

**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL  
NOTES OF A MEETING OF NEIGHBOURHOODS AND COMMUNITIES SELECT  
COMMITTEE  
HELD ON TUESDAY, 15 MARCH 2016  
IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1, CIVIC OFFICES, HIGH STREET, EPPING  
AT 7.35 - 9.40 PM**

**Members Present:** M Sartin (Chairman), H Brady (Vice-Chairman), N Avey, R Gadsby, L Hughes, R Jennings, L Mead, S Neville, A Patel and B Surtees

**Other members present:** R Bassett, W Breare-Hall and G Waller

**Apologies for Absence:** A Mitchell

**Officers Present** D Macnab (Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Neighbourhoods), K Bean (Planning Policy Manager), J Chandler (Assistant Director (Community Services)), A O'Connor (Museum, Heritage & Culture Manager), B Copson (Senior Performance Improvement Officer) and A Hendry (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

**53. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (COUNCIL MINUTE 39 - 23.7.02)**

It was noted that there were no substitute members for this meeting.

**54. NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The notes of the meeting held on 19 January 2016 were agreed.

**55. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made pursuant to the Members Code of Conduct.

**56. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND WORK PROGRAMME**

The Committee noted their Terms of Reference and Work Programme.

**57. MUSEUM DEVELOPMENT TRUST**

The Committee received a report on the proposal to establish a Museum Development Trust for Epping Forest and Lowewood Museums. At the meeting were the Assistant Director for Community Services and Customer Relations, J Chandler and the Museum, Heritage and Culture Manager, Tony O'Connor.

The meeting noted that In April 2015, officers were successful in securing £55,000 funding from Arts Council England (ACE) as part of its Resilience Programme, to undertake two feasibility studies. The aim of the studies was to investigate opportunities for supporting resilience of the Museum, Heritage and Culture (MHC) service over the long-term and during economic austerity.

Two companies were appointed to fulfil the required work; these were the Management Centre and Baker Langham both of whom had a high level of

experience in the cultural sector and significant expertise in the areas to be considered. In addition, Winckworth Sherwood Legal Consultants were appointed to provide legal advice in relation to the establishment of the proposed Trust entity.

The key recommendation to come out of the study was to establish a Development Trust to operate in parallel to the general management of Epping Forest and Lowewood Museum services based on the model of a company limited by guarantee and registered charity.

Part of this preparatory research work was to undertake comparator interviews with three museum services that have been through a similar transition: Hampshire Cultural Trust, Norfolk Museums Service and Maidstone Museum Foundation. These interviews indicated the positive benefits of setting up a separate charitable entity, which included the ability to access a range of funding possibilities that were not previously available to them, the opportunity to secure additional grants and donations and the ability to claim Gift Aid on qualifying ticket sales.

Beyond the structure, one of the key things to come out of the comparator interviews was the role of the Board and the number of positive benefits that an effective Board could bring, beyond being a legal necessity. Legally, there are minimum requirements for the Board, but beyond this it would be up to EFDC to decide the extent of any active engagement. There will need to be a close relationship between the charity and the Museum Services; and the Board will need to have a good understanding of the museum, its work and the priorities and constraints of the staff.

The comparator organisations also reflected on the values of a skills-based Board and suggested the key skills and experience needed, and also recommended that we include two elected Members on an ex-officio basis, as this was important in ensuring good links and alignment between Council, Museum and Charity.

The role of Chair would be key to the functioning of the Board, and it had been suggested that a recruitment process for the chair could run in parallel to the process for other Board members. The first Chair of the Board could be an Elected Member to ensure this position was filled early on in the recruitment process.

The Charity would also need to be supported with practical administration, and will need separate banking arrangements to the Council in order for accounts to be prepared and returns made to Companies House and the Charity Commission. It was possible for this role to be organised through the Council and it could provide the conduit between the Museum's, the Council and the Board.

The Council had an opportunity to pump prime the structure required to set up the Trust, through funding from the Arts Council England (ACE) Resilience Fund, which has recently opened a second round of funding to support Museums and the Arts. Due to the rigid timeframes around the application process, officers have already submitted an Expression of Interest (EOI) ACE, if successful with the EOI, the Council will be invited to submit a fully developed application, which needed to be in by May 5<sup>th</sup> 2016. The total amount of the funding bid was £280,000. Under this round of funding, applicants were required to contribute a minimum of 10% match funding towards the overall bid and the Cabinet had agreed sum of £20,000 to be made available from the invest to save budget. This sum has been supplemented by Broxbourne Borough Council and Chelmsford City Council, who have agreed to contribute £10,000 each towards the bid, which would include the provision of specialist support for Lowewood Museum and Chelmsford Museum.

