

South Hams Overview and Scrutiny Panel



Title:	Agenda												
Date:	Thursday, 27th July, 2017												
Time:	10.00 am												
Venue:	Cary Room - Follaton House												
Full Members:	<p style="text-align: center;">Chairman Cllr Saltern Vice Chairman Cllr Smerdon</p> <p><i>Members:</i></p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td>Cllr Baldry</td> <td>Cllr Hicks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Birch</td> <td>Cllr Huntley</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Blackler</td> <td>Cllr May</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Cane</td> <td>Cllr Pennington</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Green</td> <td>Cllr Pringle</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Hawkins</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Cllr Baldry	Cllr Hicks	Cllr Birch	Cllr Huntley	Cllr Blackler	Cllr May	Cllr Cane	Cllr Pennington	Cllr Green	Cllr Pringle	Cllr Hawkins	
Cllr Baldry	Cllr Hicks												
Cllr Birch	Cllr Huntley												
Cllr Blackler	Cllr May												
Cllr Cane	Cllr Pennington												
Cllr Green	Cllr Pringle												
Cllr Hawkins													
Interests – Declaration and Restriction on Participation:	Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest not entered in the Authority's register or local non pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda (subject to the exception for sensitive information) and to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on an item in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.												
Committee administrator:	Member.Services@swdevon.gov.uk												

1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Minutes	1 - 10
to approve as a correct record and authorise the Chairman to sign the minutes of the Panel held on 6 July 2017;	
3. Urgent Business	
brought forward at the discretion of the Chairman;	
4. Division of Agenda	
to consider whether the discussion of any item of business is likely to lead to the disclosure of exempt information;	
5. Declarations of Interest	
Members are invited to declare any personal or disclosable pecuniary interests, including the nature and extent of such interests they may have in any items to be considered at this meeting;	
6. Public Forum	11 - 12
A period of up to 15 minutes is available to deal with issues raised by the public;	
7. Draft Executive Forward Plan	13 - 16
Note: If any Member seeks further clarity, or wishes to raise issues regarding any future Executive agenda item, please contact Member Services before 5.00pm on Monday 24 July 2017 to ensure that the lead Executive Member(s) and lead officer(s) are aware of this request in advance of the meeting.	
8. T18 Payback Period and Transitional Funding Arrangements	
To follow	
9. Planning Enforcement Service Review	17 - 22
10. Street Naming and Numbering Policy	23 - 44
11. Quarterly Performance Indicators	45 - 56

12. SH/WH Joint Steering Group Update **57 - 78**

13. Task and Finish Groups (if any)

- (a) Dartmouth Lower Ferry;
- (b) Discretionary Grant Funding; and
- (c) Performance Measures

14. Actions Arising / Decisions Log **79 - 82**

15. Annual Work Programme 2017/18 **83 - 84**

to consider items for programming on to the annual work programme of the Panel, whilst having regard to the resources available, time constraints of Members and the interests of the local community.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL
HELD AT FOLLATON HOUSE, TOTNES ON
THURSDAY, 6 JULY 2017**

Panel Members in attendance:			
* Denotes attendance		∅ Denotes apology for absence	
*	Cllr K J Baldry	*	Cllr E D Huntley
*	Cllr J P Birch	*	Cllr D W May
∅	Cllr J I G Blackler	*	Cllr J T Pennington
*	Cllr B F Cane	*	Cllr K Pringle
*	Cllr J P Green	*	Cllr M F Saltern (Chairman)
*	Cllr J D Hawkins	*	Cllr P C Smerdon (Vice Chairman)
∅	Cllr M J Hicks		

Other Members also in attendance:
Cllrs H D Bastone, I Bramble, J Brazil, R D Gilbert, J M Hodgson, T R Holway, N A Hopwood, J A Pearce, R C Steer and S A E Wright

Item No	Minute Ref No below refers	Officers in attendance and participating
All		Executive Director (Service Delivery and Commercial Development); Group Manager – Customer First and Support Services and Senior Specialist – Democratic Services
7	O&S.15/17	Group Manager – Business Development
8	O&S.16/17	Section 151 Officer; Deputy Monitoring Officer; Specialist (Assets); Specialist (Place and Strategy) and Specialist (Place Making)
9	O&S.17/17	COP Lead – Housing, Revenue and Benefits and Case Management Manager

O&S.12/17 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel held on 18 May 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

O&S.13/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and officers were invited to declare any interests in the items of business to be considered during the course of the meeting. These were recorded as follows:

Cllr J D Hawkins declared a personal interest in Item 11: 'Hearing Decision Notice Arising from the Code of Conduct Sub Panel Meeting held on 28 June 2017' (Minute O&S.19/17 below refers) by virtue of being a Member of Kingswear Parish Council and remained in the meeting during consideration of this item;

Cllr B F Cane declared a personal interest in Item 8: 'Section 106 Agreements' (Minute O&S.16/17 below refers) by virtue of having sold land for which a Developer had then had to make a Section 106 deposit to the Council and remained in the meeting during the debate and vote on this item.

O&S.14/17 **PUBLIC FORUM**

In accordance with the Public Forum Procedure Rules, the following questions had been received for consideration during this agenda item:

(a) Questions from Lesley Hughes (Town Clerk, Ivybridge Town Council):

- 1. I am concerned that the report gives no information on named Officers who could advise Town/Parish Councils or Ward Councillors in respect of the status of 106 obligations, e.g. if work has commenced on site and certain work/payments were due at certain points which can have implications for triggering subsequent payments. Who are the named Officers who will be dealing with this issue? The reason for wanting names is that in Ivybridge we can receive no answers about actions required in respect of the 222 Barratts Homes development where quite significant 106 payments will be made.*

In reply, the Panel Chairman stated that, in bringing the report to the Committee, the Council was reviewing the way in which it monitored contributions due in accordance with Section 106 Agreements. The named officers were for Affordable Housing Section 106s Alex Rehaag or Cassandra Harrison and for Open Space contributions, Rob Sekula.

With regard to the Barratts application and Section 106 contributions, with affordable housing it was all on-site provision and there were no financial contributions to be paid. With regard to the other financial contributions on the development which were due to the District Council, these became due in instalments before the occupation of the 10th dwelling. If there were further questions which the Town Council had, Cllr Saltern asked that he was made aware of these and he would ensure that all queries were answered.

Cllr Saltern proceeded to advised that the Council would put together a list of all Section 106 contributions which had both been received and were due to be received in the future (once the trigger points had been met) to all Town and Parish Councils, so that Town and Parish Councils could also assist in alerting the Council to when trigger points had been met and to keep the Council informed of progress of development.

Finally, Cllr Saltern informed that it was recommended to the Panel under agenda item 8 (Minute O&S.16/17 below refers) that quarterly reports be provided by Finance, Open Space and Affordable Housing officers as part of the quarterly Capital Programme Monitoring reports.

2. *In addition, the Risk section of the report, paragraph 8, Implications fails to include the risk of non-collection of 106 contributions – which is a real risk and has occurred. In the case of Ivybridge, there has been a major problem in that £97,845 Affordable Homes contribution and £14,625 for sports and recreation has not been collected – this dates from an agreement dated 4 October 2011. What actions have been taken to date and what assurances can we have that the money will be recovered? When will the Town Council be able to access the sports money which it needs for a partnership project with Erme Primary School at Victoria Park? How many other 106 Agreements have similarly fallen through the net?*

The Panel Chairman responded by advising that the Council recognised the risk of non-collection of Section 106 contributions. The Council sought to reduce this by placing obligations on the Developer to notify the Council at various points through development. Section 106 Agreements were a registrable local land charge and, in the event of a proposed disposal of land, it was common practice for the Council to be contacted to ensure that obligations had been met. This assisted in the monitoring of Agreements, which had to date been undertaken by officers within Planning.

Where money was not due or not collected at the time the Agreement was entered into, there was provision for interest to be added to the amount due at the time it was to be paid. Such obligations ran with the land and this ensured that Councils could continue to recover contributions or enforce obligations against successive Owners.

Cllr Saltern then confirmed that, in respect of the case cited in this question, the contributions had been paid and were received by the Council within the last week.

In terms of allocation of the funding, subject to local Ward Members and Executive Portfolio Holder agreement, this money could be allocated to Victoria Park.

Finally, the legal department of the Council was pursuing two other cases where the monies due were outstanding on Section 106 Agreements, but as yet, legal proceedings had not been necessary.

O&S.15/17 EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN

The Panel was presented with the most recently published Executive Forward Plan and, in discussion, made reference to:-

- (a) the Commercial Property Acquisition Strategy agenda item. Some Members expressed their disappointment that the Strategy had not been presented to the Panel before being considered by the Executive. In reply, officers advised that the Strategy had been scheduled on the Forward Plan for a number of months and its content was broadly the same as the version that had been initially presented to the Executive at its meeting on 9 March 2017 (Minute E.70/16 refers). A Member (who was also a Member of the Invest to Earn Working Group) took issue with this response and felt that there had been significant changes proposed to the Strategy since 9 March 2017 and was therefore of the view that it should be initially presented to the Panel for its consideration.

(POST MEETING NOTE: as a result of this discussion point, the Chairman, in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 5.2, called an Extraordinary Panel meeting that would take place on Thursday, 20 July 2017 to specifically consider the draft Strategy);

- (b) the Salcombe Land Holdings agenda item. A local ward Member informed that a video that was currently circulating on social media contained a number of inaccuracies which, in light of the exempt nature of this future agenda item, she would highlight to interested Members outside of this Panel meeting.

O&S.16/17 SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

The Panel was presented with a report that set out the Section 106 contributions that the Council had received. As of 31 March 2017, it was noted that the contributions totalled £4.413 million.

In discussion, reference was made to:-

- (a) the report being welcomed. In welcoming production of the report, a number of Members felt that it constituted a significant step forward for the Council;
- (b) communication with local Ward Members. A number of Members expressed their disappointment that they had not been kept informed of progress regarding Section 106 Agreement contributions. Further concerns were raised in relation to the apparent lack of emphasis that was currently being given to monitoring and control of the funding arrangements. In taking these points a step further, an additional two recommendations were **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** to read as follows:

'That the Panel expresses its concern over the lack of emphasis being given to monitoring, control and communication as part of the current process for spending Section 106 funds; and

That the Panel stresses the need for the Council to appoint a person to be responsible for the monitoring, control and liaison with both local Ward Members and town and parish councils as part of the process for spending S106 funds.'

When put to the vote, these additional recommendations were both declared **CARRIED**.

