

Public Document Pack

Mid Devon District Council

Environment Policy Development Group

Tuesday, 13 July 2021 at 5.30 pm
Exe Room, Phoenix House, Tiverton

Next ordinary meeting
Tuesday, 7 September 2021 at 5.30 pm

Important - this meeting will take place at Phoenix House, but members of the Public and Press can and should attend via Zoom only. Please do not attend Phoenix House without prior agreement. The attached Protocol for Hybrid Meetings explains how this will work.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/97185608487?pwd=TjEyU2NtdEczUUt5RUZreUorQUdadz09>

Meeting ID: 971 8560 8487

Passcode: 595372

One tap mobile

08000315717,,97185608487#,,,,*595372# The United Kingdom Toll-free

08002605801,,97185608487#,,,,*595372# The United Kingdom Toll-free

Dial by your location

0 800 031 5717 The United Kingdom Toll-free

0 800 260 5801 The United Kingdom Toll-free

0 800 358 2817 The United Kingdom Toll-free

Meeting ID: 971 8560 8487

Passcode: 595372

Membership

Cllr E J Berry

Cllr W Burke

Cllr D R Coren

Cllr Miss J Norton

Cllr R F Radford

Cllr R L Stanley

Cllr L D Taylor

Cllr B G J Warren

Cllr J Wright

AGENDA

Members are reminded of the need to make declarations of interest prior to any discussion which may take place

- 1 **Election of Chairman (The Chairman of the Council in the Chair)**
To elect a Chairman for the municipal year 2021-2022
- 2 **Election of Vice Chairman**
To elect a Vice Chairman for the municipal year 2021-2022
- 3 **Start time of meetings**
Members to agree the start time of meetings for the remainder of the municipal year
- 4 **Apologies and substitute Members**
To receive any apologies for absence and notices of appointment of substitute Members (if any).
- 5 **Hybrid Meeting Protocol** (*Pages 5 - 12*)
To note the Hybrid Meeting Protocol
- 6 **Declarations of Interest under the Code of Conduct**
Councillors are reminded of the requirement to declare any interest, including the type of interest, and reason for that interest, either at this stage of the meeting or as soon as they become aware of that interest.
- 7 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting** (*Pages 13 - 16*)
Members to consider whether to approve the minutes of the last meeting of the Group held on 13th April 2021 as a correct record.
- 8 **Public Question Time**
To receive any questions relating to items on the Agenda from members of the public and replies thereto.

Note: A maximum of 30 minutes is allowed for this item.
- 9 **Chairman's Announcements**
To receive any announcements that the Chairman may wish to make.
- 10 **Cabinet Member for the Environment and Climate Change**
Group to receive an update from the Cabinet Member for the Environment and Climate Change
- 11 **Climate Change update** (*Pages 17 - 30*)
To receive an update Climate Change Action Plan.
- 12 **Tree Policy** (*Pages 31 - 44*)
To receive the 5 yearly review of the Tree Policy and recommend

adoption to the Cabinet.

- 13 **Public Spaces Protection Order** (*Pages 45 - 152*)
To receive the key findings from the consultation on a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for the Mid Devon area which ran from 21st May to 18th June 2021, to update the Environment PDG (and the Cabinet) on the feedback received from the PSPO public consultation and to seek approval on a revised PSPO to be made in response to the consultation.
- 14 **Performance and Risk Outturn Report** (*Pages 153 - 212*)
To consider a report of the Operations Manager for Performance, Governance and Health & Safety providing Members with an update on the performance against the Corporate Plan and local service targets for 2020/21. Previously presented to the Cabinet on 6th July 2021.
- 15 **Financial Outturn Report** (*Pages 213 - 252*)
To consider a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (S151) presenting the Revenue and Capital Outturn figures for the financial year 2020/21 previously presented to Cabinet to 6th July 2021.
- 16 **Work programming session** (*Pages 253 - 266*)
To receive an overview of work programming practices from the Scrutiny Policy and Research Officer and to agree a work program for future meetings.

Members are encouraged to bring issues to the meeting for consideration.

Stephen Walford
Chief Executive
Monday, 5 July 2021

Covid-19 and meetings

From 7 May 2021, the law requires all councils to hold formal meetings in person. However, the Council is also required to follow government guidance about safety during the pandemic. For a short period – probably until 30 June – the Council will enable all people to continue to participate in meetings via Zoom.

You are strongly encouraged to participate via Zoom to keep everyone safe - there is limited capacity in meeting rooms if safety requirements are to be met. There are restrictions and conditions which apply to those in the building and the use of the building. You must not attend a meeting at Phoenix House without complying with the requirements in the new protocol for meetings. You must follow any directions you are given.

Please read the new meeting protocol which is available here:
<https://democracy.middevon.gov.uk/documents/s21866/aaaaHybridMeetingProtocolMay2021.pdf>

If you want to ask a question or speak, email your full name to Committee@middevon.gov.uk by no later than 4pm on the day before the meeting. This will ensure that your name is on the list to speak and will help us ensure that you are not missed – as you can imagine, it is easier to see and manage public speaking when everyone is physically present in the same room. Notification in this way will ensure the meeting runs as smoothly as possible.

If you would like a copy of the Agenda in another format (for example in large print) please contact Carole Oliphant on:

E-Mail: coliphant@middevon.gov.uk

Public Wi-Fi is available in all meeting rooms.

1.

Mid Devon District Council – Hybrid Meeting Protocol

1. Introduction

Remote meetings via Zoom have been used during the Covid-19 pandemic in accordance with the temporary legislation. That legislation ceases to apply from 7 May 2021. However, Covid-19 legislation and guidance continues in place and this places specific requirements for meetings in relation to health and safety, risk assessments and related matters.

The Council has therefore put in place temporary arrangements which will enable meetings to take place in compliance with legislation, whilst providing alternative participation opportunities to maintain a Covid-19 safe environment. All are asked to remember that the Council's offices at Phoenix House are not just meeting rooms – they are the place of employment for many and there are implications beyond just how the meetings are held.

The arrangements set out in this Protocol will apply to meetings from 7 May 2021 to (and including) 30 June 2021, unless the Council decides to change, curtail or extend them. At the date of this Protocol, it is expected that arrangements may change later this year – because the Government may change the law, the Covid-19 pandemic may have further receded and/or the Council makes alternative arrangements.

2. Hybrid arrangements – how will they work?

The primary objective is to ensure that meetings can continue as safely as possible and that the rights of Members and the Public are not diminished simply because the meeting is being held through a mix of online and face-to-face means. The Chairman will retain control and discretion over the conduct of the meeting and the Zoom host will provide administrative support to facilitate the meeting.

Please note that, exceptionally, meeting arrangements may change – in response to legislation, court decisions, or risk. This may include a meeting being postponed, or the hybrid arrangements changing or being withdrawn. We ask that you check the arrangements in advance of joining or attending the meeting.

(a) Members (councillors) entitled to vote

All Members entitled to vote in a meeting must be present in the same room – if they are to be classed as 'present' (count towards the quorum) and to cast a vote. If a Member entitled to vote is not in the room, they may still participate via Zoom (see below), but they will not be present (quorum) nor be able to vote.

(b) Other Members, Officers and the Public

The Council will use Zoom to enable all other Members, officers and the Public to attend and participate in meetings safely. Zoom will be enabled in all public meetings. Those attending the meeting physically will be able to see and hear Zoom participants via the existing large TV/monitor screens in the meeting rooms.

Those on Zoom will be able to hear Members in the room and see them – although this will be a whole room view and there will be no zooming in on individual members. It is essential therefore those Members present in the room use the microphones at all times and identify themselves before speaking.

There will be some Officers in the room – the Committee Administrator, the Zoom host and, at times, an additional support officer. There may also be a meeting room host to manage the safety of the meeting. All other Officers should use Zoom, unless they are specifically invited into the room by the Chairman of the meeting.

3. Zoom

Zoom is the system the Council will be using for those attending Hybrid meetings remotely. It has functionality for audio, video, and screen sharing and you do not need to be a member of the Council or have a Zoom account to join a Zoom meeting.

4. Access to documents

Member Services will publish the agenda and reports for committee meetings on the Council's website in line with usual practice. Paper copies of agendas will only be made available to those who have previously requested this and also the Chair of a meeting.

If any other Member wishes to have a paper copy, they must notify Member Services before the agenda is published, so they can arrange to post directly – it may take longer to organise printing, so as much notice as possible is appreciated.

The Public should continue to access agendas via the Council's website - and are encouraged to do so even after the offices at Phoenix House are open again.

5. Setting up the Meeting for Zoom attendance

This will be done by Member Services. They will send a meeting request via Outlook which will appear in Members' Outlook calendar. Members and Officers will receive a URL link to click on to join the meeting. The Public will use the Zoom details on the front of the agenda. The telephone dial-in via Zoom will also be available.

6. Public Access and Participation

(a) Public Access:

Members of the Public will be able to use a web link and standard internet browser. This will be displayed on the front of the agenda. Members of the Public should attend a meeting via Zoom, unless there are exceptional circumstances justifying attendance in person.

If any member of the Public still wishes to attend in person, they must notify Member Services **at least 3 working days before the meeting**. Notifications must be sent by email to:

Committee@middevon.gov.uk

Day of meeting	Notice given by
Monday	Previous Wednesday
Tuesday	Previous Thursday
Wednesday	Previous Friday
Thursday	Monday
Friday	Tuesday

The meeting risk assessment may need to be updated. Member Services will liaise with the Chief Executive, Monitoring Officer and the Chairman of the meeting. A decision will be taken on whether attendance in person can be safely accommodated.

(b) Public Participation (speaking):

Public questions will continue in line with the Council's current arrangements as far as is practicable. However, to ensure that the meeting runs smoothly and that no member of the public is missed, all those who wish to speak must register **by 4pm on the day before the meeting**. They should email their full name to Committee@middevon.gov.uk. If they wish to circulate their question in advance, that would be helpful.

At public question time, the Chair will ask each registered person to speak at the appropriate time. In the normal way, the public should state their full name, the agenda item they wish to speak to **before** they proceed with their question. Unless they have registered, a member of the public may not be called to speak, except at the discretion of the Chairman.

If a member of the public wishes to ask a question but cannot attend the meeting for whatever reason, there is nothing to prevent them from emailing members of the Committee with their question, views or concern in advance. However, if they do so, it would be helpful if a copy could be sent to Committee@middevon.gov.uk as well.

7. Arrangements for any person attending meetings at Phoenix House

Anyone attending a meeting in person must observe the following requirements:

- (a) For non-voting members, officers and the Public – are there exceptional circumstances to justify attending? If so, please notify in advance and in paragraph 6 above. It is essential that the Council knows who is attending and how many will be in the room, so that the meeting risk assessment can be updated.

- (b) Do not attend if you: have any symptoms of Covid-19; are self-isolating (with or without a positive Covid-19 test); or are in a period of post-travel quarantine.
- (c) Wear a mask at all times except when invited to speak by the Chairman of the meeting. If you have a medical exemption for wearing a mask, please attend via Zoom unless you are a Member who must attend to vote.
- (d) Use the hand sanitiser which is available in the building.
- (e) Follow the directions for entering, moving around and exiting the building. Follow the instructions of any Officer present to manage the safety of the meeting and/or the Chairman.
- (f) Sign into the meeting if requested to do so – you may be asked to leave contact details
- (g) Enter and leave the building promptly – do not gather inside after the meeting has finished, or during any break in the meeting
- (h) Bring your own water/refreshments, as these will not be available for the time being.
- (i) Maintain social distancing throughout – this is 2 metres apart, or 1 metre with additional safeguards (e.g. face masks).

8. Starting the Meeting

At the start of the meeting, the Member Services Officer will check all required attendees are present and that there is a quorum. If there is no quorum, the meeting will be adjourned. This applies if, during the meeting, it becomes inquorate for whatever reason.

The Chair will remind all Members, Officers and the Public attending via Zoom that **all microphones must be muted**, unless and until they are speaking. This prevents background noise, coughing etc. which is intrusive and disruptive during the meeting. The Hosting Officer will enforce this and will be able to turn off participant mics when they are not in use.

9. Declaration of Interests

Members should declare their interests in the usual way. A Member with a disclosable pecuniary interest is required to leave the room. If they are attending via Zoom, they will be moved to the waiting room for the duration of the item.

10. The Meeting and Debate

- (a) For Members and Officers physically present

Each member should raise their hand to indicate a request to speak. When called, they must identify themselves for the recording and for the benefit of those attending via Zoom. The microphone must be used when speaking – standing will make it difficult for those on Zoom to hear and is discouraged, including at meetings of Full Council.

(b) For any person attending via Zoom

The Council will not be using the Chat function. The Chairman will call speakers in accordance with the usual rules i.e. either at Public Question Time, or for Members and Officers, when they raise their Zoom hand to speak.

No decision or outcome will be invalidated by a failure of the Chair to call a member to speak – remote management of meetings is intensive and the Hybrid arrangements are likely to be more so. It is reasonable to expect that some requests will be inadvertently missed from time to time.

When referring to reports or making specific comments, Members and Officers should refer to the report and page number whenever possible. This will help all present or in attendance to have a clear understanding of what is being discussed.

11. Voting

Voting for meetings in person is normally through a show of hands. The Member Services Officer will announce the numerical result of the vote for the benefit of those attending via Zoom.

12. Meeting Etiquette Reminder for Zoom attendees

- Mute your microphone – you will still be able to hear what is being said.
- Only speak when invited to do so by the Chair.
- Speak clearly and please state your name each time you speak
- If you're referring to a specific page, mention the page number.

13. Part 2 Reports and Debate

There are times when council meetings are not open to the public, when confidential, or “exempt” issues – as defined in Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 – are under consideration.

If there are members of the public and press attending the meeting, then the Member Services Officer will, at the appropriate time, remove them to a waiting room for the duration of that item. They can then be invited back in when the business returns to Part 1.

Please turn off smart speakers such as Amazon Echo (Alexa), Google Home or smart music devices. These could inadvertently record phone or video conversations, which would not be appropriate during the consideration of confidential items.

14. Interpretation of standing orders

Where the Chairman is required to interpret the Council's Constitution and procedural rules and how they apply to remote attendance, they may take advice from the Member Services Officer or Monitoring Officer prior to making a ruling. However, the Chair's decision shall be final.

15. Disorderly Conduct by Members

If a Member behaves in the manner as outlined in the Constitution (persistently ignoring or disobeying the ruling of the Chair or behaving irregularly, improperly or offensively or deliberately obstructs the business of the meeting), any other Member may move 'That the member named be not further heard' which, if seconded, must be put to the vote without discussion.

If the same behaviour persists and a Motion is approved 'that the member named do leave the meeting', then (if attending via Zoom) they will be removed as a participant by the Member Services Officer.

16. Disturbance from Members of the Public

If any member of the public interrupts a meeting the Chairman will warn them accordingly. If that person continues to interrupt or disrupt proceedings the Chairman may ask the Member Services Officer to remove them as a participant from the meeting.

17. Technical issues – meeting management

If the Chairman, the Hosting Officer or the Member Services Officer identifies a problem with the systems from the Council's side, the Chairman should either declare a recess while the fault is addressed or, if the fault is minor (e.g. unable to bring up a presentation), it may be appropriate to move onto the next item of business in order to progress through the agenda. If it is not possible to address the fault, the meeting will be adjourned until such time as it can be reconvened.

If the meeting was due to determine an urgent matter and it has not been possible to continue because of technical difficulties, the Chief Executive, Leader and relevant Cabinet Member, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer, shall explore such other means of taking the decision as may be permitted by the Council's constitution.

Where any Member, Officer or the Public experience their own technical problems during the course of a meeting e.g. through internet connectivity or otherwise, the meeting will not be automatically suspended or adjourned.

18. Technical issues – Individual Responsibility (Members and Officers)

Many members, officers and the Public live in places where broadband speeds are poor, but technical issues can arise at any time for a number of reasons. The following guidelines, if followed, should help reduce disruption.

- Join public Zoom meetings by telephone if there is a problem with the internet. Before all meetings, note down or take a photograph of the front page of the agenda which has the necessary telephone numbers. Annex 1 to this protocol contains a brief step-by-step guide to what to expect
- Consider an alternative location from which to join the meeting, but staying safe and keeping confidential information secure. For officers, this may mean considering whether to come into the office, subject to this being safe and practicable (childcare etc.)
- Have to hand the telephone number of someone attending the meeting – and contact them if necessary to explain the problem in connecting
- Officers should have an ‘understudy’ or deputy briefed and on standby to attend and present as needed (and their telephone numbers to hand)

Phone only access to zoom meetings

(Before you start **make sure you know the Meeting ID and the Meeting Password**) – Both of these are available on the agenda for the meeting

Call the toll free number either on the meeting agenda or on the Outlook appointment (this will start with 0800 --- ----)

(Ensure your phone is on 'speaker' if you can)

A message will sound saying *"Welcome to Zoom, enter your meeting ID followed by the hash button"*

- **Enter Meeting ID followed by #**

Wait for next message which will say *"If you are a participant, please press hash to continue"*

- **Press #**

Wait for next message which will say *"Enter Meeting Password followed by hash"*

- **Enter 6 digit Meeting Password followed by #**

Wait for the following two messages:

"You are currently being held in a waiting room, the Host will release you from 'hold' in a minute"

Wait.....

"You have now entered the meeting"

Important notes for participating in meetings

Press *6 to toggle between 'mute' and 'unmute' (you should always ensure you are muted until you are called upon to speak)

If you wish to speak you can 'raise your hand' by pressing *9. Wait for the Chairman to call you to speak. The Host will lower your hand after you have spoken. Make sure you mute yourself afterwards.

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a **MEETING** of the **ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP**
held on 13 April 2021 at 5.30 pm

Present

Councillors B G J Warren (Chairman)
W Burke, D R Coren, Miss J Norton,
R F Radford, R L Stanley, L D Taylor and
J Wright

Apologies

Councillor(s) E J Berry

Also Present

Councillor(s) Mrs C P Daw and R M Deed

Also Present

Officer(s): Jill May (Director of Business Improvement and Operations), Matthew Page (Corporate Manager for People, Governance and Waste), Darren Beer (Operations Manager for Street Scene), Philip Langdon (Solicitor), Deborah Sharpley (Solicitor), Vicky Lowman (Environment and Enforcement Manager), Clare Robathan (Scrutiny Officer) and Carole Oliphant (Member Services Officer)

76 **COUNCILLOR GLANMOR HUGHES**

Prior to the meeting a minute silence was held in memory of Cllr Glanmor Hughes.

77 **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (0.03.19)**

Apologies were received from Cllr E J Berry.

78 **REMOTE MEETINGS PROTOCOL (0.03.31)**

The Group had before it, and **NOTED**, the *Remote Meetings Protocol.

Note: *Protocol previously circulated and attached to the minutes

79 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT (0.03.48)**

Members were reminded of the need to declare any interests when appropriate.

80 **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (0.04.03)**

There were no members of the public present.

81 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (0.04.08)**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 9th March 2021 were agreed as a true record.

82 **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (0.04.38)**

The Chairman had no announcements to make.

83 **PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER (0.05.18)**

The Group had before it a *report of the Environment and Enforcement Manager presenting the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) under section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

The officer outlined the contents of the report and explained that officers had completed a further review of the PSPO and had contacted the parishes to clarify the maps and the areas to be included. Officers felt that this was a worthwhile exercise and thanked the parishes for their assistance. As part of this exercise additional areas of land had been identified and some changes had been made to the order which included:

- A reduction in the number of spaces where dogs were required to be on leads
- An increase in the number of dogs allowed to be walked by a single individual from 4 to 6
- An increase in the number of enclosed play areas included within the order

These changes reflected the feedback from the Group and Cabinet in previous meetings and also the first public consultation.

If the PSPO Order was made uniform signage would be erected in all the relevant places. Quotes were being obtained in relation to this.

The Environment and Enforcement Manager explained that the PSPO would now be subject to a 4 week consultation exercise with relevant stakeholders which would include press coverage, a link to the consultation on the Council website and signs being placed in the included areas. Paper copies of the consultation would also be provided to the public who requested it.

Consideration was given to:

- The number of dogs that professional dog walkers could walk being a maximum of 6 or up to the maximum on their insurance
- The allocation of district officer discretionary hours to dog fouling
- Parishes views that too little time was allocated to enforcement of dog fouling

The Group therefore **RECOMMENDED** to the Cabinet that:

- 1) Authority be given to consult with members of the public and other relevant stakeholders to introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order under section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014

- 2) The fixed penalty for breach of the PSPO be set at the maximum permitted of £100

(Proposed by the Chairman)

Reason for the Decision: To widen enforcement powers in order to deliver a cleaner and more sustainable environment across the Mid Devon District.

Note: *Report previously circulated and attached to the minutes

(The meeting ended at 5.54 pm)

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

13 JULY 2021

REPORT – CLIMATE AND SUSTAINABILITY UPDATE

Cabinet Member(s): Cllr C R Slade - Cabinet Member for the Environment and Climate Change.

Responsible Officer(s): Andrew Busby - Corporate Manager Property, Leisure & Climate Change. Jason Ball, Climate and Sustainability Specialist.

Reason for Report: To receive an update an update on the Climate Change Action Plan from the Climate and Sustainability Specialist.

Recommendation: That the Environment PDG notes and accepts this report as an update on the Council's response to the Climate Emergency – documenting progress with the Climate Action Plan (to reduce the Council's carbon footprint) and the wider Climate and Sustainability Programme.

Financial Implications: The financial implications associated with this report are the costs of the overall Climate and Sustainability Programme, budgets specifically linked to the Council's Corporate Plan, Climate Strategy and Climate Action Plan.

Budget and Policy Framework: Budgets specifically linked to the Council's Corporate Plan, Climate Strategy and Climate Action Plan.

Legal Implications: Full Council declared a Climate Emergency in June 2019 and as part of that commitment, the Council is to produce a carbon footprint in line with Environmental Reporting Guidelines published by HM Government. With regard to the Climate Emergency, the Environment Policy Development Group (PDG) is the initial owner of this policy activity and considers how best to determine the Council's own policy response(s) such as may then be subsequently recommended to Cabinet and Council. [Link to declaration decision](#).

Risk Assessment: Progress on Performance Indicators (PI) is provided separately.

Equality Impact Assessment: There are no equality impact assessment implications associated with this report.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: Please refer to **Annex A** which shows the Council's Corporate Plan Aims (Table 1) and Climate Strategy priorities (Table 2).

Impact on Climate Change: The role of the Climate and Sustainability Specialist in support of the corporate officer team is central to the Council's Climate and Sustainability Programme by actions such as the development of strategic positions and delivery of projects through internal, community and partnership work.

1.0 Introduction / Background

1.1. The Council has declared a Climate Emergency and aims to be climate neutral by 2030. Climate neutrality is a term used to describe the aim of actions that organisations, businesses and individuals take to achieve a balance, for any

given period, for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases released into or removed from the atmosphere. The goal of climate neutrality is to achieve a net zero climate impact.

- 1.2. Following the recent climate change declaration by Councils across Devon, there are now two emerging work streams:
 - an internal organisation focus to cut greenhouse gas emissions to net zero;
 - the wider agenda to enable emission reductions across the Mid Devon district.
- 1.3. Clearly, the first is a process the Council can manage / monitor / influence and control to a significant degree, as it relates to our own assets and operational base. For the wider agenda linked to the whole Mid Devon area, we will work as a partner with local businesses, organisations, community groups and other residents to support the district’s journey to achieve net zero.
- 1.4. Throughout each of the priority areas within our Corporate Plan, there is now a strong emphasis on local level sustainability.
- 1.5. This report is divided into community and corporate strands (some overlap is possible). Jason Ball as our Climate and Sustainability Specialist now leads the development of the Council’s climate and sustainability programme, working with colleagues and councillors, particularly Andrew Busby - Corporate Manager Property, Leisure & Climate Change; and Colin Slade - the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change.

2.0 Performance

- 2.1. Progress on Performance Indicators (PI) is provided separately. Annex A shows tables to summarise actions and progress in achieving the Council’s Corporate Plan aims and Climate Strategy priorities.
- 2.2. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist has begun to review the Council’s Climate Action Plan - projects and activities achieved and planned thus far, funds allocated, etc. Work will prioritise the most imminent and impactful projects, identify gaps, develop the plan, and cost the plan.
- 2.3. A timeline for costing the Climate Action Plan was provided to Scrutiny Committee 15 March 2021 as outlined below: updates are due in July, September and December of this calendar year.

Table 1 – A Timeline for Costings

Split by work stream	tCO2e impact scale (approx)	Approximate time required	Date for draft	Date for submission to Env PDG
Baseline	20402			
HOUSING, ENERGY AND ASSETS	3196	3 months	Jun-21	Jul-21
INTERNAL STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES	2615	2 months	Aug-21	Sep-21
TRANSPORT AND VEHICLES	202	2 months	Nov-21	Dec-21

3.0 Community and partnership activities

3.1.1. The Council is a partner within Devon Climate Emergency Response Group (DCERG) and a signatory to the Devon Carbon Plan (DCP). The Climate and Sustainability Specialist role includes working with the DCERG Tactical Group and the over-arching Response Group (the Chief Executive also receives Response Group communications).

3.1.2. Partnership work serves 2 main purposes:

- Seek to ensure strong strategic alignment.
- To facilitate communications and key updates e.g. current projects.

3.1.3. The Interim Devon Carbon Plan – notes from the public consultation.

- There is strong public support for action on climate change in Devon. Three-quarters (76%) of respondents “broadly support the Plan”. (Total 1,322 individuals and organisations).
- The public wish to see Devon become net-zero carbon as soon as possible but recognise that doing so is very challenging.
- The consultation results show strong support (at least 81% of respondents) for the Key Outcomes and Priority Actions presented in each section of the Interim Devon Carbon Plan.
- The Tactical Group agreed / recommended to get the Interim Devon Carbon Plan published as soon as possible, whilst keeping it open to consultation and therefore democratically mandated etc.
- Consultation continues with a Citizens’ Assembly (Devon Climate Assembly) of 70 people who demographically represent Devon with sessions 23rd June to 25th July.

3.2. Engagement: The Mid Devon climate and sustainability website. (Corporate Plan aim: env 10).

3.2.1. This will: 1) share updates on the Council's carbon reduction work; 2) provide information to residents, businesses, members and others; and 3) share and signpost resources, opportunities, events and local groups active on the climate, sustainability and biodiversity agenda.

3.2.2. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist is working with colleagues to launch and cultivate this resource.

3.3. Engagement: groups and partnerships. (Corporate Plan aim, env 10).

3.3.1. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist has attended meetings and workshops e.g. a group discussion with Sustainable Tiverton; webinars and workshops for the *Connecting the Culm* project (the Council is a partner); South West Energy Hub events; a presentation about the Devon Local Nature Partnership’s project on Nature Recovery Networks.

3.3.2. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist has corresponded with parishes, ward members, and officers at Devon County Council / other local authorities.

