



Agenda for Scrutiny Committee Thursday, 6th June, 2019, 6.00 pm

Members of Scrutiny Committee

Councillors: A Dent (Chairman), K Bloxham (Vice-Chairman),
T McCollum, K McLauchlan, C Pepper, V Ranger, J Rowland,
E Rylance, J Whibley, M Chapman, I Chubb, B De Saram,
C Gardner, P Jarvis and F King

Venue: Council Chamber, Blackdown House, Honiton

Contact: Chris Lane, Democratic Services Officer;
01395 5175441; email clane@eastdevon.gov.uk
(or group number 01395 517546)
Tuesday, 28 May 2019

East Devon District Council
Blackdown House
Border Road
Heathpark Industrial Estate
Honiton
EX14 1EJ

DX 48808 HONITON

Tel: 01404 515616

www.eastdevon.gov.uk

- 1 Public speaking
Information on [public speaking](#) is available online
- 2 Minutes of the previous meeting (Pages 3 - 8)
- 3 Apologies
- 4 Declarations of interest
Guidance is available online to Councillors and co-opted members on making [declarations of interest](#)
- 5 Matters of urgency
Information on [matters of urgency](#) is available online
- 6 Confidential/exempt item(s)
To agree any items to be dealt with after the public (including the press) have been excluded. There are no items which officers recommend should be dealt with in this way.
- 7 Decisions made by Cabinet called in by Members for scrutiny in accordance with the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules
There are no items identified
- 8 Annual report of the Scrutiny Committee 2018/19 - to note (Pages 9 - 14)
- 9 Members iPads - Services Required - Verbal Report
- 10 Forward Plan 2019/20 (Page 15)

- 11 Date of next meeting - To note that at the request of the Chairman the date of the next meeting has been changed to Thursday 18 July 2019 at 6.00pm.

Under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, any members of the public are now allowed to take photographs, film and audio record the proceedings and report on all public meetings (including on social media). No prior notification is needed but it would be helpful if you could let the democratic services team know you plan to film or record so that any necessary arrangements can be made to provide reasonable facilities for you to report on meetings. This permission does not extend to private meetings or parts of meetings which are not open to the public. You should take all recording and photography equipment with you if a public meeting moves into a session which is not open to the public.

If you are recording the meeting, you are asked to act in a reasonable manner and not disrupt the conduct of meetings for example by using intrusive lighting, flash photography or asking people to repeat statements for the benefit of the recording. You may not make an oral commentary during the meeting. The Chairman has the power to control public recording and/or reporting so it does not disrupt the meeting.

Members of the public exercising their right to speak during Public Question Time will be recorded.

[Decision making and equalities](#)

For a copy of this agenda in large print, please contact the Democratic Services Team on 01395 517546

EAST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL**Minutes of the meeting of Scrutiny Committee held at the Council Chamber, Blackdown House, Honiton on 7 March 2019****Attendance list at end of document**

The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 7.37 pm

51 Public speaking

There were no members of the public present.

52 Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the Scrutiny Committee held on 7th February were confirmed and signed as a true record.

53 Declarations of interest

Councillor Roger Giles – Minute 57, Fly tipping
Type of interest – Personal interest
Reason – Involved in RIO in Ottery St Mary

Councillor Stuart Hughes – Minute 57, Fly tipping
Type of interest – Personal interest
Reason – Member of Devon County Council

Councillor Graham Godbeer - Minute 58, Quarterly Monitoring of Performance
Type of interest – Personal interest
Reason – Daughter is the manager of a Job Centre in Minehead

Councillor Pauline Stott - Minute 58, Quarterly Monitoring of Performance
Type of interest – Personal interest
Reason – Owns a motorhome

54 Matters of urgency

The Chairman stated that an issue had arisen from the meeting of Cabinet the previous evening, and he had accordingly decided that it would have to be raised as a matter of urgency due to the timings of the two meetings involved.

At the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 7 February, four recommendations were referred to Cabinet and discussed on 6 March. At the Cabinet meeting it was resolved that the recommendations would not be accepted. The Chairman said that the final recommendation from Cllr Hughes about a post appeal panel may have been accepted but was not clear.

The Chairman was particularly concerned about the restrictions caused by having a short call-in period. He stated that at EDDC most of the decisions are made by Cabinet members and Portfolio Holders which is a small proportion of all councillors. Call-ins are an important aspect of the checks and balances within the decision making process and allow other non-cabinet members to participate in the process. They are also a rare occurrence.