- (c) deadlines to use S106 monies. For clarity, officers confirmed that, whilst it was not necessarily a requirement to have spent the money before the deadline, it must be committed before this time;
- (d) the 5% Monitoring Fee. The Deputy Monitoring Officer stressed that not all Section 106 Agreements had a 5% Monitoring Fee obligation and there was a need, in each instance, to illustrate that it was required and would be directly related to the development. As a consequence, Members noted that they should therefore not assume that the 5% Fee would be applicable for each application;
- (e) improving internal communications within the Council. The Deputy Monitoring Officer gave a commitment that the legal service would re-introduce the process whereby, upon completion of a Section 106 Agreement, notification would be sent to relevant officers with the details of each obligation outlined. The Panel subsequently expressed its support for this suggestion to improve internal communications;
- (f) the accuracy of Appendix A of the presented agenda report. In response to some confusion, officers clarified that Appendix A referred to monies that had actually already been received by the Council and not those signed agreements for which payment was still pending. In stressing the importance of a Schedule being produced that provided this information to all Members, it was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED**:

'That the Panel requires the production of a Schedule that lists all Section 106 Agreements (irrespective of whether or not payment has been received) for consideration at a future Panel meeting.'

When put to the vote, this recommendation was declared **CARRIED**;

- (g) the criteria to obtain affordable housing contributions. The Panel was of the view that the criteria required greater explanation to all Members during a future briefing session. In addition, the point was expressed that decisions relating to affordable housing contributions should be undertaken by the Council whilst bearing in mind the views of local town and parish councils.

Moreover, a Member cited instances that he was aware of where off-site affordable housing contributions were not materialising in affordable housing actually being developed and requested that this matter be included during the aforementioned Member briefing session.

It was then:

RESOLVED

That the Panel:

1. acknowledges the amount of Section 106 funding held at 31 March 2017 (as set out in Appendix A of the presented agenda report (totalling £4.413 million)) and the proposed future reporting arrangements;
2. expresses its concern over the lack of emphasis being given to monitoring, control and communication as part of the current process for spending S106 funds;
3. stresses the need for the Council to appoint a person to be responsible for the monitoring, control and liaison with both local Ward Members and town and parish councils as part of the process for spending S106 funds;
4. encourages legal officers to introduce revised procedures to ensure more effective internal communications within the Council;
5. approves the flowchart (as outlined at Appendix B of the presented agenda report) that illustrates the process for spending Section 106 funding for Affordable Housing;
6. approves the draft application form for Section 106 funding for Affordable Housing (as outlined at Appendix C of the presented agenda report); and
7. requires the production of a Schedule that lists all Section 106 Agreements (irrespective of whether or not payment has been received) for consideration at a future Panel meeting.

O&S.17/17 REVENUE AND BENEFITS PERFORMANCE AND SERVICE UPDATE

The Panel considered a report that sought to give Members a greater insight into the current performance of the Revenue and Benefits service areas. In addition, the report also provided an update and assurances about how these key areas of business, with high levels of customer interaction, were continuing to develop, using innovative new products that would improve customer service and drive through efficiency.

During the introduction into this agenda item, the Case Management Manager demonstrated the new self-service process for residents to register on the Council website.

In discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (a) Members were informed that there was an error in the published agenda report. Specifically regarding the current backlogs in the Revenues service, the Panel noted that the oldest backlog should read '2 May 2017' and not '2 May 2016' as had been published. Whilst noting the error, Members still expressed some concerns at the extent of the current backlog of cases within the service;
- (b) In respect of Universal Credits, officers advised that it was intended that those households in the South Hams with a Plymouth area postcode would go live in November 2017, with the remainder of the district then going live in May 2018. As a cause for concern to officers, the Panel noted that early indications were that Universal Credits would result in an additional workload in the Housing Benefits team which would be coupled with a reduction in grant funding. Moreover, a further challenge to the service would result from the Homelessness Reduction Act coming into effect at the same time as Universal Credits;
- (c) When questioned, officers expressed their optimism that the channel shift initiatives that would result in residents having the increased ability to self-serve would help to reduce the work pressures on the service. By way of progress in this regard, officers confirmed that the Council was currently working on developing some automated software that would be able to compute forms itself rather than having to be inputted by an officer. Finally, it was confirmed that promotion of the self-serve initiatives was to be undertaken by the Council's Locality Officers and at upcoming community events.

As a further suggestion, some Members felt that there was scope to reduce the number of letters being sent from the service to residents and send text messages instead. In accepting the point, officers advised that part of the claim form asked responders to express a preference over how they wished to be contacted in the future;

- (d) To provide some context regarding performance, the Panel acknowledged that the Council had traditionally had very high collection rates. Whilst collection rates had reduced slightly in recent years, it was noted that the Council remained in the top half of performing authorities in the county and the top quartile nationwide;
- (e) Some Members expressed their concerns at the potential for the corporate debt recovery function to be undertaken by a third party supplier. In citing reasons such as a potential lack of empathy and additional costs, the Panel formally requested that if such a proposal did emerge, then it be in receipt of a report prior to any final decision being taken.

RESOLVED

That the Panel:

1. recognises the current position and accepts the performance of the Revenue and Benefits Services, whilst expressing some concerns over the current level of backlog;
2. endorses the initiatives and improvements that are currently under development;
3. requests that, in the event of a proposal emerging whereby the debt recovery function is to be undertaken by a third party supplier, it be in receipt of a report prior to any final decision being taken.

O&S.18/17 **SCRUTINY PROPOSAL FORM**

(a) Discretionary Grant Funding Review

The Panel endorsed the request for a Task and Finish Group to be established to review existing sources of discretionary grant funding.

Having endorsed the request, Cllrs Hawkins and Pennington expressed an interest in serving on the Group. Since there was a wish for a third Member to be nominated, the Panel agreed that the Chairman should be given delegated authority (outside of this meeting) to nominate a Member who would take on responsibility for leading this Review.

(POST MEETING NOTE: having been nominated by the Chairman, Cllr D Brown has confirmed his willingness to be the third (and lead) Member of the Task and Finish Group).

(b) Contact Centre / Performance Measures

The Panel proceeded to consider a request to establish a Joint SH/WD Task and Finish Group to review the current set of Council Performance Indicators.

In agreeing to the request, the Panel appointed Cllrs Green, Hicks and Smerdon to be the Council's representatives on the Group. In addition, it was recognised that, as the previous lead Executive Member, Cllr Hicks had extensive knowledge in this area and it was agreed that he should be nominated as the Panel's lead Member for this review.

O&S.19/17 **HEARING DECISION NOTICE ARISING FROM CODE OF CONDUCT SUB PANEL**

A copy of the Decision Notice arising from the Overview and Scrutiny (Code of Conduct) Sub Panel held on Wednesday, 28 June 2017 was presented to the meeting.

When questioned, the Chairman advised that he was not aware that Cllr Trevorrow had accepted the recommended sanction whereby he should make an apology to the Complainants.

It was then:

RESOLVED

That the contents of the Decision Notice relating to an alleged breach of the Code of Conduct by Cllr Trevorrow of Kingswear Parish Council be noted.

O&S.20/17 TASK AND FINISH GROUP UPDATES

(a) Dartmouth Lower Ferry

By way of an update, the Chairman of the Task and Finish Group advised that the next meeting would be held at 11.30am on Friday, 21 July 2017.

O&S.21/17 ACTIONS ARISING / DECISIONS LOG

The contents of the latest version of the Log was presented.

In response to a question, officers gave an assurance that they would ask for a progress update to be circulated to all Members on the pre-application service review.

O&S.22/17 DRAFT ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME 2017/18

In consideration of its Annual Work Programme, the following comments, additions and amendments were made:-

(a) The Panel requested that it receive updates on the following agenda items before they were considered by the Executive at its meeting on 14 September 2017:-

- Quayside Phase 2;
- Salcombe Land Holdings; and
- Business Rates Relief Policy.

When considering report lead-in times, it was agreed that each of those items be scheduled for consideration by the Panel at its meeting on 24 August 2017;

(b) With regard to the Village Housing Initiatives Update, the Panel agreed that this item should be deferred to its meeting on 9 November 2017;

- (c) In response to a request, it was agreed that a Joint Local Plan Update be scheduled on to the Work Programme for the meeting to be held on 5 October 2017.

(Meeting started at 10.00 am and concluded at 11.55 am)

Chairman

PUBLIC FORUM PROCEDURES

(a) General

Members of the public may raise issues and ask questions at meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel. This session will last for up to fifteen minutes at the beginning of each meeting.

(b) Notice of Questions

An issue or question may only be raised by a member of the public provided that they have given written notice (which may be by electronic mail) to the Democratic Services Manager by 5.00pm on the Monday, prior to the relevant meeting.

(c) Scope of Questions

An issue may be rejected by the Monitoring Officer if:

- it relates to a matter within the functions of the Development Management Committee;
- it is not about a matter for which the local authority has a responsibility or which affects the district;
- it is offensive, frivolous or defamatory;
- it is substantially the same as a question which has previously been put in the past six months; or
- it requires the disclosure of confidential or exempt information.

This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH HAMS DISTRICT COUNCIL: EXECUTIVE LEADER'S FORWARD PLAN

This is the Leader of Council's provisional forward plan for the four months starting 14 sept 2017. It provides an indicative date for matters to be considered by the Executive. Where possible, the Executive will keep to the dates shown in the plan. However, it may be necessary for some items to be rescheduled and other items added.

The forward plan is published to publicise consultation dates and enable dialogue between the Executive and all councillors, the public and other stakeholders. It will also assist the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Panels in planning their contribution to policy development and holding the Executive to account.

Local authorities are required to publish updated forward plans on a monthly basis. The Plan is published in hard copy and on the Council's website (www.southhams.gov.uk)

Members of the public are welcome to attend all meetings of the Executive, which are normally held at Follaton House, Totnes, and normally start at 10.00 am. If advance notice has been given, questions can be put to the Executive at the beginning of the meeting.

The Executive consists of six Councillors. Each has responsibility for a particular area of the Council's work.

