

## **EPHING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MINUTES**

<b>Committee:</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	<b>Date:</b>	Tuesday, 12 October 2021
<b>Place:</b>	Council Chamber - Civic Offices	<b>Time:</b>	7.00 - 9.26 pm
<b>Members Present:</b>	Councillors M Sartin (Chairman) R Jennings (Vice-Chairman) R Baldwin, P Bolton, S Heap, A Lion, S Murray, S Rackham, P Stalker, J H Whitehouse, K Williamson and D Wixley		
<b>Other Councillors:</b>	Councillors S Kane, A Patel, C Whitbread and H Whitbread		
<b>Apologies:</b>	Councillors P Bhanot, I Hadley, J Lea, T Matthews and D Plummer		
<b>Officers Present:</b>	N Dawe (Chief Operating Officer), A Small (Strategic Director Corporate and 151 Officer), T Carne (Corporate Communications Team Manager), F Edmonds (Climate Change Officer), C Graham (Project Team Manager (Performance)), A Hendry (Democratic Services Officer), L Kirman (Democratic Services Officer), S Lloyd-Jones (Sustainable Transport Officer), V Messenger (Democratic Services Officer) and R Moreton (Corporate Communications Officer)		

---

### **36. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION**

The Chairman reminded everyone present that the meeting would be broadcast live to the Internet, and that the Council had adopted a protocol for the webcasting of its meetings.

### **37. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

The Committee noted that Councillor S Heap had been appointed as a substitute for Councillor D Plummer.

### **38. MINUTES**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting of 1 July 2021 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### **39. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest pursuant to the Council's Members' Code of Conduct.

### **40. PUBLIC QUESTIONS & REQUESTS TO ADDRESS THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Committee noted that no public questions or requests to address the meeting had been received.

**41. EXECUTIVE DECISIONS - CALL-IN**

The Committee noted that no executive decisions had been called-in for consideration since the previous meeting.

**42. CORPORATE PLAN KEY ACTION PLAN YEAR 4 2021/22 - QUARTER 1 CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORTING**

C Graham, Project Manager (Performance), introduced quarter 1 and reported on projects at red or amber status (exceptions), as the full report had previously been scrutinised by the Stronger Council Select Committee. The report also included an updated set of all the KPIs, regardless of status, because there had been some gaps in the data at the time the select committee had scrutinised it. Within Performance, more focus would be given to the start-up phase of projects, as well as budget control and resourcing.

The Committee scrutinised the following areas.

**(1) Appendix A – Status and Progress Report: Key Corporate Projects****(a) Community Health and Wellbeing service area****Epping Forest District Community and Cultural Trust**

Where did the discussions take place? Would scrutiny members see the action plan? It seemed that a key change in status of this decision was made about a service but not in a transparent way. How were directors appointed? C Graham replied the action plan was targeted for quarter 3. The Trust came under the Community and Regulatory Services Portfolio. Councillor A Patel, Portfolio Holder, believed this had been done in conjunction with the museum.

**(b) Customer Services service area****Provide insight for the future design of our service based on data and behavioural analysis and provide customer-centric services**

There was a query on the recommendation that the project be removed from reporting until the project started. C Graham clarified that an update should be able to be provided when the project had been reviewed, as it was anticipated it would commence in quarter 1 of 2022/23.

**To provide an additional one-stop portal, for all member information requirements**

Could the number of reports made by members be made available? Councillor S Kane, Portfolio Holder (Customer and Partnerships Services), advised that this would only be possible when all councillors were using the recommended forms online. Questions members directed to officers themselves were being missed but if use of the forms was adopted by all members, proper analysis could be undertaken, and suitable resources put in place.

**(c) Economic Development service area****An externally provided platform for 'Place' that will re-imagine Epping Forest District as a great location to live, work and do business**

A comment was noted on the project's goal in relation to its title that EFDC was a great place, you did not have to imagine it! How were local shops being targeted and engaged, and why was the newsletter on hold? C Graham advised that the Economic Development team was currently developing a strategy but once it was ready by

quarter 3 (target), it could be shared with members. However, she would contact J Houston, Partnerships and Economic Development Specialist, for an update.

