

**Minutes of a meeting of the
Joint Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Adur District and Worthing Borough Councils**

Gordon Room, Stoke Abbott Road, Worthing Town Hall

30 January 2020

Adur District Council:

Carol Albury
Catherine Arnold
Kevin Boram
Paul Mansfield
Andy McGregor
Lavinia O'Connor

Worthing Borough Council:

Margaret Howard
Charles James
Richard Nowak
Jane Sim
Bob Smytherman
Carl Walker

JOSC/56/19-20 Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations made

JOSC/57/19-20 Substitute Members

There were no substitutions

JOSC/58/19-20 Confirmation of Minutes

Resolved: that the minutes of the meeting of the 21 November 2019 be confirmed as the correct record

JOSC/59/19-20 Public Question Time

There were no questions

JOSC/60/19-20 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no urgent items

JOSC/61/19-20 Consideration of any matter referred to the Committee in relation to a call-in of a decision

There had been no call-in received

The Committee had a report before it attached as item 7, a copy of which had been circulated to all Members, a copy of which is attached to a signed copy of these minutes. The report before members provided background to the Committee to assist the scrutiny of the results of the Adur and Worthing 2019 bathing water quality monitoring. Representatives from Southern Water were present to answer questions.

Representatives from Southern Water made a presentation, the slides from which are attached to a signed copy of these minutes.

A Member asked about the process of misconnection and how it could be prevented. A representative from Southern Water told the Committee that it was a challenging issue. There were discussions ongoing with colleagues from different bodies which included ideas around making sure 'check a trade' affiliates were aware of how to connect to the correct sewer.

A Member asked if it were possible to have an additional testing site in East Worthing. Members were told that there could be one but it would need to be agreed with the Environment Agency and DEFRA.

A Member asked when it was expected that Worthing's bathing water quality could be designated as excellent? Members were told that 2021 was the target and the reason for this was the way in which the data was assessed (over a four year period).

A Member asked the following question: Bearing in mind the importance of misconnections, could we have a numerical update of how many, if any, owners still need to rectify their misconnections? Members were told that results were being monitored closely. A lot of money had been invested but if there was a high priority resources could be diverted. Grant money from Southern Water had allowed Adur and Worthing to put into place extra dog patrols and other measures.

A Member asked the following question: This is good work, I also understand dog poo is being washed in via roadside gullies, what work is being done with WSCC here re: 'sea starts here' campaigns or similar? Members were told that gulleys had been cleansed although that did not prevent more people picking up after their dogs. Responsible communications and public engagement could be carried out to highlight the impact of people's behaviour.

A Member asked what percentage of non-human waste taken from samples could be attributed to dogs. Members were told that the information would be provided as it wasn't available to hand. Members discussed the matter of dog fouling further and were told of the possibility that beach wardens could be authorised to hand out fixed penalty notices.

A Member asked how many properties there were with misconnections. Members were told that the only way to really know was to have greater resources to monitor the situation. Members discussed the matter and resolved to write to the Southern Water Chief Executive to request additional resources in this area.

A Member asked if there was a power to give penalties to companies found to have connected waste water to the incorrect sewer. Members were told that this may be something that the authority or environment agency could look at. Where information was

available records could be kept of responsible builders to see if patterns of miss-connection could be identified.

A Member asked if there could be funds allocated from Southern Water to promote tourism using the good bathing water quality. The member was told that this is something Southern Water could take back.

A Member asked why 28% of the regions water had been rated good and 72% as sufficient and was told that the reasons were complex, a response would be provided after the meeting.

A Member asked if PSPOs could be issued by PCSOs and was told that the matter could be looked into.

Recommendations:

i) that the Committee write to the CEO of Southern Water and request that resources be given to the misconnection team to improve and increase the size of the team.

ii) that Southern water be invited back to the Committee to present bathing water quality results following the four yearly results due in 2021

JOSC/63/19-20 Delivering Platforms for our Places - Final Progress report July to December 2019

The Committee had a report before it attached as item 8, a copy of which had been circulated to all Members, a copy of which is attached to a signed copy of these minutes. The report before Members provided the final six monthly report informing the Committee on the Councils' progress against the commitments and objectives set out in Platforms for our Places.