3.4. Project: Electric Vehicle charging points. (CS priority: 3. CP aim: env 02.)

3.4.1. As part of the Council's Climate Strategy 2020-2024, the Council seeks to facilitate the roll-out of electric vehicle (EV) charger locations across the district. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist has worked with colleagues and councillors to develop and assess a list of potential EV charging locations (rapid chargers that can top up a modern EV by 80% in 40 minutes). A report to Cabinet presented an evaluated set of 3 options for this, to facilitate decision-making and aiming to achieve at least 5 to 15 additional EV charging locations through procurement during 2021. Each of the current options would be powered by renewable electricity.

3.4.2. Primary outcomes of supporting EV charging within the Mid Devon district and in relation to Climate Change impact:

- to reduce energy consumption and climate impact per vehicle / per mile;
- to enable the potential for renewable energy sources to be utilised in powering personal transport within the district;
- to help reduce localised air pollution caused by transport;
- to boost EV driver confidence in recharger availability across the district.

3.4.3. Fully electric vehicles run with higher efficiency than those with internal combustion engines. The UK's electricity generation mix is becoming lower-carbon each year, which means electric vehicle journeys, can get 'greener' through this process or by switching to greener power suppliers.

3.4.4. The Energy Saving Trust has said:

- 'The switch to battery electric cars, vans, buses and motorbikes is a vital part of the Road to Zero strategy and any further policies introduced to accelerate decarbonisation.'
- 'The UK's renewable energy capacity is continually growing with electricity grid emissions predicted to fall by around 90% between now and 2050.'

3.4.5. Current EV charger provision can be viewed on this map:

<https://www.goultralow.com/ev-charging-point-map/>

3.4.6. Western Power Distribution (WPD) has been informed of the potential extra power capacity needs in Mid Devon, linked to this project. Published plans for WPD's Green Recovery scheme indicate support for 250% growth in EV rapid charging capacity within their network.

3.5. Strategy. Housing sustainability and Zero Carbon. (CS priority 2+3. CP aims h01, h03.)

3.5.1. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist has worked with the team writing the new Mid Devon Housing Strategy and asked them to consider how it will help deliver the Council's 2030 Net Zero ambition and incorporate the aims and priorities of the Mid Devon Climate Strategy and the Corporate Plan.

3.5.2. Strategy documents such as this could be used to encourage high housing standards in the private landlord sector and targets for the Council to improve

and build a more sustainable housing stock in line with its own 2030 Net Zero target; noting co-benefits from sustainable design, materials and performance e.g. thermal stability required as part of Climate Adaptation, healthy living environments; a boost to habitat resilience, connectivity and biodiversity; promote sustainable neighbourhoods and infrastructure.

3.6. Project: Housing Advisors Programme. (CS priority: 1. CP aims: env02, env 05, h01, h02, h03, c04.)

3.6.1. The Forward Planning team has secured £20k funding through the LGA's Housing Advisors Programme to develop an assessment tool to model various low carbon interventions and consider how they can be implemented at scale, using the Post Hill site in Tiverton as a pilot study. The framework assessment tool will:

- Help deliver the need for sustainable, affordable homes that meet local needs
- Help respond to the Council's climate emergency declaration, and facilitate a green recovery following COVID-19.
- Help address fuel poverty issues across the district, which have become more acute during the coronavirus pandemic.
- Be scalable and transferable across schemes in Mid Devon and elsewhere

4.0 Corporate activities

4.1.1. The Net Zero Advisory Group (NZAG), was set up after Cabinet approval on 23 April 2020 and the group members continue to meet to consider topics including, but not limited to, climate and biodiversity. Further meetings will take place on alternate months to the Environment PDG to enable a regular feedback cycle (**CS priority: 1. CP aims:n/a**).

4.1.2. The most recent meeting took place 15 June 2021, discussion included:

- Examples of sustainability work by other authorities.
- Community / parish wildlife projects, tree aftercare, citizen science etc.
- A community action grant for climate and sustainability projects.

4.1.3. Prior to this, the group met on 15 April 2021, topics of discussion included:

- Council practice for Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and the potential for 'amenity' (in relation to legislation and best practice) to include the contribution of trees to benefits such as biodiversity support and carbon capture.
- The Climate and Sustainability Specialist proposed a set of annual net emissions targets for the Council to adopt, based on a model trajectory to Net Zero by 2030; and demonstrated a method to monitor our trajectory of actual emissions versus annual target emissions from 2019 to 2030.

4.2. Working across service areas. (CS priorities: all. CP aims: all.)

4.2.1. Jason Ball as our Climate and Sustainability Specialist has agreed, in consultation with Andrew Jarrett and Andrew Busby, to apply a Programme

Management approach to develop and deliver the cross-cutting *Climate and Sustainability Programme*.

- 4.2.2. The programme will develop a roadmap to Net Zero to realise and look beyond the 2020-2024 Climate Strategy.
- 4.2.3. The programme would develop the necessary organisational capability, planning and practices for an integrated approach to sustainability.
- 4.2.4. This will require top level oversight and utilise recognised methods such as Managing Successful Programmes and Prince2 (existing skills within teams).
- 4.2.5. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist has proactively engaged with a range of teams and Policy Development Groups. He will attend and arrange further cross-team meetings with key officers to explore opportunities, connections, ideas and challenges from different perspectives and service areas within the council. We view each team representative as a 'Climate Connector' for the council to ensure a joined-up approach for our journey to Net Zero by 2030.
- 4.2.6. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist is working with the engagement and learning teams to set up training for members and staff. Based on 3 strands:
 - Common understanding / clarity of mission. Presentation resources on key topics in climate and environmental sustainability. Hosted on the Learning Hub. Short, incisive, concise.
 - Development. Webinars and site visits as an informal way to engage officers, highlight areas for further training, and trigger action.
 - Specialist e.g. carbon literacy, emerging national policies, decision-making tools.

4.3. Land Use and Landscape Scale Perspectives on Climate Mitigation and Adaptation. (CS priorities: 1 and 2. CP aims: env03, env07, env08, env09, h03, c04.)

- 4.3.1. Early discussion about a strategic perspective on the natural environment indicated a potential programme area to develop (linked to the Climate Change Strategy) to help address emerging future obligations on biodiversity gain, Nature Recovery Networks, etc. In a nutshell:
- 4.3.2. Explore how to realise the potential (social, economic and environmental) benefits of carbon banking and biodiversity banking as part of a strategic approach to Mid Devon land and habitat management.
- 4.3.3. To support this a bid was submitted to the Natural Environment Investment Readiness Fund (NEIRF) in order to run a pilot project.

4.4. Priority: large scale tree planting. (CS priority: 2. CP aim: env07.)

- 4.4.1. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist is exploring funding opportunities. We asked Devon CC to include Mid Devon in the county bid for the treescapes fund; this awaits the next phase. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist has invited parishes and District Councillors to propose high-potential project sites (parish / district / private landowners where access for planting etc, is agreed).
 - Local Authority Treescapes Fund (LATF). Bids must be via Devon County Council. Mid Devon can propose projects to include in the bid.
 - Urban Tree Challenge Fund (UTCf). Open to all.

4.5. Procurement: Greener Electricity. (CS priority: 2. CP aim: env02.)

- 4.5.1. The Cabinet on 04 March 2021 approved a proposal by Andrew Busby - Corporate Manager for Property, Leisure and Climate Change to procure a further 50% of our electricity via the 'Green Basket' under the LASER Framework for renewable energy. For an additional 50% of the Council's annual consumption it would cost circa £8k or 2.3% on top of current costs.
- 4.5.2. Provided the 100% Green Tariff is entirely additional, hypothetically the savings would be around 183 tCO₂e (tonnes of CO₂ equivalent) of Scope 2 emissions.

4.6. Greener operations: the Council's vehicle fleet. (CS priority: 2. CP aim: none).

- 4.6.1. The Transport Manager has worked with the Climate and Sustainability Specialist on a report to promote the adoption of Ultra Low Emissions Vehicles (ULEV) in the fleet with electric vehicles as a priority to replace selected small cars and vans. This would reduce Scope 1 emissions and save on fuel costs. Options and costs have been presented to relevant managers.

4.7. Project: Mid Devon District Council's proposals for hydro-electric power on the River Exe at Tiverton. (CS priority: 2. CP aim: env02.)

- 4.7.1. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist has begun to review and support this project. Current work includes flood risk assessment data modelling.
- 4.7.2. Work is underway to address and resolve issues behind planning objections.
- 4.7.3. Western Power Distribution has been informed of the plan to connect 150kWp generation capacity.

4.8. Project: Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS). (CS priority: 1, 2. CP aim: env01, env02, ec01.)

- 4.8.1. A brief update.
- Phase 1: Heat Decarbonisation Plan. Work is underway to assess and devise solutions for 4 key council buildings: Phoenix House, and the 3 leisure centres.
 - Phase 1: £310,821 grant being spent. Work in progress to install energy-efficiency and low-carbon improvements at the 3 leisure centres.
 - Phase 2: no bid; grant fund exhausted within 2 weeks.
 - Phase 3: the Heat Decarbonisation Plan would inform a Phase 3 bid.

4.9. Project: Archetype housing - energy efficiency and low carbon performance. (CS priority: 2. CP aim: env01, env02, c04.)

- 4.9.1. The Housing team will work on exemplar homes typical of Council stock (beginning with 2 buildings this year) to optimise energy performance and retrofit energy solutions. This project will inform costed plans to improve the rest of the Council stock of this type.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1. That the Environment PDG notes and accepts this report as an update on the Council's response to the Climate Emergency – documenting progress with the Climate Action Plan (to reduce the Council's carbon footprint) and the wider Climate and Sustainability Programme.

Contact for more Information: Andrew Busby - Corporate Manager Property, Leisure and Climate Change: Email ABusby@MidDevon.gov.uk Tel: 01884 255255. Jason Ball - Climate and Sustainability Specialist: Email: JBall@MidDevon.gov.uk Tel: 01884 255255.

Circulation of the Report: Cabinet Member for the Environment and Climate Change, Leadership Team.

List of Background Papers: The previous climate change report update, [Environment PDG 09 March 2021](#). [Link to paper](#).

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

13 JULY 2021

ANNEX A- CLIMATE AND SUSTAINABILITY UPDATE

1.0 Performance

1.1.1. Progress on Performance Indicators (PI) have been provided separately.

1.1.2. The tables below summarise actions and progress in achieving the Council's Corporate Plan *aims* and Climate Strategy *priorities*.

Table 1 - Relevant Aims from the Corporate Plan (CP)

ref	Aim	Notes on actions taken
	Environment	
env 01	Encourage retrofitting of measures to reduce energy usage in buildings.	<p>Forward planning: The Climate & Sustainability Specialist (C&S Specialist) will work with teams to develop interim statements and policies to sit alongside Local Plan.</p> <p>Planning and Regeneration: The C&S Specialist will work with teams to review Plans and Strategies e.g. Culm Garden Village.</p> <p>Housing: archetypes project; retrofit projects; ongoing solar PV generation; bids for funds.</p> <p>Property: PSDS projects to decarbonise; ongoing solar PV generation; bids for funds.</p>
env 02	Encourage "green" sources of energy, supply new policies and develop plans to decarbonise energy consumption in Mid Devon.	<p>Electric Vehicle charging points. Solar PV for householders - the Council is part of the Solar Together Devon project.</p> <p>The Council has facilitated the Green Homes Grant and others.</p>
env 03	Identify opportunities to work with landowners to secure additional hedgerow planting, biodiversity and reforestation.	<p>The C&S Specialist has approached Devon County Council (DCC) to be part of the county LATF bid.</p> <p>Consulting members, staff, and parishes, for LATF and UTCF proposals.</p>
env 04	Consider promoting the designation of the Exe Valley as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).	<p>The C&S Specialist will liaise with Policy Development Groups and officer teams e.g. Planning and Regeneration to examine this.</p>

<p>env 05</p>	<p>Encourage new housing and commercial developments to be “exemplars” in terms of increasing biodiversity and reducing carbon use.</p>	<p>The C&S Specialist has commented on the Cullompton Town Centre Masterplan.</p> <p>The C&S Specialist will continue to work on this aim with Forward Planning (statements and policy guidance) and others in the Planning and Regeneration section (e.g. input to Town Centre Plans, Neighbourhood Plans and Master Plans).</p> <p>The C&S Specialist will help to develop the Culm Garden Village Sustainability Strategy.</p> <p>The C&S Specialist will work with others to explore opportunities based on exemplars e.g. Cornwall Council, Eastleigh Borough Council.</p>
<p>env 06</p>	<p>Increase recycling rates and reduce the amounts of residual waste generated.</p>	<p>The C&S Specialist will work with Street Scene etc.</p>
<p>env 07</p>	<p>Explore large-scale tree-planting projects and re-wilding to enhance biodiversity and address carbon pressures.</p>	<p>The C&S Specialist proactively asked members, staff and parishes for planting site proposals (ongoing).</p> <p>The C&S Specialist will work with others to seek external funding and partnership work to support nature recovery and habitat enhancements.</p>
<p>env 08</p>	<p>Promote sustainable farming practices in partnership with local farmers, district and county councils; including research into best practice re better soil management and animal husbandry.</p>	<p>The C&S Specialist will work with others to seek external funding and support partnership work with land managers.</p>
<p>env 09</p>	<p>Work with parish and town councils to promote the development and retention of parks and play areas across the district.</p>	<p>Primarily a responsibility outside the C&S Specialist role, but relevant to e.g. healthy lifestyles, green infrastructure, nature recovery, climate adaptation.</p>
<p>env 10</p>	<p>Support community activities that improve the environment</p>	<p>The C&S Specialist is working with groups, partnerships and at parish level to support activity.</p> <p>Met with Sustainable Tiverton; conversations with parish councillors and clerks; plans to meet others.</p>

env 10	CONT Support community activities that improve the environment	<p>The C&S Specialist will enable community groups to promote sustainability activities and resources on the new climate and sustainability website.</p> <p>The Housing team is giving plug-in electricity monitors to all of the Council's social housing tenants.</p>
Homes		
h01	Introduce zero carbon policies for new development.	<p>The C&S Specialist has worked with the Housing Strategy team to embed and respond to Council's aim for Net Zero and to help deliver on this corporate plan priority.</p> <p>The C&S Specialist is working with others e.g. Planning and Regeneration to realise this priority.</p> <p>Agreed to work with Forward Planning on an interim statement to support the Local Plan (climate and sustainability). Agreed to work with colleagues on e.g. sustainability strategy for Culm Garden Village.</p>
h02	Encourage the piloting of Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) and self-build opportunities.	<p>The C&S Specialist will work with others e.g. Planning and Regeneration to realise this priority.</p> <p>The Council's Building Services team are commissioning modular housing units with excellent SAP 'A' scores (Standard Assessment Procedure) with renewable energy installed to achieve Net Zero emissions.</p> <p>The Council is a supporter of the National Custom and Self Build Association and continues to invite proposals for custom and self-build projects.</p>
h03	Use new development as opportunities to help communities to become increasingly sustainable and self-sustaining at neighbourhood level (district heating, energy use, recycling / re-use systems etc.).	<p>The C&S Specialist will work with others e.g. Planning and Regeneration to help realise this.</p> <p>The C&S Specialist will work with others to realise opportunities based on exemplars.</p>

Economy		
ec 01	Promote zero carbon exemplar sites within commercial settings.	The C&S Specialist will work with others in the Property team and colleagues in Planning and Regeneration to realise this.
ec 02	Use car park pricing mechanism to effectively balance the needs of vehicular access with those of reducing car use.	This seems a natural next step after the 2021 Electric Vehicle (EV) charging units project.
ec 03	Promote the development of the farming economy and local food production.	Local sourcing and networks. (as above)
ec 04	Working in partnership with farmers to develop and grow markets on the principle of reducing carbon emissions and sustainability.	The C&S Specialist will work with others to seek funding, partnership work, and promote good practice exemplars. The Environment PDG March 2021 had a talk on sustainability in farming.
Community		
c 01	Work with developers and Devon County Council to deliver strategic cycle routes between settlements and key destinations.	The C&S Specialist will work with others in Planning and Regeneration to realise this.
c 02	Secure decent digital connectivity for all of Mid Devon.	The C&S Specialist will encourage this via Planning and Regeneration teams.
c 03	Work with education providers to secure appropriate post-16 provision within the district to minimise the need to commute out for A/T level studies.	The C&S Specialist will encourage this via Planning and Regeneration teams.
c 04	Promote new, more integrated approaches to promoting good health and healthier living especially in the context of planned new developments.	The C&S Specialist will encourage this via Planning and Regeneration teams.

Table 2 - Climate Strategy (CS) 2020-24 Key Priorities

	Key Priorities	Notes on actions taken
1	Increase climate knowledge, literacy and capacity at Mid Devon District Council.	Net Zero Advisory Group (NZAG) active. The C&S Specialist consulted NZAG on 15 April 2021 and will work with the learning and communications teams on a programme of learning and engagement.

2	Identify schemes that will put us on track for net zero carbon by 2030.	A timeline for reviewing and costing the Council's Climate Action Plan was submitted to Scrutiny Committee 15 March 2021. The Council has decided to procure greener electricity to reduce its climate impact.
3	Enable and encourage the use of renewable energy locally.	EV chargers. Solar PV scheme.
4	Create a 'Community Climate & Biodiversity Support Fund'.	The C&S Specialist will seek funding from internal and external sources. The NZAG has begun to consider how best to set up a grant.
5	Identify cycling and walking priorities and opportunities	TBC. The C&S Specialist will seek funding and partnership opportunities. Must link into Devon county level activities / plans.
6	Review and update MDDC Procurement strategies.	Topic raised at NZAG 15 April 2021; once the procurement post is filled, strategies can be discussed and implemented.

1.2. Monitoring the Council's Carbon Footprint.

- 1.2.1. The Council reports its 'Greenhouse Gas Inventory' or 'Carbon Footprint' which is an assessment of its climate change impact as an organisation, measured in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e). The tCO₂e is based on the Global Warming Potential (GWP) of different greenhouse gases over a 100-year period in comparison to carbon dioxide (CO₂).
- 1.2.2. Carbon Footprint assessments were carried out by the University of Exeter using internationally accepted methods, and cover Scopes 1, 2, and 3.
- 1.2.3. For the reporting period inclusive of April 2018 to March 2019: gross emissions were 20,372 tCO₂e. This was the 'baseline' year.
- 1.2.4. For the reporting period inclusive of April 2019 to March 2020: gross emissions were 19,754 tCO₂e and nett emissions were 19,439 tCO₂e.
- 1.2.5. Work for the reporting period April 2020 to March 2021 is in progress. Results will be reported as soon as available. (We are aware the 2019-2020 carbon footprint was 439 tonnes higher than the next 2020-2021 target of 19,000 tonnes or less - with at least 439 tonnes to cut.)
- 1.2.6. Net emissions are calculated based on reductions in greenhouse gas emissions linked to e.g. the generation of renewable energy. Net emissions will be estimated in retrospect for 2018-2019.

Table 3 - Mid Devon District Council - Carbon Footprint

Year	Gross (tCO₂e)	Net (tCO₂e)
Apr 2018 - Mar 2019	20,372	(TBC)
Apr 2019 - Mar 2020	19,754	19,439

Contact for more Information: Andrew Busby - Corporate Manager Property, Leisure and Climate Change: Email ABusby@MidDevon.gov.uk Tel: 01884 255255.
Jason Ball - Climate and Sustainability Specialist: Email: JBall@MidDevon.gov.uk
Tel: 01884 255255.

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP 13 JULY 2021

REVIEW OF TREE POLICY

Cabinet Member(s): Cllr Colin Slade Cabinet Member for the Environment and Climate Change.

Responsible Officer: Andrew Busby Corporate Manager for Property, Leisure and Climate Change.

Reason for Report: To inform members of proposed changes to the Tree Policy following the recent scheduled review and to recommend to Cabinet the adoption of this policy for a further five years.

Recommendation: The PDG recommends that Cabinet adopts the revised Tree Policy attached at Annex A for five years.

Financial Implications: There are no direct financial implications arising from this review. It should be noted that the impact of Ash Die Back and the management of trees affected would become more significant. It is anticipated that development of the tree stock to support Net Zero carbon emissions will have limited direct cost impact.

Budget and Policy Framework: It is essential that the budget for trees is maintained to enable the Council to fulfil its obligations for their management. Development of the stock in support of Net Zero is anticipated to be delivered with support group volunteers and 'free issue' trees with limited direct budget impact.

Legal Implications: The Council could be prosecuted or a civil claim brought in the event of any injury arising from a falling or dangerous tree.

Risk Assessment: A Tree Policy that sets out how Mid Devon manages its tree stock is essential and ensures that the inherent risk associated with trees is managed.

Equality Impact Assessment: This Policy does not directly impact any Equality issues.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: Trees form an essential part of our landscape and it is essential they are looked after. Trees enhance our open space, contribute to well-being and support the mitigation of the effects of climate change.

Impact on Climate Change: Trees form an essential element of the Council's drive towards Net Zero carbon emissions.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Community Services Committee originally adopted Mid Devon's Tree Policy in March 2006 and it was last reviewed by Members in 2016.

- 1.2 In line with Council protocol, after five years the Tree Policy is scheduled for a further review. The revised policy is attached at Annex A.
- 1.3 A leaflet for Guidance to Residents reflects the Tree Policy and is available at our offices and can also be found on the Council's web page. Annex B.

2.0 **Scope of Policy**

- 2.1 The Policy covers only the management of the Council's trees and woodland.
- 2.2 It does not cover:
 - a) Protected trees (Tree Preservation Orders, Conservation areas and Planning Conditions) on private land
 - b) Trees affected by development
 - c) Dangerous privately owned trees
 - d) Privately owned trees or woodland
 - e) Trees managed by another authority or agency
 - f) High hedges

3.0 **Changes to Previous Version**

- 3.1 There is no fundamental change to how the Council shall deal with tree issues and with its current Tree Policy.
- 3.2 The previous version of the Policy was set out with a number of conservation objectives and set out with clear headings stating how the Council shall deal with subjects such as Tree Maintenance, Tree Pruning, Tree Removal, Tree Planting and Subsidence.
- 3.3 This revision restates and reinforces the objective and principles of the previous policy and seeks to raise the profile of the part trees can play in the Council's carbon reduction and Net Zero objective obligations, in light of the Climate Emergency declaration.
- 3.4 This revision makes reference to Ash Dieback disease. Trees affected will be managed in-line with the Policy for pruning and felling as necessary. It should be noted that this may consume an increasing element of the tree budget.

4.0 **Management Arrangements**

- 4.1 The Council manages its own stock by initially surveying its trees, recording this survey on the tree database/ GIS system and follow-up cyclical inspections with period based on risk assessment score.

- 4.2 Management Plans are being prepared for areas of more dense tree stock for their maintenance and development as amenity and environmental assets.
- 4.3 Concerns raised by residents or the impact of unforeseen events are dealt with on a case by case basis in accordance with the Policy.

5.0 Finance

- 5.1 The budget for tree management sits within the General Fund Parks and Open Space cost centre. In the current 2021/22 financial year is £26k made up of £14.1k for works, £2.2k for software and £9.7k Tree Officer salary contribution. The Housing Revenue Account has budget of £19.8k made up of £10k for works and £9.8k Tree Officer salary contribution and Planning a £13k budget for Tree Officer salary contribution.
- 5.2 The Property Services unit manages the tree stock on the General Fund and supports the Housing Service with the management of trees on HRA land.

6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 The Tree Policy has been reviewed in 2021 and Climate Change objectives have been considered; there is no fundamental change to the existing Tree Policy.
- 6.2 There is a recommendation to the Environmental PDG to recommend the renewal of the tree policy for a further five years.

Contact for more Information: Andrew Busby -Corporate Manager for Property, Leisure and Climate Change, Email: abusby@middevon.gov.uk ,Tel: 01884255255.

Circulation of the Report: Cabinet Member for the Environment and Climate Change, Leadership Team.

List of Background Papers:

Proposals for Tree Planting –Environment Policy Development Group 10 March 2020

<https://democracy.middevon.gov.uk/documents/s16929/Environment%20PDGTree%20Reportv2%20Final%20280220.pdf>

Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan – Environment Policy Development Group 8 September 2020

<https://democracy.middevon.gov.uk/documents/s18313/Environment%20pdg%20Climate%20Strategy%20Report%2008092020%20v4.pdf>

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

TREE CONSERVATION AND MAINTENANCE POLICY

For trees owned or managed by Mid Devon District Council

VISION

A healthy, diverse and expanding population of trees that enhances the environment of Mid Devon.

Aims

The aims of the Policy are to:

- *Conserve and protect the tree resource of the District Council by establishing clear objectives and policy.*
- *Provide clarity over why decisions and actions are or are not taken.*
- *Work towards a proactive management of trees not just a reactive service.*
- *Balance the risk and nuisance to persons and property against the other aims.*

Scope

This Policy covers individual trees or groups of trees and woodland owned by Mid Devon.

It does not cover the management of privately owned trees or woodland, trees managed by another authority or agency.

High Hedges, Tree Preservation Orders, and trees within Conservation Areas are not covered by this Policy as they are subject to separate legislation.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Council owns or controls a large and varied population of trees. They are scattered across a range of landholdings from parks and housing estates to road verges and village greens. These trees form a vital conservation and amenity resource and add to the visual environment that signifies Mid Devon as a predominately rural area.
- 1.2 The trees also contribute to the Council's climate change objectives.
- 1.3 This Policy will guide the Council in conserving, managing and developing that resource and will help fulfil its Corporate Plan, namely Environment and related climate change commitments.

- 1.4 The Environment Policy Development Group has, as one of its responsibilities, the setting of Policy for the conservation and management of trees and woodlands across all service areas
- 1.5 Policy relating to development planning issues as they affect the landscape and environment is already contained within the Local Plan. This Tree Policy adds to those policies and will, it is envisaged, link with the Local Development Framework.
- 1.6 This Tree Policy in particular applies to Council owned or controlled trees affected by development, but not subject to normal planning scrutiny because the development is permitted by virtue of the General (Permitted) Development Order 1994 or other exceptions.
- 1.7 Trees within the grounds of Council owned housing stock will be covered by these policies subject also to the provision of the tenancy agreements. Where housing stock is to be disposed of to associations or other multiple owners they should be encouraged to adopt these policies.
- 1.8 Where the Council sells or otherwise disposes of land it must ensure the trees contained therein are adequately protected against removal or poor management so that the trees may provide visual amenity now and/or in the future. This may be achieved through the use of Tree Preservation Orders.
- 1.9 The aims are given effect by the following objectives.

