

# Public Document Pack



**North East  
Derbyshire**  
District Council

Contact: Tom Scott

Tel: 01246 217045

Email: [thomas.scott@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk](mailto:thomas.scott@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk)

Date: Thursday, 6 April 2023

To: **Members of the Organisation Scrutiny Committee**

Please attend a meeting of the Organisation Scrutiny Committee to be held on **Tuesday, 18 April 2023 at 10.00 am in the Council Chamber**, District Council Offices, Mill Lane, Wingerworth, Chesterfield S42 6NG.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sarah Steenberg".

**Assistant Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer**

## **Members of the Committee**

<b><u>Conservative Group</u></b>	<b><u>Labour Group</u></b>	<b><u>Independent Group</u></b>	<b><u>Liberal Democrat Group</u></b>
Councillor Stephen Clough Councillor Michelle Emmens Councillor Diana Ruff Councillor Philip Wright	Councillor Joseph Birkin Councillor Maggie Jones Councillor Pat Kerry	Councillor John Funnell	Councillor David Hancock

**For further information about this meeting please contact: Tom Scott 01246 217045**

# **AGENDA**

## **1 Apologies for Absence**

## **2 Declarations of Interest**

Members are requested to declare the existence and nature of any disclosable pecuniary interests and/or other interests, not already on their register of interests, in any item on the agenda and withdraw from the meeting at the appropriate time.

## **3 Minutes of Last Meeting (Pages 4 - 13)**

To approve as a correct record and the Chair to sign the Minutes of the Organisation Scrutiny Committee held on 14 March 2023.

## **4 Human Resources Update**

To receive an update on Human Resources – Sara Gordon, HR & OD Manager.

## **5 Draft Scrutiny Review Report (Pages 14 - 25)**

To agree the draft report for Scrutiny Review.

## **6 Monitoring of Overview and Scrutiny Recommendations (Pages 26 - 32)**

To monitor the implementation of previous committee and review recommendations.

## **7 Forward Plan of Executive Decisions (Pages 33 - 35)**

To consider the attached Forward Plan of Executive Decisions dated 15 March to 15 April 2023.

The most up-to-date Forward Plan of Executive Decisions can be accessed via the following link:

<https://democracy.norfolk.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RPId=1137&RD=0&bcr=1>

## **8 Work Programme (Pages 36 - 41)**

To consider whether the Committee's Work Programme has been completed at year end.

## **9 Additional Urgent Items**

To consider any other matter which the Chair of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.

## 10 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Organisation Scrutiny Committee is scheduled to take place in the new Municipal Year.



**North East  
Derbyshire**  
District Council

### Access for All statement

You can request this document or information in another format such as **large print** or **language** or contact us by:

- Phone - [01246 231111](tel:01246231111)
- Email - [connectne@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk](mailto:connectne@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk)
- Text - [07800 00 24 25](tel:07800002425)
- **BSL Video Call** – a three way video call with us and a BSL interpreter. It is free to call North East Derbyshire District Council with [Sign Solutions](#) or call into the offices at Wingerworth.
- Call with [Relay UK](#) via textphone or app on [0800 500 888](tel:0800500888) – a free phone service
- **Visiting** our [offices](#) at Wingerworth – 2013 Mill lane, [S42 6NG](#)

## **ORGANISATION SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 14 MARCH 2023**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Stephen Clough (Chair) (in the Chair)

Councillor Joseph Birkin  
Councillor David Hancock  
Councillor Philip Wright

Councillor John Funnell  
Councillor Pat Kerry

#### **Also Present:**

J Hawley	Principal Planning Enforcement Officer
D Stanton	Senior Scrutiny Officer
T Scott	Governance and Scrutiny Officer
L Shaw	Managing Director (Rykneld Homes)

#### **OSC/ Apologies for Absence**

**50/2**

**2-23** Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Jones and Councillor D Ruff.

#### **OSC/ Declarations of Interest**

**51/2**

**2-23** Members were requested to declare the existence and nature of any disclosable pecuniary interest and/or other interest, not already on their register of interests, in any item on the agenda and withdraw from the meeting at the appropriate time.

Councillor S Clough declared an interest in his capacity as a Member of the Rykneld Homes Board of Directors. He indicated he would remain and participate in the meeting.

#### **OSC/ Minutes of Last Meeting**

**52/2**

**2-23** RESOLVED – That the Minutes of the previous meeting of the Organisation Scrutiny Committee held on 24 January 2023 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

#### **OSC/ Rykneld Homes**

**53/2**

**2-23** The Managing Director of Rykneld Homes delivered a presentation to Members updating them on the work being undertaken by Rykneld Homes. This included:

- Partnership between Rykneld Homes Ltd (RHL) and North East Derbyshire District Council (NEDDC)
- Working with Cabinet and Councillors
- Governance Arrangements

- Tenant-led Operational Board (Non-decision Making)
- Asset Management Strategy
- Housing Services
- Enforcement
- Developing Talent

Members referred to the Enforcement section of the presentation and were concerned that sometimes Enforcement was brought in too late as part of the anti-social behaviour process. The Managing Director (Rykneld Homes) explained that it was complex for Rykneld to manage this because of housing law.

Members felt that Rykneld Homes had been providing a very good service, and links between them and the Council might strengthen when both were in the same building at Mill Lane.

RESOLVED – That Committee noted the update.

**OSC/ Scrutiny Review (Interview)**

**54/2**

**2-23**

The Chair welcomed the Principal Planning Enforcement Officer to the Environmental/Planning Enforcement service review interview.

The Chair explained that the following questions had been submitted to the Principal Planning Enforcement Officer prior to the meeting:

1. How do the Planning and Environmental enforcement teams work together on environmental enforcement cases?
2. How do the Planning and Environmental enforcement teams work with outside agencies on environmental enforcement cases?
3. What do you think is best practice?
4. Is the Council working with partners effectively?
5. Which partners are the most difficult to contact?
6. How are enforcement queries handled and what processes are in place to track them?
7. How quickly are queries dealt with?
8. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer presented his responses as follows:

1. How do the Planning and Environmental enforcement teams work together on environmental enforcement cases?

There are a range of different frameworks set out in legislation that the Council's various enforcement teams work within.