Following discussion at Cabinet, Cllr Thomas had suggested that training for Councillors might be helpful.

Scrutiny members were disappointed with this outcome, particularly because call-ins were infrequent.

Cllr Wragg stated that she had initiated the suggestion to have a call-in on the specific issue discussed at the last Scrutiny Committee because she was not getting information and answers to questions she was putting to officers. It was not a trivial matter and involved a potentially large sums of money. The Chief Executive, Mark Williams, had informed those supporting a call-in that it could be discussed at Scrutiny Committee but not called-in.

Cllr Bond stated that the Strategic Lead for Governance & Licensing and Monitoring Officer, Henry Gordon-Lennox, had addressed the issue at Cabinet and stated that the Portfolio Holder decision in the case concerned had been called in correctly, but the amount of money involved was too small to warrant the call-in.

Committee members queried whether the recommendations put to Cabinet and not accepted, could be re-presented and go to Council in order for a debate to be had on the issues raised. Cllr Godbeer suggested that the issue could be discussed at Council if was raised as a called minute.

During the discussion some members wanted the timescale for call-ins to be clarified. Others commented that they had no experience of a call-in since being a councillor and because so few decisions were called-in.

The Chairman stated that he was not confused about the issues relating to call-ins, and considered that the conditions for call-ins were too restrictive. Henry Gordon-Lennox had commented at Cabinet that if the process was extended from five days to ten, it would not be helpful.

Cllr Chapman stated that the message given to members changed throughout the process of dealing with this issue, having initially being told that they were out of time, and then being told by Mark Williams that the call-in was in time. She went on to query that if members supporting the call-in were not out of time, then what was the position and what course of action were they able to pursue.

In relation to the recommendation that in all future cases the Legal Services Team should be involved, Henry Gordon-Lennox had stated that it was already involved in all cases.

The Chairman said that in the case under discussion, the Scrutiny Committee had heard evidence that this was not the situation, and in other cases that assistance from the Legal Team was optional, and members were concerned that there may be many other similar cases. The officer who had dealt with this case had indicated that there may be many similar cases which could arise in future.

The Legal Advisor, Anita Williams, stated that a longer call-in period would impact on all decisions and not just those that were called in.

Cllr Stott confirmed that particularly in cases related to housing, delaying significant decisions could have a considerable impact, such as the loss of a potential house purchase.

The Chairman stated that Mark Williams had informed members at Cabinet that the correct procedure had not been followed before it came to members.

Cllr Wragg pointed out that there were a number of principles at issue. This case did not appear to have been handled correctly. She referred to the estimated value of the property involved and that the potential profit from its sale would have allowed the loan from EDDC to be repaid.

Cllr Bond asked Anita Williams to explain the legal position if they were told the amount was too small to fulfil the criteria for a call-in, but all Portfolio Holder decisions are circulated to members containing a suggestion that they can be called in, however, if the amounts involved are small then they cannot be called in and she considered this to be confusing and wasteful of everyone's time and effort. Cllr Bond queried whether it would

not have been better to have made the decision and not informed anyone rather than be in the current situation.

Anita Williams outlined that the call-in was successful in terms of timing and procedure followed, but an exemption existed relating to the amount of money involved, and that in this case it was under a certain amount. She stated that it was the case that all Portfolio Holder decisions were published and that a number of those would not be capable of being called in because their values were under the exemption amount. She advised that if these decisions were not published there would be questions regarding the transparency of the processes used; she also stated that there is a standard template for Portfolio Holder reports and this contains a box regarding call in as standard.

Cllr Chapman wanted to know in cases where money was being waived, whether the Council had a limit on how much they would be prepared to waive, since even if they were low individual amounts, it would soon add up significantly.

Following further comments the Chairman asked the committee how it wanted to proceed on this issue.

RESOLVED;

- 1) That the issue of Call-ins would be put onto the Scrutiny Committee Forward Plan and discussed in further detail at a meeting following the elections, with a view to re-presenting recommendations for changes to the process in future, and
- 2) That the Scrutiny committee would request more information in relation to the waiving of money in cases where people were in situations of being asset rich but cash poor.

55 **Confidential/exempt item(s)**

There were no items that officers recommended should be dealt with requiring the exclusion of the public or press.

