

SCRUTINY REQUESTS

Scrutiny request A

Issue - The impact on local people and council policy in relation to The Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development and Miscellaneous Amendments) (England) (Coronavirus) Regulations 2020.

Request from - Councillor Martin McCabe

Public interest - The creation of a new class of permitted development rights to make it possible to build up to two additional storeys to provide additional flats on top of purpose-built, detached blocks of flats without requiring full planning permission.

This will have a dramatic impact on local peoples' wellbeing, provision of services and democratic voice. Peoples' sense of place and community cohesion could be dramatically affected.

Score = High

Ability to change - At the least, a working group could be established to review this issue. Evidence could be gathered and allow the Council to give feedback to Government on the local impact of these changes.

Score = Medium

Performance - No, it is not a review about the poor performance of a Council Service . But this has huge implications for the Council's Planning department and Local Plan.

Score = Medium

Extent - Huge

Score = High

Replication - No. This is of vast importance and urgency.

Score = High

Expected Outcomes - Collate evidence demonstrating the impact on Worthing of changes to Permitted Development. Use this evidence for the Council to take a policy position based on the facts.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

Platforms for our Places: Going Further and the sister document 'And then' make reference to the aim to create the right opportunities and conditions to lead recovery of the communities by providing sustainable growth and using regulatory powers to assist growth..

Score = Medium

How could this review be undertaken? Working Group or report to JOSC.

Note for JOSC: The Adur & Worthing Planning Committees are responsible for determining individual planning applications and JOSC cannot get involved in individual planning matters due to these being quasi judicial.

Matters relating to policy are also within the remit of the Planning Committees, the Executives, Full Councils and the Executive Members for Regeneration also have responsibility for the Local Plans. JOSC has the opportunity to review other issues which affect Adur and Worthing residents and the services which they receive. JOSC could ask for a report on the policy implications of the new Town & Country Planning Regulations to provide some background and understanding on the issues and consider if it should make any representations to the Planning Committees, Councils and Executive Members as appropriate to assist in policy direction.

The Council will be considering the matter through the emerging Local Plan and, if it wanted to, JOSC could be involved by considering just the visual impact of the Permitted Development rights and then express concern to the Planning Committee and Cabinet Member. However, there is a Judicial Review against these changes in mid October and if JOSC does want to get involved then it should hold off for a while to see the outcome of this legal challenge.

Note: The new [Permitted Development](#) rights came into effect into Monday 31 August, and permit two-storey upwards extensions on homes with prior approval - which will be [fast-tracked](#) through the planning process from this week - and for developers to be given the right to demolish commercial and residential buildings and rebuild them as homes. The independent campaigning group Rights: Community: Action (RCA) is pushing for an immediate high court order to suspend the new rights because of the "significant environmental consequences of these reforms".

Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-

That this matter be not added to the JOSC Work Programme because it is considered that the issues can be considered elsewhere at Planning Committee and by Executive Members if appropriate. The Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen are also aware of the workload of JOSC at this time and other Scrutiny requests received elsewhere on this agenda so want to avoid any duplication.

Scrutiny request B

Issue - Anti social behaviour, drug taking and litter

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - People sit in public and smoke bonges, take nitrous oxide and leave all their rubbish where they have been sitting. This is intimidating and means other people have to clear up. The area I am concerned about is St Julian's Church yard and the lych gate where I regularly clear up drug rubbish.

Score = High

Ability to change - This matter has been ongoing for over 12 months and is known about by the Council and the Police as I have already made reports. After fires had been set in the church yard I was told there would be a meeting with the Police and Council but not happened so far.

Score = High

Performance - Yes I think the more the matter is highlighted the better chance of something being done.

Score = N/A

Extent - It puts people off going to the church and although leaving rubbish on an almost daily basis may not seem a huge problem it is down to local volunteers to clear up the mess and has been going on for too long.

Score = High

Replication - No

Score = High

Expected Outcomes - That the area will be safe for visitors and that something is done to help the drug takers and to stop the littering.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

Platforms for our Places: Going Further - Platform 2 - Thriving people and communities - Commitment to work with the Safer Communities Partnership to help address these issues and to review the anti social behaviour policy and approach to enforcement.