Cllr John Tucker – Leader of the Council

Cllr Simon Wright – Deputy Leader and lead Executive Member for Support Services

Cllr Keith Wingate – lead Executive Member for Business Development

Cllr Rufus Gilbert – lead Executive Member for Commercial Services

Cllr Hilary Bastone – lead Executive Member for Customer First

Cllr Nicky Hopwood – lead Executive Member for Customer First

Further information on the workings of the Executive, including latest information on agenda items, can be obtained by contacting the Member Services Section on 01803 861185 or by e-mail to member.services@southhams.gov.uk

All items listed in this Forward Plan will be discussed in public at the relevant meeting, unless otherwise indicated for the reasons shown

INDEX OF KEY DECISIONS

Service	Title of Report and summary	Lead Officer and Executive member	Anticipated date of decision

KEY DECISIONS:

For the purpose of the Executive Forward Plan, a key decision is a decision that will be taken by the Executive, and which will satisfy either of the following criteria:

'to result in the local authority incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the local authority's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates

(For this purpose significant expenditure or savings shall mean:

Revenue – Any contract or proposal with an annual payment of more than £50,000; and

Capital – Any project with a value in excess of £100,000); or

to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards or electoral divisions in the area of the local authority, in the opinion of the Monitoring Officer (or the Democratic Services Manager in his/her absence).

A key decision proforma will be attached for each key decision listed above.

OTHER DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE

Service	Title of Report and summary	Lead Officer and Executive Member	Decision maker	Anticipated date of meeting
SLT	Sherford Delivery Team	SJ/Cllr Tucker	Council	Date TBC
Strategy and Commissioning	Business Development Opportunities	DA/Cllr Wingate	Council	STANDING ITEM
Customer First	Quayside Phase 2 – to update Members on the master plan outcomes include public consultation for Quayside and put forward next steps for consideration	CB/Cllr Tucker	Executive	14 September 2017
Customer First	Request for s106 spend – Affordable Housing	CH/Cllr Hopwood	Executive	14 September 2017
Strategy & Commissioning	Productivity Plan Joint Committee	DA/Cllr Tucker	Council	14 September 2017
Support Services	Business Rates Relief Policy	IB/Cllr Wright	Council	14 September 2017
Support Services	Medium Term Financial Strategy	LB/Cllr Wright	Council	14 September 2017
Support Services	Transformation Programme Closedown	LB/Cllr Wright	Executive	14 September 2017
Customer First	Food Safety Audit	IB/Cllr Hopwood	Executive	7 December 2017
SLT	Draft Budget 2018/19	LB/Cllr Tucker	Executive	7 December 2017
Support Services	Insurance Procurement – Award of Contract	LB/Cllr Wright	Council	7 December 2017

* Exempt Item (This means information contained in the report is not available to members of the public)

SJ – Steve Jordan – Executive Director Strategy and Commissioning and Head of Paid Service

SH – Sophie Hosking – Executive Director Service Delivery and Commercial Development

LB – Lisa Buckle – Finance COP Lead and s151 Officer

HD – Helen Dobby – Group Manager Commercial Services

SM – Steve Mullineaux – Group Manager Support Services

IB – Isabel Blake – COP Lead Housing, Revenues and Benefits

LC – Lesley Crocker – Senior Specialist Media and Communications

CBowen – Catherine Bowen – Monitoring Officer

DA – Darren Arulvasagam – Group Manager Business Development

SLT – Senior Leadership Team

CB – Chris Brook – COP Lead Assets

TJ – Tom Jones – COP Lead Place Making



South Hams
District Council

Report to: **Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

Date: **27 July 2017**

Title: **PLANNING ENFORCEMENT SERVICE REVIEW**

Portfolio Area: **Customer First**

Wards Affected: **All**

Relevant Scrutiny Committee: **N/A**

Urgent Decision: **N** Approval and clearance obtained: **Y**

Date next steps can be taken:

Author: **Patrick Whymer** Role: **Community of Practice Lead – Development Management**

Contact: **patrick.whymer@swdevon.gov.uk**

RECOMMENDATION

That the Overview and Scrutiny Panel support the actions proposed and the ongoing monitoring of the Service by the Community of Practice Lead and the Case Management Manager.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1** Further to scrutiny of the Planning Enforcement Service taken to Special Council on 25th February 2016, this report provides an update on the current workload position and revisions to the Service to address the business need.
- 1.2** The report provides performance figures for current open cases, cases closed since March 2016, and data regarding open cases that were received before March 2016.
- 1.3** Revisions to the Service are proposed including the recruitment of an additional permanent enforcement specialist, the provision of a formal mechanism for Members to receive feedback from the service and to review decisions made to seek learning opportunities.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1** Pressure to improve the performance in determining planning applications during 2015 meant that specialist and case management resources were not focussed on enforcement and in February 2016 the number of open cases had risen to in excess of 500 open cases in South Hams and over 200 open cases in West Devon.
- 2.2** In February 2016 the Council's agreed that a dedicated, temporary team be set up to deal with the backlog of cases and allow the post T18 model to deal with all new cases. The backlog team of 2.6 temporary enforcement officers and case management support was put in place to deal with all open cases that were received prior to 1 March 2016. When the team started the total cases across the two Councils amounted to 773 (213 in West Devon and 560 in South Hams).
- 2.3** The backlog team was funded for 12months. The residual cases are now being dealt with as part of the rest of the caseload that was received after 1 March 2016. As set out above the backlog team took on 773 cases and as of the 12 July 2017 there are 153 of these cases still open (64 in West Devon and 89 in South Hams). The table below indicates the progress which has been made.

	South Hams	West Devon
Not Started Yet		
Ongoing	28	22
Planning Application Invited	19	18
Planning Application Submitted	11	13
Remedial Action required	9	
Formal Enforcement Notice Required	12	7
Enforcement Notice Served awaiting Compliance	7	3
Prosecution/Injunction Required	2	1
Breach Resolved awaiting Closure	1	

- 2.4** The backlog team was successful and did clear over 80% of cases that had been received prior to 1st March 2016. All cases have been reviewed and progress has been made on the majority of the cases that remain open.
- 2.5** Whilst there are no Government targets for planning enforcement complaints, there are legal timescales for taking planning enforcement action. Depending on the specifics of the case, an enforcement notice must be served within 4 or 10 years of the date of the original breach after which the Council is unable to take enforcement action.

- 2.6** Issues have been raised by Members relating to the interaction of the enforcement service with Members and quality control of decisions made.

3. PERFORMANCE UPDATE

- 3.1** With the establishment of the backlog team to progress all cases received before 1st March 2016, all work on new cases received from that date across both Councils has been led by a focussed Senior Case Manager.
- 3.2** The enforcement workload across the two Councils since March 2016 has remained high with a total of 851 cases being received (246 in West Devon and 605 in South Hams). This equates to just over 50 cases per month/600 cases per year.
- 3.3** Of the 851 cases that have been received since 1 March last year 399 have been closed and 452 remain open. When the residual cases from the backlog team are added, as of the 12 July there are 605 open enforcement cases. (200 in West Devon and 405 in South Hams).
- 3.4** In any planning enforcement regime it would expected to have open cases in the region of the number of cases that are received in a 3-4 month period. As such it would reasonably expected to have in the region of 150-200 open cases across both councils, which is significantly less than the level of open cases that we have.
- 3.5** The overall level of caseload (600 per year) is high compared to neighbouring authorities with Torridge having some 220 cases per year, Torbay 290 cases, Teignbridge 441 cases and Plymouth 380 cases.
- 3.6** It is clear that the volume of cases being received is greater than can be dealt with by a single focussed Senior Case Manager. Across neighbouring Councils the average enforcement case load per Enforcement Officer is 180-200 cases.
- 3.7** In response to the issue and in recognition that the level of work is too much for a single Senior Case Manager, a second full time permanent Senior Case Manager has been employed and started in that role on 18th April 2017.

4. PROPOSED ACTIONS

- 4.1** Following a more recent assessment of the service and in response to concerns raised by Members, it is recognised that further resource is required to provide an effective enforcement service.

Following a review of demand across Specialists within Customer First it has been agreed that an existing vacancy will be filled with a L5 Specialist dedicated to Enforcement, primarily across planning, but with transferable skills to other areas as and when necessary. This will provide a resource of three dedicated planning enforcement roles and should be sufficient to deal with the level of cases that are normally received.

- 4.2** In addition to increasing the dedicated resource to enforcement work, recruitment of the Specialist will have numerous benefits including; increasing the high level technical knowledge within the service, reducing the demand on Development Management and providing technical supervision for the Case Management Officers.
- 4.3** However it is accepted that the present caseload is not simply dealing with recently received cases but includes a significant number of older cases as well. Once the enforcement specialist is in post a further review will be required to establish what additional actions are required to ensure that an efficient and effective service is provided.
- 4.4** A Local Enforcement Plan is to be drafted for consultation with Members by the end of this year. The plan will set out service standards, including re-visiting the prioritisation of work, performance indicators and targets and monitoring. The prioritisation of work will indicate three categories; High, Medium and Low the details of which will be set out in the Enforcement Plan.
- 4.5** Service level targets for response times will be initiated and monitored and will be set out in the Local Enforcement Plan. The Targets could include:
Register all complaints with 5 working days and provide an acknowledgement and reference number with a point of contact.
Respond to 90% of cases within the following target response times:
High Priority – Investigation to commence within one day.
Medium Priority – Investigation to commence within one month.
Low Priority – Investigation to commence within three months.
- 4.6** There should be better interaction between the team and Members, particularly regarding updates on open cases. At a time when more cases are received than we are currently closing it would be too time consuming to provide full written status updates on all open cases. We are currently investigating on whether we can make changes to the IT systems to provide members with more information on the status of enforcement cases. However if any Member would like a verbal update of the open cases and an opportunity to discuss cases in their Ward this will be arranged if the CoP lead or Enforcement Team are contacted.

4.7 Members have raised some concerns regarding the decisions made on a small number of Enforcement Cases. The provision of more dialogue between Members and the Enforcement Team as set out in 4.6 above will help to explain decisions made. However, following any enforcement decisions made, if a Ward Member is concerned this can be brought to the attention of the CoP Lead and whilst the decision will not be altered it can be considered by one of the Senior Development Management Specialists to see if there are any learning opportunities arising from the decision.

5. CONSIDERATION OF RISK

5.1 The absence of an effective and efficient Enforcement Service has a number of risks. If the Council fails to take appropriate enforcement action within a specified timescale, the result is that the breach becomes unenforceable and undermines the Planning System.