2.0 Tree Management

- 2.1 Mid Devon has a wide range of trees ranging from newly planted to one of the oldest trees in Devon. The Council manages trees in open spaces, parks, cemeteries, on housing land and on adopted land following development. The mature trees within its formal parks are an important asset to the Mid Devon landscape.
- 2.2 Before undertaking tree work the status of the tree(s) shall be considered to ensure the requirements of the various Planning, Forestry and Wildlife and Countryside Acts and Regulations are met. Development Control shall be provided with the required notice of works to trees within a Conservation Area and apply for works to trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders, as is considered to be best practice in accordance with guidance.
- 2.3 Before negotiations are started for the disposal of Council land, the Corporate Manager for Property should be consulted to see if a full tree survey is needed so that appropriate measures to protect trees can be considered.
- 2.4 A full tree survey shall be undertaken on Council land that is to be developed to ensure sympathetic development and so that the amenity provided by the trees is preserved.
- 2.5 Management decisions are made in the context of the wider benefit of the trees to the general public and wildlife conservation. Tree works will be

evaluated primarily in relation to the assessment of risk posed, visual amenity and environmental benefit offered.

- 2.6 Where the best technical solution for a tree incurs significant additional expenditure, the cost of the work shall be balanced against the tree's value assessed using the procedure of CAVAT (Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees). If the best solution is beyond available resources the Corporate Manager for Property shall be consulted.
- 2.7 The Council will continue a rolling maintenance plan to reduce avoidable risks. This will include an inspection regime, which is recorded on an electronic database. The maintenance plan will highlight issues such as:
- a) The removal of identifiable risks
 - b) The pruning of new and young trees to ensure a good stock
 - c) The removal or pruning of trees where they are proven to be causing excessive problems or significantly affecting the quality of life (this will be discussed further within the Policy)
- 2.8 Works to trees outside the programmed maintenance plan will only be undertaken when the tree is clearly identified as being a hazard or with reasonable probability will become a hazard, i.e. it is:
- a) Unsafe
 - b) Obstructing public footpaths or roads
 - c) Proven to be damaging property
- 2.9 The Council shall, wherever practicable, vigorously pursue any perpetrators of serious acts of wilful damage or destruction to its trees.

3.0 Woodland Management

- 3.1 Mid Devon owns several small areas of woodland which are managed for conservation, public access and safety. Management Plans will be prepared for improvement and development.

4.0 Tree Pruning

- 4.1 Trees, from time to time may require pruning. Ideally trees would be planted in situations where pruning would not become necessary, however it is recognised that this has often not been the case. Pruning may become necessary if a tree is to be retained in a space that is too small, to prolong the safe life of a mature tree, to alleviate a nuisance, to remove a hazard or formative pruning (where young newly planted trees are pruned to encourage a good branch structure). A request for tree pruning will be considered on a case by case basis but as a general rule:
- 4.2 Permission will not normally be given to prune trees because of:
- a) Leaf fall
 - b) Fruit fall
 - c) Bird droppings

- d) Interference with TV signals
- e) They block a view
- f) They cause an acceptable level of shading
- g) Fears that they may damage a building or surface with no evidence
- h) Aphid infestation (Honeydew)
- i) Because they are considered by some to be too tall
- j) Because they overhang an adjacent property, where no damage is likely (each case is assessed individually)
- k) They are shading solar panels

4.3 Permission for pruning will normally be considered or granted where the work is in the interests of the tree's future and accords with the latest version of BS3998 Tree Work Recommendations (2010) and:

- a) Is required to prevent proven direct or indirect damage to a building
- b) Would not adversely affect public amenity
- c) Where it is necessary to improve the growth of adjacent better quality trees
- d) In cases of excessive shading where the public amenity will not be affected

5.0 Tree Removal

5.1 There is a need to conserve the present tree cover but on occasion tree removal may be justified. This Policy sets out circumstances where tree removal may be acceptable.

5.2 The principle reasons for tree removal may be where a tree is in a hazardous condition, is causing proven damage to a building; or its removal would benefit the long term development of adjacent, better quality trees.

5.2.1 Cases of shading of property and garden are considered individually. Where shading is excessive and shown to affect the living conditions of those involved, consideration may be given to the removal of the tree. In the majority of cases claims of trees causing shading is not sufficient reason to have trees removed.

5.2.2 Any request for tree removal will be considered on a case by case basis but as a general rule:-

5.3 Permission will not normally be given to remove trees because of:

- a) Leaf fall
- b) Fruit fall
- c) Bird droppings
- d) Interference with TV signals
- e) They block a view
- f) They cause an acceptable level of shading
- g) Fears that they may damage buildings with no evidence
- h) They are deemed to be too tall
- i) Aphid infestation (Honeydew)
- j) They are shading solar panels

5.4 However, the Council does recognise that there may be occasions where trees can cause excessive problems when in close proximity to property, which can significantly affect the quality of life. In such exceptional circumstance the Council may consider removing a Council owned tree. When reaching a decision the Council will take into account:

- a) Public amenity value
- b) Species
- c) Size
- d) Age
- e) Condition
- f) Density of the canopy
- g) Proximity to the building
- h) Any proven damage
- i) Scope for replanting with a more suitable species

5.5 Normally consideration will only be given to fell a Council tree if one or more of the following apply:

- a) The tree is proven to be causing or likely to be causing damage to a building (see subsidence).
- b) Where a council tree is in a hazardous condition and felling is the only solution.
- c) Where a significant level of shading is caused to a home or garden and the tree is not of exceptional amenity value (An assessment will be made for each individual request).
- d) Where the removal of the tree would be in the interests of good silvicultural or arboricultural management and would benefit the long term development of adjacent better quality trees.

5.6 Where there is a requirement or duty to plant a replacement tree it shall be of suitable size and species to avoid causing future problems. On the whole replacement trees are necessary where permission has been given to fell protected trees. The Council will endeavour to plant replacement trees where suitable, following removal; this may require finding a more suitable location or careful species selection.

6.0 Tree Planting

6.1 The Council wishes to increase the tree cover across the District, but budget restrictions may mean that we cannot commit to replacing every Council tree that is felled. Where public amenity is affected by tree removal we will endeavour to plant replacement trees.

6.2 The Council follows the Right Tree – Right Place approach: the principal of which is to ensure that only trees appropriate for a site are considered and hence avoiding potential problems forever.

6.3 Planting native trees will generally be preferred especially if the intent is to encourage wildlife. Non-native specimens may be selected for park and slightly more formal areas as these species are often an important feature of

the landscape, particularly in town. Many of the species present in our parks are non-native. Consideration will also be given to current pest and disease problems when selecting trees.

- 6.4 The Council has a commitment for tree planting to support Net Zero carbon emission objectives and is actively engaging with volunteer groups to supplement its own resource for tree planting and woodland management.

7.0 Subsidence

- 7.1 Subsidence is a complex interaction between the soil, building, climate and vegetation that occurs on highly **shrinkable clay soils** when the soil supporting all or part of a building dries out and consequently shrinks, resulting in part of a building moving downwards.

- 7.2 Trees lose water from leaves through transpiration that is replenished by water taken from the soil by the roots. If the tree takes more water from the soil than is replaced by rainfall, the soil will gradually dry out. Trees have a large root system and they can dry the soil to a greater depth, critically below the level of foundations. The amount of water trees can remove from the soil can vary between different species. This policy seeks to set out the Council's response to both subsidence claims against its own trees.

- 7.3 The opposite of subsidence is a process called 'heave' and this occurs as **shrinkable clay soil** rehydrates and begins to increase in volume exerting upward pressure. Heave can also cause damage to buildings and is just as undesirable as subsidence.

- 7.4 However, trees are not the only factors that can cause building movement. For example natural seasonal soil moisture changes, localised geological variations, lack of flank wall restraint, over loading of internal walls, internal alterations reducing the load bearing capacity of the original building, installation of replacement windows without proper support, loft conversions, settlement and land slip etc. can cause building movement.

- 7.5 While the Council recognises its responsibilities for the trees it manages, it will expect any claim against its own trees to be supported by sufficient evidence to show that the tree in question, on the balance of probabilities, is an influencing cause in the subsidence.

- 7.6 Where necessary the Council will obtain expert specialist advice to verify submitted evidence and where it demonstrates that the tree is an influencing cause, permission to remove the tree will not be unreasonably withheld.

- 7.7 Modern building standards mean that the risk to newer buildings tends to be isolated and the Council will expect new buildings to be built to industry guidance and therefore should not subside due to trees that were in existence when the building was constructed.

- 7.8 Where cracking to property has occurred you should consult with your insurers to determine a probable cause.

- 7.9 There is no evidenced based or credible guidance as to how close trees need to be to cause damage; although there is some information on the internet which the Council feels can be quite misleading. Many trees and houses are able to co-exist happily in often close proximity.
- 7.10 The Council will not normally subject its trees to a regular cycle of heavy pruning to deal with suspected subsidence damage. Instead it will usually opt for removal and replacement planting with an alternative species that will not cause future subsidence related problems.
- 7.11 It should be noted that cases of tree related subsidence are rare in the Mid Devon area.

8.0 Provision of Advice

- 8.1 The Council recognises the need to raise awareness of tree issues. One way to achieve this is to provide a range of easily understood and relevant arboricultural advice. A “Tree Guidance” leaflet has been produced which aims to answers many of the frequently asked questions relating to tree problems. The leaflet is available at the Council offices and on the Mid Devon Web Site.
- 8.2 The Council may provide verbal information to assist with commonly asked questions but is unable to offer a full advisory service to private individuals. It will encourage the use of the Arboricultural Association’s Directory of registered consultants and contractors.
- 8.3 The Council would like to be involved in community projects relating to tree planting and maintenance and assist with environmental education within the community of Mid Devon as and where requested, appropriate and according to available resources.

9.0 Supplementary

- 9.1 The Council will use contractors for tree work who can demonstrate compliance with all the necessary health and safety regulations can provide the highest standard of work operationally and meet the highest arboricultural standards. Preference, where appropriate or available, may be given to those contractors approved by the Arboricultural Association.
- 9.2 The Corporate Manager for Property shall review this policy on a regular basis and recommend necessary changes. This may include data on infringements, referrals, problems of interpretation or operation and gaps in coverage.

Tree Guidance

Introduction

Mid Devon District Council is firmly committed to maintaining and enhancing the areas trees and woodlands, as a vital part of the environment.

In view of the benefits that we receive from trees and the Council's responsibility for tree management and protection it is fitting for the Council to set out its approach to these issues. The purpose of this document is to identify and address fundamental issues raised by members of the public with frequently asked questions. If the questions identified within this document do not answer your enquiry please contact our Tree Officer on 01884 255255 for a case by case assessment.

The benefits of urban trees within Mid Devon

There is a substantial body of research that supports the following benefits that trees bring to urban areas.

Environmental

- Reduce localised temperature extremes.
- Provide shade, making streets and buildings cooler in summer.
- Help to improve air quality by reducing dust and particulates.
- Improve environmental performance of buildings.
- Help to reduce traffic noise, absorbing and deflecting sound.
- Help to reduce local wind speeds.
- Increase biodiversity and provide food and shelter for wildlife.
- Assist in land remediation.
- Reduce the effects of flash flooding by rainfall interception.

Social

- Improve the quality and perception of the urban environment.
- Create community focal points and landmark links.
- Create sense of place and local identity.
- Benefit communities socially by instilling higher public esteem and pride for an area.
- Positive impact on both physical and mental health and well being.
- Positive impact on crime reduction.
- Improve health in the urban population.

Economic

- Have the potential to increase residential and commercial property values by between 7% to 15%.
- Improve the environmental performance of buildings and therefore the economic performance through reducing heating and cooling costs.
- Can provide mature landscapes that confer a premium for development sites.
- Assist the appreciation of property values proportionate to their scale as they grow larger.
- Creating a positive perception for prospective purchasers of property.
- Enhance the prospects of securing planning permission.
- Improve health in the urban population, thus reducing healthcare costs.
- Provide a potential long term renewable energy resource.

What will the Council do about...

The Council owned tree is too big, moves in the wind and looks dangerous...

The Mid Devon District Council Tree Officer is a qualified tree expert who will inspect a tree following an enquiry or in-line with the tree risk management strategy following routine inspections. All inspections are recorded electronically. It is recognised that the movement of trees in the wind does not automatically signify that a tree is dangerous, our inspection will determine its condition.

The tree outside my house in the pavement is blocking the passage of pedestrians and or vehicles...

Trees will be pruned to meet the legal requirement as stated within the Highways Act as identified by the County Councils Highways Inspectors.

The tree outside my house has not been pruned for ages, is too tall and needs to be lopped back...

Trees in Mid Devon District Council ownership are regularly inspected, any safety or maintenance related works are reported at this time. Mid Devon District Council does not reduce the height of trees as a matter of course, as this can stimulate rapid regrowth and/or cause significant defects in the tree's structure, which are hard to detect.

A council owned tree is shading my property...

Householders have no right to light from across a neighbour's land. Likewise there is no right to a view, and a view obstructed by the growth of trees cannot legally be regarded as a nuisance. Where requests are made to prune trees to increase light levels, each instance will be assessed on its merits. The householder may be assisted where appropriate, if this is possible without excess injury to or removal of healthy trees or branches. As a general policy the council will not undertake the topping, thinning or felling of trees simply to allow more light to a property, where the trees in question would not otherwise require any surgery.



The tree is making a sticky mess on my car or garden...

The problem is caused by aphid infestation and is known as honeydew. This is a particular problem with tree species such as Lime and Sycamore. Unfortunately this is a problem that cannot be solved by pruning or spraying with insecticides. Mid Devon District Council will prune trees where the work complies with best practice but will not fell or disfigure trees to deal with this issue. The sugar solution is only a mild one and should not affect paintwork on cars, if the car is washed at regular intervals.

Birds roosting in the trees outside my house are creating a mess on my car or drive...

This inconvenience is not sufficient justification to remove or disfigure the tree. Unfortunately pruning the tree is not the solution either, as the birds will simply roost on the remaining branches.

Tree branches growing across my boundary...

There is no requirement in law to prevent trees spreading over a boundary. However, whilst there is no obligation to prune trees, if branches or roots encroach on to neighbouring land they are legally regarded as a nuisance. Under the terms of law the tree owner is not obliged to cut back the branches overhanging their neighbours garden. The onus is on the owner of the adjacent land concerned to action their legal right and 'abate the nuisance'. Where requests are made to prune trees that overhang a boundary each instance will be assessed on its merits. As a general policy, the council will only undertake work to lessen tree encroachment, where the extent of that encroachment is considered significant in relation to the size and position of the trees. Where a tree's branches touch or are very close to a building, the work will take priority. Where overhang of the boundary is relatively minor or at considerable height, works may not be undertaken. Alternatively they may be considered for re-inspection within two years, depending on the size, type and growth of the trees concerned. Where tree roots are deemed to have encroached, works will only be undertaken where damage to property can be shown, beyond reasonable doubt, to have been a causal factor or damage is reasonably foreseeable in the future.

The tree is effecting my television and satellite reception...

There is no legal right to television reception. Existing trees on neighbouring land which interfere with television reception, especially with satellite transmissions are unlikely to be regarded as a nuisance in law. As a policy the council will not undertake the topping, thinning or felling of trees simply to improve television or satellite reception, where the trees in question would not otherwise require any surgery.

Tree position, general nuisance and interference...

Although trees may be considered an inconvenience to those living adjacent to them, by law they must be shown to be a substantial interference to a neighbour's comfort and convenience to be considered a nuisance. As a general policy the council will not undertake the topping, thinning or felling of trees simply to prevent the accumulation of leaves, seeds or minor debris on adjacent property, where the trees in question would not otherwise require any surgery.

The tree is causing damage to my Utility services...

Instances of underground pipes being broken by the growth of tree roots are very rare, but penetration and blockage of damaged pipes is not uncommon. As a general policy the council will not undertake the topping, thinning or felling of trees to prevent roots entering damaged pipes. Repair of the defect in the pipe is the only certain remedy that will prevent future problems. Modern materials and joints will significantly reduce pipe damage and subsequent root encroachment in the future.

The tree is covered in ivy and is killing it...

Ivy is a climbing, scrambling plant abundant as a groundcover shrub in the under storey of many rural woodlands. It has a variety of conservation benefits and forms an integral part of a woodlands habitat. In the urban environment there is the need to balance three main considerations for its retention: tree safety, conservation and aesthetics. Ivy causes no direct damage to trees. However in some situations it may be considered unsightly and more importantly can create problems for efficient management by obscuring structural defects and fungal fruiting bodies. It also increases the weight of a tree's crown and the 'sail' effect during the wet, windier, winter months, when deciduous trees have shed their leaves. As a general policy the council undertake the removal of ivy from trees only where it is considered necessary to aid visual tree health assessment.

My neighbour's trees are blocking my light, what can I do?

Technically your neighbour only has a duty to ensure their trees are safe. There is currently no height restriction on trees. If you have concerns regarding a tree ask your neighbour how they intend to maintain it: you may be able to cut the overhanging branches back to the boundary. However, before either you or your neighbour undertakes works to any trees it is important to check the trees are not covered by a Tree Preservation Order, or located within a Conservation Area.

A tree is lifting paving slabs/affecting my drive, can I cut the roots of a protected tree?

Cutting the roots of any tree is generally ill-advised as it may affect the tree's health and stability. If a tree is covered by a Tree Preservation Order, or if it stands in a Conservation Area an application will be required before root pruning can take place.

My tree doesn't look very healthy can the Council advise me? If not where else can I seek advice?

Local tree contractors and consultants will be able to offer advice on the health and management of trees however this is not a service that is currently offered by the council's Tree Officer. Further details of tree contractors and consultants operating throughout the UK are available from the Arboricultural Association web site www.trees.org.uk.

What do I do if I think someone has/is or are intending to work on a protected tree?

Contact Mid Devon District Council immediately and we can check to see if the work is authorised and if not take appropriate action. All queries regarding potentially unauthorised works will be dealt with in the strictest confidence.

The tree roots are blocking my drains, what can I do?

It is very unusual for roots to physically break drains and associated pipe work. However, tree roots can be opportunistic and if an old pipe with poor joints is leaking into the surrounding soil this will attract the roots that may then exploit the existing weakness. Then, when repairs are required, a proliferation of tree roots often leads to the blame being placed with a nearby tree. However replacement of faulty drains/pipes with modern materials will usually eliminate the leak and stop problems from reoccurring. Again if you believe tree roots have caused damage to structures you should consult your insurers or an expert.

As a general policy the council will not undertake the topping, thinning or felling of trees to prevent roots entering damaged pipes. Repair of the defect in the pipe is the only certain remedy that will prevent future problems. Modern materials and joints will significantly reduce pipe damage and subsequent root encroachment in the future.

I have a big tree near my property, I am worried about the damage the roots may be doing to my house, what should I do?

Tree roots may potentially cause damage to built structures in two ways:

Direct damage – is caused when the physical expansion of tree roots or stem lifts paving stones or cracks walls etc. Due to the weight of a house no amount of physical expansion will affect it - but garden walls and small structures such as garages or outbuildings might be at risk.

Indirect damage – can be caused to larger structures such as houses when trees roots grow underneath the foundations, extract the water there causing clay soils to shrink and the structure to subside. If a building has been built on clay soil near an existing tree, and that tree is then removed, the soil may expand which can cause heave (the opposite of subsidence). Modern building standards mean that the risk to newer buildings tends to be isolated and the council will expect new buildings to be built to industry guidance and therefore they should not subside due to trees that were in existence at the time they were built. Should you believe that trees are the cause of cracking to property then you should consult with your insurers to determine the probable cause.

There is no evidenced based or credible guidance as to how close trees need to be to cause damage although there is some information on the internet, which the council has found to be quite misleading. Many trees and houses are able to co-exist happily in often close proximity.

How can I tell if my tree is safe?

Such assessments are best made by qualified experts however this is not a service that is currently offered by the Council's Tree Officer. Further details of tree contractors and consultants operating throughout the UK are available from the Arboricultural Association web site www.trees.org.uk.

ENVIRONMENT PDG 13TH JULY 2021

PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER - DOGS

Cabinet Member(s): Cllr Colin Slade, Cabinet Member for the Environment

Responsible Officer: Vicky Lowman, Environment & Enforcement Manager

Reason for Report and Recommendations: This Report sets out the key findings from the consultation on a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for the Mid Devon area which ran from 21st May to 18th June 2021, to update the Environment PDG (and the Cabinet) on the feedback received from the PSPO public consultation and to seek approval on a revised PSPO to be made in response to the consultation.

RECOMMENDATION: that Cabinet be asked:

- 1. To resolve to make and bring into force the draft PSPO at Appendix A**
- 2. To authorise the Monitoring Officer to take all necessary steps to make and bring it into force the draft PSPO at Appendix A**

Financial Implications: Whilst a consequence of enforcement may be an increase in Fixed Penalty Notices, income generation is not the reason for introducing a new PSPO. New signage will need procuring to enable enforcement for all areas listed within the Schedules. Where possible we will recycle old signage to reduce costs.

Budget and Policy Framework: The Council had measures in place to control dogs under Dog Control Orders made under the Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act 2005. These became PSPOs (under transitional provisions in the Anti-social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014) but expired on the 19th of October 2020. The making of the revised PSPO is to ensure approved measures to control dogs.

Legal Implications: The revised PSPO is designed to curb anti-social behaviour arising from dog fouling and other matters which is to be set out in the revised PSPO. The Explanatory Notes for the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 explain that “the term “anti-social behaviour” describes the everyday nuisance, disorder and crime that has a huge impact on victims’ quality of life.” Further it states that “much of what is described as anti-social behaviour is criminal (for example, vandalism, graffiti, aggressive begging and people being drunk or rowdy in public), but current legislation also provides a range of civil powers, ... these offer an alternative to criminal prosecution and give the police and other agencies the ability to deal with the cumulative impact of an individual’s behaviour, rather than focus on a specific offence. Any PSPO approved by the Council is for a period of no more than 3 years.

Risk Assessment: While no PSPO is in place the Council is at risk of not being able to enforce infringements which could result in reputational damage for not taking appropriate action against offenders. The Council will also be at risk of not meeting statutory duties such as under Section 89 of the Environment Protection Act 1990 to ensure that land is clear of litter which includes dog waste

Equality Impact Assessment: An updated EIA can be found at Appendix D.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: The Street Scene Enforcement Service is a frontline service which works throughout the District ensuring cleanliness and attractiveness of our public realm through both education and enforcement.

Impact on Climate Change: A PSPO requires or prohibits certain activities from taking place in certain places (restricted areas) in order to prevent or reduce any detrimental effect caused by those activities to local surroundings and people. Further, reduced levels of dog related anti-social behaviour improve the desirability of our open spaces.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Council made Dog Control Orders under the Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act 2005. These became PSPOs under transitional provisions in the Anti-social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014, but these PSPOs automatically expired on the 19th October 2020.
- 1.2 A previous draft PSPO in relation to dogs, with the approval of the Cabinet and on the recommendation of the Environment PDG, went out for public consultation from 12th May 2020 to 17th July 2020
- 1.3 After the consultation ended a Special meeting of the Environment PDG, was held on the 19th October 2020. Members raised a number of concerns about the draft PSPO including that the plans submitted with the draft PSPO contained errors. It recommended to the Cabinet that the draft PSPO be redrafted to take account of the public consultation responses and on additional areas proposed before it went out again for further public consultation. The Cabinet on the 29th October 2020 endorsed this recommendation.
- 1.4 A revised PSPO was sent to a Special meeting of the Environment PDG on 13th April 2021 and then to Cabinet on the 13th May 2021. Authority was granted to consult with members of the public and other relevant stakeholders to introduce the revised PSPO, with the fixed penalty for breach of the PSPO to be set at the maximum level permitted of £100. A copy of the revised PSPO can be found at Appendix A.
- 1.5 The revised PSPO went out to public consultation from 21st May 2021 to 18th June 2021
- 1.6 This Report sets out a summary of the provisions of the revised PSPO that went out for consultation, a review of the relevant considerations involved in deciding whether to bring the revised PSPO into force and a review of the responses to the consultation.

2.0 SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE REVISED PSPO (APPENDIX A)

2.1 Prohibiting dog fouling

The revised PSPO prohibits dog fouling in all areas within the District of Mid Devon defined as “Public Spaces”. The term “Public Spaces” is defined at clause 1.1 of the revised PSPO to mean land within the District of Mid Devon, which is open to the air including covered land which is open on at least one side and to which the public are entitled and permitted to have access, with or without payment, with the exception of Forestry Commission Land

Clause 5.1.1 of the revised PSPO provides that in any Public Space if a dog defecates at any time the person in charge of the dog must remove the faeces from the land forthwith

Clause 5.1.2 of the revised PSPO provides that a person in charge of a dog must have the appropriate means to pick up the faeces and must produce this if required to do so by an authorised officer or a police constable.

The local authority provides bins in parks and many other public areas which may be used by dog owners. If there is not a bin around, it should be taken home for disposal.

2.2 Dog on Leads

Clause 6 of the revised PSPO deals with the requirement of dogs on leads.

Dogs must be on leads if any of the following apply:

- (a) In any public cemeteries or churchyards which are listed in Schedule B to the revised PSPO and shown on the relevant plans to the revised PSPO.
- (b) In any public parks which are listed in Schedule C to the revised PSPO and shown on the relevant plans to the revised PSPO.
- (c) If requested by an authorised officer or a police constable where reasonably necessary to prevent a nuisance or behaviour by the dog likely to cause alarm, distress or disturbance to any other person or animal or bird on the land.

2.3 Excluding Dogs from enclosed play areas

Clause 7 of the revised PSPO excludes dogs from enclosed play areas, which are listed in Schedule D and shown on the relevant plans to the revised PSPO.

2.4 Limit on the number of dogs

Clause 8 of the revised PSPO limits the number of dogs a person can be in control of in a Public Space to 6 dogs.

2.5 Exemptions

Clause 10 sets out certain exemptions. These cover those needing assistance dogs or with some form of disability which might prevent them from complying with the revised PSPO. There are also exemptions for certain working dogs i.e. those involved in law enforcement, military duties, statutory emergency services and search/rescue and those using a working dog for agricultural activities or exempt hunting as set out in Schedule 1 of the Hunting Act 2004.

2.6 Offences

Clause 9 sets out that breach of any of the requirements or prohibitions listed above would constitute a criminal offence which could be prosecuted. Instead of prosecution the Council can issue a FPN as an alternative. The proposed fixed penalty of £100 is designed to maximise the deterrent. If payment of the fixed penalty is made within 14 days from the date of the FPN the penalty is reduced to £50. If there is a refusal to pay the fixed penalty, the case may be taken to court, and on conviction a fine of up to £1000 could be imposed.