**(2) Appendix B – Quarterly KPI Reporting**

**(a) Customer Services service area**

**Overall Customer Satisfaction**

As most people who contacted councillors were not satisfied, was the target too low, as 80% (actual target) did not seem very good, and should the target not be a 100%? C Graham advised that the target percentage was being looked at currently, but as it was reviewed against the previous quarter its journey could begin to be seen.

**(b) Community Health and Wellbeing service area**

Were KPIs generated for portfolios and how did they emerge? Councillor S Kane explained that targets were evaluated from previous years. Councillor C Whitbread, the Leader, continued that part of the process was for the Stronger Council Select Committee to look at the full suite of data. C Graham added that initial discussions had begun on how to set these KPI targets.

**Total visits in person to Epping Forest District Museums including; school outreach and loan box service**

The Committee noted that this figure had probably increased above its target as the public was looking to do more activities / outings locally in the District following the Covid pandemic.

**(c) Contracts service area**

**Percentage change of leisure centre attendees from previous years quarter: Casual swimming and Club Live membership**

The Committee was pleased by the increase in numbers across all leisure centres especially Ongar following the completion of its refurbishment.

**(d) Stronger Place KPIs**

**Waste: Recycling rate**

The Committee asked why this was just below target? C Graham replied that the Waste team now had more staff capacity to focus on developing initiatives to improve recycling.

**(e) Stronger Council KPIs**

**People: Diversity & Inclusion – % of workforce by ethnicity**

The Committee observed that staff were increasingly withholding ethnicity information, which was understandable but disappointing, as this was a reasonable question to ask. Did this need to be looked at further? C Graham replied that she would refer this comment to the People Team.

**RESOLVED:**

That the committee reviewed quarter 1 Corporate Performance.

#### 43. CLIMATE CHANGE AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT UPDATE

Climate Change Officer, F Edmonds, and Sustainable Transport Officer, S Lloyd-Jones, reported on their respective areas within the update report before the Committee.

##### (a) Climate change update

A public consultation on the draft Climate Change Action Plan was to take place from October to November. This would comprise online elements and include video links, as well as a series of in person events organised for members, the Youth Council and the community to attend. A proposal to plant around 2,300 trees in Jessel Green (Loughton) to enhance the local environment was being funded by a £65,000 grant from the Forestry Commission's Local Authorities Treescapes Fund. There would be a public consultation to help decide on the final planting design. The Green Homes Grant Local Authority Delivery scheme would be helping to raise the energy efficiency of lower income and low energy performance homes with a focus on energy performance certificate (EPC) ratings of E, F or G. Split into three phases, the first had been completed in August 2021 with nine properties upgraded. It was also reported that a carbon literacy toolkit had been trialled with some Service Managers that would be used to teach staff the basics of climate change science.

The Committee asked the following questions.

How was the Council engaging with councillors on the climate change action plan? F Edmonds advised that a Member Briefing on the climate change action plan was organised for 14 October 2021.

Who was included in the online public consultation on the draft Climate Change Action Plan? Also, householders were paving front gardens and not leaving any vegetation. F Edmonds advised that a community Q&A would take place on 26 October and had a very wide audience. Parish councils and community leaders had access to carbon literacy courses and the Essex Association of Local Councils was running some planet change courses. Paving front gardens was more a planning matter. Councillor A Patel continued that online video streams worked well, and it would be beneficial if the Youth Council was involved in this project. Also, the Procurement Strategy had been updated in 2021 to enhance climate change ideals.

The Committee was supportive of tree planting. However, it was difficult to visualise the amount of space that would be utilised, as the open aspect of Jessel Green was important as well as its use for activities and what would the likely tree survival rate be? There must also be community involvement for residents in the Loughton Fairmead and Broadway wards and the ward members. F Edmonds replied that to retain its openness, periphery type planting was favoured with residents being consulted on specific areas. Councillor H Whitbread, Housing Services Portfolio Holder and County Councillor, replied that it was a portfolio holder decision and discussions had been held with officers, who had submitted the bid to the Forestry Commission. At County, she was luckily on the Essex Climate Commission. Unfortunately, when a massive tree planting scheme had recently been embarked on in Chelmsford, 90% of trees had died. Therefore, the Council needed to make sure this tree planting initiative would work.