This tripartite arrangement came into being in early February, following an approach by Chelmsford City Council for support and advice in relation to operation of their Museum Service, which has just received funding for a major Heritage Lottery Fund project.

Mr O'Connor noted that two senior officers from Chelmsford came to look at our museum and talk to senior officers here. They had discussions about the Trust and how to set it up. They were very impressed with our work and were keen to act as a partner agency for us and set themselves up as a separate foundation Trust. We shall establish a close relationship with them as well as Broxbourne.

There was a lot of interest out there for this type of model and a lot of support funding to be had.

Councillor Surtees asked how far we were from drawing up of the trust documentation etc. He was told that officers were presently taking it forward by the external funding route and would know in June if they were successful in getting the funding. If not successful they could apply to the Heritage Lottery Fund for funding. They would know by the autumn if they should go ahead with this.

Councillor Jennings was supportive of the notion of the Trust but wondered what this would mean for the visitors. Mr O'Connor replied that the operation would remain with the Council; the Trust would provide the developmental money to help develop the site. A lot of charitable bodies would fund a Trust but not local authorities, so a lot of local authorities were setting up Trusts to get access to this funding.

Councillor Sartin asked how successful had others been with this. She was told that Norfolk had started to do this along with Maidstone and Hampshire, but we would have to wait a year to find out how successful they were.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Select Committee considered and noted the proposal to establish a Development Trust for Epping Forest and Lowewood Museums, to operate in tandem with the management of the facilities; and
2. That the Committee agreed to the proposed form of the Development Trust and would recommend this to the Cabinet for formal ratification.

**58. PREVENT INITIATIVE AND RADICALISATION ISSUES**

Assistant Director for Community Services and Customer Relations, J Chandler introduced the report on the Home Office funding for the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism – the 'Prevent Duty' that came into force for local authorities on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015.

In October 2015, the Council received notification from the Home Office, that it would be allocating £10,000 to all local authorities (excluding priority areas) as a one off payment in this financial year, for the delivery of specific work to support the implementation of the Prevent Duty.

All Councils were required to apply for the funding and needed to present a plan on how the money would be spent. The application on behalf of EFDC focussed on two distinct areas of work; the upgrading of the Council's IT systems to prevent misuse of

IT for extremist material, and, the provision of a Prevent Education Programme within the district's local secondary schools, for both pupils and teachers.

The Council was successful in its application for prevent funding and the Council's ICT Department had undertaken the work to improve security to IT infrastructure by the upgrading of a number of Firewalls to improve protection for ICT connectivity to remote offices and the installation of a number of Branch Routers to improve ICT connectivity and security for Home Workers.

In regard to Prevent Education work, the Council's Community, Health and Wellbeing Team initially consulted with the secondary schools in the district to ascertain their perceived need for Prevent training for pupils and staff, and found that all schools were very keen to be provided with support.

Nationally recognised Training programme '*Me and You Education*' was therefore commissioned to undertake the delivery of in-schools Prevent work and this has been delivered to pupils in years 7 – 13.

Out of the schools visited, Ongar Academy, which was a very new school in the district, opted for a programme of teacher training. Officers from the Council therefore attended a half day training session alongside the teachers, which they found was very useful for building on knowledge about Right Wing and Muslim Extremism; identification of vulnerabilities and how to report concerns.

It was noted that the Prevent Training had been offered to Epping Forest College, but the offer had been declined.

It was also noted that the £10,000 funding had not been sufficient to cover the education programme and that the Council had to supplement it.

Councillor Waller added that the Home Office was impressed with how we used our funding and with what we provided. As the Home Office was so impressed we may well get back the extra £2,000 we had to put in. It was a shame that we had not managed to get into Epping Forest College.

Councillor Neville asked why the college had not taken up our offer. He was told that officers had heard that they would be providing their own programme as they considered that they had their own expertise on their staff. Councillor Breare-Hall added that they had been involved in a lot of this prevent initiative before and had built up internal expertise on this.