- As the law surrounding environmental enforcement is considerable and very broad, it is not possible for one team to know everything to do with all aspects of
- We each have our own specialism, knowledge and expertise
- We each have our own support network for help and guidance e.g. planning officers to discuss planning merits.

Planning law prescribes circumstances where local planning authorities are required to consult specified bodies prior to a decision being made on an application.

The decision maker (e.g. planning officer), decides who to consult.

Similarly, the planning enforcement officer will decide who to consult, seek advice and help from, where there is a breach of planning control.

Officers understand what can be taken into account in planning and what cannot. If it's something planning cannot take into account then it may be best dealt with by another team.

We carry out some initial investigations at this point we may know

- Is it a Rykneld property? Is there a tenant?

- Is it Council property, rented, sub-let?
- Information on Council tax records, business rates?
- EPR register, are the owners dangerous etc.?

The allegation determines who we get involved and when

- Use of land involving noise, burning etc. then we will ask EH.
- Use of buildings involving breeding dogs then we ask Licencing.

Share evidence and information on investigations, write witness statements etc.

Make an assessment of urgency, how quickly something needs to be dealt with or stopped.

Planning isn't necessarily a quick fix, but can have lasting effects for controlling development.

Set up the Corporate Enforcement Group (CEG) where we discuss high profile/priority cases and increase information sharing between Council departments.

- 

Conscious of the customer – rather have a single point of contact however reports could be made either via email or through the 'report it' function on the Council's website.

- Some of this information has to be asked through formal channels with internal sharing agreements GDPR – taken time to implement.
- Other cases we can go to individual officers
- Officers may have given comments on a particular development
- We've recently allowed access to our spatial mapping data.
- We're uploading more information to our mapping system and making that available.
- Some cases morph from strictly planning issues into something much more serious.
- Our actions can jeopardise criminal investigations

2. How do the Planning and Environmental enforcement teams work with outside agencies on environmental enforcement cases?

Planning authorities are required to consult specified bodies prior to a decision being made.

Officers understand which agency to consult based on any breach of planning control.

- Guidance is given in the PPG
- Officers know through experience
- Overlap in planning functions between County and District – abuse of process to get this wrong.

We make a planning judgement which issues we need to involve external agencies in.

There are prescribed timescales for responses in planning process which don't apply to enforcement. If we don't receive any help or advice, then we may need to act without that advice.

### 3. What do you think is best practice?

Officers exercise judgement to see if and when help and advice is needed – minimises the burden on partner agencies.

- Understand that if we're seeking advice then the situation warrants it
- Robust in deciding where another agency needs to lead
- could be complications from being a landowner
- Easier and more appropriate powers

Making contact with the owner/developer as soon as possible.

CEG group.

ASB meetings with Police.

Carry out joint site visits where possible, Information sharing protocols.

Complicated high priority issue is multi-agency working.

### 4. Is the Council working with partners effectively?

Yes, but once partners are engaged. Internal working (e.g. EH and EP) is excellent.

Each partner will have its own priorities –

- Have their own caseload, which they no doubt prioritise,
  - What might be important to us, might not be for them. We can't influence that.
  - Have their own threshold for action.
  - We may want a particular partner to progress something, but they're not willing to because it's not expedient.
  - Might be part of a wider issue, too narrowly focused.
  - Not required to give advice, unlike the Planning Application process.
- Means we may need to progress without key stakeholder involvement.

- Ombudsman Case.

### 5. Which partners are the most difficult to contact?

Each partner has a different preference for being contacted

- Private utility companies – ones which the Council has no control over.



- EA is the most difficult because it's a national contact centre. Can sometimes take several months to receive a reply – brief is so broad that most district level matters aren't a priority
- Processes may have been introduced to deal with volume of emails and enquiries
- All agencies and partners are dealing with increased caseloads.
- Whether we have an 'in' – a personal basis/relationship works best.
- Key strengths is working well with individuals – because we filter out issues that aren't relevant.

6. How are enforcement queries handled and what processes are in place to track them?

Alleged breach is recorded in the Council's planning database – enquirers are attached to the breach.

Improved the reporting forms on the website and we've instructed customer contact centres to refer people on.

Telling people how they can expect enquiries to be dealt with –

- That we won't normally contact them with updates until something is closed
- We will accept further information is that helps our investigations
- That we can be contacted if they've not had a response
- Updated email and website enquiry forms

Investigating enquiries within the priorities and timescales set out in the Local Enforcement Plan.

Keep a record of events on the system

- dates of communications
- substance of telephone conversations
- Progress of investigations
- Who we've contacted and the updates we're waiting for
- Next steps

Carry out site visits based on Parish to minimise travel and maximise time and resources

Priorities are constantly being assessed and changing –

- Depends on the number of active cases.
- The severity of the breaches at any one time

Have regular case reviews and admin days.

- Might not know an application has been approved and that we can close a case.
- Help on deciding expediency – NE reports
- Investigations prove fruitless – decisions made on expediency

7. How quickly are queries dealt with?

The context of the overall workload - we have a significant backlog of cases:

- Now we have sifted through most of the historic cases, many are high priority and serious breaches which are very time consuming.
- Dealing with appeals
- Ombudsman investigations
- Saw an increase of 80% in reported cases in 2021/22.
- Perhaps a result of pandemic, but new case load has not reduced
- Enforcement notice register – significant admin task
- IT issues present set-backs

Depends on what's alleged and its priority/urgency and whether a breach is found or not.