Could anything be learnt from the high percentage of trees dying? F Edmonds advised that the Council's tree officers were identifying the best sites on Jessel Green. Only trees that were hardy enough and had a survival rate of 75% would be used. Involving the community would help reduce damage to trees. Councillor

H Whitbread added that very young trees had been planted in Chelmsford. Councillor B Jennings explained that if whips (bare root trees) were planted there was a high death rate. There was a better success rate with standard to extra standard trees, which could be planted properly. Involving local children gave them a sense of community ownership.

When the houses were upgraded under the green homes grant, was it means tested? F Edmonds advised that the criteria for a home grant was an income of below £30,000 or being in receipt of certain benefits while also having a low efficiency home with an EPC rating of D, E, F or G.

#### **(b) Sustainable transport update**

S Lloyd-Jones outlined progress on electric vehicle charge (EVC) points in the District's car parks and an increase in the provision of on-site charging at the Civic Offices to accommodate EFDC and Qualis fleet conversion to EV. A campaign was underway to understand incentives and barriers to the adoption of EV by minicabs and taxis. The use of street lamps was not favoured by ECC but at least 36% of local homes did not have access to viable off-street parking, which would seriously impede EV adoption within the next 18 months. General local commuting was still low as a result of hybrid / working from home and other major users like the elderly, who were still being cautious. An EV bus would be trialled in November and December between the Broadway and the Epping Forest Retail Park in Loughton. Demand responsive travel (DRT) would be piloted in the District to Epping Green and Harlow and work was ongoing as there was a demand from school pupils who needed to reach schools in Epping, Loughton and Chigwell.

The Committee asked the following questions.

The Council needed to provide a process for people to find and use EVC and looking at street maps would be a source. Some people might be uncomfortable with going out to use EVC points, so a process did need to be provided to people to enable them to charge EVs. Did the street lamps belong to Essex Highways? S Lloyd-Jones confirmed this and that he would be contacting the London Borough of Redbridge for their advice. Most of ECC's street lamps were set back from the kerb and he was aware EVC that was safe to use needed to be provided. Councillor M Sartin asked if the three County members at the meeting could lobby ECC on this matter.

Could Council-owned lamp posts be used for EVC and priority should be given to housing residents where it was not possible to charge at properties? S Lloyd-Jones affirmed that EFDC did own some lamp posts.

Could grassed housing land be used? S Lloyd-Jones commented that there was a case for grassed drainage areas owned by ECC and EFDC that might be feasible to use for EVC.

Was rapid charging detrimental to car batteries? S Lloyd-Jones said that rapid chargers should not solely be relied upon as no more than 80% of the battery should be charged by a rapid charger. A network would never consist of rapid chargers only.

How successful had the trial of E-on's vehicle to grid method at the Civic Offices been, what was the criteria being used and had this expanded? S Lloyd-Jones replied that the vehicle to grid method would be a way and means to expand the system and there was a definite need for it by taxis and road fleets of small electric vans. Instavolt, a commercial company, was judged on usage and was of low to zero cost to the Council, generated site rental and profit share, e.g. for taxis, trade and

light industrial vans. Officers were currently investigating if this could work in EFDC owned car parks. Contract terms could help improve the uptake of EVs as they were attractive to taxi drivers and electric vehicle contract renting schemes. It was noted that although a large number of Hackney carriage drivers lived in the District, they worked outside the District.

Disabled drivers might find it difficult to access EVC points, was this being identified? S Lloyd-Jones explained that national connectors to chargers were used but some might not be as compatible as others and he would look into how different kits performed to national standards.

When the retail park was built some members had pointed out that a shuttle service was needed, so the forthcoming trial was welcome. How was accessibility by users and their mobility judged? The Council would be renting a shuttle bus, but it would not have the capability to be lowered to pavement level. The first priority was to test the concept of the shuttle service, monitor usage and accessibility, as adjustments for vehicle lowering could be made to the bus later.

In Chigwell, there was the potential of a school bus with ECC, but it was thought that an alternative strategy was needed. S Lloyd-Jones said that the Chigwell trial was worth undertaking but ECC's school transport scheme criteria needed to be evaluated including some financial and operational analysis.