56 **Decisions made by Cabinet called in by Members for scrutiny in accordance with the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules**

There were no decisions called in.

57 **Fly tipping**

The Chairman confirmed that Cllrs Tom Wright and Marcus Hartnell, as Portfolio Holder and Deputy, had been invited to the meeting but were unable to attend. Cllr Rylance had particularly wanted this issue raised but was also unable to attend the meeting. Andrew Hancock confirmed that he and Cllr Wright had met Cllr Rylance to discuss the issues that she had raised.

The Service Lead for Streetscene, Andrew Hancock, was in attendance and had provided a number of reports which summarised the situation in East Devon and provided comparisons to the national average, as well as enforcement action taken by EDDC.

Andrew Hancock stated that Fly tipping in East Devon is not a large-scale issue compared to the national picture, however, the Council takes pro-active steps to tackle it. The graphs circulated with the agenda papers show that fly tipping levels are low (when compared to the national average. Between 2013 – 2017, the national average was 2700 incidents, whilst EDDC for the same period was 533.), and the overall trend is decreasing. A slight decrease can be seen in both graphs provided.

Andrew explained that the public report fly tips via the Council's Customer Service Centre. It is then logged onto the LAGAN system for action by the REACT team. EDDC cleans up fly tips on average within 3 days. Streetscene has a team of five operatives (REACT) who are responsible for all fast road litter picking and fly tipping clearance. They bag any evidence they find and forward it to the Environmental Health team who then investigate and take the appropriate action. The REACT team spends around 40% of its time on fly tipping, costing EDDC approximately £55k p.a.'

Whenever EDDC is able to it takes enforcement action where evidence leads to the perpetrator. The waste offences spreadsheet show how many FPNs have been issued for this. EDDC has taken 75 enforcement actions since 2015, equating roughly to 5%.

If caught, perpetrators are charged for the cost of removing the fly tip. Unfortunately, there is usually little evidence, since fly tips tend to occur in isolated places. Covert surveillance via RIPA (Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000) is limited, and the ability of Councils to take more enforcement actions are limited legally, for example, by decriminalisation of offences such as littering.

Andrew stated that social media is used to seek the public's assistance with reporting fly tips, and successful prosecutions resulting in fines result in EDDC issuing a press release. Environmental Health undertake the investigations and enforcement actions. Cllr Hughes asked about abandoned vehicles which were reported to Devon County Council but required action by district councils. Andrew confirmed that this was not a big issue for EDDC with approximately 200 incidents each year. Once again, the powers for a Council to deal with them were restrictive. A vehicle is often not abandoned and then EDDC is unable to intervene and it becomes a highways authority (Devon County Council) problem. A vehicle can be determined as being abandoned if it is not taxed, in which case the DVLA will support actions taken.

In the case of vehicles being abandoned and removed, they would be scrapped if the value is under £1000, or if more than this amount they would be stored temporarily before a contractor scraps them. Costs cannot be recovered from previous owners because they often dispute ownership, and costs to use bailiffs by EDDC would not be covered by the actual costs recovered.

The Chairman went on to refer to the Re-use credit scheme administered by Devon County Council (DCC), on behalf of The Devon Authorities Strategic Waste Committee (DASWAC) which had been running for 22 years. DCC were currently consulting on a number of future options, which included; scrapping the scheme altogether; continuing to run it as it is presently, or continuing to run it in a different way. Cllr Wright is the Vice Chairman of DASWAC currently.

In response to questions from committee members, Andrew stated that if the scheme was scrapped, it was unlikely to increase fly tipping in East Devon due to the different demographics of people involved. If removal charges were scrapped, Andrew stated that this would be unlikely to reduce fly tipping, since the majority of fly tipping was commercially based or related to organised crime. However, he said that the scheme was beneficial.

Andrew reminded members that fly tipping was a crime, and that monies from Fixed Penalty Notices or fines went back into the budget of EDDC and would help to offset the costs of collection.

RESOLVED

That the Scrutiny Committee

- 1) Thanks Andrew Hancock for his presentation and the work of the team involved in dealing with fly tipping

- 2) Responds to DCC on their Consultation about the Re-use Credit Scheme, recognising the positive benefits of the scheme and supporting its continuation. (The consultation period runs from 25th February until 5th April).