2.7 Defences to offences under clauses 5, 6, 7 and 8

Offences under these clauses will not be committed if:

- (a) A person has a reasonable excuse
- (b) A person has permission from the owner of the land
- (c) A person is exempt under clause 10

SCHEDULE A of the Revised PSPO refers to a Map of District shown on Plan 1 to the PSPO

SCHEDULE B of the Revised PSPO has the following list of the Cemeteries and Churchyards shown on the respective plans attached to the Revised PSPO

Plan 2 – All Saints Church Cemetery, Culmstock

Plan 3 – Cemetery, Black Dog

Plan 4 – Burial Ground, Cheriton Fitzpaine

Plan 5 – St Matthew’s Church, Cheriton Fitzpaine

Plan 6 – Methodist Cemetery, Copplestone

Plan 7 – St John the Baptist Church, Cove, Tiverton

Plan 8 – Cemetery, Crediton

Plan 9 - Cemetery, Cullompton

Plan 10 – Cemetery, Culmstock

Plan 11 – Cemetery, Halberton

Plan 12 – Cemetery, Hemyock

Plan 13 – St Andrew’s Church Cemetery, Colebrooke

Plan 14 – St Andrew’s Church Cemetery, Cullompton

Plan 15 – St George’s Church, Tiverton

Plan 16 – St Mary’s Church Cemetery, Hemyock

Plan 17 – St Mary’s Church Cemetery, Uffculme

Plan 18 – St Mary’s Church, Willand
Plan 19 – Cemetery, Tiverton
Plan 20 – Cemetery, Uffculme
Plan 21 – Cemetery, Wembworthy
Plan 22 – Cemetery, Willand

SCHEDULE C of the Revised PSPO has the following list of Public Parks shown on the respective plans attached to the Revised PSPO

Plan 23 – Skate park, Lords Meadow, Crediton
Plan 24 – Newcombes Meadow, Crediton
Plan 25 – Skate park, Meadow Lane, Cullompton
Plan 26 – Ploudal Road Play Area, Cullompton
Plan 27 – Logan Way, Hemyock
Plan 28 – Amory Park, Tiverton
Plan 29 – Skate park, Bolham Road, Tiverton
Plan 30 – Marley Close, Tiverton
Plan 31 – People’s Park, Tiverton
Plan 32 – Priory Road, Tiverton
Plan 33 - Westexe Recreation Ground, Tiverton
Plan 34 – Play Area, Westleigh
Plan 35 - Recreation Ground (Jubilee Field), Gables Road, Willand
Plan 36 – Victoria Close, Willand

SCHEDULE D of the Revised PSPO has the following list of Enclosed Play Areas shown on the respective plans attached to the Revised PSPO

Plan 37 – Recreation Ground, Morebath Road, Bampton
Plan 38 - Play Area, Station Road, Bampton
Plan 39 - Play Area, Godfrey Gardens, Bow
Plan 40 - Play Area, Iter Park, Bow
Plan 41 - Play Area, St Martins Close, Bow
Plan 42 - Play Area, Village Hall, Bow
Plan 43 - Play Area, Barnes Close, Bradninch
Plan 44 - Play Area, Townlands, Bradninch
Plan 45 - Play Area, Bray Close, Burlescombe
Plan 46 - Play Area, Chawleigh
Plan 47 - Recreation Ground, Chawleigh
Plan 48 - Play Area, Glebelands, Cheriton Bishop
Plan 49 - Play Area, Landboat View, Cheriton Fitzpaine
Plan 50 - Play Area, Coleford
Plan 51 - Play Area, Fernworthy Park, Copplestone
Plan 52 - Play Area, Sunnymead, Copplestone
Plan 53 - Play Area, Barnfield, Crediton
Plan 54 - Play Area, Beacon Park, Crediton
Plan 55 - Play Area, Beech Park, Crediton
Plan 56 - Play Area, Cromwells Meadow, Crediton
Plan 57 - Play Area, Fulda Crescent, Crediton
Plan 58 - Play Area, Kirton Drive, Crediton
Plan 59 - Play Area, Lords Meadow, Crediton

Plan 60 - Play Area, Monks Close, Crediton
Plan 61 - Play Area, Newcombes Meadow, Crediton
Plan 62 - Play Area, Queen Elizabeth Drive, Crediton
Plan 63 - Play Area, Spinning Path Gardens, Crediton
Plan 64 - Play Area, Tuckers Meadow, Crediton
Plan 65 - Play Area, Walnut Drive, Crediton
Plan 66 - Play Area, Ash Drive, Cullompton
Plan 67 - Play Area, Bockland Close, Cullompton
Plan 68 - Play Area, Bullfinch Close, Cullompton
Plan 69 - Play Area, Chaffinch Drive, Cullompton
Plan 70 - Play Area, Conifer Close, Cullompton
Plan 71 - Play Area, Crossparks, Cullompton
Plan 72 - Play Area, Dove Close, Cullompton
Plan 73 - Play Area, Hanover Gardens, Cullompton
Plan 74 - Play Area, Haymans Close, Cullompton
Plan 75 - Play Area, Haymans Green, Cullompton
Plan 76 - Play Area, Headweir Road, Cullompton
Plan 77 - Play Area, Knightswood, Cullompton
Plan 78 - Play Area, Linden Road, Cullompton
Plan 79 - Play Area, Linear Park, Cullompton
Plan 80 - Play Area, Rivermead, Cullompton
Plan 81 - Play Area, Saxon Close, Cullompton
Plan 82 - Play Area, Siskin Chase, Cullompton
Plan 83 - Play Area, Spindlebury, Cullompton
Plan 84 - Play Area, Starlings Roost, Cullompton
Plan 85 - Play Area, Stoneyford, Cullompton
Plan 86 - Play Area, Tufty Park, Cullompton
Plan 87 - Play Area, Water Meadow, Cullompton
Plan 88 - Play Area, Windsor Close, Cullompton
Plan 89 - Play Area, Hunter's Hill, Culmstock
Plan 90 - Play Area, Lower Town Halberton
Plan 91 - Play Area, Hollingarth Way, Hemyock
Plan 92 - Play Area, Logan Way, Hemyock
Plan 93 - Play Area, Longmead, Hemyock
Plan 94 - Play Area, Millhayes, Hemyock
Plan 95 - Play Area, Holcombe Rogus
Plan 96 - Play Area, Church Close, Lapford
Plan 97 - Play Area, Greenaway, Morchard Bishop
Plan 98 - Play Area, Wood Lane, Morchard Bishop
Plan 99 - Recreation Ground, Oakford
Plan 100 - Play Area, Puddington
Plan 101 - Play Area, Cornlands, Sampford Peverell
Plan 102 - Play Area, Mill Lane, Sandford
Plan 103 – Play Area, Newbuildings Sandford
Plan 104 - Play Area, Town Barton, Sandford
Plan 105 - Recreation Ground, School Close, Shobrooke
Plan 106 - Play Area, Silverton
Plan 107 - Skate park, Silverton
Plan 108 - Play Area, Ellerhayes, Silverton
Plan 109 - Play Area, Amory Park, Tiverton
Plan 110 - Play Area, Ashley Rise, Tiverton
Plan 111 - Play Area, Banskia Close, Tiverton

Plan 112 - Play Area, Coles Mead, Tiverton
Plan 113 - Play Area, Everett Place, Tiverton
Plan 114 - Play Area, Grand Western Canal, Canal Hill, Tiverton
Plan 115 - Play Area, Hawthorne Road, Tiverton
Plan 116 - Play Area, Orchard Leigh, Tiverton
Plan 117 - Play Area, Palmerston Park, Tiverton
Plan 118 - Play Area, Popham Close, Tiverton
Plan 119 - Play Area, Spencer Drive, Tiverton
Plan 120 - Play Area, Starkey Close, Tiverton
Plan 121 - Play Area, Trickey Close, Tiverton
Plan 122 - Play Area, Waylands Road, Tiverton
Plan 123 - Play Area, Westexe Recreation Ground, Tiverton
Plan 124 - Play Area, Wilcombe, Tiverton
Plan 125 - Play Area, Culm Valley Way, Uffculme
Plan 126 - Play Area, Recreation Ground, Highland Terrace, Uffculme
Plan 127 - Play Area, Pathfields, Uffculme
Plan 128 - Play Area, Pippins Field, Uffculme
Plan 129 - Play Area, Wembworthy
Plan 130 - Play Area, Buttercup Road, Willand
Plan 131 - Play Area, Chestnut Drive, Willand
Plan 132 - Play Area, Gables Lea, Willand
Plan 133 - Play Area, Harpitt Close, Willand
Plan 134 - Play Area, Mallow Court, Willand
Plan 135 - Play Area, South View, Willand
Plan 136 - Play Area, The Orchards, Willand
Plan 137 - Play Area, Worcester Crescent, Willand

3.0 REVIEW OF CONSIDERATIONS INVOLVED IN DECIDING WHETHER TO BRING THE REVISED PSPO INTO FORCE

3.1 Under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (Section 59) a local authority may make a PSPO if satisfied on reasonable grounds that the following two conditions have been met:

- The activities carried on in a public place within the authority's area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality or it is likely that activities will be carried on in a public place within that area and that they will have such an effect, and
- The effect or likely effect of the activities are to be of a persistent or continuing nature, such as to make the activities unreasonable and justifying any restrictions imposed in the PSPO.

3.2 Between 1 April 2019 and 31 March 2020 the Council received 70 correctly completed reports of antisocial behaviour relating to dogs:

- 51 dog fouling reports
- 18 dog on dog/person reports
- 1 nuisance behaviour report

- 3.3 Responsible dog ownership enforcement via a PSPO will aid the reduction of risk to the general public of diseases such as toxocariasis from dog faeces; freedom from potential animal attacks and safeguarding the public and wildlife via the 'dogs on a lead' elements.
- 3.4 Any requirements or prohibitions that are to be imposed must be both reasonable to impose and aimed at preventing or reducing the risk of the detrimental effect from continuing, occurring or recurring.
- 3.5 The decision to make a PSPO is discretionary but the consequence of not having a PSPO may lead to a small percentage of irresponsible dog owners allowing their dogs to run out of control and not picking up after them. This is likely to have an effect on the quality of life of others using the public spaces.
- 3.6 One of the advantages to having a PSPO in place is that if there is an offence of failing to comply with a requirement or prohibition then the offender may be given a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN); if the FPN is not paid then the offender may be prosecuted.
- 3.7 This can be contrasted with the alternative of using a Community Protection Notice ("CPN"). The purpose of a CPN is similar to a PSPO, which is to stop a person aged 16 or over, business or organisation committing anti-social behaviour which spoils the community's quality of life, however the use of a CPN is considered problematic in the context of dog control.
- 3.8 Prior to the issue of a CPN a written warning must be issued to the individual concerned that if they do not stop the anti-social behaviour i.e. their dog fouling, they could be issued with a CPN. Only if the dog fouling happens again on a separate occasion can a CPN be issued. If the dog fouling then happens again on another separate occasion, in breach of the CPN, an offence is committed and a FPN can be issued. It is submitted that the public would be concerned if a FPN could only be issued on the third occasion of the dog fouling.
- 3.9 Similar issues apply in using the Dogs Act 1871 in relation to dangerous dogs. Civil proceedings that a dog is dangerous, and not kept under proper control can be brought at a Magistrates' Court and this can be done by the police, local authorities, or individual members of the public. If the Magistrates are satisfied that the complaint is justified they can make any order they feel appropriate to require the owner to ensure that the dog is kept under proper control or in extreme cases destroyed. This type of action is usually only appropriate for serious cases and is time consuming involving court hearings which can take considerable time to arrange
- 3.10 There are other criminal offences that can be prosecuted under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 and the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 (as amended) in relation to dogs out of control and dangerous dogs. Such prosecutions would be time consuming and expensive
- 3.11 A check of the websites of Devon district councils as well as the unitary council Plymouth, reveal the following:

- 6 of the 8 district councils report on their website they have a dog control PSPO.
 - Plymouth Council reports on its website it has a dog control PSPO.
- 3.12 It should be noted that in the revised PSPO, the number of areas subject to the requirement of dogs on leads has been reduced from 50 as per the previous draft PSPO to 14. This means that there are more areas available where dogs will be allowed to be off their leads.
- 3.13 This change is to reflect the first public consultation response in relation to the question of whether the public agree that dogs should be kept on leads in the named public parks. The response was 50.22% against the question. Officers recognise that under the Animal Welfare Act 2006 dog owners are required to provide for the welfare needs of their dogs and that in most cases this will include off-lead exercise
- 3.14 This reduction in areas subject to dogs on leads control has resulted in more localities being available in the District for dogs to be exercised freely. These areas do not require dogs to be on leads unless requested by an authorised officer or a police constable where reasonably necessary to prevent a nuisance or behaviour by the dog likely to cause alarm, distress or disturbance to any other person or animal or bird on the land.
- 3.15 There are also some dog runs in the District for example:
- Beacon Park, Crediton
 - Bluebell Avenue, Tiverton
 - Cottey Brook, Tiverton
 - Crow Bridge, Cullompton
 - Glebelands Road, Tiverton
 - The land at Moorhayes adjacent to Lea Road, Tiverton
 - Mountbatten Road, Tiverton
 - People’s Park, Crediton
 - Railway Walk Tiverton
 - River Exe Recreation Ground, Tiverton
 - The Oval, Tiverton
 - Knighthayes, Tiverton
 - CCA Fields, Cullompton
- 3.16 As summarised above Clause 8 of the revised PSPO limits the number of dogs a person can be in control of in a Public Space to 6 dogs.
- 3.17 The previous draft PSPO provided that only 4 dogs could be walked by any one person. The revised PSPO allows for 6 dogs to be walked at any one time. This figure takes into account the feedback given by Members at both the Environment PDG and Cabinet meetings, and in some of the responses to the first public consultation, about professional dog walkers being prejudiced by a lower number.

DEFRA has stated in its official guidance (“Dealing with irresponsible dog ownership Practitioner’s manual”) that “[w]hen setting the maximum number of dogs able to be walked by one person, the most important factor for

authorities to consider is the maximum number of dogs which a person can control; expert advice is that this should not exceed six”.

The Dogs Trust “Professional Dog Walkers’ Guidelines” states that the maximum number of dogs that can be walked at any one time should not exceed the number stated in the walker’s insurance policy and comply with local authority requirements regarding the number of dogs. It is recommended that no more than 4 dogs are walked at any one time. All dogs under a dog walker’s care should be reliably under control at all times and transported in accordance with the guidance in this document.

- 3.18 As summarised above the revised PSPO protects enclosed play areas by prohibiting dogs. Officers consider that this approach is justified as children are more susceptible to diseases from exposure to faeces and urine from dogs. Similarly it is felt that young children are more at risk of injury from dogs. This is because young children will naturally be excited whilst playing which may provoke a reaction from dogs in the area. The consequences of a dog attack on a young child is likely to be more severe than on an adult.

4.0 HUMAN RIGHTS

- 4.1 In deciding whether to make a PSPO, the Act says councils must have particular regard to the rights of freedom of expression and freedom of assembly set out in Articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The need to “have particular regard” to Articles 10 and 11 suggests that Parliament, in passing the Act, has sought to give these rights an elevated status in relation to deciding whether to make a PSPO.
- 4.2 PSPOs are a powerful remedy because they affect the behaviour of every person within a specified area rather than being targeted at individuals. For this reason the Council will need to ensure that they balance the need to tackle anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder against the desire and entitlement of the public to use a public space.

Article 10: freedom of expression

1. *Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers. This article shall not prevent States from requiring the licensing of broadcasting, television or cinema enterprises.*

2. *The exercise of these freedoms, since it carries with it duties and responsibilities, may be subject to such formalities, conditions, restrictions or penalties as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society, in the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or rights of others, for preventing the disclosure of information received in confidence, or for maintaining the authority and impartiality of the judiciary*

Article 11: freedom of assembly and association

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and to freedom of association with others, including the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

2. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of these rights other than such as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. This article shall not prevent the imposition of lawful restrictions on the exercise of these rights by members of the armed forces, of the police or of the administration of the State

4.3 Officers submit that making the revised PSPO will not unnecessarily interfere with what would otherwise be legitimate and lawful activity and that the revised PSPO does balance the need to tackle anti-social behaviour associated with dogs against the desire and entitlement of the public to use a public space.

5.0 2021 CONSULTATION

5.1 The consultation revised PSPO went out to public consultation from 21st May 2021 to 18th June 2021.

5.2 The following were stakeholders were consulted:

- All Parish & Town Councils in Mid Devon
- Chief Constable of Devon & Cornwall Police
- The Police & Crime Commissioner
- All neighbouring Local Authorities
- Operational Managers of all Council departments within Mid Devon District Council
- Community Centres
- Members of Parliament whose constituencies include part of the Mid Devon District
- All Councillors
- Ramblers & Walking Groups
- Animal Welfare Groups
- The Kennel Club
- Boarding Kennels within the Mid Devon District
- Sports Clubs
- Members of the public

5.3 The consultation included the opening and closing dates of when consultees could respond to the consultee, via:

- Letter
- Mid Devon District Council's website

- Newspaper Advert
- Email

For those who could not access the internet, other options were advertised, such as the option to send a letter. Officers also undertook direct consultation in the areas listed within the Schedules during the consultation period to ensure views from users were captured by providing a QR code to enable direct access to the consultation page on the Council website and a phone number for the customer services call centre. A hard copy of the revised PSPO and maps was also available at the front desk of Phoenix House which could be viewed by appointment.

5.4 The purpose of the consultation was to seek views on the Council’s intention to implement a PSPO in relation to dog controls within the Mid Devon District Council boundary. A breakdown of the responses is set out below in section 6 of this Report, but specific comments from the responses are to be found in the spreadsheet accompanying this Report at Appendix B.

5.5 A summary of the stakeholders’ responses can be found at Appendix C.

6.0 CONSULTATION RESULTS

6.1 Part A – Dog fouling

In respect of the proposed controls in the revised PSPO

- You must pick up your dog’s faeces, and
- You must always have something to pick up the faeces with, e.g. bags, and produce evidence of this if asked by an Enforcement Officer or the police.

The responses can be broken down as follows:-

Q1	Do you agree that those in charge of a dog (owners and walkers), should pick up their dog’s faeces in Public Places (as defined)?		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	187	99%
	NO	2	1%

Q2	Do you agree that every person in charge of a dog (owners and walkers) should carry sufficient appropriate means e.g. bags to pick up after the dog?		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	185	98%
	NO	3	2%

6.2 Part B – Dogs on leads

In respect of the proposed controls in the revised PSPO:

- Dogs to be on leads In public cemeteries which are listed in Schedule B to the revised PSPO
- Dogs to be leads in public parks which are listed in Schedule C to the revised PSPO
- Dogs to be on leads if requested by an authorised officer or a police constable

The responses can be broken down as follows:-

Q3a	Do you agree that dogs should be kept on leads In the named public cemeteries?		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	125	80%
Q3b	Do you agree that dogs should be kept on leads? In the named public parks		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	106	69%

Q3c	Do you agree that dogs should be kept on leads If requested by an Enforcement Officer or the Police??		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	102	73%

6.3 Part C – Excluding dogs from children’s play areas

In respect of the proposed control in the revised PSPO that dogs should be excluded from the enclosed play areas listed in Schedule D to the revised PSPO the response can be broken down as follows:

Q4	Do you agree that dogs should be excluded from the enclosed play areas identified at Schedule D to the Order?		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	169	90%
	NO	19	10%

6.4 Part D – Limit on the number of dogs

In respect of the proposed control in the revised PSPO that a limit should be set on the number of dogs under the control of the owner/walker the responses are broken down as follows:-

Q5	Do you agree that a limit should be set on the number of dogs under the control of the owner/walker when in Public Spaces?		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	161	86%
	NO	27	14%

Q6	Do you agree that the limit should be set at 6 dogs?		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	79	42%
	NO	107	58%

In relation to the Q6 specific comments in Appendix B Members will note that the public disagree quite strongly with the limit being set at 6 dogs.

6.5 Part E – Additional questions

Q7	Are there any adverse impacts to the proposals which you wish highlight		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	87	46%
	Skipped question	103	54%

Q8	The draft Order says dogs should be kept on leads in public parks identified in the Order at Schedule C. Do you think that this restriction should apply only during specific times or periods for the parks identified in the Order at Schedule C? For example: (1) the restriction of dogs on lead in the park only applies during the period 1 April to 30 September inclusive or (2) the restriction that dogs must be on lead applies only between the hours of 10:00 to 18:00 hours		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	50	27%
	Skipped	136	73%

Q9	Following on from Q8 which restriction would you consider to be more appropriate? SEASONAL RESTRICTION/TIME RESTRICTION.		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	18	22%
	Skipped	63	78%

Q10	Feedback from the first consultation suggested that increased education would reduce dog fouling with the District. Do you agree with this view? If YES, can you give details of the sort of education you think would be effective?		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	95	51%
	NO	92	49%

Q11	Do you own or walk dogs?		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	113	61%
	NO	72	39%

Q12	Do you walk dogs in Mid Devon?		
		Number	Percentage
	YES	116	63%
	NO	69	37%

7.0 ENFORCEMENT

- 7.1 If the revised PSPO is made, consideration will also need to be given to enforcement as there will be raised expectations from the public which will need to be managed. A stepped and proportionate approach to sanctions will need to be developed. The Council's enforcement policy must be followed in all instances.
- 7.2 If the amount of time spent on statutory and mandatory duties remains unchanged a total of 300 discretionary annual hours will be allocated to discretionary duties such as litter enforcement, compulsory recycling, Cleansing inspections and dog fouling patrols.

Duties	Allocation of Time
Compulsory Recycling	40%
Cleansing Inspections	10%
Litter Patrols	40%
Dog Fouling Patrols	10%

- 7.3 Although the PSPO is made by the Council, enforcement should be the responsibility of a wider group. Council officers will be able to enforce the

restrictions and requirements. In addition, police officers and PCSOs will have the ability to enforce the PSPO.

8.0 CONCLUSION

8.1 Officers submit that the revised PSPO, if made, will introduce a range of reasonable and proportionate prohibitions and requirements on the use of publicly accessible land that would better control the activities of irresponsible dog owners whilst enabling responsible dog owners to continue to exercise their dogs without undue restrictions. The consultation exercise has revealed widespread support for the measures.

Contact for more Information: Vicky Lowman Environment & Enforcement Manager
(01884 244601 vlowman@middevon.gov.uk)

Circulation of the Report: Cllr Colin Slade, Cabinet, Leadership Team

Appendix A - Revised PSPO and Schedules

Appendix B - 2021 Consultation specific responses summary

Appendix C - 2021 Consultation summary of the Stakeholder responses

Appendix D - Equality Impact Assessment

List of relevant documents:

Maps for schedules

<https://www.middevon.gov.uk/your-council/consultation-involvement/past-consultations/>

Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/12/contents/enacted>

Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (Publication of Public Spaces Protection Orders) Regulations 2014

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2014/2591/contents/made>

NHS information on Toxocariasis

<https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/toxocariasis/>

Keep Britain Tidy information on Dog Fouling Issues

https://www.keepbritaintidy.org/sites/default/files/resource/Keep%20Britain%20Tidy%20Policy%20Position_Dog%20Fouling.pdf

Local Government Association - Public Spaces Protection Orders – Guidance for Councils

https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/10.21%20PSPO%20guidance_06_1.pdf

DEFRA Dealing with irresponsible dog ownership Practitioner's manual (Oct 2014)

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/373429/dog-ownership-practitioners-manual-201411.pdf

Dogs Trust Professional Dog Walkers' Guidelines

<https://www.dogstrust.org.uk/news-events/news/dog%20walking%20guide%20online.pdf>

This page is intentionally left blank

**The Mid Devon (Public Spaces Protection)
(Dog Control) Order 2021**

**Section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime
and Policing Act 2014**

DRAFT

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Scope
3. Duration
4. Title
5. Dog Fouling
6. Dog on Leads
7. Dogs Excluded (Enclosed Play Areas)
8. Limit on number of dogs
9. Offences and Penalties
10. Exemptions
11. Appeal
12. Validity (Severance)

DRAFT

Introduction

Pursuant to Section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

Mid Devon District Council (in this Order called “the Council”), in exercise of its powers under Section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (“the Act”) and of all other enabling powers, after consultation carried out in accordance with the Act, and being satisfied that uncontrolled and irresponsible dog walking in public places has a detrimental effect on the quality of life of the local community and that the conditions set out in Section 59 of the Act are met, hereby makes the following Order.

1. Definitions and Interpretation

1.1 In the following provisions of this Order, the following terms shall have the meanings hereby respectively ascribed to them:-

“Authorised Officer” means a person who is authorised in writing by the Council for the purposes of this Order

“District of Mid Devon” means the land shown edge red on the plan marked “District” and referred to in Schedule A

“Person in Charge” means the person who has the dog in his possession, care or company at the time the offence is committed or otherwise, the owner or person who habitually has the dog in his possession

“Plans” means the plans attached to the Schedules to this Order

“Police Constable” means any person lawfully designated and authorised by a Chief Officer of Police to exercise the powers and duties of a Police Constable

“Public Spaces” means land within the District of Mid Devon, which is open to the air including covered land which is open on at least one side and to which the public are entitled and permitted to have access, with or without payment, with the exception of Forestry Commission Land

1.2 Except when the context otherwise requires, the singular includes the plural and vice-versa; and the masculine includes the feminine and vice-versa.

1.3 Reference to an Act of Parliament, statutory provision or statutory instrument includes a reference to that Act of Parliament, statutory provision or statutory instrument as amended, extended or re-enacted from time to time and to any regulations made under it.

1.4 References to articles and Schedules are to the Articles and Schedules of this Order.

1.5 Where land is listed in a Schedule the location and extent of the land is shown in the corresponding Plan referred to in the Schedule.

2. Scope

This Order applies to the Public Spaces, public parks, public cemeteries and churchyards and enclosed play areas cited in this Order within the District of Mid Devon, and shown on the plans to Schedules A, B, C and D hereto.

3. Duration

This Order shall come into effect on [] 2021 and shall remain in force for a period of 3 years from this date, unless extended by further orders made under the Council's statutory powers.

4. Title

This Order may be cited as "The Mid Devon (Public Spaces Protection) (Dog Control) Order 2021"

5. Dog Fouling

5.1 In any Public Spaces -

5.1.1 If a dog defecates at any time, the Person in Charge must remove the faeces from the land forthwith; and

5.1.2 A Person in Charge of a dog must have with them an appropriate means to pick up any faeces deposited by that dog, and must produce this if requested to do so by an Authorised Officer or Police Constable.

5.2 For the purposes of Article 5.1.1 -

5.2.1 Placing the faeces in a receptacle on the land which is provided for the purpose or for the disposal of waste, shall be sufficient removal from the land; and

5.2.2 Being unaware of the defecation (whether by reason of not being in the vicinity or otherwise), or not having a suitable device or means of removing the faeces shall not be a reasonable excuse for failing to remove the faeces.

6. Dogs on Leads

6.1 In any public cemetery or churchyard or part of it listed in Schedule B to this Order, any Person in Charge of a dog, at any time, must put and keep the dog on a lead and under proper control.

6.2 In any public park listed in Schedule C to this Order any Person in Charge of a dog, at any time, must put and keep the dog on a lead and under proper control.

6.3 Subject to Articles 6.1 and 6.2 in all Public Spaces a Person in Charge of a dog, at any time, must put and keep the dog on a lead and keep it under proper control when directed to do so by an Authorised Officer or Police Constable.