Councillor Patel asked about the older youths aged between 18 and 20, what were we doing to address them? Ms Chandler said that the funding was only for schools; also it was difficult to engage with people who had left education as we did not have the ability to target them.

Councillor Surtees considered that the college should be co-ordinating with us on the Prevent Agenda and also on the British Value Agenda. We also needed to develop some community awareness and community responsibility on this and to engage with the community generally so that what was done at school was not lost.

Councillor Brady asked if this was just a one off grant for this year. She was told that it was, but officers had decided to put something like this into the Reality Road Show that they ran every year in schools.

**RESOLVED:**

That Select Committee noted the report on work undertaken in the district in relation to the Home Office Prevent agenda, which had been funded through a £10,000 grant from the Home Office.

**59. BRENTWOOD DRAFT LOCAL PLAN: PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

The Planning Policy Manager, Mr K Bean introduced the Brentwood Draft Local Plan 2013-2033 consultation report. The Committee noted that the Brentwood Draft Local Plan includes the strategy, planning policies and proposed land allocations intended to cover the period 2013 to 2033.

The Borough has an area of about 15,300 ha, 89% of which was Green Belt. Its 2011 population was 73,601 with the 2014 mid-year estimate being 75,600. It provided about 30,000 jobs, dominated by micro and small businesses.

The Draft Plan sought to fully meet its Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) within Brentwood's boundary – 7,240 houses (net) between 2013 and 2033 - an average rate of 362 per annum. Provision will also be made for an additional 5,000 jobs (250/annum), requiring about 33ha new employment land mainly located (23.4 ha proposed) at Junction 29 of the M25 – Brentwood Enterprise Park.

Areas within the two key transport corridors (i.e. the A12 and A127) created the focus for sustainable growth. Brentwood and Shenfield would be the main focus for development in the A12 corridor supported by two strategic allocations in the A127 corridor, making provision for new homes and jobs.

To meet local needs fully there will be limited release of Green Belt for development within transport corridors. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, would take place in villages within rural areas at a level which maintained local amenity and distinctiveness, and was commensurate with available services and facilities. This means that development in the Rural North of the Borough (the area adjoining this district) was extremely unlikely to be of significant extent or to have any adverse consequences for Epping Forest District.

The Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) published in July 2014 identified a need for an additional 84 pitches in the Borough between 2013 and 2033. Since July 2013, permission has been granted for 17 new pitches, reducing the GTAA target to 67. The Draft Plan included a criteria-based policy to deal with planning applications for pitches and proposes the Dunton Hills "Garden Village" as a broad location for future provision of about 20 pitches. Epping Forest District and Brentwood Borough are in a very similar situation – i.e. with challenging pitch provision targets from the GTAA (112 and 84 respectively) and with very comprehensive Green Belt coverage (92% and 89% respectively), so there could be some advantage in considering joint provision in the general area of the common boundary. The Draft Plan suggested that the target for new pitches may fall slightly in light of the revised guidance, and the GTAA was being reviewed.

**RESOLVED:**

That the following comments be made to Brentwood Borough Council in response to the consultation on its Draft Local Plan 2016:

- (a) To support Brentwood Borough Council's spatial strategy which
  - (i) concentrates new housing and employment development in the A12 and A127 corridors; and
  - (ii) allows for limited release of Green Belt for development, and limited development, including infilling, within rural villages.
- (b) To support the aim of Brentwood Borough Council to make provision for its full Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (7,240 new houses) entirely within its own area.
- (c) To suggest that the final version of the Local Plan should include
  - (i) direct reference to the Duty to Co-operate and related future arrangements with neighbouring authorities; and
  - (ii) consideration of the potential for joint working with neighbouring authorities to make sufficient provision for the needs of the travelling community, with particular reference to paragraphs 4(d), 10 (c) and 16 of "Planning policy for traveller sites" (2015).