- If we find no breach then we may investigate and update the enquirer that day.
- If we find a breach, it may then take time to investigate fully and then even longer to see through to completion.
- E.g. a shed in a garden is relatively easy - some of the big housing developments are incredibly difficult to unpick
  - Grounds of appeal
  - Expediency – public interest test
  - Appeals backlog – one appeal decision in the last 15 months.
  - Not like a planning application – that assumes PP is required
  - We must consider whether it's development,
  - What it is – if it's a use, what are the uses?
  - Is it Permitted Development – requires assessing guidance, case law
- appeal decisions
  - Is it lawful? Evidence gathering, PCNs
  - The planning history, previous lawful uses any planning permissions;
  - Information is difficult to retrieve, planning history might not be complete
  - Site visits have to be carried out. Difficulty accessing sites, contacting owner/developers
  - Often dealing with people with terrible personal circumstances
- Enforcement action carries rights of appeal and these are picked over by Barristers
- Admin intensive –LB breaches for example are criminal offences - everything has to be saved and recorded. Have a 0.6 technician who does admin, but she has her own case load

We're digitising the planning enforcement notices within the context of increased workloads.

Speed at which queries are dealt with depends on the

- Agency of the enquirer, knowledge, background etc.
- Everyone is now an expert on planning – google, availability of case law.
- Motivations of the enquirer.

How the party contravening planning rules engage with the Council –

- How easy it is to make contact with them
- How willing they are to resolve the issue
- Some issues may be finely balanced

- Make a planning application
- Whether they stop or carry on

The 'what about them' factor

- Government intending to introduce a range of planning targets relating to enforcement – case closed in 6 months, number of cases over 6 months

9. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

A number of suggestions were put forward to Members which included reporting channels and mechanisms, proactive enforcement, training and Local Enforcement Plan amendments.

Members asked who could make the decision if there was an Enforcement offence on a highway. The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer explained that the decision would be made by him, since enforcement did not have a statutory committee overseeing its decisions

Members enquired if the digitised system in place was fit for purpose. The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer explained that the system could sometimes be difficult to use, but the service had a requirement to utilise it.

Members asked the Principal Planning Enforcement Officer what the service's stance was on information sharing. Members were informed that Enforcement information sharing was tightly regulated.

Members enquired if the public were informed that Enforcement cases could take up to three years to be resolved. The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer explained that in these cases, people would be referred to the Enforcement Plan.

Members suggested that the Principal Planning Enforcement Officer could present reports to a Committee on the number of Enforcement cases.

Members enquired if the Principal Planning Enforcement Officer felt that the service was understaffed. Members were informed that the service was very busy and could use some help with administrative tasks, but the same was true of every service in the country.

Members enquired where the service reported to when Enforcement action had been taken. They were informed that in these cases, the Planning Committee was notified.

Members felt that there were occasions where Members had Enforcement issues to inform the service about but had not been successful. The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer explained that all issues Members had should be sent to him.

The Chair thanked the Principal Planning Enforcement Officer for attending.

The Committee considered all of the evidence which it had received during its review of the Council's Planning Enforcement Service.

The Committee identified areas of good practice such as:

- Officers on top of the job
- Every breach dealt with
- Software working well
- Good digitisation
- Now have an Enforcement team
- Team functioning at its maximum
- Ombudsman case – due process followed

Members also highlighted a number of areas for improvement. These included:

- Help with staffing numbers (admin staff)
- Better communication
- Number of emails being received means some are missed – one point of contact is important
- Perception of difficulties
- Communicating to the public the service's prioritisation methods
- Too many cases – cannot deal with them all
- Member Training – to improve Member awareness of cases and be able to report back to Parish Councils
- No KPIs for service
- Might not want to take action
- Some partners difficult to communicate with but this is generally down to factors outside of the Council's control
- Local Enforcement Plan needs updating
- More regular reporting to a Committee
- Standard response at start of process

RESOLVED – That the draft report on the Committee's review be prepared and submitted to Committee for approval.

**OSC/ Forward Plan of Executive Decisions**

**56/2**

**2-23** RESOLVED – That the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions be noted.

**OSC/ Work Programme**

**57/2**

**2-23** The Senior Scrutiny Officer informed Members that the next scheduled meeting of the Committee had been moved from 16 May 2023 to 18 April 2023.

RESOLVED – That the work programme be noted.

**OSC/ Additional Urgent Items**

**58/2**

**2-23** There were no additional urgent items.

**OSC/ Date of Next Meeting**  
**59/2**

**2-23** The next meeting of the Organisation Scrutiny Committee was scheduled to take place on Tuesday 18 April 2023 at 10.00 am.

**NORTH EAST DERBYSHIRE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**



**North East  
Derbyshire**  
District Council

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
PLANNING/ENVIRONMENTAL  
ENFORCEMENT  
APRIL 2023**

## Contents

	Page
Chair's Foreword	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Recommendations	4
3. Scope of Review	4
4. Method of Review	5
5. Evidence and Research	5
6. Key Findings	5-11
7. Conclusions	11
Appendix A Stakeholders Engaged During the Review	12

## Chair's Foreword

I am pleased to present this report on behalf of the Organisation Scrutiny Committee. These are the findings, conclusions and recommendations from its review into planning/environmental enforcement.

The Committee felt that the review was timely given the investment that the service had received, and that the service was a priority to residents. Members were impressed with how much of a better position the Council was in to take action against those who breached planning control, and how staff worked hard to resolve cases in the public interest.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Committee for their input and also the stakeholders who helped inform the review. I would also like to thank the Senior Scrutiny Officer for his support of the Committee's work and democratic services for the help they have provided.

*Councillor Stephen Clough  
Chair of Organisation Scrutiny Committee*

## Review Panel

The review panel comprised the following members:

Councillor S Clough	-	(Conservative) – Review Panel Chair
Councillor M Emmens	-	(Conservative)
Councillor J Birkin	-	(Labour)
Councillor M Jones	-	(Labour)
Councillor D Ruff	-	(Conservative)
Councillor D Hancock	-	(Liberal Democrat)
Councillor P Wright	-	(Conservative)
Councillor J Funnell	-	(Independent)
Councillor P Kerry	-	(Labour)



## **1. Recommendations**

That the Council:

- 1.1 Provides training to Councillors and Parish Councils on Planning Enforcement, and distributes the planning enforcement service progress reports that Planning Committee receives to all Members following training;
- 1.2 Monitors year on year increases in cases to assess whether an additional post in the Planning Enforcement Team is required;
- 1.3 Explores ways of reducing cases being received via email and instead channels complaints through the online 'report it' function with a view to closing down public complaints to the email channel if possible. This was to ensure that there was one point of contact, that complaints were not missed, and that expectations of the service were clearly explained and communicated; and
- 1.4 Reviews the Local Enforcement Plan to remove impracticalities and make it consistent.