6.4 For the purposes of Article 6.3, an Authorised Officer or Police Constable shall only give a direction to put and keep a dog on a lead if such restraint is reasonably necessary to prevent a nuisance or behaviour by the dog likely to cause alarm, distress or disturbance to any other person or animal or bird on the land.

7. Dogs Excluded (Enclosed Play Areas)

A Person in Charge of a dog is prohibited from taking that dog onto, or permitting the dog to enter or remain on any enclosed play area listed in Schedule D to this Order.

8. Limit on number of dogs.

No person in any Public Spaces shall be in charge of more than 6 dogs at any time. This Article does not apply to enclosed play areas referred to in Article 7 as dogs are prohibited from the said enclosed play areas.

9 Offences and Penalties

9.1 Any failure to comply with the requirements or prohibitions imposed in Articles 5, 6, 7 and 8 of this Order shall constitute a criminal offence, unless:

9.1.1 The person has a reasonable excuse for failing to do so;

9.1.2 The owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so; or

9.1.3 The person is exempt under Article 10 of this Order.

9.2 Any person guilty of an offence under this Order shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale (on the date of this Order, this is set at £1,000).

9.3 A Fixed Penalty Notice may be issued by an Authorised Officer or Police Constable to anyone believed to have committed an offence under this Order. The Fixed Penalty shall be £100.00. Payment of the Fixed Penalty of £50.00 within 14 days from the date of the Fixed Penalty Notice will discharge the liability for prosecution.

10. Exemptions

10.1 The requirements and prohibitions imposed by this Order shall not apply to any person who:

10.1.1 is registered as blind, sight or hearing impaired under the National Assistance Act 1948, or any other legislation;

10.1.2 has a disability which affects his mobility, manual dexterity, physical coordination, or ability to lift, carry or otherwise move everyday objects, in respect of a dog trained by a registered charity and upon which he relies for assistance;

10.2.3 is using a working dog for purposes of law enforcement, military duties or statutory emergency services (search and rescue); or

10.2.4 is using a working dog for agricultural activities or exempt hunting as set out in Schedule 1 of the Hunting Act 2004.

11. Appeal

Any interested person (defined as an individual who lives in the restricted area or who regularly works in or visits that area) may question the validity of this Order, pursuant to Section 66 of the Act, on application made to the High Court within 6 weeks from the date of the Order.

12. Validity (Severance)

If any provision of this Order is held invalid or unenforceable for any reason by a court of competent jurisdiction, such provision shall be severed and the remainder of the provisions of the Order shall continue in full force and effect as if the Order had been executed with the invalid, illegal or unenforceable provision eliminated.

THE COMMON SEAL OF Mid Devon District Council

was hereunto affixed

in the presence of:-

Authorised Signatory

DRAFT

THE SCHEDULES

List of Plans

SCHEDULE A District of Mid Devon

Plan 1 – Map of District

SCHEDULE B Public Cemeteries and Churchyards

Plan 2 – All Saints Church Cemetery, Culmstock

Plan 3 – Cemetery, Black Dog

Plan 4 – Burial Ground, Cheriton Fitzpaine

Plan 5 – St Matthew's Church, Cheriton Fitzpaine

Plan 6 – Methodist Cemetery, Copplestone

Plan 7 – St John the Baptist Church, Cove, Tiverton

Plan 8 – Cemetery, Crediton

Plan 9 - Cemetery, Cullompton

Plan 10 – Cemetery, Culmstock

Plan 11 – Cemetery, Halberton

Plan 12 – Cemetery, Hemyock

Plan 13 – St Andrew's Church Cemetery, Colebrooke

Plan 14 – St Andrew's Church Cemetery, Cullompton

Plan 15 – St George's Church, Tiverton

Plan 16 – St Mary's Church Cemetery, Hemyock

Plan 17 – St Mary's Church Cemetery, Uffculme

Plan 18 – St Mary's Church, Willand

Plan 19 – Cemetery, Tiverton

Plan 20 – Cemetery, Uffculme

Plan 21 – Cemetery, Wembworthy

Plan 22 – Cemetery, Willand

SCHEDULE C

Public Parks

Plan 23 – Skate park, Lords Meadow, Crediton

Plan 24 – Newcombes Meadow, Crediton

Plan 25 – Skate park, Meadow Lane, Cullompton

Plan 26 – Ploudal Road Play Area, Cullompton

Plan 27 – Logan Way, Hemyock

Plan 28 – Amory Park, Tiverton

Plan 29 – Skate park, Bolham Road, Tiverton

Plan 30 – Marley Close, Tiverton

Plan 31 – People’s Park, Tiverton

Plan 32 – Priory Road, Tiverton

Plan 33 - Westexe Recreation Ground, Tiverton

Plan 34 – Play Area, Westleigh

Plan 35 - Recreation Ground (Jubilee Field), Gables Road, Willand

Plan 36 – Victoria Close, Willand

SCHEDULE D Enclosed Play Areas

- Plan 37 – Recreation Ground, Morebath Road, Bampton
- Plan 38 - Play Area, Station Road, Bampton
- Plan 39 - Play Area, Godfrey Gardens, Bow
- Plan 40 - Play Area, Iter Park, Bow
- Plan 41 - Play Area, St Martins Close, Bow
- Plan 42 - Play Area, Village Hall, Bow
- Plan 43 - Play Area, Barnes Close, Bradninch
- Plan 44 - Play Area, Townlands, Bradninch
- Plan 45 - Play Area, Bray Close, Burlescombe
- Plan 46 - Play Area, Chawleigh
- Plan 47 - Recreation Ground, Chawleigh
- Plan 48 - Play Area, Glebelands, Cheriton Bishop
- Plan 49 - Play Area, Landboat View, Cheriton Fitzpaine
- Plan 50 - Play Area, Coleford
- Plan 51 - Play Area, Fernworthy Park, Coppleshone
- Plan 52 - Play Area, Sunnymead, Coppleshone
- Plan 53 - Play Area, Barnfield, Crediton
- Plan 54 - Play Area, Beacon Park, Crediton
- Plan 55 - Play Area, Beech Park, Crediton
- Plan 56 - Play Area, Cromwells Meadow, Crediton
- Plan 57 - Play Area, Fulda Crescent, Crediton
- Plan 58 - Play Area, Kirton Drive, Crediton
- Plan 59 - Play Area, Lords Meadow, Crediton
- Plan 60 - Play Area, Monks Close, Crediton
- Plan 61 - Play Area, Newcombes Meadow, Crediton
- Plan 62 - Play Area, Queen Elizabeth Drive, Crediton
- Plan 63 - Play Area, Spinning Path Gardens, Crediton
- Plan 64 - Play Area, Tuckers Meadow, Crediton
- Plan 65 - Play Area, Walnut Drive, Crediton
- Plan 66 - Play Area, Ash Drive, Cullompton
- Plan 67 - Play Area, Bockland Close, Cullompton
- Plan 68 - Play Area, Bullfinch Close, Cullompton

Plan 69 - Play Area, Chaffinch Drive, Cullompton
Plan 70 - Play Area, Conifer Close, Cullompton
Plan 71 - Play Area, Crossparks, Cullompton
Plan 72 - Play Area, Dove Close, Cullompton
Plan 73 - Play Area, Hanover Gardens, Cullompton
Plan 74 - Play Area, Haymans Close, Cullompton
Plan 75 - Play Area, Haymans Green, Cullompton
Plan 76 - Play Area, Headweir Road, Cullompton
Plan 77 - Play Area, Knightswood, Cullompton
Plan 78 - Play Area, Linden Road, Cullompton
Plan 79 - Play Area, Linear Park, Cullompton
Plan 80 - Play Area, Rivermead, Cullompton
Plan 81 - Play Area, Saxon Close, Cullompton
Plan 82 - Play Area, Siskin Chase, Cullompton
Plan 83 - Play Area, Spindlebury, Cullompton
Plan 84 - Play Area, Starlings Roost, Cullompton
Plan 85 - Play Area, Stoneyford, Cullompton
Plan 86 - Play Area, Tufty Park, Cullompton
Plan 87 - Play Area, Water Meadow, Cullompton
Plan 88 - Play Area, Windsor Close, Cullompton
Plan 89 - Play Area, Hunter's Hill, Culmstock
Plan 90 - Play Area, Lower Town Halberton
Plan 91 - Play Area, Hollingarth Way, Hemyock
Plan 92 - Play Area, Logan Way, Hemyock
Plan 93 - Play Area, Longmead, Hemyock
Plan 94 - Play Area, Millhayes, Hemyock
Plan 95 - Play Area, Holcombe Rogus
Plan 96 - Play Area, Church Close, Lapford
Plan 97 - Play Area, Greenaway, Morchard Bishop
Plan 98 - Play Area, Wood Lane, Morchard Bishop
Plan 99 - Recreation Ground, Oakford
Plan 100 - Play Area, Puddington

Plan 101 - Play Area, Cornlands, Sampford Peverell
Plan 102 - Play Area, Mill Lane, Sandford
Plan 103 – Play Area, Newbuildings Sandford
Plan 104 - Play Area, Town Barton, Sandford
Plan 105 - Recreation Ground, School Close, Shobrooke
Plan 106 - Play Area, Silverton
Plan 107 - Skate park, Silverton
Plan 108 - Play Area, Ellerhayes, Silverton
Plan 109 - Play Area, Amory Park, Tiverton
Plan 110 - Play Area, Ashley Rise, Tiverton
Plan 111 - Play Area, Banskia Close, Tiverton
Plan 112 - Play Area, Coles Mead, Tiverton
Plan 113 - Play Area, Everett Place, Tiverton
Plan 114 - Play Area, Grand Western Canal, Canal Hill, Tiverton
Plan 115 - Play Area, Hawthorne Road, Tiverton
Plan 116 - Play Area, Orchard Leigh, Tiverton
Plan 117 - Play Area, Palmerston Park, Tiverton
Plan 118 - Play Area, Popham Close, Tiverton
Plan 119 - Play Area, Spencer Drive, Tiverton
Plan 120 - Play Area, Starkey Close, Tiverton
Plan 121 - Play Area, Trickey Close, Tiverton
Plan 122 - Play Area, Waylands Road, Tiverton
Plan 123 - Play Area, Westexe Recreation Ground, Tiverton
Plan 124 - Play Area, Wilcombe, Tiverton
Plan 125 - Play Area, Culm Valley Way, Uffculme
Plan 126 - Play Area, Recreation Ground, Highland Terrace, Uffculme
Plan 127 - Play Area, Pathfields, Uffculme
Plan 128 - Play Area, Pippins Field, Uffculme
Plan 129 - Play Area, Wembworthy
Plan 130 - Play Area, Buttercup Road, Willand
Plan 131 - Play Area, Chestnut Drive, Willand
Plan 132 - Play Area, Gables Lea, Willand
Plan 133 - Play Area, Harpitt Close, Willand

Plan 134 - Play Area, Mallow Court, Willand

Plan 135 - Play Area, South View, Willand

Plan 136 - Play Area, The Orchards, Willand

Plan 137 - Play Area, Worcester Crescent, Willand

DRAFT

Q1

I've ticked no because I believe that the current measures in place are more than adequate and most dog owners are perfectly capable of respecting public spaces and do collect their dogs mess. I strongly disapprove of further overly controlling measures to enforce dog owners therefore potentially criminalising good people and creating Further rules which have only the effect of making people feel under pressure and restricted. I believe dog owners are already very responsible and there are already good measures in place to keep our public spaces clean and safe.

"Re; Fouling of Land by Dogs Order: Dogs Trust consider 'scooping the poop' to be an integral element of responsible dog ownership and would fully support a well-implemented order on fouling. We urge the Council to enforce any such order rigorously. In order to maximise compliance we urge the Council to consider whether an adequate number of disposal points have been provided for responsible owners to use, to consider providing free disposal bags and to ensure that there is sufficient signage in place. "

They should clear up but I strongly oppose this as a focus of a PSPO - failure to do so should not be criminalised in this way

Basic health and safety. And common courtesy.

Absolutely. There is never any excuse for dog faeces not to be picked up

If you are responsible enough to have a dog then picking up dog poo is easy

I am a responsible dog owner and pick up my dog's faeces. Dog faeces can cause blindness, smell disgusting and are antisocial. Dog mess is offensive and has a detrimental impact on local environment.

Who want to step in faeces plus it could be dangerous especially for pregnant ladies and for children.

If you own a dog you are responsible for cleaning up after it!

Hygiene, elf and safety

Every dog owner I know agrees that it is unacceptable and disgusting not to pick it up, yet judging by the amount of dog faeces left in Public Places there are numerous other dog owners who don't.

I play football for bampton and there is nothing worse than on a Saturday after picking up dog mess before a game also you can't get it all and I have lost count the amount of time people have slid in dog mess is disgusting and very unpleasant.

Public health risks and common decency - completely disgusting that some don't do it.

It's a health risk not to pick up and also horrible to see on paths and walkways.

Owners should pick up there own dog poo.

It's disgusting & against the law not to. I am a dog owner & believe that is part of responsible ownership.

It is anti social to leave your dog's faeces anywhere within any public area, including footpaths. If you have a dog you should be responsible for clearing mess away.

It is a health hazard and unpleasant for others to see

Hygiene

It should be their responsibility as it's their dog. Same as littering.

There is far too much poo not picked up currently.

Because its discusting when I take my children to the recreation ground and we have to be on dog poo alert constantly!

Their dog, its faeces so their responsibilty

Yes and No, if the dog does it in a 'wild area' (like a patch of gorse bushes) and there's no way anyone is going to tread on it then it's best to leave it where it lies, however on a footpath then yes, however there should be equal fines for leaving filled poo bags to leaving dog poo

Including rural areas

Because all responsible dog owners should

I do not want to step in it and be constantly looking at the ground when out walking

health hazard unpleasant to look at and to smell, apart from the risk of stepping in faeces, particularly children.

Those few irresponsible owners give us good owners a bad name.

It's dangerous not to. It makes using parks and green spaces hazardous and unpleasant.

It is their responsibility to do so.

Unhygienic, detrimental to health, the main reason I avoid public areas

Hygiene and appearance of area

child safety, and unpleasant for walkers

It is good manners and safer for other users of the aw4a

They should pick up their dog's faeces wherever it is.

It is a known public health issue and horrible when children get dog mess on them.

This is obvious and as noted, the vast majority of people do it. However, Imposing a PSPO is a massively heavy handed overreach of the law and once in place, we will be at risk of being criminalised for any number of misdemeanors as decided by the whim of the local authority. This is a slow creep of excessive power.

dog faeces carry diseases and are dangerous to all, particularly young children. It put me off going to places where dog poo is not picked up. It sticks to your shoes and is difficult to remove. It is smelly and can be trodden into your house and car. It is generally disgusting.

Faeces must always be picked and responsible dog owners do. If bins are not available then bags should be taken home. Sometimes though very elderly people who find great companionship from their dogs have difficulty bending down to pick up.

As dogs usually defecate in the same area, this is extremely important to avoid faeces to build up

Dog faeces are unhygienic and unpleasant.

Of course. There's simply no excuse not to. These are public spaces for use by ALL and should be clean and safe.

It's unsightly and unpleasant if stepped upon

Do not leave them for others to clear up. I have had dog fouling on my front lawn

It is our responsibility to keep areas clean to prevent spreading of diseases and unwanted mess on shoes clothes etc.

It's a health issue to those who use recreational facilities. Children can become ill if we're they touch dog faeces. It's not nice to step dog faeces .

We have two dogs and always pick up their faeces however on walks we have spoken to several dog owners who refuse to do this. This needs to change as our village is an unpleasant and unhealthy place to walk when there is the risk of exposure to dog faeces, especially to children.

It's a health hazard at worst and a messy hazard in the least. Plus the dog owners responsibility.

To limit risk of infections and diseases both in humans and animals.

Unpleasant if not picked up and unhygienic

Because in the village of Uffculme where I live, the incidents of children stepping in for faeces is ridiculously high. In the village there is dog faeces in all the paths and more needs to be done to stop people leaving the faeces.

It would be anti social not to do so.

I believe it's a social responsibility to clear up after any animal you own. I am disabled and cannot walk so my wheelchair wheels are my legs, if people don't pick up their dogs poo I could end up going through it and then drive my wheelchair into my home, leaving excrement on my floors, which is not only disgusting but it can cause diseases that could blind me. It also means that my carer has to clean my wheels and the floor taking time away from caring for me. Just because someone was too lazy to pick up THEIR DOG's Poo.

Otherwise people step in it by accident. It is a nuisance and a risk to health.

Bacteria and disease spread very easily - particularly with young children - too easy for even adults to step in dog mess and not realise it - filth gets transmitted into houses

It's a disgusting health risk to the public.

Any responsible Dog owner should pick up after their Dog, with NO exceptions. I am a Dog owner.

There are no reasons not to: none.

Why should unsuspecting members of the public have to clean it off their shoes? Dog faeces can cause Toxoplasmosis, which is serious.

..and not restricted to 'Public Spaces'. To do otherwise is anti-social.

Obvious, why ask the reasons.

It's part of the responsibility of being a dog owner

I live on Bartows Causeway where there is always dog faeces - people let their dogs off the lead on their way to the park.

If you take on the responsibility of owning a dog you should pick up, not to is disrespectful to your community

It is important to have a clean space and not tread in dog excrement into your own homes along the streets back to homes, it is an expectation that this should be done by every own if they wish to own and dog.

Apart from the fact it is disgusting to step in, wheel a pushchair or mobility scooter/wheelchair, it is a public health hazard

Unpleasant and unhealthy to other walkers, children and farm animals

Dog Faeces are an environment hazard and should be picked up and disposed of in a bin

Risk of disease to dogs and children. Dog faeces can take 12 months to break down and may wash into storm drains. As a responsible dog owner It is common courtesy to pick up your dog's faeces, to keep our open spaces clean.

For the health & safety of the general public

Common sense, courtesy, hygiene, sociably acceptable etc. etc. etc.

too much dangerous fouling around Hensleigh area near to tiverton foxhounds. This has been going on for years/decades. I have sent 3 emails this year without response.

Public health

Dog mess is a serious health hazard and dog owners should be obliged to clear up after their dogs and dispose of the waste safely and appropriately.

Responsible Dog owners do

it's the decent thing to do

It is unhealthy and irresponsible to leave dog faeces on the ground.

No one wants to walk in dog faeces

Injurious to children's health and wellbeing; detrimental to enjoyment of environment. Responsible dog owners do this anyway, every dog owner should.

Health and safety and just good manners

Not to do so is a hazard to public health and demonstrates a complete lack of social responsibility

For the health of humans and dogs.

It is unacceptable for dog owners not to clear up after their pets, and it is most unpleasant to see pavements, and other public areas with dogs mess left on them.

Public health

Dog mess is smelly, dirty and dangerous, and people who are responsible for dogs should ensure that they remove it. This is a health and safety issue and there should be clear powers to stop fouling.

Because it's dangerous and revolting to leave dog faeces lying around.

It is no longer acceptable to leave your dog's faeces behind.

Foul smelling, especially in warm weather. Risk of spreading disease from dog to dog, other wildlife or anyone unfortunate enough to slip and fall in it!

'Disgusting and potentially dangerous when you step in it. Our village (Bampton) and the surrounding roads are plagued with people who will not pick up the mess

Pathogens in dog faeces are a danger to human health.

Every dog owner should be responsible for picking up the mess. Most owners do, and no matter how many orders you put in place, there will still be those that don't whether on a lead or not

Being in charge means 'in charge of EVERYTHING', including the poo! Council's have made it easy to dispose of them with 'Any Bin Will Do'. It is unkind to allow child buggies and bikes to unwittingly collect poo on their wheels and end up with it indoors at home or having to have a thorough scrub. I'm very old and a dog-owner but my sympathies lie with parents, children, walkers, cyclists...

it is their responsibility

dog faeces are a health hazard and responsible owners should take responsibility for their animals

We live in Crediton by the popular public footpath called tin pot ally - there is , on a daily basis bags of dog faeces and actual faeces littering the steps and pathways and even hung on the trees despite the provision of bins on the walk

Healthespecially that of children. Dog faeces make our streets and parks unwelcoming. Rapid control of dogs that turn dangerous.

If you own a dog you are responsible for any mess that dog makes. Others should not have to pick up after you or have the worry of stepping in dog mess.

Because dog faeces is a serious public nuisance and a health hazard. Cleaning it off shoes or clothing is grossly unpleasant and can be the cause of several serious illnesses

It is horrible for other people wanting to make use of the given area and especially with children

and heavily fined if not.

Q2

I believe that most dog owners already do carry appropriate measures to collect dog poo. However everyone is capable of making a mistake and forgetting something so therefore I do not feel it is appropriate to take yes in this box.

"We question the effectiveness of issuing on-the-spot fines for not being in possession of a poo bag and whether this is practical to enforce."

It is an essential part of responsible dog ownership

Again, they should but there are many reasons why someone might fail to do so and, again, to criminalise that failure in this way of a wholly disproportionate use of the law

If they can afford to keep a dog then they can afford bags for their mess.

Responsible dog owners do carry them. Some people walk their dogs off lead and do not seem to care when they wander off and have no idea what their doing

All dog owners should do this. Dog waste bags are cheap and readily available. No exceptions.

Why should someone who doesn't have a dog pay to clean up after lazy dog owners.

How can you pick up after your dog if you don't carry the appropriate and number of bags to pick up poo.

To pick up their poo.... I take my baby's nappy home with me. They should take their peta poo home with them

Picking up dog faeces is only part of the process, it should then be disposed of in the bins provided and not hung from trees or fences or flung into the undergrowth. Bampton Town Council provide both bags and bins in recreational areas but it makes no difference.

Always pick up after yourself

Part of the responsibility in owning a dog. There should also be requirements to use a bin and fines for those who leave bags of poo beside paths, hanging in trees etc. Disgusting.

No excuse not to be prepared

How else would they clean it up?

Your dog, your responsibility.

It is responsible ownership

Common courtesy

It should be totally their responsibility to pick up their animals mess abs so if course they should have something to pick it up and dispose of it.

There tiny and not hard to carry

Depends what you call appropriate Council need to provide more bins

They will not pick it up without bags

without bags, they are unable to remove faeces. Suggest an increase in bins to deposit. it would be impossible to enforce but why so some people hang the bags in hedges and on fences?

If they have no bags they are clearly not intending to pick up and should be prosecuted

If you own a dog you need to cleanup after it.

Dog owners need to be responsible for their own dog's mess and not rely on the council to provide them with bags, etc.

If you choose to have a child you choose to look after it including ensuring any biological waste is appropriately dealt with and disposed of, its no different with animals.

If they have no bags, they have no intention or picking up

To ensure they clear up their dogs mess

This is obvious and as noted, the vast majority of people do it. However, Imposing a PSPO is a massively heavy handed overreach of the law and once in place, we will be at risk of being criminalised for any number of misdemeanors as decided by the whim of the local authority. This is a slow creep of excessive power.

Having no poo bag is used as an excuse not to pick up and this is not right.

There is no excuse for not doing so,

It is very easy to pick up faeces and deposit the bags in bins

Bags needn't be expensive. Standard nappy bags are plentiful and cheap.

This should be mandatory.

If you wish to be a dog owner you need to accept the responsibilities that come with it.

To clean up the mess a dog has made. The bags should then be disposed of in either appropriate bins or at home.

If you more then one dog they don't do their business at the same time .

It is a dog owner or walkers responsibility to do this.

Their responsibility.

Dog not dof!

You cannot clean up after your dog unless you have the means with which to do so.

Won't be able to pick up if no bags

As a responsible owner you should always have dog bags to pick up faeces.

There is no excuse not to clear up the mess if they have the means to do so on their person.

It is very easy to put a handful of dog poo bags in your pocket or fix them to your dog lead and then when they are full - Take them home to dispose of - Do Not Hang On A Tree Branch !!

Prevention of spread of disease and unpleasant mess

As above. If owners don't carry bags then they have no intention of picking up their dog waste.

Any responsible Dog owner should pick up after their Dog, with NO exceptions. I am a Dog owner.

No reason not to

Of course. Why should it be left as a health hazard for people to step in?

how else to comply? walk the dog and look after it.

I know people who never pick up after their dog.

Shows your intention to do the right thing and pick up

Common sense and shows a responsible dog owner with good intent.

a responsible dog owner would already carry these, it's the ones who don't clean up that need to have this enforced

To save others treading in it

so that they can pick up after the dog

I agree that everyone should carry appropriate means to use to pick up dog faeces however enforcing this requirement could prove very difficult. You have to start considering what powers will council enforcement officers have to search individuals and require them to turn out their pockets.

Dogs often poo more than once on a walk & without the means of picking up they are unable to provide the required health & safety of the general public

Disposal of dog mess is best carried out using a compostable disposable waste bag. A clean and complete removal into a bag is the best way for an owner to clear it away completely.

Again responsible people do

they should, but we all forget them sometimes and i don't think a punitive measure should be the case for not carrying a bag.

If you decide that you want to keep a dog, you should take into account everything that you need to do so that the dog is not a nuisance in any way to others.

Owners/ walkers of dogs have a civic and moral responsibility to always be appropriately prepared to clear up after the dogs.

Have a dog -your responsibility

It's obvious. No bag.. No pick up.

Dogs can go 2 or3 times on each walk.

Dog owners, or a person exercising a dog(s) should be made aware that it is unacceptable, and unlawful, not to be prepared to clear up after it.

Dog owners need to show that they are responsible and having the means to remove faeces is just one way to show that they are prepared to manage dog mess.

Because not to do so would make question 1 impossible to achieve.

It is no longer acceptable to leave your dog's faeces behind.

And to dispose of in appropriate bins, or take the bag home for disposal. NOT just left in hedges, on pathsides etc.

No bag, no pick up. Collection bins are as important

Again, pathogens in the faeces constitute a risk to human health. It is deeply offensive to have to clean dog muck from shoes or clothing, especially children's footwear.

Bags are inexpensive and easy to carry. Of course they MUST pick up so of course they MUST have the means to do so.

without bags they cannot comply

if you own a dog then you should have the means to clean up after it.

To fulfil reasons given in section 1. Dogs may defecate several times on a walk.

If you have a dog - buy dog poo bags .. or use nappy sacks. They aren't expensive - some are biodegradable - there are plenty of bins to put them in.

Because there is a social obligation to pick the stuff up and it ought to be a legal obligation too.

It is no excuse to say you have run out of bags, most responsible dog owners know how many to take on a given walk and heavily fined if not.

If dog owners are approached at the end of a walk they may have already used the bags that they have taken out or given a spare bag to someone who has run out for example.

Q3

I'm unable to take any of the following boxes because I think it's common sense to put the dog on a lead when the owner knows it's not capable of controlling the dog without doing so. I prefer people to use common sense where possible.