Score = High

How could this review be undertaken? Report to JOSC or JOSC Working Group set up to investigate the issues.

Note for JOSC: At the beginning of August, there was a multi agency meeting with a variety of actions allocated to the Police and members of the Communities and Wellbeing Team:

AWC Actions:

Liaise with Shoreham Academy to flag up young people gathering- Completed- joint patrols planned with school and PCSO

Signpost youth outreach- completed- outreach has visited and found no young people

Raise awareness at Peer Group Conference- completed- no further intelligence received

Link the PCSO for the area to the vicar- completed

Police actions:

Arrange a multi agency meeting with WSFR, Vicar, AWC and Sussex Police- in progress- chasing PCSO for dates.

Matrix drop - to collate more detail of times, descriptions etc- outstanding- we will chase or take over the action.

Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-

That this matter be added to the JOSC Work Programme for the November JOSC to consider the issues raised in this request and a more general report from the Safer Communities Team on anti social behaviour controls in Adur and Worthing. This should be linked with the matters contained in Scrutiny request C.

Scrutiny request C

Issue - I would like the Committee to review the constant anti social behaviour that is an on going problem connected to the rotunda opposite Windsor Road.

For the last 4 years the rotunda has been a gathering place for the residents of all local hostels, b&bs catering to the homeless. Due to the constant issues during the lock-down the rotunda was secured by fencing, which was meant to keep people out. This has not stopped them, people climb over the fencing, a 'door' has been cut into a panel and for the last 6 weeks have had people sleeping in there. Using the beach as a toilet, human excrement constantly being found around the fishing boats. Rubbish in and around the rotunda, needles, drug paraphernalia, stolen bikes, discarded around, drug dealing, prostitution at times.

The glass in the rotunda, supposedly anti scratch, has now been replaced 3/4 times, repainted, deep cleaned, all for the use of the homeless, no one else will use it.

Cameras have been fitted but not on line yet.

All this greatly impacts on the life of local residents. People don't feel safe, putting up with fights, anti social behaviour, drug use and drug dealing.

Even before 'covid' there have been constant issues with the rotunda, constant money being spent on it but no benefit at all for local residents and people walking by. Need a permanent solution, either remove the glass or the whole centre like the one by Lancing green.

Request from - Worthing resident

Public interest - The on going issues impact on all those on Brighton Road who live near it, also on residents of Windsor Road. People feel intimidated and do not feel safe walking past it. The general public cannot use it as always in a disgusting state, urination, rubbish, needles, pornographic graffiti on walls, glass, seating. People in there often very drunk, high on drugs, loud, aggressive. Can be very frightening for young and old. Cost of maintaining is high, waste of resources that could be used for better resources for the residents of Worthing.

Score = High

Ability to change - The Council can be pro active and actually deal with the issues that have been on going for 4 years, constantly reported, to police, council members, beach patrol, housing. Instead of constantly moving people on, cleaning, replacing windows, the rotunda could be permanently sealed as others have been in town, remove glass from windows so people would not find it a place to sleep, party, spend time drinking, using drugs. This was done before and quite effective. Can remove the centre structure, if necessary put in supporting pillar, to discourage use as at the moment, but still provide a shelter from the rain for residents passing by.

Score = High

Performance - Having been in constant contact with my local councillor; Keith Bickers for the last few years and being constantly frustrated by the lack of progress by other council members and departments, feel very let down and no support at all. This does not include Keith as he has been constantly supportive and is himself very frustrated at the lack of action and support for locals. I am not the only person who has constantly complained and asked for help. I feel that as we are out of town centre the council feel they can ignore the issues here.

I feel if the Committee agrees that there are major issues here that can be addressed and sorted, pressure can be put on the appropriate departments who will have to take action instead of fobbing us all off with platitudes.

Score = N/A

Extent - The issue does stem from one main source - the rotunda opposite Windsor Rd, but it connects directly to The Wolsey b&b, 6 Winsor Rd, Turning Tides hostel on Lyndhurst Rd and hostels on Selden as the residents of all these places seem to see the rotunda as their 'club house'. From contact with the police, they are constantly being called to deal with issues connected to the rotunda and surrounding area, would gladly see it gone.