5.2 If the Council fails to take action on planning enforcement matters there is a significant risk to the reputation of the local planning authority, loss of confidence in the general public and a perception that unauthorised works can happen in the District with no action being taken. Some breaches of planning regulations are prosecutable offence/criminal acts and the LPA should take action against these offences

6. IMPLICATIONS

Implications	Relevant to proposals Y/N	Details and proposed measures to address
Legal/Governance	Y	Paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework states "effective enforcement is an important as a means of maintain public confidence in the planning system."
Financial	N	There are no direct financial implications of the contents of the report.
Risk	Y	As outlined in section 5.0 of the report
Comprehensive Impact Assessment Implications		
Equality and Diversity	N	
Safeguarding	N	
Community Safety, Crime and Disorder	Y	Planning enforcement officers work closely the police and other bodies
Health, Safety and Wellbeing	Y	Planning enforcement can have a high impact on individuals and communities
Other implications	N	

This page is intentionally left blank

Report to: **Overview and Scrutiny Panel**
Date: **27 July 2017**
Title: **Street Naming and Numbering Policy**
Portfolio Area: **Customer First – Cllr Hilary Bastone**

Wards Affected: **all**

Relevant Scrutiny Committee: n/a

Urgent Decision: **N** Approval and clearance obtained: **Y / N**

Date next steps can be taken:
**Recommendations to the Executive meeting
on 14 September 2017**
*(e.g. referral on of recommendation or
implementation of substantive decision)*

Author: **Kate Hamp** Role: **Case Management Manager**

Contact: **01803 861302/email: kate.hamp@swdevon.gov.uk**

Recommendations:

That the Panel RECOMMEND to the Executive to RECOMMEND to Council the adoption of the revised Street Naming and Numbering Policy.

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 Following a briefing paper presented to Overview and Scrutiny on 23rd February 2017 it was resolved that the Street Naming and Numbering Policy be reviewed and revised in response to Members concerns.

2. Background

- 2.1 The briefing paper brought to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 23rd February 2017 referenced the Street Naming and Numbering Policy which was approved in 2009 and not updated since 2010.
- 2.2 During the discussion reference was made to:
- a) the lack of reference to Members. A number of Members were of the view that the current approach to Street Naming and Numbering was lacking reference to the role of elected Members

during the consultation process. Furthermore, some Members cited their examples of specific instances when this policy was not being adhered to. In light of these concerns, Members requested that the policy be reviewed and updated before being presented back to the Panel at its June 2017 meeting;

- b) the frequency of town and parish council meetings. In light of the frequency of these meetings, a Member was of the view that providing town and parish councils with only 21 days to consider a street name was unreasonable. Since most town and parish councils met on a monthly basis, the Member felt that a 38 day time window would be more reasonable;
- c) the use of apostrophes in street names. Having questioned why apostrophes were not permitted in street names, officers committed to providing a response to this query outside of the meeting.

3. Outcomes/outputs

- 3.1 Appendix A shows the revised Street Naming and Numbering Policy

4. Options available and consideration of risk

- 4.1 On reviewing the policy there were also a number of areas that needed updating due to changes in organisation and ways of working.
- 4.2 The policy was almost identical to the policy adopted by West Devon Borough Council so it made sense to combine the two into a shared policy at the same time as the review.
- 3.2 Although relevant Ward Members were already consulted on naming streets in new developments, this was not specified in the policy, so was added in to the revised version.
- 3.3 The proposed extension to the consultation period was considered, however Legal have advised that as the legislation imposes tight timescales (one month from the date of receipt of the proposed name) for serving a notice of objection to a proposed name (should such an objection be considered appropriate) the timescales for responses from Town/Parish Councils cannot be extended beyond 21 days as this would mean we would not be able to serve such a notice of objection within the statutory timescale . If the Council does not object within a month the proposer would be entitled to erect a street name without specific approval. This is laid down in section 17 of the Public Health Act (1925) – see page 4 of Appendix A.
- 4.5 These proposals were discussed with The COP lead for Development Management and the Case Managers using the policy on a daily basis.

5. Proposed Way Forward

- 5.1 Members are asked to endorse the revised policy and recommend it is adopted by Council

6. Implications

Implications	Relevant to proposals Y/N	Details and proposed measures to address
Legal/Governance	Y	Street Naming and Numbering is a chargeable discretionary service however it is extremely important that this is done in line with the Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG) and Street Naming and Numbering (SNN) data entry conventions for the National Land and Property Gazetteer (NLPG). Following these conventions ensures our practices are compliant with the British Standard BS7666:2006
Financial	N	This report has no financial implications
Risk	N	There are little or no risks associated with the changes made. Increased consultation time will increase the overall time to complete the naming but this should be negligible
Comprehensive Impact Assessment Implications		
Equality and Diversity	N	There are no equality and diversity implications
Safeguarding	N	There are no safeguarding implications
Community Safety, Crime and Disorder	N	There are no community, safety, crime or disorder implications
Health, Safety and Wellbeing	N	There are no health, safety or wellbeing implications
Other implications	N	

Supporting Information

Appendices:

Street Naming and Numbering Policy and Procedure

Background Papers:

None

This page is intentionally left blank



South Hams
District Council



West Devon
Borough
Council

Street Naming and Numbering Policy and Procedure

Approved by:
Contents

Introduction	Page 3
Statutory Context	Page 4
Naming Streets and Numbering Dwellings	Page 5
Criteria for Naming Streets	Page 6
Criteria for assigning a new Postal Address	Page 7
Postal Address Format	Page 8
Guidelines for Numbering Buildings	Page 9
Procedure for New Developments	Page 11
Procedure for Changing or Adding a Property Name	Page 12
Procedure to Rename an Existing Street, Renumber Properties or Name a Street that was previously unnamed	Page 14
Charging for Street Naming and Numbering Service	Page 16
Appendix A	Page 17

South Hams District Council and West Devon Borough Council Street Naming and Numbering Policy Document

Introduction

The naming and numbering of streets and buildings within South Hams is a Statutory function of South Hams District Council and is covered by Sections 17, 18 and 19 of the Public Health Act 1925 which was formally adopted by the Council on 18 March 1976.

The naming and numbering of streets and buildings within West Devon is a statutory function of West Devon Borough Council and is covered by Sections 17 and 19 of the Public Health Act 1925 (which was formally adopted by the Council (Minute No. 65(a) 1975/76)) and Sections 64 and 65 of the Town Improvement Clauses Act 1847 in relation to numbering only (which was formally adopted by the Council (CM 9b(ii))).

Decisions on these matters are made and controlled by South Hams District Council and West Devon Borough Council (the Councils).

The purpose of this control is to make sure that any new street names and numbers are allocated logically with a view to ensuring, amongst other things, the effective delivery of mail and that emergency services vehicles are able to locate any address to which they may be summoned.

Anyone wishing to change the name or number of their property or seeking an address for a new property or wish to change the name of an existing street should apply in writing to the Council following the procedures detailed in this policy.

As far as street naming proposals are concerned the Council encourages developers or owners to propose their own preferred names for consideration. However, it is recommended that more than one suggestion for a new name should be put forward, just in case one fails to meet the Council's criteria outlined in this policy. It is desirable that any suggested road name should have some connection with the area.

If proposals comply with the Council's Policy on Street Naming and Numbering and, for street names, do not meet with an objection from the Town/Parish Councils or the Royal Mail Address Development Centre, the new address will be formally allocated and all relevant bodies will be notified by the Council. See Appendix A for a list of those bodies informed by the Council.

To aid emergency services, the Council will endeavour to ensure that where appropriate, if a street name has street signs relating to that name, all properties

accessed off it will be officially addressed to include that street name and also where appropriate, all new properties will be numbered.

Statutory Context

Public Health Act 1925

Section 17 – Notice to Council before street is named

Section 17(1): Before any street is given a name, notice of the proposed name shall be sent to the Council by the person proposing to name the street.

Section 17(2): The Council, within one month after the receipt of such notice, may, by notice in writing served on the person by whom notice of the proposed name of the street has sent, object to the proposed name.

Section 17(3): It is unlawful to set up in any street an inscription of the name:

- (a) until the expiration of one month after notice of the proposed name has been sent to the Council under this section; and
- (b) where the Council have objected to the proposed name, unless and until such objection has been withdrawn by the Council or overruled on appeal;

and any person acting in contravention of this provision shall be liable to a penalty determined by the Magistrates' Court.

Section 17(4): Where the Council serve a notice of objection under this section, the person proposing to name the street may, within 21 days after service of the notice, appeal against the objection to the Magistrates Court. .

Public Health Act 1925

Section 18 – Alteration of name of street

Section 18(1): The Council may, by Order, alter or amend the name of any street, or any part of a street, or assign a name to any street, or any part of a street, to which a name does not already exist.

Section 18(2): not less than one month before making an Order under this Section, the Council shall cause notice of the intended Order to be posted at each end of the street, or part of the street, or in some conspicuous position in the street or part affected.

Section 18(3): Every such notice shall contain a statement that the intended Order may be made by the Council on or at any time after the day named in the notice, and that an appeal will lie under this Act to the Magistrates' Court against the intended Order at the instance of any person aggrieved.

Section 18(4); Any person aggrieved by the intended Order of the Council may, within 21 days after the posting of the notice, appeal to the Magistrates' Court

Public Health Act 1925
Section 19 - Indication of name of street

Section 19(1): The Council shall cause the name of every street to be painted, or otherwise marked, in a conspicuous position on any house building or erection in or near the street, and shall, from time to time, alter or renew such inscription of the name of any street if and when the name of the street is altered or the inscription becomes illegible.

Section 19(2): if any person pulls down any inscription of the name of the street which has lawfully been set up, or sets up in any street any name different from the name lawfully given to the street, or places or affixes any notice or advertisement within 12 inches of any name of a street marked on a house, building or erection in pursuance of this Section, he shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding level 1 on the standard scale and thereafter to a daily penalty.

Local Government Act 2003

Local Authorities have the power to charge for discretionary services where there is no other power to charge provided that the charge does not exceed the cost of providing the service.

Naming Streets and Numbering Dwellings

Council has responsibility for naming streets and to ensure that street names are displayed.

The Councils will name and number streets and dwellings in line with the Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG) and Street Naming and Numbering (SNN) data entry conventions for the National Land and Property Gazetteer (NLPG). Following these conventions ensures the Councils' practices are compliant with the British Standard BS7666:2006.

Ensuring that the Councils have a comprehensive Street Naming and Numbering Policy that complies with BS7666:2006 is important because the Councils need to ensure:-

- Emergency Services can find a property quickly – delays cost lives and money
- Mail is delivered efficiently
- Visitors can easily find where they want to go
- There is a reliable delivery of services and products

- Service providers have up to date and accurate records - poor record keeping is only a disadvantage to the customer
- The Council will bill the right person, in the right property, at the right time for Council Tax and National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR)

Procedure on receipt of suggested street name

Property developers can suggest names for new streets. These will be received by the respective Council and checked against the criteria (see later), then forwarded to the Town/Parish Council and the local Ward Member as appropriate for consideration. The Town/Parish Council will consider the name and may approve, otherwise they may suggest another name. If another name is suggested by the Town/Parish Council then the Council will forward this suggestion to the developer for consideration. Once both parties are in agreement the Council will officially allocate the street name.