## 60. LOCAL PLANS UPDATE

The Planning Policy Manager, Mr K Bean introduced the latest updating report on the Local Plan. The meeting noted that:

- The Local Development Scheme agreed by Cabinet on 11 June 2015 has the timetable for consultation on the draft plan scheduled for July 2016 to September 2016. However, this timescale is now looking very challenging given that the timetable for the Green Belt Review Stage 2 has slipped and that strategic transport work remains outstanding.
- The Government was now looking in our direction and EFDC was visited on 1 February 2016 by an official from DCLG when it became apparent that we are one of the authorities on the Government's list for potential action. One of the penalties proposed for not having produced a plan, (it is not clear yet how this will be interpreted), is the loss of New Homes Bonus. It is clear that the Council needs to make good progress this year and to have consulted on our Draft Plan Preferred Approach prior to the Government's yet to be determined 2017 cut-off date.
- Recent Member workshops have covered design on 28 January 2016 and evolving work on stage 2 work of the Green Belt study on 25 February 2016. Both were well attended and Members provided valuable information and opinions on the matters presented. In respect of the Green Belt workshop, Members were afforded a short period (until 10<sup>th</sup> March), to send further comments on the parcel boundaries and to feed in local knowledge and views about the areas now being looked at in more detail.
- It was intended that future workshops to inform the Draft Plan (Preferred Approach) would consider climate change, energy and flood risk; development management policies; settlement policy and preferred sites.
- Government guidance and emerging Inspectors' reports make clear the need to undertake a comprehensive Green Belt Review of the entire District before the release of any Green Belt land was considered. It was important to remember that the outcome

of the Green Belt Review was only one, albeit an extremely important, piece of the evidence base that will inform the Council's future plan-making decisions.

- Consultants recently ran a workshop to ensure that Member views were appropriately taken account of in this work. Once the Stage 2 study has been completed, (now likely to be around mid-April), together with the other evidence the findings will be used to inform the Draft Plan (Preferred Approach).
- The position of junction 7 and 7a was still unclear and more engagement was needed from Highways England. Also a watch in brief needed to be kept on the potential impact of Enfield's Northern Gateway Access Package.
- Town and Parish Councils are also to be asked for expressions of interest in participating in work leading to the establishment of a Green Infrastructure Framework for the District.
- Moreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers have finalised their draft Plan and submitted it to the Council. The plan has now been published and is currently being examined.
- Eight other Parish and Town Councils have applied to designate neighbourhood planning areas for their areas (Chigwell, Epping, Buckhurst Hill, Theydon Bois, Loughton, North Weald Bassett, Epping Upland and Waltham Abbey). Many of these are now at early stages in scoping out and drafting their plans.

Councillor Bassett informed the committee that he had tried to strike a balance and keep everyone informed, so that nothing came as a surprise. There had been a lot of workshops so far and he was grateful to the Town and Parish Councils for their input. He noted that the information they got from the workshops could help them in formulating their own local (Neighbourhood) plans, but added that this was for them to complete as the District Council could only advise.

He emphasised the pressure that government was exerting on authorities such as EFDC to complete our plan, other authorities were using short cuts by moving straight to pre-submission draft (Regulation 19) plans but EFDC were keeping to the proper way by undertaking full public consultations before reaching the Regulation 19 stage. Also Highways England was not fully engaging with us on strategic transportation matters and therefore delaying us taking forward work on the draft plan. We have had recent meetings with surrounding authorities on transport matters including Crossrail 2 and they all have expressed concerns about limited Highways England engagement and how this was adversely impacting on local plan progress.

We were going as fast as we can but were consulting and engaging on every step we take. It was difficult to continually let the public know what we are doing and what were the options open to us. The Council were shortly to appoint consultants to assist with public relations and stakeholder engagement matters on local plan preparation.

Councillor Neville asked about the Green Belt review (part 2) and if the nature reserves were taken into account? Councillor Bassett said that they were looking for reasons to keep things in the green belt and not take them out.

Councillor Surtees commented that he had concerns that we were only just opening tenders on how to improve consultations at this late stage. We had large, well attended consultation meetings at the beginning of the process, but then it went very quiet. They were now happening again, smaller and with fewer people. We know that people are concerned, especially about the green belt review. He thought that there was not enough guidance from the forward planning team. They needed good communications now and he would like the review to be made public.

The Planning Policy Manager said that the Green Belt Stage 2 report would be made public at a later stage in conjunction with the publication of the preferred approach draft plan later this year having considered all the local plan evidence in the round. Councillor Bassett added that there was a lot of information on the website and he had tried talking to the press trying to get information out there. Councillor Surtees suggested we give Parish Clerks a regular update. Councillor Patel suggested that the Parish and Town Councils have their own magazines that we could use to publicise messages and the put in local plan updates.