The Chief Executive introduced the report to the Committee and provided an overview of progress made to the end of the Platforms for Places programme

A Member asked the following question: In terms of our town centres, the document provided said "the visual signals of progress are all around" because major developments are underway and we are building. It notes promoting the vitality and distinctiveness of our town centres. To what extent has Platforms delivered vitality to our various town centres? Members were told that there had been significant work in town centres across Adur and Worthing. The retail economy had been changing fast. The HMRC building would be occupied by the end of the year bringing 800-900 jobs to the town centre. Other things included sponsoring new activities in town centres, making improvements to the public realm; improving car parks, securing visitor attractions such as the Big Wheel; and in areas such as Lancing, working with local landlords and businesses to support new activities in vacant spaces.

A Member asked the following question: A future focus of our social economies is the development of a new housing strategy. Bearing in mind the range of issues we have that restrict capacity to provide affordable housing for people, not least the issue of available to space to build, can we have a sense of how this strategy will differ from, and build upon, the previous strategy to address this issue? Members were told that the issue

was a difficult one and schemes were detailed for members such as housing related wellbeing and support, better homes - stronger communities and increasing the housing supply. Members were informed that the Councils had recently been shortlisted for an award for the 'opening doors' scheme

A Member asked the following question: Paragraph 4.6.2 of the December JSC report notes progressing efforts to manage our natural environment. The controversial removal of shrubbery from the south side of Beach House Park suggests a loss to the air quality and character of the park. In hindsight would public consultation have been valuable before making this decision and does it have implications for the strategic management of our parks going forward? Members were told that a consultation had been carried out with key stakeholders. There had been competing views as to the issue and the park and it was not possible to meet the expectations and desires of all consultees. The parks team were keen to establish a 'friends of' group for the park to enable wider engagement.

A Member asked the following question: What role has the public had in Platform for our Places and the evaluation of its success as a strategic approach? The Public was critical to Platforms for our Places which aimed to enable and facilitate people. Across the Platforms there had been consultation and involvement programmes rather than a consultation on the document as a whole.

A Member asked the following question: Beat The Streets - What were the objectives for success? Will we see an overview report and what behavioural changes did you see? Did it see an increase of bike to school take-up? Members were told that Beat the Street was a fun, free challenge that saw schools, businesses and community groups across Adur. Adur and Worthing competed to see who could walk, run or cycle the furthest in just six weeks. The initiative, led by Intelligent Health, was funded by West Sussex Public Health, TCV, CCG and Adur, Worthing and Arun Councils. The game phase of the project took place across Adur, Arun and Worthing last year for 6 weeks between 19th June - 31st July. The target was to get 13,000 people being more active through participating in the game through increasing their walking and cycling. The objectives were to:

- Increase the number of people reaching the recommended amount of physical activity
- Lift people out of inactivity
- Increase the number of people participating in active travel
- Increase in health and wellbeing among participants

The evaluation, carried out by Intelligent Health used self reporting data from participants through a pre-, post- game and six-month surveys with participants, data from beat boxes and qualitative data from case studies.

- There were 15,275 players, 60% in Adur and Worthing and 40% in Arun.
- The biggest group of participants was children under 11 years closely followed by adults in their 30s and 40s.

From the pre and post evaluations

- The data showed that 60% of inactive adults became active

- In Adur, the data showed that there was a 6% drop in car use and a 5% increase in cycling

The six-month data was still being collated.

The pre- and post- game reports have been shared with funding partners and the six-month report was expected in April 2020.

A member asked the following question: Temporary accommodation - we see a vicious circle in that there is no temporary accommodation with cooking facilities whilst major capital works or repairs need to take place on council tenant properties. How will this be focused on in 2020? Members were told that Since 2017, the Councils had reduced the number of temporary accommodation units without adequate cooking facilities, especially for households with children. Newly acquired properties for temporary accommodation had adequate cooking facilities. Due to increasing demand for temporary accommodation, particularly among single households who need to be housed locally, some accommodation without adequate cooking facilities are still in use. Currently, the Councils used 15 different properties for temporary accommodation accommodating 163 households. These were a mixture of shared units (55 households) and self-contained units (108 households): Of the 'shared units' only one of these properties (an HMO) does not have adequate cooking facilities; All the self-contained properties, except one, had cooking facilities (hob & oven) and bathroom. The Councils had acquired properties to develop as suitable self-contained accommodation and will continue to do so to ensure that it has sufficient stock of suitable temporary accommodation for both single person and family households.