In cases where both parties cannot agree on a street name, the decision will be made under delegated authority by the COP lead for Development Management.

In cases where a street name has been put forward by a property developer all costs for the erection of street nameplates will be borne by the property developer. There are Street Nameplate Specifications and Installation Guidelines available and the Council will inform the developer of this.

Maintenance of street nameplates becomes the Council's responsibility once a street has been adopted.

As stated above under "Section 17 Public Health Act 1925" It is not lawful to erect a street nameplate until the street name has been confirmed in writing by the Council.

Criteria for Naming Streets

The Street Naming and Numbering (SNN) Case Manager will use these guidelines when agreeing a new number or address and Developers and Town/Parish Councils should follow these guidelines for any suggested street names:-

- New street names should try to avoid duplicating any similar name already in use in a town/village or in the same postcode area. A variation in the terminal words, for example, 'street', 'road', 'avenue' will not be accepted as sufficient reason to duplicate a name. A common request is to repeat existing names in a new road or building titles. This is not allowed as it can have a detrimental effect in an emergency.
- Street names should, where possible, reflect the history or geography of the site or area.
- Street names should not be difficult to pronounce or awkward to spell.

- Street names must not cause offence and will be verified by the Street Naming and Numbering Case Manager to ensure that they do not do so, having particular regard to race, disability, gender, age, faith & belief and sexual orientation.
- Street names that could be construed as advertising will not be allowed.
- The use of North, East, South or West is only acceptable where the road is continuous and passes over a major junction. It is not acceptable when the road is in two separate parts with no vehicular access between the two.
- Phonetically similar names within a postal area should be avoided
- The use of a name that relates to a living or deceased person should be avoided.

All new street names should ideally end with one of the following suffixes;- Street, Road, Avenue, Drive, Way, Grove, Lane, Gardens, Place, Crescent, Court, Close, Square, Hill, Circus, Vale, Rise, Row, Wharf, Mews.

All new pedestrian ways should ideally end with one of the following suffixes:- Walk, Path, Way.

Further notes:-

For private houses it is sufficient that the name should not repeat the name of the road or that of any house or building in the same postcode area: see **Procedure for Address Changes** below.

Criteria for assigning a new Postal Address

After receiving a request for an address for property/properties, which currently do not have an address, the Council will first check for approved planning permission or building control approval. If this has been granted then the procedure to create a new address will commence. The Council will not address properties without the relevant planning permissions and will only address properties once the foundations have been laid on site. The reason for this is to ensure the numbering sequence of any street is not compromised and addresses are not created in error.

Issuing an address to properties without planning permission will have no bearing on planning matters or be capable of being used in support of any planning appeal. We will still add your property to the Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG) and you will still be liable for Council Tax or NNDR.

Agricultural Land

Agricultural land parcels can be added to our LLPG. They are flagged as non-postal addresses. This is to assist emergency response and create a unique record for each property for future use.

The Council will only request an official address from Royal Mail where we have an operational requirement to do so or we believe the property is being used for permanent residency. Such addresses will have to meet Royal Mail's requirements for secure delivery points.

The Council's planning enforcement team will be informed about any believed change of use of the land.

Postal Address Format

For clarification, official postal addresses always take the following format:-

Any Ltd	Company or Organisation Name (if applicable)
123 Any Street	Postal Number/Name of Street
Anywhere	Locality (if applicable)
ANYTOWN	POST TOWN
Devon	County
TQ00 0AA	Postcode

When an approved address is agreed by all parties, Royal Mail will confirm a postcode. The maintenance and any future changes to this Postcode are the responsibility of the Royal Mail.

Localities within an official postal address are the responsibility of Royal Mail. Where applicants object to a locality name in their address, the SNN Case Manager will advise them to consult Royal Mail, who has a procedure laid down in their code of practice by the Postal Services Commission for adding or amending locality details.

We will, however, remind applicants that postal addresses are not geographically accurate descriptions, but routing instructions for Royal Mail staff and they can and do contain names for villages, towns and cities that may be several miles away from the actual location of their property.

For further information about addresses, you are advised to read the Royal Mail's guidance, which can be found on their website: www.royalmail.com.

Guidelines for Numbering Buildings

A new street should be numbered with the odd numbers on the left and the even numbers on the right from the entrance of the street.

In the case of a small cul-de-sac, consecutive numbering in a clockwise direction is preferred.

Private garages and similar buildings used for housing cars, etc., should not be numbered.

All numbers should be used in the proper sequence. The number 13 will be excluded from a numbering scheme unless a request is made to include it. Once numbered we will not normally re-number properties. We will only renumber a property where there can be shown to be consistent delivery problems.

Where an existing street or similar is to be extended, it would be appropriate to continue to use the same street name. This will include the continuation of the street numbering.

Buildings (including those on corner plots) will be numbered (or named) according to the street in which the main entrance is to be found.

If a building has entrances in more than one street, is a multi-occupied building and each entrance leads to a separate occupier, then each entrance should be numbered in the appropriate road. Exceptions may be made, depending on circumstances, for a house divided into flats.

In residential buildings (i.e. a block of flats), it is acceptable to give a postal number to each dwelling where the block is up to six storeys in height. When the block exceeds this height or there are insufficient numbers available because of existing development, it should be given a name and numbered separately internally. Such building names will be put through the same criteria for issuing house names.

Where a property is sub-divided, or in the case of flats and apartments, individual properties should always be numbered or suffixed with a letter rather than described (i.e. Flat 1 or Flat A used rather than First Floor Flat). Where numbered properties are sub-divided, it is preferred that individual units retain the number of the 'parent' property (i.e. Flat 1, 36 High Street).

Royal Mail will only register properties which have their own entrance and/or their own secure letter box. Sometimes this can cause problems as people think their address/flat should be registered. If mail for a building is delivered to a single letter box, and occupants then collect their own mail, Royal Mail class this as a 'building in multiple occupation' and will only register the parent building and not individual flat numbering schemes within the building.

Legislation permits the use of numbers followed by letters. These will be suitable, for example, when one large house in a road is demolished, to be replaced by (say) 4 new smaller houses. To include the new houses in the existing numbered sequence of the road would involve renumbering all the higher numbered houses on the side of the road affected by the proposal. To avoid this situation, the new houses should be given the number of the old house with A, B, C or D added (i.e. 21A, 21B, 21C, 21D).

Where new houses are built in an existing road, where properties are named rather than numbered, it is essential that the houses be officially allocated names. The name should not repeat the name of the road or that of any house or building in the area. It should also be sufficiently different to other property names used locally. This situation normally applies on roads where there has been no formal property numbering scheme.

New properties in streets where the existing properties are numbered will be allocated a new number. Individual properties are generally built on infill land, large gardens, or on the site of previously demolished properties. These will be numbered within the existing sequence if possible, and letter suffixes (e.g. 16A) will be used if necessary. Where building takes place on the site of a demolished property, the new building will inherit the existing number.

Where two or more properties on a numbered street are merged, the numbers of the original properties should normally be retained. For example, 4 and 6 Fore Street being combined would become 4-6 Fore Street. There are however instances where it may be considered appropriate to use a single number. Each case will be considered on its own merits.

Where a property has a number, it must be used and displayed. Where application is made to add a name to a property with a number, the number must always be included. The number cannot be removed from the official postal address and it cannot be regarded as an alternative. This applies to both domestic and commercial property.

The Councils will not normally register company/business names as part of an address unless the company name is the only way uniquely to identify the property in question.

The Councils are not responsible for erection or maintenance of nameplates on buildings or for directional signs to individual properties or groups of houses (these are the responsibility of the owner(s)). The Councils are also not responsible for traffic or highway directional signs – this is the responsibility of Devon County Council.

Procedure for New Developments

The property developer should not give any postal addresses, including postcode, to potential occupiers, either directly or indirectly (e.g. via solicitors or estate agents) before the respective Council has issued formal approval. The Councils will not be liable for any costs incurred or claims for damages caused by failure to comply with this.

Developers should always apply directly to the respective Council at the earliest opportunity for new postal addresses, i.e. as soon as development starts on site.

For Roadways to be adopted by the Highway Authority

To register new development addresses, developers should send in a covering letter setting out the full details of the proposal. A development is considered to be two or more dwellings or properties.

All applications must be accompanied by the fee of £36.00 per property.

All proposals must also be accompanied by a site location plan - this should be at a minimum scale of 1:2500 and should contain sufficient detail to accurately locate properties. The confirmed layout drawing showing the road layout, plot numbers and any suggested house numbers (or names) is the most appropriate plan (for convenience a maximum size of A3 is preferred). For developments that include flats, internal layout plans are also required.

The applicant or developer may suggest a possible name or names for any new street(s). Several suggestions for names can be made in case the Council, Royal Mail or the Town/Parish Council object.

The proposed street names are then passed via email to the relevant Town/Parish Council and Ward Member for approval, copying in the portfolio holder for SNN. Town/Parish Councils and/or Ward Member can at this stage suggest their own names that conform to our Policy.

Town/Parish Councils will contact us once the members have considered any proposal and within 21 days from the date of consultation. If the Town/Parish Council or the Council objects to the proposal, the Council will serve a notice of objection in writing and consult with the developer. Where no agreement can be made, final approval of street names is made under delegated authority by the COP lead for Development Management.

The developer will cover the initial costs of street nameplates and ensure they adhere to the Councils specification and installation guidelines (Appendix C). Normal street sign practice is to erect one sign at the entrance to a street; however two signs may be more appropriate where there is access to a busy street, or where visibility is restricted. Where appropriate, additional information regarding

access to other streets may also be added e.g. 'Leading to ...' Each case will be considered on its merits and road safety should be a primary consideration.

The Council will cover maintenance costs after the street nameplate has been erected in accordance with our installation guidelines and appropriate specification. On occasions street nameplates may become damaged or defaced and will require replacement. Anyone needing to report a problem with a street nameplate should contact the Council on the main switchboard number.

Numbering of the new street(s) will be carried out following guidelines within this policy. All properties on newly named streets will be allocated numbers. All new properties on existing streets will be numbered if possible unless existing properties on that street all have official dwelling names and no numbers, or it is an infill development.

Where the development is an infill development on an existing street the Council will number the properties wherever possible, and suffix the number with a letter as appropriate in order to accurately define the location of the property on the street.

Where the street does not have an existing numbering scheme the developer should suggest property names. The property name must comply with the guidance set out in this policy.