Councillor Waller asked if the government officer from the CLG got the message that we were not dragging our feet. The Director of Neighbourhoods said that we did put our point across and she was impressed with what we were doing. But, we were on their list and have to be seen to be making timely progress.

Councillor Jennings was disappointed that the timetable had been put back; was it not time to put in more resources? The Director of Neighbourhoods replied saying that we had always had good resources dedicated to production of the Local Plan. There were issues for retaining Planning Policy Officers; London Boroughs pay a lot more than we could. It was not a question of throwing money at it. People including consultants undertaking some of the technical work were always surprised that we involve and consult Town and Parish Councils to the extent that we do as other authorities tended not to. Councillor Bassett added that Harlow had received 16 responses to their consultation, where as we got 6,000 to our issues and options draft.

Councillor Sartin noted that we have just lost a long standing member of staff in the forward planning team, through retirement, Ian White. The Committee agreed that the member's gratitude and thanks for Mr White's professional work should be officially recorded in the minutes and that the Chairman drop him a note of thanks.

## **61. RESPONSE TO LOWER THAMES CROSSING CONSULTATION**

The Committee noted that Highways England was consulting on proposals for a new road crossing of the River Thames connecting Kent and Essex. It was considered that a new crossing was needed to reduce congestion at the existing Dartford Crossing and unlock economic growth, supporting the development of new homes and jobs in the region.

For over 50 years, the Dartford Crossing had provided the only road crossing of the Thames east of London. It was a critical part of the UK's major road network carrying local, national and international traffic. The proposed multi-billion pound road tunnel across the Thames connecting Essex and Kent would provide a valuable alternative to the existing congested Dartford Crossing and assist regeneration plans on both sides of the estuary.

In 2009 the Department for Transport (DfT) commissioned a study identifying five locations for a crossing to potentially alleviate congestion at the existing Dartford



Crossing. The two most easterly of these were found to be too far from the existing crossing to ease the problems at Dartford and were eliminated from further consideration.

In 2012 the DfT commissioned a study to assess three remaining location options:

- Option A: located close to the existing crossing;
- Option B: connecting the A2 Swanscombe Peninsula with the A1089;
- Location Option C: connecting the A2/M2 with the M25 between junctions 29 and 30;
- Location Option C variation: which would additionally widen the A229 between the M2 and M20.

The current proposal being consulted on was the culmination of lengthy investigations into options for a new Lower Thames Crossing which has been lobbied for by Kent and Essex County Councils and business leaders. The consultation period commenced on 11<sup>th</sup> February and ran until 24<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

It was noted that option 'C' was the preferred option.

Councillor Waller noted that the County Council would like a united front on our responses to the consultation in support for option 'C'. This would have less impact on the environment than the bridge.

Councillor Neville noted that this new crossing would create about 5,000 extra jobs, what sort of jobs? He was told that would be for the future as the crossing would have an impact on economic growth once it was completed.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That on consideration the Council's response to the Highways England Consultation for the proposed location and route for construction of the new Lower Thames crossing linking North Kent to South Essex should be expressed as:

- a) Support for the principle of constructing a new Lower Thames Crossing;
- b) Preference for the new crossing at Location C as a twin bore tunnel; and
- c) Preference for the line of the connector roads following Route 3 north of the Thames linking onto the M25 between junctions 29 and 30.

## **62. CHANGE IN ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

With the Committee's agreement the meeting considered agenda item 14a, 'Replacement Essex Waste Local Plan – Consultation', next.

## **63. REPLACEMENT ESSEX WASTE LOCAL PLAN - CONSULTATION**

The Committee noted that the Replacement Waste Local Plan: Pre Submission Draft was the version of the Plan proposed to be submitted to the Secretary of State, leading up to independent examination by a Planning Inspector later in 2016. It included a vision statement, objectives and a spatial strategy to enable the delivery of sustainable waste development, site allocations and policies to manage waste development. The Plan covers the administrative areas of Essex County Council and

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council. The consultation period runs from 3<sup>rd</sup> March to 14<sup>th</sup> April 2016.

The focus of this consultation, which was being carried out under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 was on soundness and legal compliance. The Planning Inspector (who will receive copies of all representations) can only address these issues in their consideration of the Waste Plan.