## **2. Introduction**

- 2.1 At its meeting on 06 September 2022, the Organisation Scrutiny Committee agreed to undertake a review into Environmental Enforcement in respect of Planning.
- 2.2 The Committee agreed that the Review was timely given that the service was a priority for residents and had recently been given significant investment.

## **3. Scope of Review**

- 3.1 The review aimed:
  - To understand how the Planning Enforcement Team worked with Environmental Enforcement and other teams;
  - To understand how the Planning Enforcement Team functioned and carried out multi-agency working;
  - To establish best practice; and
  - To identify any improvements that could be made.
- 3.2 The Committee noted that whilst enforcement action took place within a number of Council departments, for the purpose of this review, its focus was on cases channelled through Planning Enforcement, and subsequently how work was carried out to resolve those cases.

#### **4. Method of Review**

- 4.1 The review panel met on five occasions to consider the scope of the review, key issues they wanted to discuss and key people they wished to interview.
- 4.2 Evidence was gathered in a variety of ways including written sources and interviews with a range of stakeholders.

#### **5. Evidence and Research**

- 5.1 A number of documents and evidence were provided to the review panel for consideration. Details are provided below:
- Planning Enforcement Plan
  - Environmental Health Service Enforcement Policy
  - Report of the Assistant Director of Planning on Environmental Enforcement Procedures at NEDDC
  - Stakeholder interviews from NEDDC internal officers in Planning and Environmental Enforcement, and external interviews from officers at Derbyshire County Council
  - Planning Enforcement Service Progress Reports

#### **6. Key Findings**

##### **6.1 Observations**

- 6.1.1 The Assistant Director of Planning presented a report to the Committee at its meeting on 15 November 2022 which outlined the current situation regarding how the Council currently carries out multi-agency working on environmental enforcement cases.
- 6.1.2 Members heard that the Planning and Environmental Health Services are the two main areas in the Council where environmental enforcement issues are received and investigated, and where necessary, other Council services and external agencies were brought in to assist. It was stated that sometimes, those agencies had their own environmental or legal issues with the same site and thus multi-agency responses to cases were instigated.
- 6.1.3 The Review Panel noted that Planning took into account a wide and varied range of material considerations which were matters that could lawfully be taken into account when deciding planning applications. As part of that process, the Council sought advice and guidance from a range of internal and external organisations and statutory consultees who help inform the Council whether a development is acceptable or what action was required to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- 6.1.4 The Committee was informed that when a development was carried out without planning permission, any decision to take, or not to take enforcement

action, was effectively a planning decision. Any party or organisation, therefore, consulted or involved in the determination of a planning application may also be involved in the planning enforcement process. It was stated that the Planning Enforcement Team regularly consults and seeks advice from those agencies to decide whether or not to take enforcement action.

- 6.1.5 The Assistant Director of Planning advised Members that those agencies operated under their own regulations and legislation and had their own enforcement powers. Therefore if the Planning Enforcement Team received a report of a breach of planning relating to a car breakers yard, for instance, it might be that that the Environment Agency, Police and County Council would be interested and that there were breaches of their powers also.
- 6.1.6 The Review Panel heard that all planning applications must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. The Development Plan in North East Derbyshire comprised of the adopted Local Plan 2014-2034. The protection of the environment and of residential and local amenity was part of that Development Plan. The Council had to prioritise the breaches that caused the most harm. In some cases this could mean that the Council prioritised spatial objectives above localised harm to residential amenities for example.
- 6.1.7 The Committee was informed that when a complaint was received, officers carried out a brief investigation which tended to be a desktop exercise to make a judgement as to whether some or all of the matters fell within the control of Planning or outside of it. Members noted that, for example, a noise complaint could have been made about a lawful industrial premises. Planning Officers may be satisfied that a development was lawful (had planning permission) and no conditions or limitations were being breached, but Environmental Health Officers might investigate and find that enforcement action was needed based on their own remit and functions.
- 6.1.8 If a breach of planning had been identified (either through a report or monitoring) it is researched and the Planning Enforcement Team will decide whether to seek help and guidance from other agencies. It was stated that the agency depended on the circumstances and nature of the breach and differed in every case.
- 6.1.9 It was stated that how the Council worked and consulted with those agencies depended on the process and procedures that each agency had settled on. It generally took place via email for speed and evidence trail purposes. Each agency tended to have their own reporting mechanism.
- 6.1.10 The Committee received an overview of the agencies that had their own powers of enforcement and investigation that the Council worked with. These included internal partners such as Environmental Health and Revenues & Benefits, as well as external partners such as DCC Highways and DCC Lead Local Flood Authority.

## **Strengths/Observations**

- 6.2.1 Members noted that the Planning Enforcement Team was working hard to resolve a high caseload, and that since 2021/22 there had been an 80% increase in the number of reported cases. The pandemic had also caused a backlog in unresolved cases due to officers being unable to conduct investigative work. There were currently 380 open cases (as of 14 March 2023) and these were being managed by staff at 2.6 FTE. The 0.6 FTE staff member was a Support Officer responsible for administrative assistance but also had their own caseload. Members agreed that staff were working exceptionally hard given the high number of cases and small team to resolve them, and that the Council was in a much better position to deliver for the public and take enforcement action against planning breaches following significant investment in the service.
- 6.2.2 The Review Panel discussed best practice amongst other Local Authorities. Members agreed that difficulties to recruit and low staff levels were a common theme amongst partner agencies and other comparable Councils. The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer stated that the staff at NEDDC had been accustomed to making good judgement calls and only seek data and advice from other agencies when the situation warranted it. The Committee noted that by doing this officers were able to build relationships with officers from partner agencies. It was stated that who should be consulted was set out in planning legislation known as 'statutory consultees', and when officers were considering an application for planning permission they were required by law to consult with them. For Planning Enforcement, however, they were not required by law to consult with those agencies but did so anyway. It was explained that it was good practice to ensure that the appropriate advice and guidance was received from other agencies, particularly if the Council was challenged by appeal on an enforcement decision.
- 6.2.3 Members heard about the process for recording cases. It was explained that breaches of planning conditions could be reported either via email or through the website and that they had recently improved the reporting forms and instructed customer services to refer people to it to ensure 'one point of contact' for reporting cases. This was then given a unique reference number and recorded in a log. An audit trail was also kept within this log to ensure that multiple officers were able to pick up cases in the event of any staff annual leave or sickness. The breach was only recorded once regardless of the number of times a complaint had been made against it (although the number of complaints were recorded for audit trail purposes), and that every case would be investigated and actioned.