When numbering and naming is complete the Council will contact the Royal Mail who will allocate the postcode to the address, and add the property to their 'not yet built' file.

Once the Royal mail have allocated the postcode, the Council will write to the developer with official confirmation of the full postal address, and where applicable, any instructions for the erection of street nameplates.

The Council will notify users who have requested address change information and supply a plan indicating the location of all the properties. A list of those notified is shown in Appendix A.

Where developers have not applied for an address and occupation of the property has taken place, the Council will endeavour to contact the owner or developer and ask for an official application to be submitted. If an application is not received within four weeks of the Council contacting them, the Council will allocate an address. If at a later stage, the owner wishes to change the property name, they will have to follow the official procedure to make the change and a charge will be made.

Procedure for Changing or Adding a Property Name

If you wish to change the name of your property, or add an official 'alias name' to your property you must use the following procedure and you should note that -

The Royal Mail does not accept name changes from anyone other than a Council.

To request a change to a property name, the owner must complete the relevant application form, supply a location plan and pay the appropriate fee.

To make an application, you can complete the application online or by filling in the relevant application form (Appendix B).

Requests can only be accepted from the owners of properties and not tenants.

All applications must be accompanied by a site location plan - this should be at a minimum scale of 1:2500 and should contain sufficient detail to accurately locate the property.

All applications must be accompanied by the fee of £21.00 per property.

The Council cannot formally change a property name where the property is in the process of being purchased, that is, until exchange of contracts has been completed, although the Council can give guidance on the acceptability of a chosen name change, in principal, before exchange of contracts.

A check is made by the Council to ensure there are no other properties in the locality with the same name. Under no circumstances will the Council allow a replicated house name in the same postal area; the SNN Case Manager can refuse such names. The Council also strongly recommends against using similar sounding names, although we will not refuse these requests. The Royal Mail cannot guarantee mail delivery if the Council's advice is ignored.

Under no circumstances will the Council allow a name that is offensive, or can be construed as offensive.

If the property already has a house number, it is not permitted to replace the number with a name. However the Council will allow you to add an 'alias name' to the address. The name will be held by the Royal Mail on their 'alias file' and will not form part of the official address. The alias name can only be used with the property number, not as a replacement of it.

Once all the checks have been satisfactorily completed and the necessary fees received the Council will change the name of the property and advise the relevant parties detailed on Appendix A.

The Council will then confirm the new official postal address in writing to the owner of the property.

Procedure to Rename an Existing Street, Renumber Properties or Name a Street that was previously Un-Named

Town/Parish Councils may from time to time request that the Council rename an existing street or name a street that was previously un-named. Town/Parish Councils can only make such a request if they can demonstrate that the owners/residents of all affected properties have been consulted and at least two thirds are in agreement to the change.

Applications can also be received by the Council direct from the residents but it is considered a courtesy to liaise with the Town/Parish Council before submitting an application to the Council.

Applications can be made online on the Council's website for a fee of £37.00 per property.

All proposals must be accompanied by a site location plan indicating the full length of the street to be named.

If the proposal is approved, a Notice will be erected on site and lodged with the Clerk to the Justices for one month whereby objections to the proposal can be received. After consideration a decision will be made on whether to approve the proposal using delegated authority by the COP lead for Development Management.

Once approved the Council will confirm the new street name is acceptable with the Royal Mail. The Royal Mail may issue a new postcode for the street.

The Council will advise the residents/owners of their new official postal address as well as those Authorities detailed on Appendix A.

All costs associated with a change of address will be met by the owners/residents themselves.

All costs associated with providing and erecting street nameplates, except in exceptional circumstances, will be met by the residents/owners of the street or the Town/Parish Council as appropriate. Once erected the Council will maintain the street nameplate.

Sometimes, the Council may decide that in order to improve the delivery of mail, and the routing of emergency services a street needs to be renamed, or renumbered. The Council will only do this after consultation with the owners of the affected properties and will always give one month's notice in writing as detailed above. In these circumstances all costs associated with providing and erecting street nameplates will be met by the Council.

The Royal Mail may also approach the Council where they believe there is an operational necessity to make changes to addresses. The Council will only make

such changes where we believe there is a need, and after consultation with the residents/owners of the properties affected.

Any appeals should in the first instance be made to the Street Naming and Numbering Case Manager at the Council. If this is not satisfactorily dealt with, appeals should be directed through the formal complaints procedure. Details are available on the Council's website.

DRAFT

Charging for Street Naming and Numbering Service

The Council will charge for the Street Naming and Numbering process as specified below

Under Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003, Local Authorities have the power to charge where they provide a service if they are authorised, but not required, to provide the service. The charge must not exceed the cost of providing the service.

For Street Naming and Numbering these charges are:-

- (1) £21.00 per property for changes to house names;
- (2) £37.00 per property for changes to street names;
- (3) £36.00 per property for naming new developments.

These charges have to be paid prior to any changes being made.

Changes made without contacting us will not be registered with services and organisations listed in Appendix A. These organisations will not be informed until payment is received. The Council cannot be held liable for mail delivery problems caused by failure to inform us of house name changes.

These charges will be reviewed on an annual basis.

The Council is keen to ensure all new developments are postally named and numbered correctly.

Appendix A

Internal Departments (list used depends on location of application site)

Building Control; Council Tax/National Non-Domestic Rates; Electoral Registration;
Environmental Health; Environmental Services; LLPG Custodian; Land Charges;
Development Management Department (Planning)

External Departments (list used depends on location of application site)

British Gas; Dartmoor National Park; Devon and Cornwall Police; Devon County
Council Highways Department; Devon County Council Land Charges Department;
Devon & Somerset Fire and Rescue; Focsa Services Ltd; Geographer's A-Z Map
Company; Plymouth & District Land Registry; Royal Mail Address Development
Team and local sorting offices; South West Water; South Western Ambulance
Service; Valuation Office; Wales & West Utilities Western Power

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 11

Report to: Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Date: 27 July 2017

Title: Q1 2017/18 Performance Report

Portfolio Area: Strategy & Commissioning

Author: Jim Davis, Specialist - Performance & Intelligence

Presented by: Cllr Keith Wingate

RECOMMENDATION

That Members note the performance levels against target communicated in the Balanced Scorecard and the performance figures supplied in the background and the exception report.

Executive summary

- 1.1. Performance measures for Quarter 1 have been generally good with the majority of issues highlighted as temporary in the previous report having been overcome.
- 1.2. Q1 performance had 1 measure at 'Red': % calls answered in 20 seconds.
- 1.3. Due to the meeting schedule, waste measures haven't been reported on as the information from DCC and third parties comes in later than other measures.
- 1.4. Planning determination performance in Q1 was above target for all types of applications for the sixth successive quarter.
- 1.5. New dashboards have been developed to display information in an easy to understand way. These are available online from any web-enabled device and can be used to monitor performance in between the O&S reporting cycle. There is a regular update of the previous month's figures that occurs by the 3rd Wednesday of the month, for SLT to keep on top of performance issues.

2. Background

- 2.1. The current set of indicators came from a review of all Performance measures which was undertaken by a Task & Finish Group. The format has changed to allow better viewing in black & white and to include target information to provide context.
- 2.2. The balanced scorecard had four areas including information about the T18 Programme. The programme has moved past the active project management phase so these measure are less informative and new measures will be developed focusing on website transactions and uptake or online services.
- 2.3. The new web-based performance dashboards provide monthly up-to-date information to provide context against the report that comes to Committee and gives access to a much larger range of data if desired.

3. Outcomes/outputs

- 3.1. **Appendix A** is the balanced scorecard – this contains the high level targeted performance information.
- 3.2. **Appendix B** is an information and exception report. This contains the data only performance information for context and the detail of the targeted measures which have fallen below target in the quarter being reviewed.
- 3.3. **Appendix C** contains the description of the targets chosen for the Balanced Scorecard
- 3.4. Covalent Dashboards are accessed via a web-link and users have access to more than one dashboard. All the dashboards can be

'drilled into' for more information and they can be viewed on any web-enabled device, smartphone or ipad.

4. **Options available and consideration of risk**

- 4.1. O&S reporting could be dealt with completely through dashboards or in conjunction with reports, with the report element focusing on other areas such as management comments rather than data.

5. **Proposed Way Forward**

- 5.1. Feedback from Members is encouraged to improve dashboard usability and usefulness to aid Members fulfil their scrutiny role. Further training sessions will be organised and communicated through the Member bulletin.

6. **Implications**

Implications	Relevant to proposals Y/N	Details and proposed measures to address
Legal/Governance	N	Whilst there are no longer statutory performance measures, some measures are still reported nationally. We collect these in the same format as required to improve consistency. Other measures aim to improve efficiency & understand workload.
Financial	N	There are no direct financial implications of the contents of the report
Risk	Y	Poor performance has a risk to the Council's reputation and delivery to our residents. These proposals should give the Scrutiny Committee the ability to address performance issues and develop robust responses to variation in delivery
Comprehensive Impact Assessment Implications		
Equality and Diversity	N	
Safeguarding	N	
Community Safety, Crime and Disorder	N	
Health, Safety and Wellbeing	N	
Other implications	N	

Supporting Information

Appendices:

Appendix A – Corporate Balanced Scorecard

Appendix B – Background and Exception Report

Appendix C – Explanation of targets

Background Papers:

None

Approval and clearance of report

None

Corporate Balanced Scorecard

Community/Customer

Q4	Q1	
	-	Overall waste recycling rate % Awaiting DCC data
	-	Residual waste per household Awaiting DCC data
	-	Average no. of missed bins Awaiting DCC data
		CST: % of calls answered
		CST: % of calls answered in 20 secs

Processes

Q4	Q1	% of planning applications determined within time frame
		Major(Statutory)
		Minor
		Other

Q4	Q1	
		Avg End to End time Benefits New Claims
		Avg End to End time Benefits Change of circumstances

Online uptake

Q4	Q1	
		Ratio of benefits web/post submissions (IEG4)
		Ratio of web/call-post-email submissions (W2)

Performance

Q4	Q1	
		EH: % of nuisance complaints resolved at informal stage
		Avg days short term sickness/FTE
		Complaint response speed

Page 49

Updated measures to replace the T18 programme measures that added little extra information.

Additional measures to better quantify online uptake and benefit to the council will be developed as the new website goes live.

Key

	Below target performance
	Narrowly off target, be aware
	On or above target

This page is intentionally left blank

Information Report


Non-targeted (data-only) performance measures that will be reported every quarter to provide context and background information – not suitable for the Balanced Scorecard page as no targets applicable or relevant.