All of the above

"Re; Dogs on Leads Order: Dogs Trust accept that there are some areas where it is desirable that dogs should be kept on a lead. Dogs Trust would urge the Council to consider the Animal Welfare Act 2006 section 9 requirements (the 'duty of care') that include the dog's need to exhibit normal behaviour patterns – this includes the need for sufficient exercise including the need to run off lead in appropriate areas. Dog Control Orders should not restrict the ability of dog keepers to comply with the requirements of this Act. The Council should ensure that there is an adequate number, and a variety of, well sign-posted areas locally for owners to exercise their dog off-lead. Re; Dogs on Lead by Direction Order: Dogs Trust enthusiastically support Dogs on Leads by Direction orders (for dogs that are considered to be out of control or causing alarm or distress to members of the public to be put on and kept on a lead when directed to do so by an authorised official). • We consider that this order is by far the most useful, other than the fouling order, because it allows enforcement officers to target the owners of dogs that are allowing them to cause a nuisance without restricting the responsible owner and their dog. As none of the other orders, less fouling, are likely to be effective without proper enforcement we would be content if the others were dropped in favour of this order. "

Part (a) & (c) YES part (b) answer YES & NO

I DISAGREE with ALL of the above, but it is not possible to leave all options unticked - this is a flaw in the design of the survey. There is already ample legal provision regarding proper control of dogs where this is a problem. In general, dog owners should be trusted to know how their dog can best be walked. Again, this kind of blanket proposal appears wholly disproportionate as a response to something that does not appear to be a problem in many of the local areas covered, and would also severely limit dog owners' options for walks that give their pets appropriate exercise, as well as forcing many of them into extra and longer car journeys to find places that are conducive to walks that give their dogs sufficient exercise and stimulation, harming other attempts by the council to encourage people to be more environmentally friendly. Furthermore, being on a lead is no guarantee that a dog is under control - an owner

that does not have appropriate control of their dog as a matter of course will rarely have any better control with a lead, although this might give others a false sense of security

I agree with all of the above. All dogs should be on leads in public areas. Too many owners allow their dogs to wander when exercising them. Extendable leads use should also be restricted in public areas.

There are signs at the entrances to the church yard in Bampton, but some dog owners pay no attention to this

I have tried to check all options above but the survey would not allow me to

What is the park for if dogs can't run around play if they are looked after by responsible owners and kept away from the children's play area. Bike riders and joggers no better than dog owners. Give the dogs and responsible owners a break .

Dogs should be kept on a lead at all times when out of their home.

I think it's bad news to specify that dogs have to be kept on leads in public parks. I completely understand in children's parks but public parks I think is terrible. My dog is so well behaved and walks to heel and I feel we are being penalised as other people don't know how to train their dogs. I always pick up my dog poop and again feel dog owners are all being tarnished with the same brush

There is no option for all of the above My children are scared of dogs and I don't want dogs running up to them, sniffing them, or reaching up to them.

I would like to check all of the above, and I would also like to see enforcement officers from time to time otherwise this PSPO is a pointless paper exercise.

I wanted to tick all the above but no option to do this. The behaviour of dogs can be erratic and as a passer-by you cannot know if a loose dog is aggressive or not. More people seem to have aggressive breeds these days too. I especially worry about children being attacked in parks and public spaces. It's not a nice feeling to be anxious when just enjoying family time in a public space.

The form will only allow me to select one option. I believe that all 3 are important.

Actually I would tick all three options, but the survey won't let me.

Parks except for enclosed play areas are designed for dog exercise.

Dogs shouldn't be allowed to go in areas such as the recreation ground or anywhere where children play or the public use for community events such as football matches etc., when there are other perfectly good fields to walk their dogs in! They would lick up the poo of it was in their garden I bet!

Within reason this is ok but sometimes the older generation can't travel to walk their dogs

Why Can't I tick all three (Non working) dogs in public place should be under the control of a lead

You can't check more than 1, although I think they should be on leads in church yards, parks I think it depends on the size of the park

Only play parks Council provide dog parks

I checked all 3

Dogs should be kept on leads in ALL public places

i would like to check them all

Churchyards are important and dogs should not roam free off leads.

They should be on leads in cemeteries and parks and if requested by officer

Enforcing the rules will be difficult and the fine is only damaging to those on a tight budget...the penalty should be higher and easier to enforce but also there should be a system for those trying to keep their pet if they are responsible with things like bags or leads available at discounted prices or through free serviced where necessary

I would have checked all

Should be applied in all circumstances

All of the above

Badly behaved dogs can be dangerous and frightening for both children and adults. They can also attack other dogs and animals.

With any of the above yes. However, Imposing a PSPO is a massively heavy handed overreach of the law and once in place, we will be at risk of being criminalised for any number of misdemeanors as decided by the whim of the local authority. This is a slow creep of excessive power.

Some public parks have large enough areas to allow dogs off lead in some areas

I ticked them all but they unticked and would only let me pick one - I think that all apply

I wanted to select all 3 of the options, however this was not possible. All dogs should be kept on suitable leads to avoid dogs attacking other dogs, children or cyclists, walkers as well as causing accidents by running into cyclists. It is distressing having to explain other dog owners that very few dogs are completely reliable and obedient and close control is required at all times which can only be achieved by keeping them on leads.

I want to be able to select all of the above options but am limited to one for some reason.

Schedule B excludes the cemetery/churchyard in my village of Zeal Monachorum. Please can this be added as the public regularly walk through.

I believe there should be designated areas where dogs can be let off lead. Pent up energy and the absence of dog socialisation often leads to dog aggression

I also think the Tiverton Canal should be included

Dogs should be allowed off lead exercise. It is absolutely ridiculous that you are going to force dogs to be on lead all the time!

Yes to all of the above

Tried to check all three.

Enforcement officers - will likely lead to the abuse of power (different for police, agree they should be listened to!). Not in all of the parks - dogs need exercise off the lead. By limiting public space for this there is the risk of more dogs off lead through land with livestock. They need somewhere large and safe to go. Solution is to fence around play equipment. Dogs should be on the lead at the skateparks - risk of injury to dogs and skaters.

The survey will only allow me to check one box but I want to check all the above.

All of the above

Dogs should be let off the lead if under control and providing not in enclosed play areas.

I think you should have the option to tick 1 and 3 options as I agree with two options .

I would have checked all three.

Dogs should be on leads at all times in public areas.

All three should be ticked

I'm trying to check all 3

all the above

A drip-drip towards banning dogs from everywhere.

Agree with all 3, only allows me to select 1.

because the survey would not allow me to check more than one !!!!

Restriction on Amory Park is unfair to dog walkers, currently 90 % is restricted for sports or BMX track, with a small triangle area used by dog walkers, why can't this area be fenced off for dog walkers for off lead throwing of balls etc, restricting the whole of Amory Park is unfair, and not considerate to dog walkers that currently use this area more often than sports field.

I do not agree that dogs should need to be on a lead in Willand Recreational Ground. Willand is one of the most densely populated areas as long as the owners have their dogs under control everyone should be able to enjoy this space. Dog owners pay council tax as well as parents and they should have appropriate areas where dogs can be exercised. During lockdown without the opportunity to travel this has been the only place with in the Parish Boundary that you can throw a ball for a dog.

I would have preferred to be able to tick all three locations

I think all things above should apply. I have seen several dogs attack other dogs causing harm and vets visits and this should not be allowed. I do not like dogs running towards me or my children I do not know if they are safe and I feel it is frightening.

There should be an area set aside where dogs could be freely exercised and socialised

I think that all of the above apply but it only allows one option to be checked

I agree to all 3 proposals.

all options

All the above.

I want to check all but the system

I wanted to check all of the above. I live in people's Park and have had 3 dogs off leads attack my pets, killing 2 and causing massive physical damage to my husband when he tried to protect one. I've seen at least 3 incidents of dogs off the lead attack other dogs, and twice of them knocking children off their bikes. The owners never seem to have control so dogs need to be kept on leads except in specific areas designated as dog areas

In public parks and cemeteries and churchyards amongst other places, to keep them from running round, urinating and messing in those areas and others.

Responsible people do not need to be told what to do with their animals

respectfulness to mourners is absolutely necessary. dog exercise areas have not been mentioned at all. this issue doesn't have to be one thing or the other without any compromise. a few signs in parks have to be more cost effective than extra enforcement officers patrolling the parks.

I think that dogs should be kept on leads in all the above environments.

would tick all of these. Very glad to see List in Schedule has been amended

Agree with all 3

Agree with all 3.

I agree with all of the options but am unable to select them all. I have repeatedly seen and talked to dog owners who believe that their dog is fine to let off the lead in parks and there is no law to stop them

Why isn't it all of these, or at least the first two?

Dogs have no place in cemeteries and churchyards and I believe they should be banned. Having said that, I am a frequent visitor to Crediton's extremely well kept cemetery and I cannot recall ever having seen a dog in it.

I agree that dogs should be under control, however there should be provision where dogs can be exercised off lead. It is cruel to deny some animals the need to run, especially those of medium and larger size. The largest users of park areas are those using them for exercising their dogs.

Agree with all above, but can only check one. Some dogs, children and adults are anxious when dogs get close and therefore cannot use public paths where dogs might be off lead. . Not all dogs recall well - therefore ALL dogs on leads in any public space.

Strict enforcement of the rules. Name & shame in the local paper.

Sorry, but this survey is flawed, you can only tick 1 box. I agree with all of the above

Absolutely on all three options.

To the maximum extent permissible by law, dogs should be held on a short lead at all times when not in secure private areas.

Park (in Wembworthy) prohibits dogs already.

People and dogs need space and the latter has been a lifeline for people like me during Covid restrictions and with no immediate family in the UK. Some free-running space is important. Sweden and Finland provide such areas for dogs and their owners. It seems that the Council may take away a few that are

available (i.e. Old Park, Tiverton) with no provision for more. Elderly people (like me) often take dogs (on leads, of course) to visit graves while people with no respect let dogs run free. Dog wardens need to work out of office hours to catch offenders like the man who every evening lets his dog loose in Tiverton Cemetery and another with two large dogs throws balls between the gravestones.

In all places of public use.

Dogs should not be in either cemetery or churchyard. Safety & health should always come first.

Q4

I do not agree that any further enforcement needs to be carried out to ensure that dog owners keep dogs out of public parks. Most public parks have a sign that restricts dogs from entering and where this is seen dog owners are already complying with that guidance.

"Re; Dog Exclusion Order: Dogs Trust accepts that there are some areas where it is desirable that dogs should be excluded, such as children's play areas, however we would recommend that exclusion areas are kept to a minimum and that, for enforcement reasons, they are restricted to enclosed areas. We would consider it more difficult to enforce an exclusion order in areas that lack clear boundaries. Dogs Trust would highlight the need to provide plenty of signage to direct owners to alternative areas nearby in which to exercise dogs. "

every child should be able to play safely in an area where there is no possibility of dog fouling

The exclusion of dogs from play areas, especially since of the larger sites, would constitute an indefensible discrimination as to which residents can and can't use public amenities, as well as reinforcing for many children that dogs are to be feared.

Children should be allowed safe clean areas to play in. Dogs have the use of most of park areas, it is not a hardship for them to have no access to play areas. Ideally the dogs should be given their own designated area to run and play.

Dogs should be excluded from children's play areas, BUT (in the case of the Bampton play area on Morebath road) the gates are regularly left open by the people using the play area. If gate springs were fitted, the gates would automatically shut themselves. Young teenagers using the play area yesterday had a terrier with them and refused to take it out. Their argument was that it was friendly and they had poo bags with them

Risk of children playing in dog mess in playground and health risk to pregnant women

Safety

Children need areas to play safely in without being frightened of aggressive dogs and avoiding dog poo.

As the above.. my children are scared of dogs

Obviously we don't want dog faeces where children are playing but we also don't want aggressive dogs in these areas. Not all children are comfortable with dogs and should be able to play safely.

Reasons above

For public safety and cleanliness & health.

Many children (and adults) are frightened of dogs especially when they run around and jump up at them

Everyone should be able to enjoy the spaces, you shouldn't be allowed to exclude one type of person (dog owners). It's about making sure people respect the areas i.e. picking up dog pop, throwing away rubbish, not vandalising play areas etc. No banning people from using it.

To provide dog-free play space for children's play. I am pleased to see that the Bampton Morebath Road play area is included but that the wider recreation field is not. This is used by large numbers of Bampton residents for exercising dogs (often while kids play in the new play area) so the arrangement works well for family life.

Dog faeces is detrimental to health not to mention disgusting if stood in or children touch it. Also not everyone is happy around dogs and many children are scared of them. It is intimidating for children and parents if there are dogs in a safe area.

Dogs and ex item dogs do not mix

The owner can then ensure the dog doesn't out of sight and leave a mess.

Children are there. Some dogs are not good around children.

It's disgusting!

So often families particularly in our area have dogs and children. This is the countryside. If you ensure that ALL dogs are kept on leads at ALL times the owners (including myself) cannot miss their dogs defalcating and MUST pick it up or we can never come to Bampton which effects us the community the income of Bampton and our dogs welfare for exercise.

If you are in control of your dogs can't see the problem, sometimes I have people's children run upto my dogs mine aren't used to kids

As a source of antisocial behaviour, infection and irritation, dogs should be so excluded

Just seems like not a great place to take a dog

Difficult as families have dogs so maybe only dogs if with families with children

I do not want my grand children harmed by dog mess or aggressive dogs

health and safety hazard

If it is a clearly marked play area for children with equipment and secure boundrie absolutly yes!

Child play areas are enclosed for a reason, don't punish us good dog owners and good dogs because of the behaviour of the few. Discrimination at its best no reason to be in play areas.

Regardless of how friendly dogs can be they can all turn and children are more likely to be unable to recognise a quick change in temperament and situation, unfortunately neither all dog owners nor parents feel the need to monitor situations such as interactions between children and animals appropriately.

But not the areas around.

For the reasons given in 1 and 3 above.

However, Imposing a PSPO is a massively heavy handed overreach of the law and once in place, we will be at risk of being criminalised for any number of misdemeanors as decided by the whim of the local authority. This is a slow creep of excessive power.

For reasons given in number 1. It is hard to stop children accidentally stepping in/picking up or falling into it.

Some young children are afraid of dogs even on a lead. But as families with young children take dogs out with the children it would be thoughtful if hitching points for dogs could be available away from the entrance to the play area so parents do not have to stand outside with the dog.

Dogs on leads should not cause a problem

Even if dogs are well behaved or kept on a lead, having them in a sometimes hectic and unpredictable playground area, is clearly a risk.

Dog mess and children is a health hazard

Stops children being exposed to dog mess

If they are on a lead they should be allowed. Often parents with a dog will want to walk the dog and allow children to play at the same time. Family time restraints.

Not all children like dogs it then spoils their enjoyment of playing. Even if a dog is friendly a child went up to pat it the dog could still turn not only that but also of health issues of a dog fouling.

Dog faeces carry disease. Children need clean places to play.

A lot of families have a pet dog.

I think that if Specific play area as children play on grass etc

Not all children are comfortable around dogs. Also to limit dog fouling.

Keep kids safe and clean

Safer for children using play equipment

To lessen the risk to users of the areas posed by dogs eg mess anti social behaviour.

Play areas should be for parents and their children only but I believe there should be an area outside of the park where a dog or dogs can be tied up whilst the parents supervise their children, whilst also able to watch their dog/dogs. As dogs are part of the family.

Prevent dog fouling and difficulties with children

If dogs are under control and waste is picked up there is no risk to children. But people will abuse it if allowed.

They spread diseases, they bite.

Go poo can carry Toxoplasmosis, which could blind a child. A child should also not have to encounter dogs which may frighten them.

kiddies can get excited when playing. An excited dog in the same space is not clever.

Obvious.

Risk of eye damage from infection.

I think it would be appropriate for dogs on a lead to be able to walk through the Orchards, Willand it connects a housing estate to Jaycroft which is a nice walk for dogs to get there without wading through could involve walking on roads with out footpaths and which are also busy.

I think children and adults should have access to clean spaces.

with the current spate of dog thefts dogs should be allowed inside, but tied up in sight

I think all small enclosed play areas should have dogs excluded but in Willand the Orchards should allow dogs on leads to be in keeping with the other areas identified it is not a small enclosed play area. It can be a useful cut through from Orchard Way to Jaycroft where dogs are allowed off the lead

Yes, dogs must be under control in designated children play areas.

Plenty of places to exercise dogs without having to mix with children in their play areas.

Common sense.

fouling is dangerous to young children

They are dangerous around small children and some children are scared

Dog mess harbours nasty bacteria that can cause very serious health issues for children and adults. Play areas must be kept clear of dog mess. Some dogs may be unsafe and/or frighten or hurt children.

Enclosed children's areas need to be protected

some children aren't comfortable with dogs. dog faeces remain even after being picked up.

Some children are frightened or nervous of dogs, and some owners do not keep their dogs in check in these areas.

Children should be kept free to run and play without the risk of harm be that from an out of control animal, even if it is just excited play and also kept safe from dog mess within play areas. As not all dog owners can be relied on to be responsible a ban safeguards children thoroughly.

Hazards to children's health

Responsible dog owners should not be penalised

Dogs naturally mark areas and need to be excluded apart from potential danger from unsupervised dogs attacks and fouling

Because even when picked up, dog faeces remain in small amounts which would pose a risk to children and just be really unpleasant for anyone using the area.

Some children find dogs intimidating.

Children should not be expected to play in areas where they have to look out for dog mess

We need to encourage young people to go to designated play areas. Dog faeces make it less likely to happen

Children are particularly vulnerable to dog faeces left on the ground because they play on the ground and with balls that have been in contact with the ground that they then handle.

Not all dogs are child-friendly and not all children are confident with dogs. If the area is designated for children/young people, then take dogs elsewhere and give youngsters the space and opportunity to enjoy themselves.

play areas are for children and families not dog exercise areas.

To protect children from dog faeces and over excited dogs who may bite.

No matter how well behaved your dog is it can cause a nuisance to very young children who may not know how to act around a dog - keep them on a lead.

For the safety of the public and the avoidance of public nuisance and alarm.

As children play there

Lots of dogs are family pets and so children may be unsupervised if not allowed in; could make it mandatory that they are kept on leads in the area instead.

These people should be named and shamed (in The Gazette?) like those who regularly exercise dogs on football pitches (like Amory Park) and children's playgrounds.

Of course! Dog muck causes disease!

Q5

An arbitrary maximum number of dogs is an inappropriate approach. Consider accreditation scheme for commercial dog walkers.

How can anyone on a mobile phone concentrate on 4-6 dogs.

I believe that there is no need to actually place a restriction on the number of dogs with a dog owner instead I think the restriction should be on the safe use of walking dogs. For example if six dogs or more are extremely well-behaved and safe and there is no issue however when somebody is with one dog that is not under control this is unsafe and therefore they are not capable of controlling the dog properly and should not be in a public space.

"Re; Taking more than a specified number of dogs onto a land: The behaviour of the dogs and the competency of the handler need to be taken into consideration if considering this order. Research from 2010 shows that 95% of dog owners have up to 3 dogs. Therefore the number of dogs taken out on to land by one individual would not normally be expected to exceed four dogs. "

multiple dogs on leads are a hazard to both the general public and the the dog walker

Again, there are many reasons why it might be appropriate for an individual to walk several dogs at once, as long as they are properly under control this is not in and out itself a problem, and so a blanket been is once again an entirely disproportionate proposal

A lot of dog owners seem to lack the capability to walk one dog let alone multiple ones. There has to be a limit on how many dogs one person can control.

It can be hard enough negotiating pavements with one or two dogs. The strength of dogs when they want to pull should never be underestimated

Professional dog walkers may exercise greater than 6 dogs at a time. Most common offenders of dog owners not picking up their dog mess have just one dog

How can someone with many dogs control them.

I don't see why this needs to be done. You are just targeting dog walkers who are all responsible people .

Limit should be lowered

Control.. or lack of with too many dogs

I have often observed people walking numerous dogs, they can barely keep them under control, never mind picking up after so many animals. While one dog is doing it's 'business ' the others are tugging the owner/walker along and invariably the faeces gets left

Dogs should be banned from the recreation ground

No need for anyone to have more than 6 dogs. I would even limit it to less. No-one can control do many and their behaviour tends to be worse. Also professional dog walkers should not use our public spaces and basically destinations to deposit a whole lot of dog poo.

For safety, i would imaging it's difficult to control multiple dogs so to limit risk, limit the numbers.

I do not know enough to comment. If they are all under control/being supervised by a responsible owner, I am not sure what the issues would be.

yes definitely

The dog Walker has to be responsible for all the dogs in their care all the time.

Ten dogs under strict control can be safer than one dog not.

Too many dogs and there will be no control

Walking too many dogs means the Walker does not have full control of all dogs, mess may not be picked up when too many dogs .

If you have more than two dogs you are very likely to be a responsible to be a very good and aware dog owner. The tiny minority and I'm sure we all know who they are, should not affect our countryside environment. All dogs on a lead at all times solves the issues as we can point out irresponsible owners as we all should do.

One human two hands therefore two dogs maximum

If the walker is in control then no problem

dogs of one family Business walkers should be less

they either fill pavements or are a nuisance on lanes

Again not all dogs are bad behaved, there are a good few that have been trained.

Limit should be THREE at most(TWO better)As long term dog owner i know noone can be in control of more than two or three.(exception could be for reg.dog walkers-say 5)

The more dogs the less chance of being able to physically hold onto them all in some situations or be able to protect them from attack from humans and other animals.

picking up and control over numerous dogs is all but impossible

To ensure full control can be exercised

An owner or dog walker cannot control more than 6 dogs at once.

This is irrelevant. If people are having excessive numbers of dogs with them, or by any other behaviour and causing a nuisance, tackle them. Do not impose a PSPO.

Dogs are powerful and it could be very hard to restrain several large dogs.

If the dogs are under control and behaving well or on leads I think this seems harsh. Pre Covid groups of owners walked dogs together and it would be unfair to limit a single owner when some groups can be quite large and well behaved.

Yes. I do not see how it is possible to suitably control more than 2 dogs at a time. 2 hands, 2 dogs...

It is very difficult for an individual to have complete control over a large number of dogs

Quite simply, there is only a certain number of dogs that one person can keep under control at any one time, no matter how small. The larger the dog of course, the harder that job becomes.

Impossible to be fully in control of that number of dogs

6 is too many. They have to be held while the handler bags the droppings. Find out by experiment what the max number of dogs that can be handled in order that all mess is cleaned.

Unless a qualified dog walker / minder.

Having witnessed how some owners can't control their dogs on or off leads .

One person cannot control a large number of dogs both on or off a lead. They cannot watch dogs going in different directions and could fail to notice when dogs are defecating.

It's up to individuals how many dogs they have

As a dog owner and walker I see too many people walking dogs out of control.

There's a limit on how many dogs one person can be reasonably responsible for.

Surely it is impossible to control a large number of dogs

Safety for children and to enable Walker /owner to keep track of faeces collection

Difficult to control large numbers of dogs and to see if they need to be cleaned up after.

Because I do not believe handling too many dogs is safe.

I think 6 is too many and it should be no more than 4.

It is very difficult to hold onto more than 6 dogs. I would limit owners of small dogs to max of 6 and large / medium dogs to a maximum of 5. If another owner's dog goes for one of your 6 dogs how are you going to intervene and maintain control of the other 5?

Difficult to keep track of dog fouling

People should have control of their dogs at all times.

Any more than 6 i believe is unmanageable , to some degree it does depend on sizes of dogs

Basic common sense

Because they MUST have control over their mutts and the higher the number, the less chance of this.

If all dogs had perfect training then this wouldn't be an issue. However not all owners have control or the strength to hold more than 1 or 2 dogs.

to be responsibly in control? most people could not handle 6 (yes I know that some people can handle more)

I would limit to 4. More than 4 dogs, very hard to control.

The key here is 'under control', if competent an owner can control multiple dogs, if not then 1 dog is too many.

People who walk dogs professionally should be allowed to walk an unspecified number of dogs.

Impossible to be aware of the behaviour of a large number of dogs.

The important thing is for the owners/walkers to be in control. I don't feel this is the councils job to dictate. Some owners can't control 1 dog others spend a lot of time training and can lots.

Few people have the ability to control one dog let alone 4 or 5.

I still think six dogs is excessive, dog walkers tend to have more and they are not always in control of these dogs. Dog walkers are often the people who let the dogs off in the park.

one person could not control a large number of dogs in the event of something happening, eg an accident to the person in charge

People can not easily keep an eye on more than one dog when they are running free although it is easier if they are on leads.

You should consider the proportionality of this restriction as you will be targeting a minority group of the community.

Too many dogs together work as a "Pack" and in general cannot be controlled - better to be safe than sorry when looking after a lot of dogs.

Too many and they lose control over them

There are too many dogs for a start! It's hard for people to keep control over or clear up after, more than 2 dogs.

Because its not the number of dogs itshow well trained they are.

If you look after dogs properly this isn't an issue

should be common sense but that isn't so common.

I do not think it is so easy for one person to control a larger number of dogs.

Anyone would struggle to responsibly control and clear up after large groups of animals.

The number may be multiples, but should be reasonable to be under effective control

I think it should only be two to have proper control of the dogs.

Responsible dog owners should not be penalised

It may seem obvious but some dog walkers do not appear to realise that all dogs should be under control and a limit is needed for practical reasons

Because these pro dog walkers cannot properly control a large number of animals and they cannot properly manage their fouling.

This gives the walker a better chance of keeping control.

To maintain control. If one dog decides to 'turn' aggressive, how can 1 person control it when they have multiple dogs/leads to manage? Or if another dog in the area is not properly controlled and attacks?

We see too many " dog walkers " with too many dogs and out of control.

A dog walker can only watch one or two dogs closely at any one time. The usual practice, I have observed, is to let them all off the lead together and they run off and poop.

Happily there are now enclosed specialist dog-friendly secure fields which can be booked to allow dogs to run free. If a walker/owner is running unlimited numbers in public spaces, their control may not only be compromised but keeping an eye on lots of dogs e.g. where they poo etc. is less easy. Some people feel quite intimidated by a 'pack' or bunch of dogs running free or going up to them.

I think it should be lower than six

to allow access for pedestrians and safety of all road and footpath users and of course the safety of the dogs .

Too many dogs can overwhelm a dog walker.

Dogs - no matter how well behaved - can act unexpectedly sometimes - if you have too many dogs it'll be hard to control all of them 100% of the time.

A single person cannot exercise full control over more than one dog. Six is too many. Two should be the maximum.

They are not able to keep them all under control or surveillance to pick up poo

Q6

Once again I do not see any point in placing a number on the number of dogs that are kept safely and under control.

As above

I do not think 6 dogs can be safely controlled. I am a reasonably fit 15 stone male who sometimes struggles to control one border collie. logically it should be limited by the total weight of dogs in relation to that of the walker but this is obviously impractical so I would suggest a maximum limit of 4

I disagree with the principle of setting a limit. If a limit is to be set, the reasoning behind the number specified ought to be explicitly spelled out by the order. (If satisfactory explicit reasoning cannot be given, then a limit ought not to be imposed)

6 is a lot of dogs for 1 person to be in charge of 4 or 5

It really depends on the dogs and person in charge of them

I think it should be 4, 2 per hand is reasonable.