An automatic response was then forwarded to the complainant pointing them towards the Local Enforcement Plan and advising them as to when they could expect a response. This was usually done once a decision on enforcement had been made and the case closed, but after 8 weeks the complainant was able to contact the Team to enquire as to the status of the investigation. They were also able to contact again to provide further information.

6.2.4 Due to the high number of cases, and relatively small number of staff, the Planning Enforcement Team were constantly having to change their priorities and that the threshold for action always shifted depending on the workload. Some cases were highly complex and took several years to resolve involving a number of different agencies. There were 12 enforcement notices issued last year and this was only done when there was no other route to resolve and when it was expedient to do so.

It was stated that their biggest focus was on irreparable damage (such as through the damage of TPO's or large scale harm caused by a significant development) rather than localised harm, for example to a residential property. Those priorities were outlined in the Local Enforcement Plan which split cases into high priority (where what was being done could cause irreversible harm), medium priority (where there was clear harm but it could be reversed if necessary), and low priority (cases that cause lesser degrees of harm to a neighbourhood). Cabinet considered and endorsed the Plan, and the Planning Committee approved the Plan, in September 2020. Any changes to those priorities would have to be made through the Enforcement Plan. Members noted that having a Local Enforcement Plan was not mandatory but was good practice. The Plan can be viewed at:

<https://www.ne-derbyshire.gov.uk/documents/repository/p/planning-enforcement-plan>

The Review Panel agreed that it would be useful to provide training to Councillors and Parish Councils so that they could understand the difficulties that the service faces and the cases that they have to prioritise in the public interest. This could then help Councillors filter out cases that may not be in the jurisdiction of planning enforcement as well as clarify public expectations of the service. Members noted that regular reports were being provided to Planning Committee on enforcement matters and the Committee encouraged that continues on a bi-annual basis. The Committee also asked that the planning enforcement service progress reports be circulated to all Councillors after being considered by the Planning Committee. Ultimately, all Members received reports from constituents on alleged breaches of planning.

6.2.5 The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer explained that the service was digitalising its publically available records such as Planning Enforcement Notices so that these were more easily accessible to see and share amongst different Council departments, the public and external agencies. The process was, however, administratively intensive and this was being done within the context of increased caseloads. Additional support in this area had already been identified by the AD for Planning as and when there was finance available.

6.2.6 The Committee heard that communications amongst different Council departments generally worked well. There was a Corporate Enforcement Group that met frequently to discuss high priority cases and ensure that enforcement leads at the Council, such as Environmental Health, Planning

and Legal worked well together. These meetings considered new and significant investigations, case progress, agreeing action plans and raising issues with the Portfolio Holder or relevant Member. Regular case review meetings and administrative days within service areas also took place to ensure that cases were kept on top of.

- 6.2.7 The Review Panel heard about a recent draft Ombudsman decision which had agreed with the Council in regards to an enforcement decision and that the Authority had followed due process. The complainant had alleged a breach of planning condition, and the Ombudsman concluded that the Council had properly responded to the complaint, conducted site visits, met with the complainant, and sought information and advice from the relevant consultees to advise that there had been no breach of planning control and explain why it proposed to take no formal action. This case had taken over two years to resolve.

### **Areas for Improvement/Observations**

- 6.3.1 Although the Review Panel agreed that the Planning Enforcement Team were doing excellent work with the resources that they had, they questioned whether it was sustainable in the long term as workloads continued to increase. There was a consensus that as reporting channels should become more accessible and used, it was likely that the number of reported cases would rise year on year. Members noted that the average number of reported cases from April 2018 to March 2021 was 225. For the reporting year from April 2021 to March 2022 this increased to 358 and by October 2022 of the latest reporting year (April 2022-March 2023) the figure was already at 219 suggesting that this increase was continuing. If this rise was to continue, the Review Panel agreed that it would be prudent for the Council to explore options in providing funding for an additional post to manage the increase in cases depending on the resources available. The Committee agreed that ultimately, as reported cases increased, so did the threshold for taking enforcement action.

There was a consensus that those priorities should be more clearly communicated, and welcomed the automatic response given on the reporting channels through the Council's website outlining when a complainant should expect to see a response. Members enquired as to whether officers could investigate the merits of encouraging all complaints to come through the 'report it' function on the Council's website to ensure one point of contact, that emails were not missed, that all cases were given an automatic unique reference number and logged, and that they received an automatic response outlining expectations of the service (which did not happen if a case was reported via email), and that they were pointed towards the Local Enforcement Plan for information. The email could then be used for other purposes.

- 6.3.2 The Committee heard that the process of investigating breaches was often slow and administratively intensive, complex, and involved a number of

different agencies. The Council had to conduct its own initial investigations such as whether what was being reported was actually a permitted development, conducting site visits, and assessing planning history. Then, if appropriate, advice needed to be sought from partner agencies as to whether a breach had taken place. Other complicating factors included whether a criminal offence had occurred, and as such interviews and correspondence had to be carefully recorded as it could be used as evidence in a criminal investigation. Resolving cases could also be slow due how the party who were contravening planning rules engaged with the Council.

The above processes were particularly prevalent with urgent and high priority cases which is why they could take several years to resolve. It was stated that each different agency had their own priorities and their own threshold for action and therefore responses could sometimes take several months, particularly as those agencies were also dealing with high caseloads. The Environment Agency was used as an example as a partner agency that worked on a national basis and thus would have a higher threshold for action so wouldn't be particularly responsive to localised issues.