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 sets out the four tests of soundness against which Local, Waste and Minerals Plans will be assessed at Examinations in Public. A sound Plan is one which was (i) positively prepared – i.e. seeking to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements; (ii) justified – the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives; (iii) effective – deliverable over its period; and (iv) consistent with national policy.

Officers believe that the Pre-Submission Plan fails the second test of soundness as the identification of Langston Road as an Area of Search was not an appropriate strategy, given the significant change of use which was currently taking place, and for which waste management facilities would be an inappropriate and unsuitable neighbour.

Without more detail about the potential land requirements for a waste management facility, or how the Waste Authorities proposed to deal with land ownership issues, there was considerable doubt about the delivery of a facility on Langston Road in the period of the Plan. Officers therefore consider that the third soundness test – effectiveness – also failed.

**RESOLVED:**

That this Council make the following response to the consultation:

To object, on two grounds of soundness, to the inclusion of the Langston Road Industrial Estate as an Area of Search:

- a) Given the significant change of use of part of the site to a high-class retail park, the potential development of waste management facilities in such a location was considered to be unsuitable and inappropriate. This proposal was therefore not considered to be the most appropriate strategy, and the “Justified” test of soundness had therefore failed; and
- b) The document gives no information about specific land requirements for new waste management facilities or how land ownership issues would or could be addressed. There must therefore be considerable doubt about whether a site on the Langston Road Industrial Estate could be delivered over the Plan period, so the “Effectiveness” test had also failed.

**64. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2015/16 - QUARTER 3 PERFORMANCE**

The Senior Performance Improvement Officer introduced the Quarter 3 update on the Key Performance Indicators specific to this Select Committee.

The Committee noted that twelve of the Key Performance Indicators fell within this Committee's areas of responsibility. The overall position with regard to the achievement of target performance at the end of Q3 for these indicators was as follows:

- (a) 8 (67%) indicators achieved their Q3 target;
- (b) 4 (33%) indicators did not achieve their Q3 target; and
- (c) 0 (0%) indicators performed within their tolerated amber margin.
  
- (d) 8 (67%) indicators are currently anticipated to achieve their cumulative year-end target;
- (e) 3 (24%) indicators are currently not anticipated to achieve their year-end target;
- (f) 1 (8%) indicator, it is uncertain whether it will achieve its year-end target.

The Committee went on to review each indicator that looked to be in trouble and to question any inconsistencies that they came across.

**NEI002** – *What % of all household waste was sent to be recycled, reused or composted* – Councillor Breare-Hall commented that this KPI was now just wrong and should be set lower. There was recognition across the sector that the weight of recyclable materials was dropping and so there was a need to adjust our target. It was not just us struggling with this but it was the same all over the country. Also, there was a need to educate people about putting in their food waste into the recycling bins as too few of them were doing so at present.

**NEI004** – *What % of our district had unacceptable levels of detritus* – it was noted that, as a rural area, detritus was difficult to measure. Biffa had problems with their machinery at first but now have got much better machinery and the figures will improve.

**NEI008** – *What % of the recorded incidences of fly-tipping are removed within 10 working days of being recorded* – it was noted that this was heading in the right direction for the end of the year.

## 65. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2016/17 - REVIEW AND TARGETS

The Committee noted that the adoption of challenging but achievable KPIs each year was an important element of the Council's Performance Management Framework, and the KPI set was reviewed annually by Management Board to ensure the indicators and their targets were appropriate to provide challenge in the Council's key areas and to meet its objectives.

Whilst the recent annual review had considered that the current indicator set was appropriate to provide challenge and improvement, a number of changes to targets had been identified for the coming year, and one indicator has been split to enable greater focus and evaluation.

The review of the KPIs which fall within the areas of responsibility of the Neighbourhoods and Community Services Select Committee has resulted in a number of changes, the details of which are set out below:

- |   |   |                             |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) NEI005 Complaints response times</li> <li>b) NEI006 Fly-tipping response times</li> <li>c) NEI011 Commercial rents</li> </ul> | } | targets have been increased |
|---|---|-----------------------------|

- d) NEI002 Recycling - has been deleted and replaced by:
- e) NEI013 Household waste - recycling                      NEW INDICATOR
- f) NEI014 Household waste - composting                      NEW INDICATOR

Improvement plans will be developed for each KPI for 2016/17, identifying actions to achieve target performance. The plans will be considered and agreed by Management Board, and submitted to the relevant select committees along with the 2016/17 first quarter performance submission.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Select Committee considered and agreed the proposed Key Performance Indicators and targets for 2016/17 for those areas which fall within its areas of responsibility.