Residents in housing on Brighton Road, Windsor Road are constantly affected. Residents of Worthing using the footpath are affected, also visitors to the local beach area. The local fishermen are very much affected, often the fisherman's boxes are urinated on, defecate around the boats, use the boats to stash their property, have caused damage. All been reported.

There are several b&bs on this stretch, definitely impacting on business. Guests woken at all hours of the night, been threatened, feel unsafe using foot path, seeing people publicly urinating, defecating in front of them.

Score = High

Replication - Despite many of us contacting police, councillors, asking for meetings, bar cameras being put up, not on line yet, nothing gets done. The latest sleepers have been there for over a month! Not a priority, even local councillors are frustrated at lack of action!!

Score = N/A

Expected Outcomes - I hope that proper action will be taken to address all the issues connected to the constant anti social behaviour, drug taking, criminal activity. The rotunda will be made so that it cannot be used for homeless to sleep there and use it as their 'club house'. The number of homeless that are gathered within 4 streets of each other will be looked at and the homeless departments will look for ways to disperse the numbers (look at how Finland has coped) that congregate and live here.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

Platforms for our Places: Going further - Platform 2 - Thriving People and communities - Commitment - Supporting stronger, participative and resilient communities

Score = High

How could this review be undertaken? Report to JOSC or JOSC Working Group on the issues.

Note for JOSC: A range of measures have been carried out in response to some of the concerns around the Rotunda. Reports of ASB to the Police have been very low over the last few months but we do know that a few residents have expressed concern with the presence of some individuals and damage to the Rotunda. CCTV is now in place and will help with any retrospective evidence where ASB is reported. The Police have been patrolling there in response to issues and the outreach team have been visiting there daily. To help alleviate some of the issues and damage the Councils are considering other short and long term measures to prevent further damage.

**Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-**

That this matter be added to the JOSC Work Programme for the November JOSC to consider the issues raised in this request and a more general report from the Safer Communities Team on anti social behaviour controls in Adur and Worthing. This should be linked with the matters contained in Scrutiny request B.

Scrutiny request D

Issue - I wish to discuss the former impulse leisure centre and the future of leisure facilities.

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - The health of residents

Score = High

Ability to change - JOSOC does have the ability to investigate this issue

Score = High

Performance - Yes. The outcome of the review can help improve the situation.

Score = High

Extent - The issue is critical.

Score = High

Replication - No

Score = High

Expected Outcomes - Leisure facilities reopening.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

This is a similar request to Scrutiny request E -

Note for JOSOC: Adur District Council has pledged to do all it can to speed up the search for a new operator for its leisure centres after allocating more than £350,000 of government funds towards the task.

Recognising the importance exercise plays in the health and wellbeing of residents the Joint Strategic Committee in September agreed to explore the option of an existing provider taking on the running of its facilities on a short term basis. The Committee also approved the allocation of government emergency COVID funding towards the project to ensure any new operator can reopen its centres as quickly as possible.

Score = High

| |
|--|
| |
| <p>How could this review be undertaken? Report to JOSC or JOSC Working Group to review the issues or ask for a position statement on the progress on a search for a new operator for the leisure facilities.</p> |
| <p>Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-</p> <p>That JOSC receives a statement from the relevant Executive Member on this matter and contact is made with the resident to reassure them that the Council is doing all it can to ensure that the provision of leisure facilities is maintained. JOSC will continue to keep this matter under review.</p> |

Scrutiny request E

Issue - The swimming pool, leisure centre, tennis courts, new covered football pitches, football club, must be reopened. These amenities will become derelict and take lots more money to bring them up to scratch the longer they remain closed.

Are cyclists going to be asked to pay some form of road tax for the upkeep of the cycle lanes that are springing up everywhere?

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - Not specified.

Score = N/A

Ability to change - Not specified.

Score = N/A

Performance - Not specified.

Score = N/A

Extent - Not specified.

Score = N/A

Replication - No

Score = High

Expected Outcomes - Access and use of fairly priced sporting amenities for Southwick and local communities.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

Note for JOSC: Adur District Council has pledged to do all it can to speed up the search for a new operator for its leisure centres after allocating more than £350,000 of government funds towards the task.