There was also no prescribed time frame on agencies responding to the Council on enforcement issues (whereas there was when consultation was sought on a planning application). Importantly, Members noted that the agencies that the Council consulted with on enforcement issues were not required to provide a response, and if any response was received it was dependant on their own workload and priorities. For high priority and urgent cases, responses were often of good quality and in a timely manner, however this was not always the case for lower priority issues. Thus, how quickly a complaint was dealt with depended on both how urgent and complex it was.

The National Planning Policy Framework also stated that enforcement action was discretionary, and that the Council should act in a proportionate way when responding to suspected breaches of planning control. Therefore the Council could not automatically justify taking formal enforcement action against minor breaches of planning control.

- 6.3.3 The Review Panel agreed that it was the complex nature of multi-agency working alongside high caseloads and recruitment and retention issues that was having an effect on wider communication and the resolution of cases. This was not just the case at the Council but also at partner agencies. For example Justine Proudler (Development Manager at DCC) and Councillor C Renwick (DCC Cabinet Member – Infrastructure and Highways) explained that cases had increased by 50% during the pandemic, and with only 1.75 FTE staff at DCC dedicated to enforcement this had resulted in a large work load.

Principal Planning Officers informed Members that the Planning Team at NEDDC were also having to employ consultants to fill gaps due to recruitment issues. This was also the case for the statutory consultees within DCC such as Highways, Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, and Lead Local Flood Authority who gave advice on a number of issues relating to applications. The

common theme was that they were all experiencing an increased number of cases and issues surrounding recruitment.

- 6.3.4 A number of stakeholders gave evidence to the Committee suggesting that legal complexities were often an issue when attempting to resolve enforcement cases. It was explained that some agencies who the Council had to contact operated outside of the planning framework and instead operated in private civil framework. Examples were used such as building regulation issues as well as private utility companies.
- 6.3.5 The Principal Planning Enforcement Officer also informed Members that officers had to be mindful of sharing data with other agencies due to GDPR rules and data protection. This generally slowed the process down. There were also grounds of appeal and therefore any enforcement decision had to be backed by evidence and in the public interest. Any appeal that went against the Council would mean it was liable for the costs.
- 6.3.6 Members were concerned that there were no KPI's for the service, however, did note that the Government was currently consulting on introducing a range of planning targets relating to enforcement including the average number of weeks taken to respond to suspected planning breaches, as well as the proportion of open planning enforcement cases that are over six months old.
- 6.3.7 The Review Panel discussed proactive enforcement but agreed that this could only be done if and when case numbers stabilised.
- 6.3.8 Members also agreed that minor changes to the Local Enforcement Plan needed to be made such as taking out impracticalities in regards to meeting Ward Members, and targets contained within the Plan which could not be met.

## **7. Conclusions**

- 7.1 The Review Panel heard from a range of stakeholders during the review process. The review identified a number of strengths including staff resilience and experience, internal officer communication, digitalisation, the approval of a Local Enforcement Plan, recent ombudsman decisions, and the enforcement of large scale planning breaches in the public interest.
- 7.2 There was, however, some areas for improvement which involved communicating with the public, Councillors, and Parish Councils particularly around caseloads and priorities, ensuring one point of contact for customers when reporting alleged breaches, introduction of KPI's and minor changes to the Local Enforcement Plan.



## **Appendix A**

### **Stakeholders Engaged During the Review**

R Purcell	-	Assistant Director of Planning
K Eastwood	-	Joint Assistant Director of Environmental Health
G Cooper	-	Principal Planning Officer
P Slater	-	Principal Planning Officer
J Proudler	-	Development Manager (Derbyshire County Council)
J Hawley	-	Principal Planning Enforcement Officer
Cllr C Cupit	-	Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services
Cllr C Renwick	-	DCC Cabinet Member – Infrastructure & Highways

DRAFT

<b><u>COMMITTEE MAKING RECOMMENDATION</u></b>	<b><u>RECOMMENDATION</u></b>	<b><u>DATE OF COMMITTEE</u></b>	<b><u>TO BE ACTIONED BY</u></b>	<b><u>OUTCOMES OF RECOMMENDATION</u></b>
<b>AUDIT &amp; CORPORATE GOVERNANCE</b>	Further update on the Car Parking Strategy requested	29 JUNE 2022	Governance Officer/relevant Director	COMPLETE
<b>GROWTH</b>	That the business engagement review be extended into the new municipal year	14 JULY 2022	Senior Scrutiny Officer	Further interviews scheduled – COMPLETE
<b>ORGANISATION</b>	That a review on Planning Enforcement be commenced  That the 2021/22 scrutiny review report into ICT & Transformation be approved  That an update on the Council's agile working policy, future arrangements for Mill Lane, and staff vacancy rates be added to the work programme	19 JULY 2022	Senior Scrutiny Officer  Senior Scrutiny Officer  Senior Scrutiny Officer	Review scoped and commenced - COMPLETE  Review report submitted to Cabinet on 08 September - COMPLETE  Added to work programme - COMPLETE
<b>COMMUNITIES</b>	That a review on leisure provisions for older residents be commenced	22 JULY 2022	Senior Scrutiny Officer	Review scoped and commenced - COMPLETE
<b>AUDIT &amp; CORPORATE GOVERNANCE</b>	That the Committee's comments regarding target ENV 17 (waste crime reduction) be reported to Cabinet	27 JULY 2022	Information, Engagement and Performance Manager	COMPLETE