58 **Quarterly monitoring of performance - 3rd quarter 2018/19 October to December 2018**

Cllr De Saram wanted to recognise the achievement of delivering quality green space and wildlife habitats alongside new development as an important action which should continue (Council priority 1).

The Chairman brought members attention to performance indicators showing a status of concern.

Under Council priority 4, days taken to process new Housing Benefit claims, members were concerned about the length of time this was taking due to Universal Credit claims taking so long and being handed to the Job Centre to process which had extended the time to about 5 weeks.

Under Service Plan objectives – Priority 4, members were concerned about the Building Control targets which were not currently being met, and the lack of signage in Exmouth for people with motorhomes and campervans to get to off street car parking, due to work done on flood defences.

Cllr Hughes suggested that this latter item be raised at the next HATOC (Highways & Traffic Offences Committee) meeting on 12th March where Cllr Stott represents EDDC.

RESOLVED

That this Committee

1. recognises the achievement of the Council Action under Council Priority 1 – Encouraging communities to be outstanding, by delivering quality green space and wildlife habitats alongside new development, and supports the continuation of efforts to maintain this.
2. Records its concerns about the delays in processing new Housing Benefit claims which can have a detrimental effect on vulnerable claimants.
3. Express concerns that Building Control targets have not been met, creating a significant shortfall in the budget, and request information be provided on;
 - a) How the target was agreed, and
 - b) What will be done to address the issues and increase the annual fee surplus as projected

RECOMMENDATION to Cabinet

1. Refer the matter of signage in Exmouth for people with motorhomes and campervans to the HATOC committee on 12th March 2019 via the EDDC representative, Cllr Stott.

59 **Scrutiny forward plan**

Following the referral of an issue from DMC involving South West Water, they would be invited to attend the next Scrutiny Committee meeting on 4th April. An invitation would also be extended to Ed Freeman in the Planning Service.

Broadband would also be discussed on 4th April and an invite extended to Gigaclear.

The Annual Report would be discussed on 4th April, with themes identified prior to the Annual Council meeting on 22nd May.

The Police & Crime Commissioner would be invited to attend on 4th April and asked to provide updates on the following;
County Lines – relating to drug related deaths within the District
Policing numbers and visibility
CCTV

Attendance List

Councillors present:

R Giles (Chairman)
Chapman
G Godbeer
S Hughes
B de Saram
E Wragg

Councillors also present (for some or all the meeting)

S Bond
P Stott

Officers in attendance:

Andrew Hancock, Service Lead StreetScene
Susan Howl, Democratic Services Manager
Anita Williams, Principal Solicitor (and Deputy Monitoring Officer)

Councillor apologies:

C Nicholas
B Bailey
C Gardner
S Grundy
V Ranger
M Rixson

Chairman

Date:

Annual Report of the Scrutiny Committee 2018/19

1. The Committee has continued to work in alignment with the Council's corporate priorities and regularly considers and comments on performance monitoring data, as well as monitoring decisions by the Cabinet and Portfolio Holders, as part of the scrutiny role as the "critical friend".
2. The last civic year started with an update to the Committee on progress since the Tree Task & Finish Forum (TAFF) report was produced in 2015. Officers reported that the TAFF had been instrumental in providing support and focus for the Tree Team, and they were now more effective in dealing with planning applications and giving advice. There have been a number of significant improvements made over the last three years driven through an ongoing systems thinking review process to deliver a more efficient front line service. The Committee questioned the impact of TAFF recommendations, such as the positive effect of greater engagement with local communities in improving the protection, understanding and management of the district's tree stock, and even more so when there were issues relating to the development of sites, when accidental breaches to Tree Protection Policy often occur. The Committee considered innovative ways to secure compliance on development sites, including use of landscape and tree protection Bonds, whereby it would be possible to retain part of the Bond to implement landscaping or mitigate for damage to trees, when a development deviates from approved plans.
The Committee thanked officers for their work on progressing the TAFF recommendations but remained concerned about the ability of the Council to pursue enforcement actions when necessary. Accordingly recommendations were put to Cabinet aimed at encouraging the investigation of ways to protect trees when sites are developed and generally to secure compliance and appropriate enforcement actions which give a strong message about the Council being prepared to take action.
3. In December 2017, the Communities and Local Government Committee (CLGC) issued its first report of session 2017-19, 'Effectiveness of local authority overview and scrutiny committees', examining the role of scrutiny in local authorities in the light of how the role has evolved since the introduction of overview and scrutiny committees in the Local Government Act 2000. The Scrutiny Committee had submitted a response to this review. Since then, the Government had responded in March 2018, and new guidance to be published by Government was awaited later in the year. The committee reviewed the recommendations by the CLGC, and subsequent Government response, in the context of the current committee arrangements of this Council.