I think the number should be lower on public pavements - maybe 4 dogs

What about dog walkers who exercise more dogs at a time? They are responsible and would be penalised if your suggested limit was imposed

Should be limited to 2

Limit to 3. I have seen owner struggling to control 3 dogs. If you wish to own more than 3 dogs then you find an appropriate area away from parks playgrounds etc.

Three is more than enough.. one out of control dog is mayhem..

Maximum should be three. One person simply cannot control anymore than that.

Reasons above

I think the limit should be less. 4 would be plenty.

Three is really enough to keep an eye on

I think 6 is too high, people struggle to control two dogs most the time 6 is too high. 6 is a pack and the dogs then behave as a pack.

I think four is a more realistic number.

As above

Seems too many still

6 is far too many. 4 would be more appropriate, 2 leads in each hand.

As above. It's not the quantity of dogs it's the owners who can't be arsed to I know up their own animals excrement. The majority should not be punished.

Think no more than four would be more appropriate

Maybe set at 6 off lead at one time but can walk more if in total control

Two, as above

Same as above

Less in highly populated areas town, canal etc

4 (two per hand)

Because all but a few are incapable of looking after more

The limit should be reduced to 2 dogs maximum

five should be the limit

I think this really depends on the size of the dogs and experience of the owner though. I can't say I see anyone walking more than 6 dogs anyway in any of the areas in Cullompton.

Should be 3 you can't keep an eye off lead with 6 dogs and unlikely to pick up after them all

As above. No one can be in full control of more than 2 or 3 dogs. I am a long-term owner and you could not be sure 6 were not being a nuisance or check none pooped out of sight

They shouldn't have them on council estates as these people have no respect for others and once one barks they all start! It's like living in a kennel!!

Should be 4

I think 6 dogs per person is too many at one time! Should be only 3

I think it should be lower - 3 max

One person cannot control 6 dogs. The limit should be 2.

It should be lower!

6 is too many! To the best of my knowledge a human has two hands a maximum of four is a push at controlling if they pull in different directions never mind how someone could begin to separate them in an attack on a human or other animals

Lower, 3 or 4

I feel that is an absolute maximum, 4 would be more acceptable

Think it should be less with the exception of say a dog walking business. Proof of exemption to be shown on request if requested by an Enforcement Officer.

Three maximum. Difficult for a keeper to control more than this number, especially if the dogs are not tiny.

I feel that a lower limit of 4 dogs would be appropriate.

It is behaviour that is the issue, not an arbitrary figure you have decided. Why aren't any of these questions asking directly above the implications of bringing in a overly punitive PSPO?

4 would be more appropriate - if they are all large dogs and are roused to chase something I think it would be very hard to control them all and they might break free.

I know 6 dogs can seem a large number but I have a small breed weighing less than 5½ kgs and I have walked 6 dogs on leads occasionally although not regularly. If I do take them off leads I only have 1 or 2 running free. This is a sensible restriction for larger dogs - perhaps over 10 kgs or 7.5 kgs.

I think it depends on the breed of dogs and the competence of the handlers

I think that is far too many for a single person.

I think it should be less. It can be very intimidating to meet multiple dogs when out walking

See above. 6 May be too many

Unless it is a business with adequate supervision for all dogs.

Because you can't control six dogs on leads let alone off their leads.

4 dogs should be the limit.

Or even lower

You are excluding qualified, and licensed dog walkers.

It only takes one incident. Not all dogs are easily controlled. I've worked with dogs and horses all my life and can't see how you can be in control of six dogs . Six tiny dogs may be ok, but it only takes one big dog to cause a problem or other dogs off lead towards your six.

I think it should be set lower, perhaps 4.

This would allow commercial dog walkers to still walk a number of dogs but even 6 is still quite, more so if they are larger dogs.

I think it should be less.

It should be no more than 4.

I believe you can control 6 well-behaved dogs but once you add more or even one badly behaved dog to the pack I believe your control is lessened.

any more than 6 for one person would be difficult to control.

My concern is someone walking 6 German Shepards or similar sized Dogs would struggle if they decide they want to go.

Should be lowered

I'd rather it was 2 or 3, but 6 is better than no limit at all.

If all dogs had perfect training then this wouldn't be an issue. However not all owners have control or the strength to hold more than 1 or 2 dogs. I would have it dependant on the dogs size and strength. One Rottweiler or 6 Yorkies.

difficult. 2 wolfhounds could not be restrained buy anyone, IF they decided to be 'naughty' (not that they ever would). can 1 person actually watch the antics of 6 Yorkshire terriers?

Maybe 6 small dogs and 4 larger dogs.

the number of dogs is irrelevant. I have working dogs that are under control and know many people that can control more than 6. I also know and see when exercising my own, many people who cannot control 1 dog.

Suggest 4 as a reasonable number

The important thing is for the owners/walkers to be in control. I don't feel this is the councils job to dictate. Some owners can't control 1 dog others spend a lot of time training and can lots.

I would set the limit at 3

I think the limit should be three and I think that they should show they can control all three dogs.

6 dogs at once is more than enough with one person in charge

I think 4 per person is sufficient

See 5 above.

6 is still too many - I would prefer a limit of 4 - with maybe the exception of suitably qualified, professional, dog walkers

Should be 3.

4 is plenty

Too many, four un enough; the more there are the more intimidating it is for the average person. let alone those wary of dogs.

6 is too many. A maximum of 3 would be more reasonable. Consider the space they take up, the impact on other people using the space, the increased potential of losing control, and of not collecting all the dog mess.

That's enough to cntrol

six is more than enough dogs to control.

6 sounds plenty.

This seems like a reasonable number of dogs that could be safely walked together.

No single person can control 6 dogs simultaneously.

Too many. A maximum of 3 should be set

6 dogs are too many for one person to control, 4 would be more reasonable.

Should be two.

I see a responsible lady who rescues dogs walking them past my house, but she always has helpers, as there are often between 8-10 of them. It would be impossible for her to keep control of them and clear up after them, if she was walking them all by herself. So I think that a limit of 6 is reasonable.

I think the limit should be lower, I think 4 dogs is the maximum that can be handled by one person

Six seems too many, I suppose depending on breed. Six chihuahuas is different to six doberman...

In my opinion the limit should be set at 4.

3 to 4 should be a maximum. No one person can control 6 dogs without causing some anti social effects.

Fewer - see above.

6 is far too many. People with 6 dogs are generally dog walking for a living

Maximum of Four dogs at a time. Nobody needs a pack of dogs.

I think 6 is generous and will help professional paid dog-walkers. Personally, I think 3 or 4 should be the maximum.

It should be less than 6 - 4 maximum in order for proper control

It should be less if they do not have a license to run a dog walking business and have had training in controlling dogs

4 is plenty. Who has 6 dogs ???

Six is far too many. Six dogs in one hand is unmanageable, and an obstruction to other users of the pavement or footpath

Fewer

Far too many for 1 person to control.

Should be no more than 3.

Should be 4.

I think 4.

or lower.

Limit should be less, maximum 4.

2

6 is too many. Suggest 3-4 as maximum.

4 dogs would be more appropriate.

It was agreed it would be difficult to determine what could be considered reasonable for individual dog owners eg individuals' capability and also the size of the dogs they are responsible for/walking.

We advise as much consistency as possible is required so that dog owners become aware of restrictions and are confident in walking their dogs in other areas. We note that the neighbouring authorities of East Devon and Teignbridge have set a limit of six so it is appropriate that Mid Devon should propose

the same number. It is not clear whether professional dog walkers have been considered and whether these are currently licenced by the authority as this is a growing business sector.

Q7

Professional dog walkers will probably want a minimum of 6 dogs.

A blanket ban on dogs "off lead" in public parks is unnecessary and oppressive. Parish & Town Councils should be given delegated/discretionary powers to ban dogs "off lead" either completely or in given areas or at specific times.

The Council should enforce heavy fines on people breaking the rules rather than inadvertently penalising those who do not offend with more restrictions imposed on responsible dog owners.

All dogs should be on lead walking amongst livestock.

Yes. When this consultation relates solely to Schedules B, C & D as opposed to across fields, public footpaths and roads etc.

When seeking to put a dogs on leads restriction in public spaces, the Forum advises that there is a need to consider a fair balance between rights of owners and non-dog owners, particularly in urban areas where the restrictions can be extensive. This could have the effect of forcing dog owners into cars to go to rural areas with public rights of way and other public space not affected by restrictions. Alternatively, owners may ignore the legislation if they believe it to be unreasonable. Dog owning is important to health and wellbeing and the major reason why people go out. More consideration needs to be given to providing areas where dogs can legitimately be let off lead.

The only thing I feel it's important to state is that the UK has a tradition of good safe management of dogs and have good levels of animal care and safety in the community and I feel that these measures will only create problems where dog owners are tying dogs outside of parts that become stressed and anxious that could then become aggressive and that they could then go on to harass people who entered or left the park. The only thing I feel it's important to state is that the UK has a tradition of good safe management of dogs and of good levels of animal care and safety in the community and I feel that these measures will only create problems where dog owners are tying dogs outside of parts that become stressed and anxious that could then become aggressive and that they could then go on to harass people who entered or left the park. in particular I feel that the UK does not need to create further laws to restrict safe use of dogs especially within quiet Rurel communities such as mid Devon. I feel it's an entirely different prospect when large and potentially dangerous dogs are kept in urban areas.

The PDSA's 'Paw Report 2018' found that 89% of veterinary professionals believe that the welfare of dogs will suffer if owners are banned from walking their dogs in public spaces such as parks and beaches, or if dogs are required to be kept on leads in these spaces. Their report also states that 78% of owners rely on these types of spaces to walk their dog. I would also like to bring your attention to the similar recommendations stated in the

Government's 'Anti-social behaviour powers -Statutory guidance for frontline professionals' document, pages 52/53. We believe that the vast majority of dog owners are responsible, and that the majority of dogs are well behaved. In recognition of this, we would encourage local authorities to exercise its power to issue Community Protection Notices, targeting irresponsible owners and proactively addressing anti-social behaviours.

Myself and a number of other responsible dog owners value the opportunity to safely exercise our dogs on linear park Cullompton. The only other similar opportunity is the CCA fields but due to antisocial behaviour these are far less safe. Damage caused by broken glass has presented me with vets bills of around £600. We note there is a new play park/assault course being built in linear park Cullompton and as far as we are aware there has been consultation on this construction. If we were to have been consulted we would have made strong representations that the area be enclosed in the same way as the existing play area in the park to ensure that dogs and children playing can safely coexist.

Part of responsible dog ownership is giving your dog appropriate and sufficient exercise and stimulation - this order seems to criminalise this aspect of good dog ownership without seeing it any good reasons why it is considered necessary and proportionate. If it is to be enacted, it should only be in locations where there is a genuine problem (for instance in my village (Willand) NONE of these issues is at all a problem, and any enactment of this nature in respect of the village would be grossly inappropriate and disproportionate. The proposals have the potential to cause an increase in traffic and pollution as dog walkers are forced out of their local area, as well as forcing more dog walkers onto country lanes where they can cause a nuisance to traffic and are themselves at significantly greater risk. Further, as a young family with hopes of dog ownership, we would be unable to make use of our local parks and play areas, discriminating against our children for no good reason. These proposals also risk reinforcing the belief that dogs are dangerous, a nuisance or to be feared, which is generally untrue and can be damaging not only to community relationships but also to children's development. Finally, it is unclear who 'Enforcement Officers' are, how they are designated or how a dog walker would identify a genuine enforcement officer from a member of the general public.

Only that the people who dont pick up still will not pick up even when their dogs are on leads. Cameras would help
sledgehammer to crack a nut springs to mind

No. Public health and safety must come before pets. You wouldn't allow a toddler to defecate in a public area nor would you allow them to run around on people's gardens, you would also prevent them from running up to strangers or into roads. Dog owners need to be aware of the impact their behaviour has on others.

I think there need to be safe places to allow dogs to run freely as we are surrounded by such beautiful countryside which is populated by wild and farm animals. Socialising puppies and young dogs off lead is important to raise dog who are safe around people and other dogs. During Covid, allowing my dog off lead to play with other dogs has been vital to my mental health. Regardless of orders being placed on areas, there are people who will always ignore them

Dog does need to run off lead and the rec is ideal and was donated to the people of Bampton not just the football team

See comments above re professional dog walkers. Potential impact on a responsible dog owner who 'runs out' of dog poo bags while out with their dog. I usually carry lots of poo bags but recent picked up my dog's mess and during the same walk I realized that I dropped the rest of the poo bags at the first poo stop. If my dog had further dog mess I wouldn't have been able to pick it up. Some dogs cannot be left tied up eg outside a play area. It is possible that some young families with dogs would have to avoid children's play areas

Rubbish always left where people sat. Meant to be alcohol free zone but it is not. Broken bottles always left around the park. Dangerous for dogs and children. People urinating against hedges we even saw a man defecating next to a tree wiping himself with leaves, near the children's play area (don't always blame the dogs).

How can anyone control 6 dogs.

Yes I feel there will be no places left to walk our dogs soon. There are a lot of responsible dog owners out there

No dog owners need to be responsible for their animals

No.. I just require owners to take responsibility for their dogs as I do for my children

A PSPO is only going to be effective if it is backed up with enforcement and fines. It also needs to be communicated within the community so that it is a proper deterrent and not just a 'tick in a box'

No, I think they should go further and extend to keeping dogs on leads on public footpaths, towpaths and bridleways.

It's no good making rules and regulations unless they are monitored

Telling people to do these things won't change the in educated it just penalises responsible dog owners there needs to be actual repercussions for owners who let their dogs fowl in the public domain without clearing it up.

Alienation of people with dogs, by not allowing them in these spaces you're stopping them from being able to enjoy them. If the dog is part of the family unit the family should be allowed to enjoy the space in the same way any other family can.

No. This seems a sensible and proportionate response for the play areas in Bampton, enabling dog owners to continue to exercise their pets while protecting children's play areas.

It seems unfair to the people that pick up after their dogs.

Elderly people who don't have transport will struggle to exercise their dogs if they must be leashed in parks.

See above. The minority fail us but the majority should prevail.

More poo bins required by footpaths, the footpaths to remain usable some are so over grown

As the restrictions are proposed for Grand Western Canal, for the same reasons the entire length of the Railway Walk should be included in the schedule. The nuisance of incontinent uncontrolled dogs and their irresponsible owners applies just as much there as in many of the other proposed restricted areas.

Yes, I think an increase in having to pick up your dogs mess in 'wild' places will lead to more filled bags being left on trees fence posts etc, instead educate people to use a stick or something to flick it off path or take bags home. I walk frequently up around the culmstock beacon and the trees up there can look like some horror story Christmas trees

The hanging of poop bags

I would also like to highlight properties close to public rights of way and/or walking dogs on public rights of way. I personally have been attacked by a dog off the lead when out riding my horse on a public right of way! I wouldn't like to imagine if it was a child on a pony instead.

No adverse impacts but how are these proposals to be enforced,I can't recall one case of a prosecution!!

The proposals and penalties should include leaving dog mess in plastic bags on the ground or hanging from trees and fences etc. Also dog mess should not be allowed to be placed in waste bins. I have no intention of using a waste bin myself if there's a risk of touching dog mess.

Elderly dog owners wanting to exercise dogs and unable to walk far.

Im not totally clear on the impact of these proposals will have in some areas. I walk my dogs in the field off of crowbridge in cullompton. I have done for 20years. As a person with a disability which can affect my mobility i rely on this field for exercising my dogs. I do not let them off if children are playing and always pick up after them. Not all dog owners are irresponsible and not all dogs are badly behaved.

Dogs need off lead exercise need to be an area for this.Dogs can be more aggressive on leads then off .

This is a complete discrimination of good dogs and good dog owners!! There will be no places we can go to play with our dogs, exercise our dogs and let them have a good play!! We should be naming kids that trash and litter the open spaces and ruin it for us that have well behaved dogs that have fun running and playing without the risk of cutting their paws with glass because of kids that don't care what they do.

No, but as a response dog owner I don't want the proposals to go too far. I would prefer to see more enforcement of the existing legislation.

You should come down heavily on bad owners with untrained dogs who are irresponsible for sake of good owners.

All dogs should not be left alone throughout the day or night and should always be on leads minimum one dog a family

Loss of social contact for single person households who use their dog walk to share time with other people

It's cruel to dogs to be kept on leads at all times

Not strict enough

This should apply to cat owners too. The smoking of cat poo on the pavements/driveways and private gardens is shocking

Fines are not high enough and have not worked to date punishment needs to be easier to enforce and greater

No, I'm a dog owner and think this is reasonable

As always good owners will be penalised - there are no consequences to bad ownership - no dog wardens and no one to report too

I do feel some areas should be able to allow a dog under control, to have some off lead exercise. ie top area of Amory Park, which I back on too. Dog owners pay tax too

No - I am pleased that the Council are taking this issue seriously.

PSPO represent as huge creeping of power and curbs of peoples use of public space. This "consultation" is a completely disingenuous tick-box activity that simply asks people about behaviours that all sensible people agree on. This "consultation" deliberately evades any mention or discussion of the impacts of PSPO themselves which can be extended to cover all manner of behaviours used repeatedly across the country to impact the lives of generally poorer and more vulnerable people. Typical of this local authority, who rather than engage anyone positively would rather cover up seating areas in corrugated metal or bringing sweeping powers to criminalise their constituents. It is awful.

Not that I can think of. The situation is pretty frustrating at the moment

If dogs aren't allowed off lead anywhere owners will take them to farmland

I am concerned about the limit of 6 dogs being walked by one person. My dogs are shown and I have no difficulty managing 6 on leads as they are small and behave well. In my experience owners with a single dog can cause more problems. Owners of multiple dogs are more responsible in all aspects of dog ownership.

The order should be enforced otherwise it will not have effect

Unfortunately it is the few irresponsible dog owners who cause problems for others. Restrictions will impact, potentially adversely on others.

Yes. People may simply think that the introduction of the PSPO means that effective action is being taken. I live close to Newcombes Meadow in Crediton and use it regularly to walk my own dogs. There are signs clearly visible at the entrance to the park saying dogs should be kept on leads and that there is a potential fine for those owners who do not abide by it. Lack of enforcement is the real issue and so those signs are ignored by many, many owners. Some dogs don't even have collars, let alone being on leads. I'm tired of hearing "Oh, he/she is friendly and wouldn't hurt a fly". My dogs are from the Blue Cross and one hasn't been socialised properly and so I often find myself having to hold him back from a dog hurtling towards us off a lead. It really doesn't help with training. Enforcing the measures that exist already would be better than introducing an unenforced PSPO.

Mandatory to carry sufficient Poobags.

Yes, please include the Zeal Monachorum churchyard

I all said above

This all seems to be about dog fouling. We are in a rural location. Are dogs blamed for fox and badger faeces? We all have to live together. How about bells on bikes and joggers letting people know that they are coming up behind you. A spooked dog will go for fight of flight then the dog is blamed and considered uncontrollable when it has been scared.

It will make life better for those who want to enjoy a dog free area without having to worry about dog mess and if a dog is going to turn on you or a child .

Detrimental and discriminative towards responsible dog owners. Dogs should be allowed off lead exercise. How about you patrol and stop all the vandalism from teenagers!!

Dogs could have less freedom to roam.

As stated above, dogs need off lead exercise and there needs to be safe places away from livestock for this to happen which also takes into account the ability of people to drive their dog somewhere, exercise their dog with children present and the mobility of elderly who won't be able to walk their dogs in some places.

I think dogs should be allowed off the lead in parks with the exception of the enclosed play areas. Responsible dog owners should be able to walk their dogs off the lead locally, particularly elderly people.

I believe there should be areas in each locality where dogs are allowed to run freely with other dogs and feel a FREE secure doggie park with lots of natural attractions would be a great asset to every neighbourhood. With dog poo bins and clean water available. I also believe there should be more dog poo bins in beauty hot spots and local walks that should be regularly emptied.

Irresponsible dog owners get away with behaviour through a) insufficient official monitoring (dog wardens) and insufficient follow up of reports of anti-social behaviour

There are rules in place presently but how will they be enforced?

My only concern is how you intend to enforce Section 5 in regards to Children walking Dogs as being under age you I believe you can't Fine them. This order should clearly state in the event of Children walking the dog it is the owner of the dog that is held fully responsible and liable to fines ec

None: problem always is implementing. I see so many irresponsible and ignorant dog owners; I have never seen any dog wardens or similar.

If it doesn't get implemented someone probably a child will get attacked

The dogs being blamed for misbehaviour when the responsibility is the humans.

Yes. Soon there will be a ban on dogs being anywhere.

Dogs must be well socialised with other dogs and people and then they will behave better. To do this, they must be allowed off lead. If we can never let them off lead, this will inevitably make any normal dog and owner anxious. Please don't tar us all with the same brush. The majority of dogs and owners I meet pick up after their dogs, and put them on leads when necessary.

Penalising people who can actually control dogs and have well trained dogs, the number of dogs isn't an issue it's the control of the dogs be it 1 or more.

You must leave spaces where people can safely allow their dogs to play off lead. Perhaps provide safe fenced areas that are only for dog exercise.

Section C Public Parks - Restriction on Amory Park is unfair to dog walkers, currently 90 % is restricted for sports or BMX track, with a small triangle area used by dog walkers, why can't this area be fenced off for dog walkers for off lead throwing of balls etc, restricting the whole of Amory Park is unfair, and not considerate to dog walkers that currently use this area more often than sports field.

Restrictions would adversely affect elderly people or people without a car who are unable to take their dogs into the countryside to exercise.

Stopping dogs being off the lead in the jubilee field will have several adverse impacts. This is a area where families with children and dogs can enjoy together. During lockdown it has been the only space that is within the village that is not under threat of development that you can throw a ball for a dog. I have spoke to various people some with dogs in flats or houses with little garden that do not know how they would have managed if they could not have

used the jubilee field to exercise their dogs. No one disputes that there are irresponsible dog owners but every one shouldn't pay the price for it. Dog owners pay council tax too so there should be space they can enjoy in their community without having to travel. If we have learnt nothing more in lockdown it is that we should not be making unnecessary journeys.

Yes, there are those who think their rights will be infringed. Invariably these very people infringe on the rights of others. The right to enjoy free space It could hinder a dog walking business, but I do not think business should be above the communities safety.

Would possibly need more bins and then emptied at regular intervals

there will be difficulty in enforcing this as those irresponsible owners will continue to ignore

no, and this question ought not to be required

Not stringent enough.

Laid dog walkers may find restrictions on numbers difficult, but the impact on other people using the space must be a priority.

Yes there should be a dog warden to catch and fine the bad dog owners why have those of us who behave have to suffer for their stupidity laxness etc. As usual the honest Joe loses out

no more enforcement officers or cctv in public spaces.

There should be a good provision made for dog walking if the restricted areas are extensive.

Do you mean impacts OF the proposal?

Dogs require off lead exercise. They need to be able to run. But they need to be under control

How do you stop a dog fouling in public spaces, it may have escaped your notice that dogs cannot talk so they they cannot warn their handler. I'd a dog need to go they need to go

Limiting places that dogs can be properly exercised

Some people have been abusive when I have challenged them in a public area regarding not having their dog on a lead. There needs to be a more effective reporting system to avoid disputes.

I suppose parents with assistance dogs may need to be able to have them accompany them and their children into play areas?

People being forced into using non-appropriate venues for exercising their dogs. Upsetting a larger group of the local community - much, much larger than the few who may have complained and prompted this proposed public spaces protection order. It seems a sledgehammer approach.

Many public spaces will still have badly controlled dogs off lead.

I pity the poor enforcement officer. The level of entitlement by many dog owners beggars belief. The Officers will likely be verbally abused for suggesting dog walkers comply with the rules.

It will be frustrating for owners of very obedient, well-trained dogs having to keep them on a lead. But, of course, there are very many dogs not under control so a PSPO would help address that. Most enforcement people are sensible and wouldn't be heavy-handed if a dog walker/owner's dog was, on occasion, unleashed. What the PSPO will do is give powers/authority to address the difficult owners/walkers.

I cannot see any mention of streets and alleyways. Chapel street, which is walked by many mothers and toddlers, has too much dog faeces and inadequate provision of poo bag bins....or any bins, and the alleyway from the old school to the Chinese takeaway had about 20 piles of faeces along it a few days ago. The bin there gets too full. The adequate supply of and emptying of bins is key to the dog owners complying.

None, save that they are not restrictive enough

Q8

No written response

Q9

I strongly do not approve of restricting dog walking times on public places such as beaches or large open parks to non-seasonal periods just to avoid disruption during tourist times. I believe that the onus needs to be put on safe and manageable well-trained and responsible dog ownership and not on creating overly controlling laws to prevent people from living peaceful lives with their dogs.

All times

Please refer to earlier comments regarding dogs on leads

Neither, too difficult to administer

If any restrictions were to be introduced (which I very strongly oppose), they should be limited to only the times of the day when they can be shown to be of particular relevance (i.e. children rarely play in play areas between 5pm and 9am, so the restrictions works be timed accordingly.

Neither dogs still need their walk regardless of time

a responsible owner would not allow their dog to be out of control - yet again a minority are spoiling the freedoms of the majority.

The restrictions should be in place at all times otherwise confusion will be caused. So long as there are specific areas where dogs can run free there should be need for restrictions.

Fortunately I live in Bampton which is not on Schedule C, but neither restriction allows for the local home/dog owners (1) who have to exercise their dogs 12 months of the year, (2) only allowing dogs off leads after 18.00 in the winter puts the elderly and children in the parks after dark in order to give their dogs sufficient exercise. This seems a dangerous proposal if there is no lighting in the park.

Neither

Neither. Should be permanent restrictions

Time restriction.

She kept on a lead at ALL times.

No restrictions completely stupid idea. Dogs need to run to be exercised properly . You cannot do this on a lead. Dogs need to be socialised and need to be digs. You are targeting this all wrong. Owners are the issue in big training their dogs properly. My dog loves to run freely and comes to my every command because I put the time and effort into training her!!

Dogs to be kept on leads in any area where children play .

Neither

All year please. My children go out all year as do dogs.. From 8am until 7pm is when children could be out.

None of these, as it simply leads to confusion. Restrictions should be clear and simple.

Full ban

It should apply at all times all year round. If can only be 1, the daytime hours slightly preferable to help protect children playing during the day.

All dates and times....dogs can mess at any time

Dogs poo all year.

Time

Time

None, the rule should be that dogs without recall should be kept on a lead. Putting dogs on a lead unnecessarily is a pointless rule.

Seasonal restrictions. If someone is an irresponsible owner & does not clean up after their dog, a time limited restriction will not make any difference.

I don't think seasonal or time restrictions would be appropriate. The rule should apply all the time, children play throughout the year and different age groups play throughout the day too. People often think the rules don't apply to them, if you give them caveats they definitely won't abide by them. You see this on Hadron Hill where people are asked to keep their dogs on a lead from March to July because of ground nesting birds. Hardly anyone does this. This rule should apply all the time.