<b>ORGANISATION</b>	A report to be brought back to the Committee outlining the planning enforcement process	06 SEPTEMBER 2022	Richard Purcell – Assistant Director of Planning	COMPLETE
<b>GROWTH</b>	CANCELLED	19 SEPTEMBER 2022		
<b>COMMUNITIES</b>	To receive further information on leisure membership structures and prices, a breakdown of membership users per age category, and a full list of activities available to older residents  The Legal Team Manager to appear at the Committee at the next meeting alongside the Assistant Director of Environmental Health to provide an update on the implementation of the CCTV in Taxis Policy	23 SEPTEMBER 2022	Chris Mills – Assistant Director of Leisure  Legal Team Manager	COMPLETE – information provided to Committee at next meeting  COMPLETE
<b>AUDIT &amp; CORPORATE GOVERNANCE</b>	RESOLVED – That  1. The Audit and Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee have considered the draft Annual Governance Statement as set out in Appendix 1 and made any observations or recommendations which they consider to be appropriate prior to the final version being incorporated within the Council's Statement of Accounts. An annual update report shall be taken to Cabinet each financial year (commencing 2023/24) advising on the	28 SEPTEMBER 2022	S151 Officer	COMPLETE

	<p>status of the programme and the proposed schemes to be brought forward for that year.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Audit and Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee approved the local Code of Corporate Governance as set out in Appendix 2.</li> <li>3. The Audit and Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee having reviewed the effectiveness of the Governance Framework were satisfied that the Council's governance and internal control arrangements are fit for purpose.</li> <li>4. That delegated powers were granted to the Chief Financial Officer in consultation with the Chair of the Audit and Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee to agree any changes which may be necessary in order to ensure the finalisation of the external audit currently being concluded by the Council's external auditors Mazars to ensure completion of the Statement of Accounts by the statutory deadline of 30 November 2022.</li> </ol> <p>The Committee received a report on the results of a review of the Internal Audit Charter.</p> <p>RESOLVED – That</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Members noted the outcome of the review of the Internal Audit Charter.</li> </ol>		<p>Head of Internal Audit</p>	<p>COMPLETE</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------	-----------------

	<p>2. The Internal Audit Charter was agreed.</p> <p>3. The agreed Internal Audit Charter be reviewed in a years' time or sooner in the event of any significant changes being made to the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards.</p>			
<b>GROWTH</b>	Revised project plan and timetable for the scrutiny review into business engagement approved	31 OCTOBER 2022	Senior Scrutiny Officer	COMPLETE
<b>AUDIT &amp; CORPORATE GOVERNANCE</b>	<p>Members were presented with a report of the Council's External Auditor (Mazars) which outlined the Audit Completion Report and the Letter of Representation for the financial year 2021/22.</p> <p><u>RESOLVED</u></p> <p>(1) That the Audit and Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee noted the attached report from the Council's external auditors Mazars.</p> <p>(2) That the Audit and Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee approved the Letter of Representation contained within the Audit Completion Report and authorised the Chief Financial Officer to sign the letter on behalf of the Council</p>	09 NOVEMBER 2022	S151 Officer	COMPLETE

	<p>The Director of Finance and Resources presented a report proposing approval of the audited Statement of Accounts for 2021/22.</p> <p><b><u>RESOLVED</u></b></p> <p>(1) That the Audit and Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee approved the audited Statement of Accounts in respect of 2021/22.</p> <p>(2) That delegated powers were granted to the Chief Financial Officer in consultation with the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Audit and Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee to agree any changes which may be necessary in order to ensure the finalisation of the external audit currently being concluded by the Council's external auditors, Mazars, to ensure completion of the Statement of Accounts by the statutory deadline of 30 November 2022.</p>		S151 Officer	COMPLETE
<b>COMMUNITIES</b>	<p>The Committee requested further updates in relation to a previous scrutiny review into residential parking</p> <p>Project plan and timetable agreed for the Committee's scrutiny review on leisure</p>	11 NOVEMBER 2022	<p>Assistant Director – Property, Estates, and Assets</p> <p>Senior Scrutiny Officer</p>	<p>ONGOING</p> <p>COMPLETE</p>

	provisions for older residents. Further information regarding demographics and memberships requested			
<b>ORGANISATION</b>	The Committee expressed its concerns with the delay to installing the appropriate AV equipment in the new Council chamber and requested that progress updates be given at future meetings	15 NOVEMBER 2022	Senior Scrutiny Officer/relevant director	COMPLETE
<b>COMMUNITIES</b>	NONE	13 JANUARY 2023		
<b>GROWTH</b>	That a report be prepared following the evidence heard on the business engagement scrutiny review	16 JANUARY 2023	Senior Scrutiny Officer	COMPLETE
<b>AUDIT &amp; CORPORATE GOVERNANCE</b>	NONE	18 JANUARY 2023		
<b>ORGANISATION</b>	Project plan and timetable for the scrutiny review on planning enforcement approved	24 JANUARY 2023	Senior Scrutiny Officer	COMPLETE
<b>COMMUNITIES</b>	That a report be prepared following evidence heard on the leisure provisions for older residents scrutiny review  Further updates be given on the previous review into residential parking	23 FEBRUARY 2023	Senior Scrutiny Officer  Assistant Director – Property, Estates and Assets	COMPLETE  ONGOING
<b>GROWTH</b>	That the Review Report on business engagement be approved and submitted to Cabinet for consideration  Further updates be given on the previous review into tourism, with the KPI's the	13 MARCH 2023	Senior Scrutiny Officer	ONGOING  ONGOING

	Committee suggested to be presented to Members in November 2023 and 2024		Regeneration and Town Centre Officer	
<b>ORGANISATION</b>	That a report be prepared following the evidence heard on the planning/environmental enforcement scrutiny review	14 MARCH 2023	Senior Scrutiny Officer	COMPLETE





North East Derbyshire  
District Council

## Forward Plan of Executive Decisions for the period 15 March 2023 – 15 April 2023

This Forward Plan sets out all of the decisions that are expected to be taken over the next four months by either: (i) The Cabinet, or (ii) an officer on an Executive function of the Council.

Some of the decisions listed in this plan are 'Key Decisions'. A Key Decision is one that is likely to:

- (a) Result in the Council spending or receiving income of over £100,000 revenue or £250,000 capital, or
- (b) Have a significant impact on two or more wards in the Council's area.

At least 28 calendar days' notice must be given before they are due to be taken by the Cabinet or an officer under delegated powers.

The Cabinet can make urgent decisions which do not appear in the Forward Plan. A notice will be published at the District Council Offices and on the Council's website explaining the reasons for the urgent decisions. Please note that the decision dates are indicative and are subject to change.