In relation to the majority of the CLGC recommendations, the Constitution of EDDC already supports them via its current arrangements, for example, the constitution allows the committee to recommend to Full Council as well as Cabinet, and is also clear in that there is a distinction between the Scrutiny committee and the Cabinet. This distinction is carried through to Task and Finish Forums (TAFF), and whilst the view of Portfolio

Holders may be sought at both committee and a TAFF, no undue influence on the recommendations from those meetings has been observed.

There was some disagreement amongst local authorities in relation to the level and nature of support and resource to be provided for Scrutiny Committees. The government considered that this should only be determined at local level since there is no requirement for a statutory scrutiny officer in district councils. It is also important that scrutiny work is member led, not set out by a scrutiny officer; and that scrutiny members play an active role in order to deliver effective scrutiny.

Updated guidance will remind councils of the requirements set out in regulations that allow scrutiny members to access exempt or confidential documents in certain circumstances. However, at EDDC, the committee have extensively covered the new model of the CCG and continue to keep a watching brief on it; as well as with other bodies, including the Police Commissioner. It is not easy to secure representatives from external bodies to attend, as has been the case in continuing discussions on mental health provision in the district. The committee was heavily involved with the new Recycling and Waste contract, including debate following the pilot scheme and subsequent meetings as the contract was agreed, and subsequently implemented. The Committee resolved to explore ways in which the public and service users could play a bigger role in the Scrutiny process and how IT or other solutions could assist.

4. Every January, a Joint meeting with the Overview Committee considers the draft budget and service plans for the coming year. Members of the Scrutiny committee were concerned that this process was not sufficient to scrutinise fully and effectively, or early enough to influence. In this civic term, the Chairman and Vice Chairman of both Scrutiny and Overview Committees had committed to reach an agreed solution of a rolling programme of review. In June, they requested an officer report with proposals for facilitating such a review by both committees.

There were ten Service Plans in 2018/19, which provided information about what services aimed to achieve in the current financial year. They also set out service challenges for the next three years, emerging risks, staffing and training and any equalities actions to be achieved.

At the meeting of the Budget Working Group (BWG) on 28th June, there was general agreement that the current Joint Overview & Scrutiny Budget meeting in January was not fit for purpose, as a standalone event. Members needed to understand the two processes of budget setting aligned to service planning much earlier, so the objective of having early involvement of members so that they can be more informed and have the opportunity for debate well in advance of that meeting was agreed by all, and also that Members' preference was to keep the reviews by the two committees separate. Accordingly, Scrutiny Committee agreed to review existing service plans ahead of the formal budget setting process, and would receive presentations from officers at each of its meetings prior to February 2019, as well as involving Portfolio Holders who could report on the functional areas for which they have a remit.

As a result of the extensive work undertaken by Scrutiny Members, the Senior Management Team recommended including an additional Joint Overview & Scrutiny meeting in September, when Strategic and Service Leads across the Council are asked to review and update their service plans to inform the budget setting process.

5. In July, and at the specific request of members, the Committee received a presentation on the food safety service provided by the Commercial Premises Team of Environmental Health.

A key objective is simply to work with food businesses to ensure that all food produced, stored, handled and consumed in East Devon is safe, wholesome and is not a health risk to the consumer. There are 1742 registered food business premises in East Devon, mainly in the food retail and catering categories.

In the UK there is a statutory regime laid down and monitored by the Food Standards Agency for the ways in which local Councils should interact with all of these businesses. The most common "intervention" is a routine inspection, when premises are visited based on the level of risk associated with those businesses. A number of years ago, in common with most other local authorities, this Council adopted the Food Standards Agency National Food Hygiene Rating Scheme, using the various risk scores applied to registered food businesses to create a simple to understand single figure rating from "0" (urgent improvement necessary) to "5" (very good). At the end of their inspection Food Business Operators are all given an official rating score card to display prominently in the window of the business but unlike the situation in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, it is not currently a legal requirement for it to be on display in premises in England.