N Dawe, Chief Operating Officer, concluded that a further post-consultation report on the draft Climate Change Action Plan consultation and tree planting updates would be useful for members to scrutinise.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Committee considered progress on the climate change and sustainable travel agendas; and
- (2) That a further post-consultation report on the draft Climate Change Action Plan and tree planting updates would be useful to scrutinise.

**44. COVID-19 UPDATE**

The Covid update report provided by A Small, Strategic Director and 151 Officer, highlighted that Covid cases were under control at the moment. Since the report had been written, figures had fallen to 220 cases per 100,000 in the District. The report set out the current position, the Council's response actions and the actions it might take in response to a significant worsening of the local or national position. Staff were largely working from home and were being asked to find a balance between home and office working. The Government had recently stated it had a Plan A and Plan B for its Covid-19 response during the autumn and winter, but our way of working was still compliant.

What was the Covid impact on schools returning? A Small replied that the Council received figures daily but in the 11-18 age group the infection rate had risen slightly.

What actions were being taken in the local communities, like Grange Hill, where there was low uptake of the vaccination? Had the Council thought about using incentives? Councillor A Patel, Portfolio Holder (Community and Regulatory Services), replied that at the last full Council, members had been signposted to local vaccination centres. There were also mobile 'pop-up' stands from special buses that had been developed in the low uptake areas of Grange Hill, Loughton and Waltham

Abbey. Marshals were actively promoting vaccinations to people on the District's streets following government guidance. Councillor H Whitbread, Portfolio Holder (Housing Services), acknowledged that promoting to the 25-40 age group was difficult particularly to women as there were fertility challenges. Younger people were quite receptive to vaccination if they were going out clubbing etc.

Social distancing was well organised at the Civic Offices but at a recent Area Plans South meeting, members were sitting too close to each other. Councillor A Patel replied that it was business as usual for the economic recovery plan and social recovery planning was moving forwards. Members were advised that if they chose to socially distance more, they could move to another seat.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Committee reviewed the Covid-19 update.

**45. LOCAL HIGH STREETS TASK AND FINISH PANEL**

N Dawe, Chief Operating Officer, briefly outlined that the pandemic had resulted in a renewed interest in town centres. Following a series of actions, reports had been requested and separately considered by Cabinet. Progress with town centre issues was now well advanced and the four options reported were discussed at the meeting.

There was general consensus that the Panel should meet once more to look at where it wanted to go. This might be to refocus on one of the four options detailed in the agenda report, or to have a time lapse to return in a few months. It was recognised that all local councillors (District and Parish) should be involved including local communities / businesses and the public. P Messenger, Town Centres Project Manager, would ensure members were contacted and would also co-ordinate with the existing commercial group and local councils.

The Committee asked about the following.

Was there an update on the quick wins identified in the town centre regeneration reports, which had been signed off? The Committee was advised that progress was due to be reported to the Stronger Place Select Committee in January 2022. An informal update could be given. Councillor S Kane, Portfolio Holder (Customer and Partnerships Services), remarked that as a result of the short-term Covid measures in Waltham Abbey, there was a lot more positive activity in Sun Street from the café culture and through use of the pavements.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Local High Streets Task and Finish Panel meet once more to look at where it wanted to go.

**46. CABINET BUSINESS**

Cabinet's Key Decision List (KDL) updated to the 1 October 2021 was scrutinised by the Committee and the following points were raised.

**(a) Finance, Qualis Client and Economic Development**

**Updated Medium Term Financial Plan 2022/23 to 2026/27** – it was recommended that the webcast of the Cabinet meeting on 11 October 2021 be viewed as this detailed in full the medium term issues and difficulties.

**(b) Environmental and Technical Services Portfolio**

**Waste contract** – N Dawe reported that work was ongoing around recommendations to either extend the contract with Biffa or go elsewhere. It was noted that the strategic options and exact timings were being discussed currently.

**Review of current EFDC off street parking tariffs and recommend tariff for EFDC off-street car parks for implementation in 2022** – it was reported this would be reviewed by Stronger Place Select Committee at an extra meeting in November 2021.

**(c) Housing Services Portfolio**

**New Fees and Charges** – Councillor H Whitbread, Housing Services Portfolio Holder, had not seen the report yet but would follow this up with D Fenton, Director (Housing and Property), and confirmed that this would be pre-scrutinised by the Stronger Communities Select Committee.