Recognising the importance exercise plays in the health and wellbeing of residents the Joint Strategic Committee in September agreed to explore the option of an existing provider taking on the running of its facilities on a short term basis. The Committee also approved the allocation of government emergency COVID funding towards the project to ensure any new operator can reopen its centres as quickly as possible.

The issue of road tax for cyclists is not a matter within the remit of JOSC.

Score = High

How could this review be undertaken? Report to JOSC or JOSC Working Group to review the issues or ask for a position statement on the progress on a search for a new operator for the leisure facilities.

Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-

That JOSC receives a statement from the relevant Executive Member on this matter and contact is made with the resident to reassure them that the Council is doing all it can to ensure that the provision of leisure facilities is maintained. JOSC will continue to keep this matter under review.

Scrutiny request F

Issue - Parking in Gordon Road, Shoreham

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - All residents of Gordon Road are negatively affected by the use of the road for commuters parking

Score = High

Ability to change - Implement a residents only parking scheme

Score = High

Performance - This request does not relate to the poor performance of a Council service.

Score = N/A

Extent - Several hundred Gordon Road residents affected.

Score = High

Replication - Not aware that the issue is being considered elsewhere.

Score = High

Expected Outcomes - Residents only parking.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

No link to strategic objectives.

Note for JOSOC: This is a West Sussex County Council matter. West Sussex are undertaking a Road Space Audit for Shoreham,

Score = Low

How could this review be undertaken?

**Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-**

That the resident be thanked for the request but advised that this is a matter for West Sussex County Council to consider, however, the resident should be advised to contact the relevant County Councillor and local District Councillors who will be able to assist with the request.

Scrutiny request G

Issue - Parking at the top of Hadrian Avenue, Southwick

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - Accidents happen often at the top of Hadrian Avenue due to vehicles parking on the double yellow lines.

Score = High

Ability to change - Either make Hadrian Avenue one way, or better still take the double yellow lines down to past the junction of The Crescent.

Score = High

Performance - This request does not relate to the poor performance of a Council service.

Score = N/A

Extent - Before too long someone will be seriously injured or killed as cars turning from the Old Shoreham Road to go down Hadrian Avenue often can't get through due to cars coming up and vehicles illegally parked on the double yellow lines. I have had two cars hit me at different times whilst I am trying to get down Hadrian Avenue..

Score = High

Replication - Not aware that the issue is being considered elsewhere.

Score = High

Expected Outcomes - That the double yellow lines will be extended down past The Crescent and illegal parkers dealt with or Hadrian Avenue will be made one way to ease the problem of getting stuck at the top and then other cars coming round and not seeing you until it's too late. It has on occasions caused a back up on the Old Shoreham Road.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

No link to strategic objectives.

Note for JOSOC: This is a matter for West Sussex County Council and would need a change to the existing Traffic Regulation Order.

Score = Low

How could this review be undertaken?

**Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-**

That the resident be thanked for the request but advised that this is a matter for West Sussex County Council to consider, however, the resident should also be advised to contact the relevant County Councillor and local District Councillor who will be able to assist with the request.

Scrutiny request H

Issue - Reinstatement of previous seasonal parking restrictions in Mardyke. Inline with the following TRO (<https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/12359/adr1801.pdf>) which completely overlooked the issues with unrestricted parking at the beach end of Mardyke in the summer months. Considerable safety issues with regards to emergency vehicle access as a result of no restrictions on the beach end of the road (other than on the junctions) and inconvenience to residents access to and from existing driveways. At least one side of the beach end of the road should have seasonal restrictions applied for the reasons stated above. Recent photographic evidence of the issue is available if required.

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - Access to and from residents property. Access for emergency vehicles (especially relevant for larger vehicles such as fire and rescue). Damage to verges and pavements as a result of people parking. Obstruction of pavements for use by wheelchair, mobility scooter and pushchair users.

Score = High

Ability to change - Yes. Reinstatement of the single yellow seasonal parking lines at the beach end of Mardyke. These can be seen to have been in place at some point in the past but have subsequently been removed.