The scheme is designed to encourage food business operators to work with regulators to improve standards and achieve the highest possible ratings, and also to give consumers an indication of the hygiene standards that existed behind the scenes in the kitchen of a food business at the time of its last inspection. This information should inform consumers' purchasing decisions.

The Committee made a number of recommendations to cabinet which were agreed, including raising the issue through the LGA to press government for it to be a legal requirement for food businesses and eating establishments to display certificates and food hygiene rating scores.

6. In October the committee received a report from the Chief Executive to update members on progress made following recommendations received by the Association of Electoral Administrators in their report on the provision of electoral services at East Devon District Council in February 2018. Progress had been made in all areas and members discussed issues including the increase in staffing resource to secure the effective running of elections, a documented proofing procedure for the printing of election materials as well as the requirement for proper conduct of political parties outside polling stations.

7. Continuing a watching brief on Broadband delivery in rural areas, the Committee heard about Talaton seeking a local solution to their poor broadband speed, beginning in 2016. One of the recommendations agreed by Cabinet in May had been to ask the Diocese for their continued support by using church premises in providing the infrastructure necessary for a broadband solution for rural parishes. This was followed up by the council's Economic Development Manager, who contacted the Senior Church Buildings Adviser to discuss Diocese support for broadband provision in rural parishes. The outcome was that the Diocese are actively engaged in enabling rural broadband provision via approving use of church buildings to host equipment, and have so far permitted the use of 9 churches (including in Talaton) to host antennas. Applications from companies representing rural community beneficiaries are sent to the Diocese to carry out the initial assessment, and rollout to date has primarily been with Airband via the CDS programme.

The Committee considered this to be a very positive response by the church authorities to an approach from EDDC, and a press release to this effect was circulated at the time.

8. In November, Connecting Devon & Somerset (CDS) circulated an update about the difficulties they had experienced in delivering their programme aimed at providing access to superfast broadband coverage for rural communities. One of their contracts with Gigaclear, was to build a whole new fibre network for such communities in Devon by December 2019. Gigaclear appointed Carillion to deliver aspects of the contract but this company was then liquidated. Despite disappointment with lack of progress and poor performance, CDS have recently been given reassurances about how Gigaclear have improved sufficiently to deliver the aims of the original contract. The Scrutiny Committee invited both CDS and Gigaclear to a meeting earlier this year to hear about the remedial plans in place, and the assurances about capacity and resources required for them to go ahead across East Devon. Due to the ongoing nature of their contract negotiations, both companies gave their apologies to meetings in March and April, but want to address the Committee early in the next civic year when specific plans can be discussed in detail.
9. The Licensing Manager updated the committee on the implementation and delivery of Street Trading since changing to a Consent designation on 2 October 2017. Members asked whether this had led to an increase in street cleansing due to litter, but the Licensing team work closely with the Streetscene team, developing a strategy for all major events to coordinate activities. There is a requirement for traders to take litter away and this is checked. They also asked how to encourage groups such as Plastic Warriors which operate in Sidmouth, to develop across the district and established that there were other groups such as in Ottery St Mary, which operate deposit schemes to deal with plastics at events like Tar Barrels. The team will seek to encourage this with all large planned events.
The clean up after Tar Barrels was a spectacular and comprehensive success through initiatives such as the £1 deposit scheme on plastic mugs.

Since October 2017, the Licensing team had processed 175 applications which represented between 2-3,000 individual traders. Despite the increased workload, the team have two performance indicators relating to the number of licensed premises inspections and number of taxi inspections, and there have been no backlogs, missed deadlines or complaints.

Committee members thanked the Licensing Manager and Chairman of Licensing & Enforcement committee for their hard work and made a recommendation to Cabinet to endorse the Street Trading Policy of using biodegradable materials wherever possible rather than single use plastics, and support a reduction in plastic waste.

10. In February, Cabinet referred the East Devon Public Health Strategic Plan 2019/23 to the Scrutiny Committee to consider the evidence used to support the Plan and how the priorities in the Plan will be progressed. The Plan sets out how the Council would encourage and assist services across the Council each to support and improve health and wellbeing across the District.