**Draft tree policy** – was there any progress on this being completed as the Committee had scrutinised it in June 2021? Councillor H Whitbread, Portfolio Holder, advised that she would follow this up as she had not seen the final policy.

**(d) Community and Regulatory Portfolio**

**Establish a new Markets Policy for the District** – Councillor A Patel advised that the new Markets Policy would be pre-scrutinised.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Committee reviewed the Executive's current programme of Key Decisions of 1 October 2021;

**47. STRONGER PLACE SELECT COMMITTEE - TERMS OF REFERENCE (PROPOSED)**

Councillor A Lion, Select Committee Chairman, introduced the proposed terms. Feedback from the select committee's members and the Joint Meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen to improve its Terms of Reference had resulted in this draft. Nothing had been left out, but it was more enhanced to reflect what had been asked for.

The Committee queried if this select committee should provide scrutiny for the corporate project (7) District Wide Leisure Services Development. This was because under the Cabinet's Forward Plan of Key Decisions, the Corporate Aims and Key Objectives (2021/22) for Stronger Communities stated under (3b), "providing culture and leisure opportunities". Transferring this key objective to Stronger Communities seemed to fit more with the corporate aims, which was agreed.

Councillor S Kane suggested that the other select committees review their Terms of Reference in line with the corporate aims to make sure there were no omissions when cross-referencing the corporate aims and objectives. It was also important to allow enough time for the pre-scrutiny of Cabinet decisions and policies on the larger projects, such as (3) North Weald airfield development and (5) economic growth, skills and employment.



Councillor A Lion agreed that members should be given enough time to look at Cabinet decisions and that if officers allowed more time to present items for pre-scrutiny, they could be factored into the work programme.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to the Terms of Reference being proposed. Councillor M Sartin, Chairman, also recommended that the other select committees review their Terms of Reference so that they aligned more with the corporate aims, which would help particularly the newer members to understand how scrutiny worked.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to the Stronger Place Select Committee Terms of Reference; and
- (2) That corporate project (7) District Wide Leisure Services Development be transferred to Stronger Communities remit as this fitted more with the Cabinet's Corporate Aims and Objectives (2021/22). (NB: Please see Minute no 49 as later in the meeting scrutiny of corporate project (7), District Wide Leisure Services Development, was referred to the next joint meeting in January 2022).

**48. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - WORK PROGRAMME**

Councillor M Sartin commented that work programme items for the next meeting on 18 November included Corporate performance reporting for quarter 2 and progress on the enforcement project.

**(a) Current work programme**

**(i) Amendments**

Item (9) sale of the Pyrles Lane site to Qualis – the Cabinet decision had been put back to 8 November 2021 (from 21 June 2021).

**(ii) New items**

**Staff induction training**

Cllr J H Whitehouse had previously met with officers of the People Team about training for new staff on what the Council did and how it was run etc. She thought that the training currently provided for new staff was inadequate and asked if this could be improved. The presentation that G Woodhall, Democratic and Electoral Services Team Manager, had given to new councillors was very good and perhaps this could be adapted but, in her opinion, members should be able to give some guidance on what they thought staff should be informed about, so could a report about what went into staff induction be presented to a scrutiny committee.

A Small replied that he would refer this request to the People Team and that a report would go to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 27 January 2022.

**Unaffordable rents**

Councillor J H Whitehouse said this question was in respect of communities because she had been made aware that houses were being bought under right to buy and then being let at affordable rents to people on the housing

waiting list, but that some of these people had turned down this opportunity because they could not afford the rents. Could a report be presented for scrutinising that detailed the number of properties being built under the Council housebuilding programme and those being bought under right to buy receipts, how many were being let at social rents and how many at affordable rents? Who made these decisions and what were they based on? Councillor H Whitbread replied that it was easier to have social rents when the Council was building properties on a scale, which would make the Council eligible for social rents and it was being looked into as officers had been liaising with Homes England. This could be looked at by a future Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee or Stronger Communities Select Committee and officers could provide a report. The Committee agreed that a report on this item should be scrutinised by the Stronger Communities Select Committee.