PI Description	Managed By	Q1 16/17	2016/17	Q1 2017/18		17/18	Comment (If Applicable)
			YTD or Total			YTD or total	
<p>Planning Enforcement (Workload)</p> <p>Change: Due to issues extracting the information, breaking down the action in each enforcement case isn't possible. Volume of all current outstanding work is being reported instead</p>	Pat Whymer	-	-	Enforcement cases closed: 74 Live enforcement cases: 314 Enforcement cases received: 135		-	<p><i>Figures as at the end of June, the end of Q1.</i></p> <p><i>Latest figures are available on the online dashboards as soon as it is available</i></p>
<p>All: Complaints resolved</p> <p>Complaints logged against each Service per quarter. Highlights changes over time and the effects of initiatives.</p>	Area	2016/17 Q4		Total	Avg Time (Days)	YTD	<p>This breakdown of area and average time to complete timings is only available for the completed complaints.</p> <p>99 complaints were logged during the quarter, 25 of the completed processes were service issues that were dealt with immediately and aren't formal complaints. The remaining 40 processes that are yet to be completed will be a mix between service issues and formal complaints.</p> <p>Note: Service Issues – Some issues are logged as complaints as the customer has a justified concern. Often these are simple issues resolved by talking with the customer so don't form part of our formal complaints process but still are captured for improvement and analysis purposes</p>
	Case Management	-	Case Management	-	-	4	
	Council Tax	1	Council Tax	5	8.1	13	
	Customer Service Team	-	Customer Service Team	2	11.4	19	
	Environmental Health	1	Environmental Health	-	-	4	
	Environmental Protection	-	Environmental Protection	-	-	1	
	Housing Benefits	-	Housing Benefits	4	11.4	10	
	Housing Advice	3	Housing Advice	-	-	4	
	ICT/Internet	-	ICT/Internet	-	-	1	
	Legal	-	Legal	-	-	1	

PI Description	Managed By	Q1 16/17	2016/17	Q1 2017/18			17/18	Comment (If Applicable)
			YTD or Total				YTD or total	
	Planning		14	Planning	12	20.5	55	
	Waste		18	Waste	7	35.9	90	
	Commercial Services		5	Commercial Services	4	28.2	16	
	Car Parks/Parking		3	Car Parks/Parking	-	39	14	
	Total		45	Total	34	21.1	232	
	Service Issues		39	Service Issues	25	N/A	211	
Long term sickness (days) Number of days lost due to long term sickness	Andy Wilson	456	YTD 456	814			YTD 814	Equivalent to 2.3 days/FTE for the Qtr. Q4 figure: 2 days/FTE
Short term sickness (days) Number of days lost due to short term sickness	Andy Wilson	188	YTD 188	219			YTD 219	Equivalent to 0.63 days/FTE for the quarter. Q4 figure: 1.22/FTE Public sector averages for all sickness (long term and short term) are around 2-3days/FTE
Top 5 call types	Anita ley			1) Call transferred to other organisation 2)Revenues move 3) Domestic waste - missed waste 4) Call dealt with on switchboard 5) Domestic waste - order bin / caddy / repair			-	Last Qtr 1) Revenues - Move 2) Call Dealt with by Switchboard 3) Revenues - Discount / Exemption 4) General - Balance Enquiry 5) General - Other Enquiry - Dealt With
Top 5 website views/trend	Kate Hamp			Not available due to staff unavailability. New role taking responsibility for web analytics will begin in June			-	
% of customer contact through online interaction (Workflow360) Demonstrating channel shift	Kate Hamp	17.8%	17.8%	49.2%			Q4 16/17 33.3%	The figures for Qtr 1 show that almost 50% of processes were initiated online. There is still scope to increase this further as more processes go online for Environmental Health & Licensing.

PI Description	Managed By	Q1 16/17	2016/17	Q1 2017/18	17/18	Comment (If Applicable)
			YTD or Total		YTD or total	
						The new website with simplified and standardised scripts, that don't require customers to log in, make it far quicker and easier for the public to interact online. Halving the mouse clicks needed in most instances and smoothing the customer journey, especially when submitted by smartphone.
Total number of online transactions	Kate Hamp	3611	3611	Workflow360(W2): 17420	17420	Number of online interactions continues to increase as well as the percentage of all contact through online means. This increase of over 10,000 transactions over the quarter show the benefit in the website redesign and enable more automation to reduce the workload for CST and for Case Managers. The increase in online transactions over the past year has been relentless and shows no sign of slowing, boosted by two factors; more processes online, and better customer experience, especially via mobile/tablets.
% of calls resolved at first point of contact Percentage of calls which are resolved at initial contact with CST	Anita Ley	70%	70%	-	-	Measure no longer captured in new phone system. Online CST dashboard has more measures data updated monthly and broken down into call types and answer speed.
Nuisance complaints Received	Ian Luscombe	79	79	172	172	The nuisance process (covering noise, odours, smoke, etc) has now gone into Workflow360, this has moved the processes into the Customer Service Team and case management with specialist involvement only required later for more complex investigation. An increase in early summer is expected with more bonfires and other outdoor issues being more prevalent.
Average time taken for processing Disabled Facilities Grants (Portion under council control) (Days)	Ian Luscombe	4 days	4 days	0 days	0 days	This is the portion of the process completely under the council's control (from application to approval). Our target is completion within 5 days The average number of days is 0 and has been improving steadily throughout the year. This means on average the completed paperwork is received and completed on the same working day.

Exception Report:

Code and Name	Managed by	Prev Status	Last Qtr	Apr 2017	May 2017	Jun 2017	Q4 2017/18		Action Response
				Value	Value	Value	Value	Target	
% calls answered in 20 seconds	Anita Ley		29%	23%	26%	25%	25%	50%	We are seeing a reduction in the quick simple calls which is due to better routing in the new telephone system alongside the introduction of the new website. This does mean the Contact Centre are dealing with longer more complex calls which will increase average call length and wait times. An increase in temporary agency staff who have required training coupled with more calls than the previous 3 months has affected performance this quarter.

Appendix C

Measure	Target	Explanation
Overall waste recycling rate %	55%	A combination of recycling, re-use & composting for household waste. A self-set stretching target based on historic collection rates and current ambitions
Residual waste per household	92kg/qtr	The residual waste left after recycling and re-use. Equivalent to c.14kg per fortnightly collection per household
Avg number of missed bins	<75 per 100,000	
<i>*Average Call Answer Time No longer captured</i>	<i>1 min</i>	<i>Additional information captured in CST Dashboard but overall figure not collated. Individual areas have % of calls answered in 5 minutes</i>
<i>*% of enquiries resolved at first point of contact: No longer captured</i>	<i>60%</i>	
% of calls answered	90%	Target set at this level as we would expect some calls dropped as customers choose to follow recorded message recommendation and submit requests online rather than hold on the phone
% of calls answered in 20 secs	50%-80%	A goldilocks measure that captures how much time CST have without a queue. Being too high would signify over-resourcing
% of Applications determined within time frame Major	60%	Statutory performance measure target
% of Applications determined within time frame Minor	65%	Old statutory performance measure target
% of Applications determined within time frame Other	80%	Old statutory performance measure target
Avg End to End time Benefits New Claims	24 days	Time for processing new claims
Avg End to End time Benefits Change of circumstances	11 days	Time for processing changes to existing claims
% of nuisance complaints resolved at informal stage	90%	Handling nuisance complaints informally saves time and money and often provides a more satisfactory outcome for all involved
Avg days short term sickness/FTE	1.5days/qtr	Private sector average of c.6 days/year, Public sector average of c.8 days has informed this initially stretching target. Agile working has had a very

Appendix C

		positive impact on sickness as people feeling under the weather have remained at home, working and reduced the likelihood of transfer of communicable infections to colleagues.
Complaint response speed	30 days	Time to respond to a Level 1 complaints
<i>T18: Programme timescales on track</i>	<i>Against Plan</i>	Superseded
<i>T18: Performance vs. Budget</i>	<i>Under/over spend</i>	Superseded
<i>T18: No. of Processes live</i>		Superseded
Ratio of web/call-post-email submissions (W2)	20% increasing over time	Ratio for customers calling vs self-servicing using integrated processes online. Customers currently fill in online forms but this then requires input into our systems. The new integrated approach inputs directly to our system and routes work where needed. Initially requires creation of account before first submission so expectation of slight drop off in ratio to begin with and then increasing as more customers sign up. Communication initiatives will be coordinated at key times during the year, for example, with annual council tax bills to drive sign ups so a stepwise increase in submissions is expected.
Ratio of benefits web/post submissions (IEG4)	10% increasing over time	Web submissions via IEG4 portal versus phone or postal submissions.

Report to: **Overview and Scrutiny Committee**
Date: **27 July 2017**
Title: **SH/WD Joint Steering Group Update**
Portfolio Area: **Leader of the Council**
Wards Affected: **Which Wards/all**
Relevant Scrutiny Committee:

Urgent Decision: **N** Approval and clearance obtained: **Y / N**

Date next steps can be taken: Immediate

Author: **Neil Hawke** Role: **Support Services Specialist Manager**

Contact: **neil.hawke@swdevon.gov.uk@swdevon.gov.uk**

RECOMMENDATION

- 1. That the support the work of the SH/WD Joint Steering Group to date be supported; and**
- 2. That, if South Hams District Council agrees to pursue the Single Council proposal, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee review the outputs of the consultation process and provide Executive with feedback from that consultation**

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 A Joint Steering Group was formed to consider potential options for addressing the future funding gap of both Councils.
- 1.2 The Joint Steering Group initially met to consider matters in respect of forming a Local Authority Controlled Company however this report only considers the work of the group since the decision was taken not to implement a company.
- 1.3 The Joint Steering Group have formally met on 5 occasions to consider options for contributing to the future funding gap with sub groups meeting to discuss individual subjects to inform the overall JSG work.

2. Background

- 2.1 A Joint Steering Group was formed in August 2016 to consider one option for addressing the future funding gap of the Councils. At that time, the Joint Steering Groups worked focused on understanding the implications of forming a Local Authority Controlled Company.
- 2.2 The groups' recommendation to the Council at that time was to not proceed with the implementation of a company band to explore other alternatives.
- 2.3 The group have continued to meet under a revised terms of reference to consider further options which the Council could explore jointly with West Devon Borough Council. The first meeting of the revised JSG was held in March 2017 and they have met on 5 occasions since that date.
- 2.4 Meetings have alternated between South Hams and West Devon with the respective Council Leader chairing the meeting. Summary updates have been provided to all Members through the Member Bulletins following a meeting and all meetings have been open for any Member to attend.
- 2.5 At the meeting in March 2017, the Joint Steering Group considered what options they wished officers to explore in more detail.
- 2.6 Based on the achievability (timescales, legal possibility etc) and the potential for options to contribute to the future funding gap, the Joint Steering Group considered the following options required further exploration;
 - Creation of single Council
 - Outsource or wholly owned company for waste and commercial services
 - Service Reductions
 - Structural Review
 - Council Tax Increase
- 2.7 In prioritising the options, Service Reductions, Structural Review and Council Tax increase were considered by the JSG to be items that both Councils should consider in line with the 18/19 budget setting process with Single Council proposal and Waste delivery being priority areas to focus officer resources.