Score = High

Performance - Possibly. The majority of the residents are in agreement that something should be done by the Council, and many are unaware of why the original restriction was lifted. As such addressing the issue would be seen as a large benefit and therefore deemed a performance increase on the councils part, by the residents.

Score = N/A

Extent - It is an issue for all residents of the Shoreham Beach area however the TRO referenced above has now moved the issue, such that more and more people are parking here instead. Many of the vehicles are parked inconsiderately and in many cases unsafely, as outlined in the public interest section above.

Score = High

Replication - Yes. Please see the TRO referenced above. It does NOT address the lack of restrictions on the beach end of Mardyke however. This seems like a rather large oversight.

Score = Low

Expected Outcomes - That the seasonal parking restriction (single yellow lines) will be reinstated at the beach end of Mardyke such that the safety and accessibility concerns outlined are addressed.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

No

Score = Low

How could this review be undertaken?

Note for JOSC: These matters are the responsibility of West Sussex County Council and would involve a change to the existing Traffic Regulation Order which needs to follow a set process.

Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-

That the matter be referred to West Sussex County Council. This matter is also being taken up by the local West Sussex County Councillor.

Scrutiny request 1

Issue - The inertia in implementation of new bike lanes in the area. Original plans have been amended narrowing lanes making them less user friendly. Routes are not joined up with some sections just designated as advisory. Council responsible seems to be prioritising motor vehicle transport with its inherent detriment on the environment rather than promoting alternative greener forms of transport.

Whole process seems to have been half-hearted. Other English councils have worked at pace to implement good well designed solutions to encouraging people to use bikes. Solutions implemented in Adur, whilst better than nothing, seem to be at best adequate and in most places poor.

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - Encouraging residents to use cycle for short journeys improves the environment (less air pollution and emissions) for everyone and the fitness and health of those that cycle.

Score = High

Ability to change - Lobby WSCC for better solutions.

Score = High

Performance - This request does not relate to the poor performance of a Council service.

Score = N/A

Extent - Area wide.

Score = High

Replication - Not aware that the issue is being considered elsewhere.

Score = High

Expected Outcomes - Better provision of cycling infrastructure across Adur

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

The 'And then' document refers to the Councils leading on a 'major shift to walking and cycling [Platforms for our Places - Commitment 3.7 - Post coronavirus, delivering pop up cycle lanes identified in the local cycling and walking plan, expanding the bike share scheme and supporting new cycling projects to link to strategic objectives. However, the new cycle lanes referred to in this request are the responsibility of West Sussex County Council.

Note for JOSC: The provision of the new cycle lanes was undertaken by West Sussex County Council and is the responsibility of the County Council on the highways.

Score = Low

How could this review be undertaken? Report to the JOSC?

Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-

That this matter not be added to the JOSC Work Programme at this time because it is inappropriate as the provision of cycle lanes on the highways is a matter for West Sussex County Council to consider. The resident should also be advised of the Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which offers a strategic approach to safe and accessible walking and cycling routes and this will also feed into the overall West Sussex cycling and walking network which can be accessed here: - <https://www.adur-worthing.gov.uk/sustainable-aw/transport/>

Scrutiny request J

Issue - Worthing's sustainable transport strategy - what plans does the council have to reduce emissions and offer alternatives to travelling in motor vehicles for residents and visitors. Particularly in the town centre and around schools and the hospital?

Request from - Worthing resident

Public interest - It is in the public interest to make our air cleaner and create a better environment for residents now and for the future.

Score = High

Ability to change - Implementation of the 2030 carbon reduction strategy. Creating a better balance of road usage which favours pedestrians and cyclists over motor vehicles. Better and more affordable public transport.

Score = High

Performance - Worthing council has been slow to respond to the climate emergency facing us all.

Score = N/A

Extent - This is a global issue. We all need to do our bit. Councils can implement dramatic changes on a local level.

Score = High

Replication - I believe there have been plans considered with regard to this issue. But feel it is urgent that concrete action is taken now.

Score = Medium

Expected Outcomes - Big changes to how we use our roads and a positive campaign of persuasion to change the car-centric attitudes of local residents.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

Platforms for our Places: Going Further - Platform 3 - Tackling climate change and supporting our natural environment.