**(b) Reserve Programme – external scrutiny**

A Hendry, Democratic Services Officer, advised that he was not aware of any external scrutiny being organised. Councillor M Sartin said that members could consider moving up from the reserve programme, Essex County Council (Children's Services). The Chairman was also mindful that some of the external organisations that might be invited to Overview and Scrutiny Committee were likely to be too busy with ongoing Covid difficulties. Therefore, if the Committee did not have any suggestions perhaps it was better to wait.

Councillor D Wixley commented that he was researching some organisations of public interest with regards to possible external scrutiny. He would forward these details in due course to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Democratic and Electoral Services Team Manager.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Committee reviewed its current work programme and reserve programme;
- (2) That an amendment be made to item (9) sale of the Pyrles Lane site, as the Cabinet decision date was due on 8 November 2021;
- (3) That a new item be added to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programme on the staff induction process regarding training on how the Council was run, which would be scheduled for the meeting on 27 January 2022; and
- (4) That a new item be added to the Stronger Communities Select Committee work programme to report on the numbers of social rents and affordable rents for properties being built under the Council Housebuilding programme and those being bought under right to buy receipts (as detailed in full above).

**49. SELECT COMMITTEES - WORK PROGRAMMES**

**(a) Stronger Communities Select Committee**

In the absence of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman Councillor S Murray reported that at the last meeting on 21 September 2021, the select committee had received two presentations. The first was from the Community Safety Team on the EFDC Funded Police Officers 6 monthly update. This was followed by the Museum

collections project and the Committee heard a detailed account of the thorough way the collections were being rationalised, the strict criteria officers were working to and that an external grant had helped to facilitate the work. A customer service update was provided by S Lewis, Service Manager (Customer Services). Members had also reviewed the outcome of the stage 1 initial consultation on the Housing Allocations Policy 2022-27, how the stage 2 consultation would work that was commencing in October until December 2021, and looked further ahead to March 2022, when formal adoption of the policies was scheduled.

Feedback from other members was that the four Housing policy items should have been nearer the beginning of the agenda as more time was needed to scrutinise them, and that shorter presentations would help in future.

### **(b) Stronger Council Select Committee**

Councillor P Bolton, Select Committee Chairman, noted the staff induction query raised by Councillor J H Whitehouse. Councillor Bolton continued that the select committee should also analyse and ensure its Terms of Reference were fit for purpose at the next meeting.

During the last meeting on 14 September 2021, the 2021 elections had been reviewed and it was noted that in some wards it could have worked better. Although the counts had gone well, the venue in a North Weald airfield hangar had been very cold. The Qualis quarterly monitoring report for quarter 3 outlined performance, which seemed to be going quite well. Qualis was working to ensure a timelier view of the budget and was gradually improving on its accounting position.

The Committee acknowledged that the counts had been held in a hangar because of Covid restrictions and everyone had been adhering to social distancing guidelines. There was universal agreement that staff had done a good job under difficult circumstances during the elections despite some ward polling station issues.

### **(c) Stronger Place Select Committee**

Councillor A Lion, Select Committee Chairman, reported that at the meeting on 23 September 2021 members had finalised the proposed Terms of Reference that had come before Overview and Scrutiny Committee tonight. Members had also considered the proposed designs and names for the re-branding of the ground floor hub at the Civic Offices, which had been outlined by the Customer Services Director, Rob Pavey, and would reflect the new community and collaborative purpose of the space.

An extra meeting was being held on 4 November 2021. The select committee had a fairly full agenda with Whipps Cross and Princess Alexandra Hospital representatives attending, waste management and the potential for the Essex Highways Cabinet member to attend in terms of its highways programme.

Councillor Lion said that regarding the Terms of Reference, scrutiny of corporate project (7), District Wide Leisure Services Development (see Minute no 47), was more to do with 'leisure infrastructure', which was a 'place' issue, and was more about where the leisure centres were situated across the District and how they worked. Councillor M Sartin replied that perhaps scrutiny of this corporate project could be discussed further at the next Joint Meeting of Overview and Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen in January 2022.

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted the progress of the three select committees against their work programmes; and
- (2) That Stronger Place Select Committee's Terms of Reference on scrutiny of corporate project (7), District Wide Leisure Services Development, be discussed further at the next joint meeting in January 2022.

**50. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

The Committee noted that there was no business which necessitated the exclusion of the public and press from the meeting.

**CHAIRMAN**