After a full debate on the issues, Committee members thanked the Public Health Project Officer for the excellent work being undertaken and supported by colleagues across the Council. They then made a number of recommendations to Cabinet (subsequently agreed) to support the intention in the Plan to cover all areas of East Devon district; to encourage improvements to communications with Town and Parish Councils in disseminating public health messages, including increasing the use of social media; to encourage greater use of Social Prescribing and healthier lifestyles, via Leisure East Devon (LED) and community led initiatives and importantly to request that the MECC (Making Every Contact Count) training programme is offered to all EDDC Councillors to help disseminate key messages about Health and Wellbeing in local communities.

11. During the only session of the civic year requiring exclusion of the public and press, the Committee scrutinised the Portfolio Holder decision regarding a Discretionary Home Stay Grant repayment. Members of the Scrutiny Committee were advised of information available to the Portfolio Holder who made the decision and responses to the subsequent Councillors' queries relating to it, so that the committee could scrutinise the process and outcome of the decision. A number of recommendations were presented to cabinet in the event that similar situations re-occurred in future.

12. In March at the request of several members, an update on incidents of fly tipping across East Devon was provided. The Service Lead for Streetscene, provided a number of reports which summarised the situation in East Devon and provided comparisons to the national average, as well as enforcement action taken by EDDC. He stated that Fly tipping in East Devon is not a large-scale issue compared to the national picture, however, the Council takes pro-active steps to tackle it. Fly tipping levels are low (when compared to the national average). Between 2013 and 2017, the national average was 2700 incidents, whilst EDDC for the same period was 533.

EDDC is able to take enforcement action where evidence leads to the perpetrator. Information on waste offences showed how many FPNs (Fixed Penalty Notices) have been issued for this. EDDC has taken 75 enforcement actions since 2015, equating roughly to 5%. If caught, perpetrators are charged for the cost of removing the fly tip. Unfortunately, there is usually little evidence, since fly tips tend to occur in isolated places. Covert surveillance via RIPA (Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000) is limited, and the ability of Councils to take more enforcement actions are limited legally, for example, by decriminalisation of offences such as littering.

Social media is used to seek the public's assistance with reporting fly tips, and successful prosecutions resulting in fines, result in EDDC issuing a press release. Environmental Health undertake the investigations and enforcement actions.

Members asked about abandoned vehicles which were reported to Devon County Council but required action by district councils, but the Service Lead confirmed that this was not a big issue for EDDC with approximately 200 incidents each year and that yet again, the powers for a Council to deal with them were restrictive. There was also reference to the Re-use credit scheme administered by Devon County Council (DCC), on behalf of The Devon Authorities Strategic Waste Committee (DASWAC) which had been running for 22 years. DCC were currently consulting on a number of future options, which included; scrapping the scheme altogether; continuing to run it as it is presently, or continuing to run it in a different way. Cllr Wright is the Vice Chairman of DASWAC and the Committee agreed to respond to DCC on their Consultation about the Re-use Credit Scheme, recognising the positive benefits of the scheme and supporting its continuation.

13. Following the referral of an issue from Development Management Committee involving the role and responsibilities of South West Water (SWW) in relation to Planning applications and the development of sites, senior representatives were invited to attend a Scrutiny Committee meeting, to discuss how the Council and SWW can work more closely in partnership in future, particularly in relation to future growth aspirations and planning for the estimated additional capacity required. As a result, SWW are poised to attend a Committee meeting early in the new civic year.

Agenda Item 10

Scrutiny Committee



Scrutiny Committee Forward Plan 2019/20

Date of Committee	Report	Lead
4 July 2019	To agree an Action Plan to discuss Service Plans South West Water tbc	
5 September 2019	Service plans & Budgets jointly with Overview – a daytime meeting commencing at 10am	
3 October 2019		
21 November 2019		
15 January 2020	Service plans & Budgets jointly with Overview – a daytime meeting commencing at 10am	
6 February 2020		
5 March 2020		
2 April 2020		

Work for allocation to the Forward Plan as appropriate:

Proposed date	Topic
tbc	Portfolio Holder update reports being sought; Committee can then subsequently ask the PH to attend committee on specific aspects of their portfolio.
tbc	Service Plans & associated budgets
tbc	Invite to the Police & Crime Commissioner to attend a meeting to discuss issues such as Anti-Social Behaviour, Vandalism and the reducing presence of Police Officers. (Awaiting confirmation of date).

Topics put forward for further information or for scoping that remain outstanding are:

) Broadband issues – to be reviewed in approx. 6 months