Score = High

How could this review be undertaken? Report to JOSC or JOSC Working

Group set up to investigate the issues.

Note for JOSC: JOSC considered a report from the JOSC Climate Change Working Group at its meeting on 17 September and these issues were considered as part of that report.

Transport infrastructure is the responsibility of West Sussex County Council.

Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-

That this matter not be added to the JOSC Work Programme. It is considered that JOSC have already undertaken a significant amount of work on transport infrastructure and climate change. The resident should be referred to the report from the Working Group on Climate Change and also the work of the Councils as part of the Sustainable Adur & Worthing framework and the Climate Change Assembly which is currently being held.

Scrutiny request K

Issue - Council houses in The Gardens, Southwick haven't been updated for 30 years. We need new bathrooms, kitchens and windows.

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - To keep the Council housing stock from falling apart.

Score = High

Ability to change - Come and look around our houses.

Score = High

Performance - Yes, the request is about performance. Our houses are being left to rot!

Score = High

Extent - This affects about 11 houses in 'The Gardens'.

Score = High

Replication - No

Score = High

Expected Outcomes - Houses brought up to date.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

Yes. Platform 2 of Platforms for our Places: Going further - Commitment to ensure that the Council role as landlord supports better homes. - Fully revised and prioritised capital programme proposed for Winter 2020.

Score = High

How could this review be undertaken? Report to JOSC or JOSC Working Group on Repairs and maintenance issues could review this case.

Note for JOSC: Elsewhere on this agenda is a report from the JOSC Working Group that has reviewed the Adur Homes repairs and maintenance service. Recommendations contained in that report include a proposal for an effective planned maintenance programme to be developed which will include The Gardens.

Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-

That this matter not be added to the JOSC Work Programme. Work is already underway to develop an effective Planned Maintenance Programme to help the Council prioritise capital works and expenditure for the Adur Homes properties. Later on this JOSC agenda is a report from the Working Group that has reviewed the Repairs and Maintenance service of Adur Homes and this makes a series of recommendations for improvements to the management of Adur Homes properties which are being recommended to the Joint Strategic Committee and Executive Member for action.

Scrutiny request L

Issue - Refuse Collection back to weekly.

Bulk Waste back to home visits from the Council to give you a quote like they used to rather than getting the home occupier or tenant to have to send in dozens of photos to them to get a quote as they now do.

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - No information provided.

Score = High

Ability to change - No information provided.

Score = High

Performance - No information provided.

Score = N/A

Extent - This affects all residents in Adur and Worthing

Score = High

Replication - Yes.

Score = Low

Expected Outcomes - Back to weekly collections and back to not having to send pictures online for bulky waste.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

Platforms for our Places: Going Further - Platform 3 - Tackling climate change and supporting our natural environment. Commitment to reduce waste, increase reuse, recycling and composting.

Score = High

How could this review be undertaken? Report to JOSC or JOSC Working Group set up to investigate the issues.

Note for JOSC: The Councils introduced a new alternate weekly refuse and recycling collection service in September 2019. A JOSC Working Group has recently (July 2020) undertaken a review on the introduction of the service. Matters relating to the collection of bulky waste were not considered by the Working Group. JOSC could ask for a report to explain the process that is

followed when requesting a bulky waste collection to see if there is a need for this to be changed to assist local residents, However, there are no plans to go back to sending staff out to quote either. The onus needs to be on the customer otherwise the fixed costs of staff make it very difficult to cover costs. Self service is the most efficient way to set this service up. Then people don't have to schedule a visit and be present for the quote.

**Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-**

That the matter be referred to the Adur Executive Member for Environment to provide a response to JOSC at the next meeting for further consideration if necessary.

Scrutiny request M

Issue - The facilities available to the users of Kingston Beach

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - The beach is used by around 200-300 people per day during the summer, which creates a large amount of waste, the Council have added extra bins which is great, but there is no-where for people to use the toilet. In the morning we use the beach and have to dodge stepping in poo, used nappies and toilet paper. Also the stench of dried urine around the lifeboat station is overpowering as this is the nearest wall for people to cover themselves and stand against. People these days don't seem to care about where they do it, but the people that live there and have to use it the next day do.