A Member referenced the United Kingdom leaving the European Union and asked what work had been done or needed doing to make sure that the correct skills and employment were in place. Members were told that relation to construction and care industries it would depend on how many European's chose to remain and how many chose to leave. There was most concern about the care sector due to current vacancies and general low pay. West Sussex County Council, however, was undertaking work to encourage careers in care.

A Member asked about data concerning young people and NEETS (not in education, employment or training) and was told that data could be provided on the subject.

Resolved: that the interview be noted

JOSC/64/19-20 Referral of Motion on Notice

The Committee had a report before it attached as item 9, a copy of which had been circulated to all Members, a copy of which is attached to a signed copy of these minutes. The report before Members set out a motion referred for the Committees attention from a full meeting of Worthing Council.

Councillor Bob Smytherman introduced his motion to the Committee and it was agreed that the matter be referred to the work programme through the committee's procedure so that it could be assessed through the same criteria as other subjects.

Resolved: that the matter be submitted to the committee through the Committee work programme protocol

**JOSC/65/19-20 Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme
2019/20 - Update**

The Committee had a report before it, attached as item 10, a copy of which had been circulated to all Members, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of these minutes. The report outlined progress with the Committee's Work Programme for 2019/20

The Adur Chairman told the Committee that he intended to propose the reinstatement of interviews with Executive Members for the Committees 2020/21 Work Programme

Resolved: that the work programme be noted

All Adur Members except Councillor Stephen Chipp left the meeting at 8.45pm

**JOSC/66/19-20 Worthing Borough Council - Budget Estimates 2020/21 and
Setting of 2020/21 Council Tax**

The Committee had a report before it, attached as item 11, a copy of which had been circulated to all Members, a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of these minutes. The report before Members set out the final budgeting report of the year, the culmination of the annual budgeting exercise, and ask members to consider.

The Chief Financial Officer introduced the report to the Committee and presented the

A Member asked the following question: Assuming the possible annual 2% Council Tax increase and identified savings won't make up the overall shortfalls identified on agenda page 60, how will the predicted shortfalls be met? Will it be the three benefits of an improving economy outlined on agenda page 78? Members were told that chapter 6 of the report before members detailed the expected impact of budget initiatives. There were still some savings to be identified for 2021/22. It was not an unusual position to be in at the current stage of the 2021/22 budget development. However, the Council had a good track record at meeting the challenge. Measures to meet the shortfall included an increase in commercial services.

A Member asked the following question: The sum of £100,000 has been set aside for additional pressures related to people experiencing homelessness. How was this figure arrived at? Members were told that the figures were developed by calculating a cost per night against a potential rise of those in temporary accommodation (based on an increasing rate on par with figures for the last year). The Councils had been undertaking a vibrant homelessness prevention scheme, had set up the opening doors scheme and engaged in the procurement of properties for the purpose of temporary accommodation.

A Member asked the following question: Agenda Page 71 says significant investment is planned for Brooklands Park. Is there an updated estimation at this stage of what the Council will contribute to this overall? Members were told that the Council had already provided funding within the capital programme for key elements of the improvements to Brooklands Park of £836,000 which included provision of new toilets, works to the outflow pipe and new play facilities. The developed design stage was in train and officers were working to specify an initial phase of deliverables. A report would be before the March

meeting of the Joint Strategic Committee which would detail phases, the total cost and how the project would be funded.

A Member asked if the museum and theatre reserves would be given to the new theatres trust. The Committee was told that the Council still had obligations with regards to maintenance of Trust buildings and there was a programmed schedule of works accordingly.

A Member asked what was being referred to in the report concerning the capital programme and public conveniences. Members were told that amounts in the budget was for expenditure on facilities in brooklands and highdown. There were other programmes for improvement .

The committee debated the budget and resolved to recommend that the joint strategic committee include a programme of works to improve public toilets.

Resolved: that the report be noted and that the Committee's comments be considered by the Joint Strategic Committee

The meeting was declared closed by the Chairman at 9.15 pm, it having commenced at 6.00 pm

Chairman