, a Member commented that the figures should be included in the report that was being presented to Full Council, page 167 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Chairman advised Members that a scrutiny report on Kingfisher Caravan Park was expected in October and that additional monitoring was being undertaken by the Audit and Governance Committee.
- In reference to the Strategic Risk for Lincshire flood defence, a Member commented on the recommended treatment for the risk as 'tolerate' and that the status should be moved to 'treat' the risk to ensure that action on flood defences was taken before it was too late, page 187 of the Agenda refers. In response the Chairman supported that the Committees comments be put forward for the risk to be treated.

- In reference to KPI's for Growth and Prosperity in relation to 'Average monthly high street footfall count per key town' and the narrative which stated that 'The figures are compiled using mobile phone data', a Member expressed dissatisfaction that figures were not reflective of footfall from people without mobile phones, page 170 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Chairman advised Members that further information would be requested on how the process accurately measured high street footfall by utilising mobile phone data.

No further comments or questions were received.

Following which, it was

RESOLVED:

That the Performance and Governance Framework - Quarter 1 Monitoring Report 2024/25 be noted.

#### **44. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION TRACKER:**

Members were referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation Tracker, pages 197 to 232 of the Agenda refer. Members were invited to review the tracker and put their comments and questions forward.

A Member commented that the type face of the report when printed on paper did not conform with the Disability Act. In response, the Assistant Director - Corporate informed Members that further attempts would be made to make the format of the report larger and more accessible. A Member highlighted to the Committee that readability was greatly improved with the use of the Modern.Gov app which was available to all Councillors on their iPads.

The Scrutiny and Policy advised Members that the recommendations on pages 197 to 200 were not overdue as indicated in the tracker and that the new timescale for Recommendation No 3 was January 2025 and for Recommendation No 4 it was November 2024. Members were further advised that Recommendation 5 was now complete.

Overview Standing Reference Group: Sutton on Sea Colonnade Project.

Recommendation No 4 'Explore opportunities with universities and museum services to develop the exhibition space', page 198 of the Agenda refers.

A Member expressed disappointment that the action was late being taken forward and commented that a strategy needed to be put in place as soon as possible for such high value projects. In response, the Assistant Director - Corporate confirmed that the Committee's comments would be provided to the project team.



Recommendation No 5 'Include more soft landscaping in the final design', page 199 of the Agenda refers.

A Member expressed dissatisfaction with accuracy of the update and stated that Ward Members had not been kept informed of any updates or meetings in relation to bringing the Colonnade project to fruition.

To explore the issues surrounding caravan licensing and enforcement

Recommendation No 1 'To recognise the need to make Caravan Enforcement a priority for the new Council, with the first priorities dealing with the issue of unauthorised occupancy and to review and strengthen licence conditions', page 201 of the Agenda refers.

A Member informed the Committee that the Assistant Director of Planning and Strategic Infrastructure had explained the delays in addressing caravan enforcement issues and had confirmed that he would be in attendance at the October 2024 meeting to answer the Committee's questions.

Recommendation No 4 'Draw up, as a matter of urgency, a register of every East Lindsey Caravan site, including existing planning permissions, and this to be shared with Emergency Planning Service', page 203 of the Agenda refers.

A Member considered that the register of every caravan in East Lindsey was beneficial for Member contacts and communications in addition to assisting the emergency services. In response, the Scrutiny and Policy Officer advised Members that the action had turned green as the register had been completed.

A Member further commented that the action should remain open to ensure that concerns were addressed on who could access the register. In response, the Chairman confirmed that the action would remain on the tracker until the next Meeting.

How can ELDC help improve the design, quality, and choice of new and existing housing in the district?

Recommendation No 4 'The Local Plan will consider a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)', page 213 of the Agenda refers.

A Member commented on the opportunity for all Members to attend Planning Policy Committee Meetings and that more Members were encouraged to attend to help shape the district's Local Plan. In response, the Chairman advised Members that further considerations on the Local Plan would need to be made from new guidelines following the change of government.

To monitor the implementation of Magna Vitae's 5-year plan, including Key Performance Indicators (part 2)

Recommendation No 1 'ELDC communications team to look at developing a promotional campaign to help increase membership numbers via their social media and communication channels', page 214 of the Agenda refers.

A Member queried whether communications had been sent out to promote increasing membership and whether this referred only to distribution via social media. In response, the Chairman confirmed that Members received emails from communications for press releases. The Assistant Director – Corporate further advised Members that the action was not believed to be completed and that further information would be sought on the level of communications that were being put out.

Public Transport in the S&ELCP area

Recommendation No 6 'To further explore the merits of how the SELCP can encourage community and commercial transportation solutions for the area and develop outline business cases for intervention', page 224 of the Agenda refers.

A Member queried whether the Overview Committee could be provided with a future update from Matthew Hogan, Assistant Director – Strategic Growth and Development. In response, the Chairman confirmed that a request would be made for his attendance at the November 2024 Meeting.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their comments.

No further comments or questions were received.

Following which it was,

RESOLVED:

That the Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation Tracker be noted.

#### **45. EXECUTIVE/COUNCIL FORWARD PLAN:**

Members were presented with the Executive/Council Forward Plan 2024-25, pages 233 to 244 of the Agenda refer and were invited for their comments.

- In reference to the Housing Standards Strategy, the Chairman queried whether the Committee wished to examine the strategy and whether sufficient time was available before the report was presented to Council, page 238 of the Agenda refers.
- In relation to the Healthy Living Action Plan, a Member queried whether Councillors had been involved in the production of the

Plan. In response, the Scrutiny and Policy Officer advised Members that two groups existed which included one for officers and one for both councillors and officers and that a full update on the Healthy Living Board and the recommendations was expected at the Overview Committee Meeting in January 2025.

- A Member referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Recommendation Tracker in relation to recommendation 7 - Healthy Living Action Plan to 'Further develop District Councils preventative approach' and queried what the Council was preventing, page 230 of the Agenda refers. In response, the Scrutiny and Policy Officer advised Members that information had been obtained from the Healthy Living Action Plan and was part of a set of actions and advised that more detailed information would be provided in future updates.
- A Member commented on the importance of Executive Members speaking about their portfolios at Full Council Meetings and to take questions. In response, the Chairman advised Members that the topic could be raised at the Group Leaders Meetings.

Following which it was,

RESOLVED:

That the Executive/Council Forward Plan 2024-25 be noted.

**46. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

The programmed date for the next Meeting of this Committee was noted as 15 October 2024.

The Meeting closed at 12.34 pm.