**66. DATA QUALITY STRATEGY 2016/17 - 2018/19**

The Senior Performance Improvement Officer, Ms Copson, introduced the report on Data Quality Strategy (2016/17 to 2018/19). She noted that the Council needed timely, accurate and reliable data in order to manage activities and meet internal and external requirements to demonstrate accountability through accurate reporting. Data was used for the assessment of the Council's performance, including the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The Data Quality Strategy set out the arrangements for the next 3 years to ensure key data meets the highest standards and was 'right first time'.

Good quality data was essential to support the Council's decision making especially decisions involving finance and performance. Additionally the Council's customers, partners and others interested in the Council's performance, needed to be able to rely on the data produced for evaluation purposes. The Council was also accountable for the money it spent and must manage competing claims on its resources. It therefore requires data which was accurate, reliable and timely in order to plan for the future and meet customer needs.

The Council had identified principles and arrangements to ensure high standards of data quality and had for a number of years, formalized them within a strategy, to support consistency and encourage high standards of practice of data quality management. This revised strategy continued to reflect the principles for data quality originally identified by the former Audit Commission.

The Data Quality Principles were:

**Accuracy** – Data must be accurate for its intended purpose and be represented clearly and in sufficient detail to enable informed decision making.

**Validity** – Data must be recorded and used in accordance with relevant requirements, rules and definitions to ensure consistency.

**Reliability** – Data must reflect stable and consistent collection methods.

**Timeliness** – Data must be available for its intended use within a reasonable time period. It must be available quickly and frequently enough to support information needs.

**Completeness** – Data must be recorded in its entirety, avoiding gaps in information and duplication of data.

**Relevance** – Data must be relevant to the purpose for which it is used.

**Security** – Data must be stored securely and confidentially where appropriate.

This report has already been to the Governance, Housing and Resources Select Committees where they discussed what was meant by the term data, but concluded that defining it would tend to exclude certain data streams. There was also a need to be aware of the relevance of the data streams.

The Chairman asked if there was a strategy for redundant data. Ms Copson said that there was always a need to know what data was up to date and therefore useful and was kept under consideration on a regular basis.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Data Quality Strategy for 2016/17 – 2018/19 was noted.

**67. ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY**

The Director of Neighbourhoods took the Committee through the updating report on the enforcement actions taken in 2015. They noted that in line with previous reports on enforcement activities of the Environment & Neighbourhoods team, the data has been broken down into 6 month periods covering the summer and winter months. In general summer months are busier, particularly for noise complaints. This pattern has been repeated in 2015.

Noise and waste/fly-tipping issues make up a large percentage of the teams enforcement work, it was estimated that the Environment and Neighbourhood Officers (ENO) spend 80% of their time on these two issues across the district.

In some cases officers are clearly working towards establishing non-compliance with the law, with the aim of instigating prosecution proceedings e.g. fly-tipping incidents. However, officers also spend a great deal of time trying to educate, deter and resolve issues informally. That was particularly the case with noise issues and other neighbour nuisance complaints. Although prosecutions draw attention, enforcement officers investigate and resolve many more cases informally.

Officers have started to use new powers to issue formal Community Protection Warnings (CPW) and Community Protection Notices (CPN) for a range of issues that had a detrimental effect of a persistent or continuing nature on the quality of life of those in the locality. This new power provided officers with more scope to deal with some issues that previously did not fall under specific statutory nuisance powers.

Although the new power was welcome, it comes at a time when other enforcement agencies, that share similar enforcement responsibilities, such as the Police, Environment Agency and Essex County Council were increasingly under pressure, leading to more enforcement work being directed to the ENO team.

The ENO team have also recently taken over the responsibility for all dog noise complaints and dog fouling issues with retirement of the Council's Animal Welfare Officer.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report on Enforcement Actions taken 2015 be noted.

**68. REPORTS TO BE MADE TO THE NEXT MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Committee considered that the report on the Museum Development Trust should be reported to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.