Score = High

Ability to change - Perhaps some portaloos would help with the problem?

Score = High

Performance - I just think the Council should adapt to the increased usage of some of the areas it looks after and address the needs of the people. They have listened and acted upon the problem with Southwick Green being left in a mess with this kind of thing, how about the beach as well, there is nothing worse than parking your car and stepping out onto a human turd.

Score = N/A

Extent - Getting worse, it is now a "go to" beach as it has free parking.

Score = High

Replication - No

Score = High

Expected Outcomes - Cleaner beach and better standards for the users and residents of Kingston Beach.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

The Committee has the ability to review facilities available for users of the beaches. This could be a review covering Adur and Worthing.

Note for JOSOC: Where Kingston Beach is concerned, the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action plan last year encompassed a redevelopment of Kingston Beach, but toilets were never mentioned. The Council have no plans to install any.

Score = High

How could this review be undertaken? Report to JOSC or JOSC Working Group set up to investigate the issues.

Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-

That the matter be added to the JOSC Work Programme and a general report be requested to a future JOSC meeting explaining what the current toilets and litter bins provision is across Adur and Worthing beaches. This report should also explain any feasibility and financial constraints involved in the provision of toilets and litter bins.

Scrutiny request N

Issue - Incomplete flood defences at the East end of Shoreham Beach and resident living on multiple boats adjacent to the South side of the Adur Ferry Bridge.

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - Flooding is a risk to those in the vicinity and the resident living on multiple boats is doing so without paying the relevant fees to both the Council & the Port Authority. How is either of these fair?

Score = High

Ability to change - If the Council cannot sort these issues, who can?

Score = High

Performance - I think the Council should stop ignoring issues that they find difficult to solve.

Score = N/A

Extent - The issues speak for themselves.

Score = High

Replication - No idea, it's always someone else's problem

Score = N/A

Expected Outcomes - Completed flood defences and a clear area by the footbridge instead of a junk yard. This area would be perfect for river dwellers to use if it were managed properly. It's also right next to the car park so access is superb.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

Platforms for our Places: Going further - Platform 3 - Tackling climate change and supporting our natural environment.

Commitment to improve the climate resilience of Adur & Worthing - Aim to deliver Adur and Worthing coastal defence programmes with the Environment Agency and other partners, maximising opportunities to leverage community benefit schemes and review flood risk management plans, including drainage network and opportunities for sustainable drainage.

Score = High

How could this review be undertaken? Report to JOSC or JOSC Working Group on the issues of flood defences in Adur and Worthing.

Note for JOSC: The flood defences which are referred to here are the responsibility of the Environment Agency.

Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-

That this matter be added to the JOSC Work Programme and the Environment Agency and the Council Engineers be requested to provide JOSC with an explanation as to why there are gaps in the sea defences in this area.

Scrutiny request O

Issue - The street lights go off early in Southview Road, all the other roads around us are well lit at night, please could you keep our lights on as it's dangerous walking up our road if we're late coming home. If the reason they're turned off is for economy purposes then can you please take it in turns with other roads

Request from - Adur resident

Public interest - Lots of my neighbours feel unsafe in the dark and we've had attempted burglaries in the past

Score = High

Ability to change - Yes.

Score = High

Performance - This request does not relate to the poor performance of a Council service.

Score = N/A

Extent - Minor issue but easily rectified.

Score = Low

Replication - Not aware that the issue is being considered elsewhere.

Score = High

Expected Outcomes - I hope to make my road safer at night.

Does the proposed review link with the Council strategic objectives or does the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee have the ability to influence and/or add value on the subject?

No link to strategic objectives.

Note for JOSCC: The majority of street lights in Adur and Worthing are looked after by West Sussex County Council (WSCC), not by Adur District Council or Worthing Borough Council.

Score = Low

How could this review be undertaken? Request to be referred to WSCC or . JOSCC could also ask for a position statement on street lighting in Adur and Worthing and discuss these issues but the issue is a WSCC issue.

**Recommendations from Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Chairmen/Vice-Chairmen:-**

That this matter be not added to the JOSC Work Programme but the matter be referred to West Sussex County Council and the local ward Councillor to take this matter up on the residents behalf.