Single Council Proposal

- 2.8 Creation of a single Council was considered by the JSG as an option for exploring much earlier due to the timescales for government approvals and the consultation that we would be looking to undertake.
- 2.9 A number of individual items were brought to the Joint Steering Group for consideration at their meetings which enabled a proposal to be developed for consideration by Members
- 2.10 Following consideration of a draft proposal, the Joint Steering Group have recommended that the Council agrees in principle to establishing a single second-tier Council for West Devon and South Hams from 1st April 2019, proceeds with public and stakeholder consultation and returns to Council for approval in October 2017 along with the outcome of the consultation.

- 2.11 The full proposal along with draft consultation document has been published ahead of a meeting of the Executive on 20th July and subsequent Council meeting on 27th July 2017.
- 2.12 Should the decision be taken to proceed with consultation, it is recommended that the consultation responses are subject to review by Overview and Scrutiny at their meeting on 5th October 2017 in order that the views can be provided to Executive before meeting later that month.

Outsource or wholly owned company for Waste and Commercial Services

- 2.13 South Hams District Council have been sharing services with West Devon Borough Council for a number of years. As West Devon's Waste and Street Cleansing contracts are expiring in the next 18 months, there is an opportunity to explore the potential for delivery of these services across the two Councils.
- 2.14 The Group Manager Commercial Services was therefore asked by the Joint Steering Group to consider options in respect of future delivery of Waste and Street Cleansing Services across the two Councils. Work continues with the Waste Working Group to consider these matters with a position being brought back to the Joint Steering Group for consideration at their August 2017 meeting before any recommendations are made to each Council.
- 2.15 The full minutes of Joint Steering Group Meetings are attached as exempt appendix A to this report

3. Outcomes/outputs

- 3.1 The Joint Steering Group will continue to explore opportunities to jointly address future funding gaps and reports will be presented to relevant committees when the options have been fully considered.

4. Options available and consideration of risk

- 4.1 Each of the options being considered by the Joint Steering Group has a different risk profile.
- 4.2 The Single Council proposal has been published and includes the key risks in proceeding with that option.
- 4.3 Risks and mitigations for other options will be fully set out in future reports to Council when the proposals have been fully developed.

5. Proposed Way Forward

- 5.1 Future Joint Steering Group Meetings have been scheduled with all Members able to attend. The meetings are currently scheduled as follows:-
- 5.2 Tuesday 22nd August 1400 – 1600 Kilworthy Park, Tavistock
Wednesday 27th September 1300-1500 Follaton House, Totnes
Tuesday 24th October 1000-1200 Kilworthy Park, Tavistock
Wednesday 22nd November 1300-1500 Follaton House, Totnes

6. Implications

Implications	Relevant to proposals Y/N	Details and proposed measures to address
Legal/Governance		N/A – update report
Financial		N/A – update report
Risk		N/A – Update report
Comprehensive Impact Assessment Implications		
Equality and Diversity		N/A – Update report
Safeguarding		N/A Update report
Community Safety, Crime and Disorder		N/A – Update report
Health, Safety and Wellbeing		N/A – Update report
Other implications		N/A – Update report

Supporting Information

Appendices:

Appendix A (Exempt) – Minutes of Joint Steering Group Meetings March 17 – June 2017 (Note that minutes of July meeting are not available at time of this report)

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. stresses the need for the Council to appoint a person to be responsible for the monitoring, control and liaison with both local Ward Members and town and parish councils as part of the process for spending S106 funds; 4. encourages legal officers to introduce revised procedures to ensure more effective internal communications within the Council; 5. approves the flowchart (as outlined at Appendix B of the presented agenda report) that illustrates the process for spending Section 106 funding for Affordable Housing; 6. approves the draft application form for Section 106 funding for Affordable Housing (as outlined at Appendix C of the presented agenda report); and 7. requires the production of a Schedule that lists all Section 106 Agreements (irrespective of whether or not payment has been received) for consideration at a future Panel meeting. 	<p>Lisa Buckle</p> <p>Becky Fowlds</p> <p>Alex Rehaag</p> <p>Alex Rehaag</p> <p>Lisa Buckle / Alex Rehaag</p>	
6 July 2017	Revenue and Benefits Performance and Service Update O&S.17/17	<p>RESOLVED That the Panel:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. recognises the current position and accepts the performance of the Revenue and Benefits Services, whilst expressing some concerns over the current level of backlog; 2. endorses the initiatives and improvements that are currently under development; 3. requests that, in the event of a proposal emerging whereby the debt recovery function is to be undertaken by a third party supplier, it be in receipt of a report prior to any final decision being taken. 	<p>Isabel Blake</p> <p>Isabel Blake</p> <p>Isabel Blake</p>	
6 July 2017	Scrutiny Proposal Form	The Panel endorsed the request for a Task and Finish Group to be established to	Nadine Trout	

	(a) Discretionary Grant Funding Review O&S.18/17(a)	<p>review existing sources of discretionary grant funding.</p> <p>Having endorsed the request, Cllrs Hawkins and Pennington expressed an interest in serving on the Group. Since there was a wish for a third Member to be nominated, the Panel agreed that the Chairman should be given delegated authority (outside of this meeting) to nominate a Member who would take on responsibility for leading this Review.</p> <p>(POST MEETING NOTE: having been nominated by the Chairman, Cllr D Brown has confirmed his willingness to be the third (and lead) Member of the Task and Finish Group).</p>		
6 July 2017	Scrutiny Proposal Form (b) Contact Centre / Performance Measures O&S.18/17(b)	<p>The Panel endorsed the request for a Joint SH/WD Task and Finish Group to review the current set of Council Pls.</p> <p>In agreeing to the request, the Panel appointed Cllrs Green, Hicks and Smerdon to be the Council's representatives on the Group. In addition, it was recognised that, as the previous lead Executive Member, Cllr Hicks had extensive knowledge in this area and it was agreed that he should be nominated as the Panel's lead Member for this review.</p>	Steve Mullineaux	
6 July 2017	Hearing Decision Notice Arising from the Code of Conduct Sub Panel O&S.19/17	RESOLVED That the contents of the Decision Notice relating to an alleged breach of the Code of Conduct by Cllr Trevorrow of Kingswear PC be noted.	Catherine Bowen	
6 July 2017	Actions Arising / Decisions Log O&S.21/17	Officers gave an assurance that they would ask for a progress update to be circulated to all Members on the pre-application service review.	Kate Cantwell	
6 July 2017	Draft Annual Work Programme O&S.22/17	In consideration of its Annual Work Programme, the following comments, additions and amendments were made:-		

		<p>(a) The Panel requested that it receive updates on the following agenda items before they were considered by the Executive at its meeting on 14 September 2017:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quayside Phase 2; - Salcombe Land Holdings; and - Business Rates Relief Policy. <p>When considering report lead-in times, it was agreed that each of those items be scheduled for consideration by the Panel at its meeting on 24 August 2017;</p>	<p>Chris Brook Chris Brook Isabel Blake</p>	<p>Work Programme updated accordingly</p>
		<p>(b) With regard to the Village Housing Initiatives Update, the Panel agreed that this item should be deferred to its meeting on 9 November 2017;</p>	<p>Alex Rehaag</p>	<p>Work Programme updated accordingly</p>
		<p>(c) In response to a request, it was agreed that a Joint Local Plan Update be scheduled on to the Work Programme for the meeting to be held on 5 October 2017.</p>	<p>Tom Jones</p>	<p>Work Programme updated accordingly</p>

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

DRAFT ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME – 2017-18

Date of Meeting	Report	Lead Officer
24 August 2017	Executive Forward Plan (to include): Medium Term Financial Position 2018/19 to 2022/23; Quayside Phase 2; and Business Rates Relief Policy	Kathy Trant Lisa Buckle Chris Brook Isabel Blake
	Task and Finish Group Updates	
	Health and Safety Policy Progress Report	Ian Luscombe
	Position Paper on the levels of support being provided to Neighbourhood Planning Groups	Thomas Jones
	RIPA Update	Catherine Bowen
	Overview of the Sickness Absence Monitoring Process	Andy Wilson
	South Devon College Principal Presentation	
	Future Use of Follaton House – to include heating	Stuart Truss
October 2017	Executive Forward Plan	Kathy Trant
	NEW Devon and South Devon and Torbay CCG Representatives (<i>confirmation awaited</i>)	
	Task and Finish Group Updates: To include the concluding recommendations of the Discretionary Grant Funding Review Group.	Nadine Trout
	Joint Local Plan Progress Update	Tom Jones
9 November 2017	Quarterly Performance Indicators (NB. to include Development Management Pl's)	Jim Davis / Pat Whymer
	South Devon and Dartmoor Community Safety Partnership – Annual Update	Louisa Daley
	South Hams Citizens Advice Bureau – Annual Update	Louisa Daley
	South Hams CVS – Annual Update	Louisa Daley
	Executive Forward Plan	Kathy Trant
	Task and Finish Group Updates	
	Allocations Policy and Devon Homes Choice Policy Review	Issy Blake
	Village Housing Initiatives Update	Alex Rehaag
18 January 2018	Draft Budget 2018/19 (joint meeting with DM Committee Members)	Lisa Buckle
	Executive Forward Plan	Kathy Trant

	Task and Finish Group Updates	
8 February 2018	Quarterly Performance Indicators (NB. to include Development Management PI's)	Jim Davis / Pat Whymer
	Executive Forward Plan	Kathy Trant
	Task and Finish Group Updates	
22 March 2018	Executive Forward Plan	Kathy Trant
	Task and Finish Group Updates	
3 May 2018	Quarterly Performance Indicators (NB. to include Development Management PI's)	Jim Davis / Pat Whymer

Future items to be programmed:-

- Regular Monitoring (Six Monthly) of the Homelessness Strategy 2017/22 and the 2017 Action Plan; and
- Renewable Energy – Income Generation Opportunities (Task and Finish?).