The Forward Plan also lists those 'Exempt' Decisions which are going to be taken over the next four months. Exempt Decisions are those decisions which have to be taken in private. This is because they involve confidential or exempt information which cannot be shared with the public.

The contact details for the officers or senior employees responsible for producing the reports and reports for these decisions are included in the plan. Please contact them if you would like more information. If you have any queries about why something is a Key Decision or is going to be taken in private then please contact the Governance Team on 01246 217391 or email: alan.maher@ne-derbyshire.gov.uk.

Published under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Sarah Sternberg  
Assistant Director of Governance & Monitoring Officer

**Published on: 15 March 2023**

### **Cabinet members and their responsibilities**

#### **Member**

#### **Portfolio of responsibilities**

Councillor A Dale	Leader and Portfolio Holder for Overall Strategic Leadership
Councillor C Cupit	Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services
Councillor M Foster	Portfolio Holder for Council Services
Councillor J Kenyon	Portfolio Holder for Economy, Transformation & Climate Change
Councillor A Powell	Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Communities and Communications
Councillor C Renwick	Portfolio Holder for Housing & Community Safety

DECISION TO BE TAKEN	DECISION-MAKER	DATE OF DECISION	KEY DECISION	EXEMPT DECISION (INCLUDING GROUNDS FOR EXEMPTION)	RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO HOLDER	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER
Proposal for a fully co-mingled Recycling Service	Cabinet	13 Apr 2023	Key	Fully exempt  Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)	Councillor Charlotte Cupit	Managing Director
Modifications to the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan	Cabinet	13 Apr 2023	Non-Key	Open	Councillor Charlotte Cupit	Managing Director

**ORGANISATION WORK PROGRAMME 2022/23  
TUESDAY AT 10:00 AM**

**CHAIR: Cllr S Clough    VICE CHAIR: Cllr M Emmens**

<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>SCRUTINY ACTIVITY</b>	<b>WHAT IT WILL COVER</b>	<b>UPDATE/COMMENTS</b>
<b>19 July 2022</b>	Remit of the Committee		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Briefing on Scrutiny:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Setting the scene</li> <li>- The terms of reference of the Committee</li> <li>- How the Committee operates, ways of working - Discussion</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer/ Committee Members
	Selection of Scrutiny Review Topic	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To consider suggestions for review and select a topic for the Scrutiny Review</li> <li>• Consider what we want to look at</li> <li>• Consider stakeholders who we want to see</li> </ul>	Committee members
	Review Report	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To agree the Scrutiny Review Report</li> </ul>	Committee

**Agenda Item 8**

			– ICT & Transformation	Senior Scrutiny Officer
	Draft Work Programme	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the draft work programme for the year and any suggested items for inclusion</li> </ul>	Committee Members/ Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer
	List of key decisions	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer
<b>06 September 2022 (at 3pm)</b>	Annual Report of Human Resources and Organisational Development	Monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Organisational Development</li> <li>➤ Apprentices</li> <li>➤ Question and Answer Session</li> </ul>	Human Resources Manager <i>Accepted</i>
	Scrutiny Review 2022/23	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Scoping of Review including scene setting – Planning Enforcement</li> </ul>	Richard Purcell – Assistant Director of Planning  Ken Eastwood – Assistant Director of Environmental Health  Cllr Charlotte Cupit – Deputy Leader & Portfolio Holder for

				Environmental Services
	List of key decisions	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer
	Scrutiny Work Programme	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Committees’ work programme</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer
<b>15 November 2022</b>	Working from home	Monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To receive an update on plans for Mill Lane (in respect of agile working)</li> </ul>	Damien Johnson – Assistant Director of Property, Estates & Assets <b>Accepted</b>
	Staff vacancies	Monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To discuss the agile working policy, staff turnover, and vacancy rates at the Council</li> </ul>	Sara Gordon – HR & OD Manager <b>Accepted</b>
	Scrutiny Review	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To receive a report outlining Planning Enforcement procedures and multi-agency working</li> </ul>	Richard Purcell – Assistant Director of Planning Ken Eastwood – Assistant Director of Environmental Health
	List of key decisions	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer

	Scrutiny Work Programme	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Committees' work programme</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer
<b>24 January 2023</b>	Scrutiny Review	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approval of Project Plan</li> <li>Approval of Timetable</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer  Committee Members
		Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Interviews</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10:00 – Graeme Cooper &amp; Phil Slater – Principal Planning Officers (NEDDC)</li> <li>10:40 – Cllr C Renwick – DCC Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure &amp; Highways, David Arnold – Assistant Director – Regulatory Services (DCC), Justine Proudler – Planning Enforcement – Minerals &amp; Waste (DCC)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	AV equipment	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To receive a progress update on the procurement and installation of new AV equipment in the Council Chamber.</li> </ul>	Jayne Dethick – Director of Finance & Resources and S151 Officer
	List of key decisions	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer

	Scrutiny Work Programme	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Committees' work programme</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer
<b>14 March 2023</b>	Scrutiny Review	Review	<u>Interviews</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10.00 – Julian Hawley – Principal Planning Enforcement Officer</li> </ul>	
	Rykneld Homes	Monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To receive an update on Rykneld Homes</li> </ul>	Lorraine Shaw – Managing Director Rykneld Homes Ltd
	Scrutiny Review	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Triangulation of evidence – Scrutiny Review</li> </ul>	Committee Members
	List of Key Decisions	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer
	Scrutiny Work Programme	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Committee's Work Programme</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer
<b>18 April 2023</b>	Human Resources Update		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To receive an update on Human Resources – Sara Gordon – HR&amp; OD Manager</li> </ul>	Sara Gordon – HR& OD Manager



	Draft Scrutiny Review report	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To agree the draft report for Scrutiny Review</li> </ul>	Committee Members
	Monitoring of O&S recommendations	Monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To monitor the implementation of previous committee and review recommendations</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer
	List of key decisions	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer
	Scrutiny Work Programme	Consultee, monitor and challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider whether the Committees' work programme has been completed at year end</li> </ul>	Damon Stanton – Senior Scrutiny Officer