Neither

On leads at all times

None why would a dog be more dangerous at specific times?

Seasonal

Time restrictions

No dogs should be allowed in areas where children play, where football matches are being held or they should just be banned from the recreation field in General!

All dogs on leads at ALL times so everyone knows where they stand.

Time restriction

Maybe look at splitting the park in areas for dog and areas for others ie bikes

All restrictions should apply at all times/seasons

Time restrictions

No times should be set dogs on lead areas

No all year around

Time restrictions, most people are working and exercise their dogs before and after work

The restriction should be at ALL times. Any aggressive or badly behaved dog stay aggressive or badly behaved all year round time restrictions. It would at least allow dogs to exercise but need to be watched by owners to pick up faeces

Time

Time

Not happy with either most dogs are better behave than children they don't throw Tesco trollies in the river and litter the parks with broken glass and rubbish

None ban children in stead of punishing us good dog owners and dogs

A combination of both

Seasonal best as on beaches.

All the time kept on leads

Restriction time

I think the restrictions should be either time or seasonally limited. The restrictions should be all the time

Seasonal restriction

Time

Neither, I don't take my grandchildren to parks where dogs are allowed, owners never pick all of the faeces up!

No

No restrictions

Restrictions should be 24 hours a day all year.

No restriction in the parks. Dogs need to be able to run freely in parks

Time restriction

Neither is appropriate...parks can be frequented at any point in time. Why should those times be restricted by giving dog walkers preferential treatment? The rules should apply all the time with no concessions as the other park rules do to everyone!

Time

Neither - dog fouling and poor dogs are around at all times and all months this won't change anything but will penalise good owners who work shifts etc

Large majority of dog fouling in Amory park occurs overnight

Dogs should be kept on leads in parks etc

Seasonal Restriction

Twenty-four hours

Permanent restrictions should be enforced.

Do not bring in a PSOP. PSPO represent as huge creeping of power and curbs of peoples use of public space. This "consultation" is a completely disingenuous tick-box activity that simply asks people about behaviours that all sensible people agree on. This "consultation" deliberately evades any mention or discussion of the impacts of PSPO themselves which can be extended to cover all manner of behaviours used repeatedly across the country to impact the lives of generally poorer and more vulnerable people. Typical of this local authority, who rather than engage anyone positively would rather cover up seating areas in corrugated metal or bringing sweeping powers to criminalise their constituents. It is awful.

No, it would be more confusing

Dogs should be on leads at all times in parks and public areas.

None. Some areas allocated for dogs and owners all year round

Both are necessary - children can fall into dog poo in the winter as well as in the summer and in the evening as well as during the day.

I would prefer no restriction but I think the time restriction more appropriate. Owners who have no alternative but to exercise their dogs off lead in the parks can do so on a daily basis within the set times. Dogs need the opportunity for free exercise from time to time. If too restricted it could become a welfare problem.

Neither

Time restrictions

Restrictions should be in place at all times.

Time restrictions

Should apply at all times

Item 2

I wouldn't consider either. In a park with children and families either BUT have a designated area where dogs can run off lead.

If I have to choose then it would be seasonal has in autumn and winter people don't tend to be out in public spaces after dark then in the spring and summer months.

No restriction otherwise owners let their dogs foul when it is dark

I suggest you limit it to times that you will employ sufficient staff to enforce it!!

Time restrictions as long as faeces was picked up. More CCTV would help around the village and in public parks etc

What's the matter with all year around. No restrictions.

N/a

I don't agree with question 8. You have set this survey up to get the answer you want!

This should be a blanket order

2 because kids use parks all year round and it Ned to be safe and clean for them all year joy just in summer.

I do not think there should be any restrictions on dogs in public parks.

I think dogs should be kept on leads at all times in parks. But I would consider a time constraints more appropriate.

The restriction should be at all times

Neither I believe all well behaved under control dogs should be able to be off the lead during their walk

It should apply at all times. With dogs off the leads owners can use the excuse they did not see their dog fouling.

Neither - should be unrestricted - dogs that cannot be controlled by voice alone should be on leads in these closed areas.

Dogs should be on a lead and under control at all times. It's nice to be able to allow your dog off the lead but there are too many irresponsible dog owners in the area.

Time restriction is more appropriate in a none tourist area, with may be seasonal ie during school holidays

All seasons all times.

Dogs should be on leads at all times, every day.

Never

let the dog off before 08.30 and from 'dusk'. Car 'lighting up' times, to keep it simple and enforceable? Must still be picked up after a No 2.

Time restriction. It is not fair to make it a seasonal restriction. Dogs need to be walked every day - not seasonally when it suits others.

Time restrictions

I don't think dogs should be allowed off the lead in public parks at any time.

Seasonal

time restrictions, when children are not playing in the park, dogs would be allowed to exercise off lead

If you provide area for dogs, then no restriction/time is required. Parks should be for all users and not exclude people with dogs

Time Restrictions

Time restriction

The only time restriction I think would be sensible would be during school drop off / pick up time as the way the school now staggers this means the jubilee filed gets very congested.

Quite simply "Dogs should be on leads in public spaces at all times"

Neither, this only serves to confuse people, I think you should implement a straight forward instruction that dogs in a public space should be on a lead. There are rolling hills and countryside, if they want to let off their dog they can do so in a safer environment.

Time restrictions as the public who are concerned about dogs having a free run time would know to avoid public spaces at that time

Time restriction

If any are brought in then it should be time restrictions

n/a

I would recommend exclusion for dates (Seasonal Restriction). Rather than times. Easier to enforce!

Restrictions should be at all times!

time

Permanent restriction.

seasonal

Should be all the year; all times.

All the time. There is no need to let them off the lead in public parks. If they want to let them off then go to a designated dog area

Restrictions should apply at all times.

Time because it allows dogs to be walked before and after work and most dog walkers don't want to walk dogs in the middle of the day in the summer.

Time restriction if I must choose

neither, i would prefer to see designated areas for dogs to exercise. like us they need to run about more ;)

Time - although if dogs are well trained, this would not need to be a restriction. In fact if people had well, properly trained dogs, many of these restrictions would not be necessary.

Time restriction

Think it needs to be a blanket ban otherwise how would it be supervised? Also fail to see difference really in time of day or year. When given access during some of the time same problems of irresponsible dog owners would still apply, so nothing really gained. Sadly fear it would need to be all or nothing.

Restrictions at all times

No restriction

Dogs must be kept on the lead at ALL times in public spaces (and on farmland where livestock is present)

Time restriction. It does not matter which season, people are always out and about.

Time restrictions.

No

Neither

Time restriction - children still go to parks throughout the year.

Neither

I do not agree with restrictions being limited as I think these restrictions should apply all the time and all year

Well, I said no to Q8, but if pushed I would say seasonal with a summer dry weather (yeah right) restriction being more stringent than during winter when people are less likely to be using the park in a way that unmanaged dogs would disturb.

I'm not in favour of a seasonal restriction. I consider the time restriction should be 8am - 6pm

Seasonal restriction is stupid. Dogs still need exercise. Better to have a time restriction so as not to cause a conflict to other users.

Neither.

Time restriction is more relevant away from the sea shore

At all times. Then there can be no misunderstanding of the order. Under the cover of darkness is probably the worst time for offending, people get away with it, because they can't be seen

Maybe run it like the beaches

Seasonal & Time Restricted.

the restriction should not be to a time or season

No, all dogs should be kept on leads at all times in public parks within the Mid Devon Devon Area.

Both seasonal and/or time restrictions should be used for the maximum benefits to be seen in the neighbourhood.

no time restrictions only

Time restriction. Dogs need exercise all year round, but most owners could walk them morning and evening if they need to be off the lead. The time would need to vary according to the season.

Time Restriction if either although I think in public parks they should be on a lead all the time . . .

The restriction should apply at all times

All the time

Time

Time restriction, due to the busier times of the day with more people and more dogs around within those hours.

Time Restriction

Time Restriction so it applies for the whole year.

At all times.

Time Restriction - more likely to be obeyed.

Dogs should be kept on leads at all times.

Time Restriction.

Time Restriction between hours of 8am to 8pm.

Blanket rules are unnecessary (see previous comments).

Time Restriction. Maybe extend time restriction to 8pm during British Summer Time.

All the time.

Time restriction.

Dogs should be kept on leads at all times in Schedule C Plan 25 & 26. Restrictions should be in force at all times.

On leads at all times. One child bitten is one too many. No restriction.

Neither

Seasonal or time of day restriction.

Q10

Fines rather than education.

It does not appear to have worked on the Grand Western Canal in spite of more signs.

There has been ample 'education' in our village by way of signs, pink spray, school poster competition, social media publicity. Best education is a few fines with press publicity.

TV/press campaigns. More stringent fines.

Signs explaining simply the problem.

In schools for future generations. Explain toxic nature of dog faeces. Posters explaining this in all parks and play areas.

The emphasis should be on successful dog handling and management not on how horrible and anti-social dogs can be.

Prosecution is the only answer. It is no use putting up more notices to be ignored.

I think those who will pick up are probably already doing so and those who won't pick up will just never be bothered.

Only if enforcement happens.

Enforcement i.e. fines and dog wardens would be more effective; Dog owners/handlers should clear up after their pets regardless of where they are walking them; Dog faeces/excrement does not need to be in a bag. Concerns regarding plastic bags thrown in hedges or left scattered around. Totally in favour in urban or defined public spaces but as long as 'waste' is dealt with responsibly, using bags is not necessarily required.

You cannot educate pork.

Many dog walkers are unaware even of the existence of dog control orders, and even less the specific details of restrictions. People are particularly unaware that dog fouling applies to all public land. In its response to a consultation on the refreshed Country Code, we suggested Social media and influencers, citizenship education in schools and clear graphic messages. These suggestions would apply equally here. Publicity and information about dogs on leads should emphasise to people that dogs should be kept on a short lead in the vicinity of livestock to protect stock from potential injury and disease.

Proactive measures include communicating to local dog owners that bagged dog faeces can be disposed of in normal litter bins; running responsible ownership and training events; or using poster campaigns to encourage dog owners to pick up after their dog.

It is my feeling that education is always the best form of society control. Education will only help inform people of the pros and cons and methods are used for responsible ownership and can avoid the need for any unnecessary punitive and controlling laws where common sense and a community-based approach is much more beneficial.

Dogs Trust works with local authorities across the UK to help promote responsible dog ownership. Please do not hesitate to contact us at campaigns@dogstrust.org.uk should you wish to discuss this matter.

Highlighting the health dangers, particularly to young children. Perhaps with case studies.

Education regarding the cost to the council of cleaning up, and as to the risks associated with dog fouling

Warning to dog owners the impact they are having by using cameras for not picking up. Not sure how you can get the offenders to listen sadly

Put more flyers up informing of fines and of diseases caused by dog fouling. Pet shops and vets could be included in educating owners. Even educating children in schools would be good as they would educate their parents.

Education doesn't work. If they don't care, education won't change that. I saw a "Wanted Poster" created by Dover District Council recently inviting people to provide information on people not cleaning up after their dogs. Reward - 'A cleaner district' Think this is a brilliant idea. We know which local residents tend to allow their dogs to roam the streets on their own

They need to be seen, named and shamed. Gives us who are responsible a bad name and only a few.

They should be fined heavily.

You need more dog poo bins more fines given out to offenders. There is no deterrent

There are some people who really don't care and no amount of education is going to make a difference. Unfortunately they never get caught and just laugh at you if you say anything or you get a mouthful of abuse.

Particularly MEN rarely pick up for some bizarre reason

No.. everyone who owns dogs know they have to look after them.. fines/penalties are the only education for these individuals

This has been an on going problem for years. Unless dog owners are named, shamed and fined they will continue to let their animals foul public areas. What is need is Enforcement Officers to be visible and for fines to be imposed. As at present nothing is enforced and these people will continue to foul public areas unchallenged. If members of the general public take it upon themselves to challenge someone they are likely to be subjected to a tirade of abuse or worse!

I think tough enforcement is needed. Everyone knows they shouldn't leave their dog poo, but they are too lazy & irresponsible to deal with it.

The owners are usually aware and opt not to pick poo up

Targeting the areas where this is a problem - for example in Bampton this is an issue which affects the whole town not just play/green spaces. It is a cultural issue - how do you change mindsets so that all understand this to be a crucial issue? How do you make it socially unacceptable? It is the same one or 2 ignorant dog owners who spoil it for everyone else.

On the spot fine

Information packs at vets

The owners of dogs that don't pick up their dogs poo are unlikely to change their behaviour but if ALL dogs MUST. E kept on leads in Bampton the irresponsible ones will find it difficult to talk themselves out of their dogs excrement when it's viewed by others.

No education would work the people who don't will never do it

Adequate public signage; sufficient dog bins; appropriate fines

Do not leave filled poo bags

Invest money in dog wardens let them do their jobs

Through schools as the children can educate their parents

Whilst I do not need to be educated to know how harmful dog fouling is, if there are dog owners that do need to be educated then I'm all for it.

Why dog faeces can be dangerous to children. notice at the entrance to park, cemetery etc. national campaign to educate all or local stations radio and tv with repeats annually

About the affects of dog poo on wildlife and people. Leaflets and visable presence. Talking to people. Unfortunately the people who cause the issues walk their dogs when they cany be seen at night.

People are idiots and don't care which is a shame as it's ruining a lot for the people that do care, do clean up after their dogs.

Concentrating on offenders and not the responsible owners.

People know right from wrong.Heavily fine those that break law on increasing scale.That would finally educate them perhaps..

Pet owners should pass animal welfare and training test before license issue.

Perhaps pop up information stands in the cca fields so dog walkers can pickup literature and learn how to access dog training options

Being challenged by a patrolling council officer

There needs to be more dog owning classes not just dog training but owner training similar to the parenting classes offered in childrens centres. Making the classes a legal requirement of owning a dog will increase the number of responsible owners

But more importantly there needs to be consequences for their actions, I have not seen a dog warden in years. So unfair for those who stick to the rules

Consistent messages via Community Groups, Dog Charities, Vets etc through Social Media campaigns dealing with responsible Dog ownership

Toxicaria risks and dog attacks on children and adults. If people wish to keep a dog they must prevent it from posing a risk to others.

Unfortunately the people that allow their dogs to foul and don't clear up after them are unlikely to take any notice of education. A fine might make them think twice before allowing it to happen again - maybe a doubling of the fine each time they are caught would be more effective.

Most of these questions are irrelevant. The issue here is not tackling irresponsible dog owners. I am more concerned about an irresponsible and overly punitive local authority who would like to bring something as far reaching as a PSPO to tackle such an issue.

Puppy training is essential for both the owner and the dog. Local canine societies run various training classes and new owners particularly should be encouraged to join classes. The Kennel Club Good Citizen Dog Scheme is excellent training for dogs and owners and covers all situations in which dogs might find themselves. Dogs are sociable animals and benefit from interaction with one another if properly trained. More support should be given by Councils to local training clubs. During the pandemic training clubs have been closed so many dogs will have missed out on crucial early socialisation and training. Council could give more publicity to training clubs.

Those who do not pick up after their dogs seem to think the rule does not apply to them, they say this only happened this once when I confront them. Similarly it is the same people who break the existing rules. The only way I see education working if the individuals caught breaking the rule had to take part in compulsory training, bit like that having to attend if one caught speeding

People who don't pick up their dog's mess are unlikely to be influenced by anything other than a fine of some sort,

Compulsory registration of all dogs and a test of competency should be part of the process

I would hope that was true but rules are the. Best way

Education on the harmful effects of faeces to children and the environment including not disposing of bags efficiently

I think people should have to have a licence to have a dog and could be told how hazardous dog poo is and the amount of children who end up treading in it are are risk

I think people choose to disregard the law as it's easier for them to do so.

Think we've been trying to educate for to long.

The risk of infections and diseases

Posters warning of fines

Tv, Radio, pop up ads, postal mail shots.

Education about the dangers of dog faeces in schools as children would then nag their parents

I believe enforcement of rules and fines needs to better

People know that dog waste is a hazard to public health. Education would be a waste of money on people that can't be educated.

People know what they need to do, they just ignore it. Heavier fines and stronger enforcement is required.

In school (ambassador dogs)

Pick up, no exceptions. It gives the message it's okay if it is not in a public place. Create more bins. Need to educate people it's not okay to bag it and leave it in the hedgerow, edge of the field etc etc.

I think those who let their dogs foul and do not pick it up do it deliberately. They often walk their dogs very early or late at night to avoid being seen. I'm not sure education would reduce this activity. Handing out more fines would make people think about what they're doing.

Shortage of dog bins is a massive issue and needs resolving

alerting people to the dangers of dog poo. You could also try rewarding people for picking up their dog poo, a simple 50 p voucher perhaps.

Posters and warnings

Emphasis on disease and public displays in parks where dogs are walked.

I think it should get the same sort of publicity that smoking does. Smoking is now seen as fairly anti-social and with the right message being continually be promoted could make people more confident to challenge anyone they see not pick up an/or give them the information on how to report offenders.

Any form of education (the practice of teaching) has to be useful. Followed by persecution through the law

I am sure officers of the Council have tried to do this, unfortunately it is the same offenders that appear to ignore and do not engage with training, because they think they know better and have a right to allow their dog to foul where they like.

A mandatory course for those not following the above outlines, schools education to hopefully produce responsible adults

Leaflet social awareness talks descriptions how farm animals can be affected

PCSO and council joint enforcement patrols. Intervention / education in schools - educate the children they educate the irresponsible adults!

Educating offenders - reduce fine & get the offenders to attend a class - a little like speed awareness classes - where they are given detailed facts & guidance as to why they should do it!

There are always those who deliberately ignore the rules.

social media is now the preferred way to discuss these issues. naming and shaming is what instills most fear in the proletariat these days.

Maybe the dangers of dog fouling to small children if they come into contact with it.

National tv advert

Posters/ leaflet campaign. Active engagement with dog owners by council representatives. More poo bins and notices too please!

Leaflets? it should be part and parcel of how you bring up a dog.

Dog wardens and better signs

Talks to schoolchildren about the responsible ownership of dogs, because if you can teach them at an early age to clear up after a dog, it will hopefully be something that they continue into adulthood.

Information about the harms of dog fouling especially for children, information about the rules, information about availability of bags, information about community and care for the environment

Efforts made so far have been very successful. Almost every dog walker I see picks up after their dog.

More signage, More fines and publication of same.

Detailed, graphic information of the disease risks. Cost analysis of cleaning up and collecting abandoned poo bags

Street posters, school talks

Hardly! This has been a problem for years. The number of polite notices have little effect. Some of these people clearly have psychological problems throwing poo bags into trees & bushes.

In my former Neighbourhood, we raised grants to employ a part-time Community Warden, complete with bodycam. His/her position had no authority but the bodycam and polite 'advice/guidance' in the park worked wonders!

provide bags and bins to take the waste

Highlight disease

Education in Schools - giving out poo bags Leaflet drops with pics of dog mess on shoes/prams Maps showing dog bins - added on MDDC website ..

Dog licences should be re-introduced at a sufficient price to include third party insurance and only issued after compulsory training, much like driving licences.

Other Comments

I raise the following points: 1 I do not consider that other options have been considered, as required by the Govt Guidance. 2 I do not consider that the need for a PSPO has been properly evidenced, as required by the Govt guidance. 3 The PSPO is unenforceable since there is no power to require names and addresses to be given to officers. The responsible cabinet member has said that the officer could simply call the police, but he is presumably unaware that it takes 40 minutes or so for a non-urgent call to police even be answered, let alone for a police officer to subsequently attend. Does he think that there is a power to detain individuals for any period? Such a power to require names and addresses is easily obtained delegated authority from the chief Constable, but it has not been done. 4 Likewise there is no power to take photographs by officers (nor are body-worn cameras issued to them) and this is remedied in the same way as point 3. 5 There is little point in having a PSPO if insufficient officer time is then given to enforce it.

This page is intentionally left blank

<u>Stakeholder</u>	For	Against	Comments
<u>Parish & Town Councils in Mid Devon</u>			
Bampton Town Council	Yes		No Comments
Burlescombe Parish Council	Yes		Time Restriction
Black dog			No Response
Bow			No Response
Bradninch			No Response
Chawleigh			No Response
Cheriton Bishop Parish Council	Yes		4 dogs would be more appropriate (Q6) - Time restriction (Q9) - I think those who will pick up are probably already doing so and those who won't pick up will just never be bothered (Q10) - Yes but not in any areas covered by the Order (12)
Cheriton Fitzpaine			No Response
Colebrooke			No Response
Copplestone			No Response
Crediton			No Response

Cullompton Town Council	Yes		Dependent on varying factors, It was agreed it would be difficult to determine what could be considered reasonable for individual dog owners eg individuals' capability and also the size of the dogs they are responsible for/walking. (Q6) - Yes. When this consultation relates solely to Schedules B, C & D as opposed to across fields, public footpaths and roads etc (Q7) - Dogs should be kept on leads at all times in Schedule C Plan 25 & 26. Restrictions should be in force at all times (Q9) - Enforcement i.e. fines and dog wardens would be more effective; Dog owners/handlers should clear up after their pets regardless of where they are walking them; Dog faeces/excrement does not need to be in a bag. Concerns regarding plastic bags thrown in hedges or left scattered around. Totally in favour in urban or defined public spaces but as long as 'waste' is dealt with responsibly, using bags is not necessarily required (Q10)
Culmstock			No Response
Halberton			No Response
Hemyock			Millhayes, Logan Way and Longmead to be added to dogs on leads, areas missed from pre consultation
Holcombe Rogus Parish Council	Yes		Should be 4 (Q6) - Time Restriction so it applies for the whole year (Q9) - It does not appear to have worked on the Grand Western Canal in spite of more signs (Q10)
Lapford			No Response
Morcharde Bishop Parish Council	Yes		Neither (Q9)
Oakford			No Response
Puddington			No Response
Sandford Peverell			No Response

Sandford Parish Council	Yes		All dogs should be on lead walking amongst livestock (Q7). - All the time (Q9)
Shobrooke			No Response
Silverton Parish Council	Yes		Only if enforcement happens (Q10)
Tiverton			No Response
Uffculme			No Response
Wembworthy Parish Council	Yes		Park (in Wembworthy) prohibits dogs already. (Q3) - Time Restriction between hours of 8am to 8pm (Q9) - In schools for future generations. Explain toxic nature of dog faeces. Posters explaining this in all parks and play areas (Q10)
Willand Parish Council	Yes		There has been ample 'education' in our village by way of signs, pink spray, school poster competition, social media publicity. Best education is a few fines with press publicity (Q10) - Many dog owning residents would appreciate being able to walk their dogs on a lead, using the edge of the grass area from the Pear Drive entrance to the Jaycroft entrance. I believe that the Victoria Close Play Area which is maintained by MDDC allows dogs within the grassed area as long as they are on a lead
Chief Constable of Devon & Cornwall Police			No Response
The Police & Crime Commissioner			No Response
<u>All neighbouring Local Authorities</u>			
Devon County Council			No Response
East Devon			Thank you for the consultation on your proposed PSPO. We have no comments to make other than it is very similar to our PSPOs with the exception of dogs on leads alongside roads
Exeter City			No Response
North Devon			No Response
Plymouth			No Response

South Hams			No Response
Teignbridge			No Response
Torquay			No Response
Torrige			No Response
West Devon			No Response
Devon County Council Canal			I note that a sign has been put up on the fence around the Canal Basin Play Park regarding the public consultation on the PSPO. I welcome this, but following on from the thread below wonder if there is a reason why the Canal Basin picnic area has not been included in the consultation?
Operational Managers of all Council departments within Mid Devon District Council	Yes		No comments
<u>Local Community Centres</u>			
Cullompton Community Centre			No Response
Old Heathcoat School			No Response
Sunningmead Community Association	Yes		Limit should be less, maximum 4 (Q6) - Dogs should be kept on leads at all times (Q9) - TV/press campaigns. More stringent fines (Q10)
The Boniface Centre	Yes		Time Restriction. Maybe extend time restriction to 8pm during British Summer Time (Q9)
Members of Parliament whose constituencies include part of the Mid Devon District			No Response

<p>All MDDC Councillors</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>and heavily fined if not (Q1) - Dogs should not be in either cemetery or churchyard. Safety & health should always come first (Q3) - Of course! Dog muck causes disease! (Q4) - A blanket ban on dogs "off lead" in public parks is unnecessary and oppressive. Parish & Town Councils should be given delegated/discretionary powers to ban dogs "off lead" either completely or in given areas or at specific times (Q7) Time Restriction (Q9) - Blanket rules are unnecessary (Q9) - On leads at all times. One child bitten is one too many. No restriction (Q9) - Signs explaining simply the problem (Q10) - The emphasis should be on successful dog handling and management not on how horrible and anti-social dogs can be (Q10) - Yes I run two dogs (Q11) - I raise the following points: 1 I do not consider that other options have been considered, as required by the Govt Guidance. 2 I do not consider that the need for a PSPO has been properly evidenced, as required by the Govt guidance. 3 The PSPO is unenforceable since there is no power to require names and addresses to be given to officers. The responsible cabinet member has said that the officer could simply call the police, but he is presumably unaware that it takes 40 minutes or so for a non-urgent call to police even be answered, let alone for a police officer to subsequently attend. Does he think that there is a power to detain individuals for any period? Such a power to require names and addresses is easily obtained delegated authority from the chief Constable, but it has not been done. 4 Likewise there is no power to take photographs by officers (nor are body-worn cameras issued to them) and this is remedied in the same way as point 3. 5 There is little point in having a PSPO if insufficient officer time is then given to enforce it.</p>
<p>Ramblers & Walking Groups</p>			

East Devon Ramblers			No Response
Ramblers			No Response
Exeter and District			No Response
Exeter Outdoor Group			No Response
South Devon Ramblers			No Response
<u>Animal Welfare Groups</u>			
Blue Cross	Yes		Far too many for 1 person to control (Q6)
RSPCA			No Response
The Kennel Club	Yes		If dog owners are approached at the end of a walk they may have already used the bags that they have taken out or given a spare bag to someone who has run out for example (Q2) - An arbitrary maximum number of dogs is an inappropriate approach. Consider accreditation scheme for commercial dog walkers (Q5) - Seasonal or time of day restriction (Q9) - Proactive measures include communicating to local dog owners that bagged dog faeces can be disposed of in normal litter bins; running responsible ownership and training events; or using poster campaigns to encourage dog owners to pick up after their dog (Q10)
<u>Boarding Kennels within the Mid Devon District</u>			
Bunkersland Boarding			No Response
Cottage Boarding & Rescue			No Response
Country Hounds			No Response
Lapford Lodge			No Response
Little Oaks			No Response

Orchard End Kennels & Cattery	Yes		Lots of dogs are family pets and so children may be unsupervised if not allowed in; could make it mandatory that they are kept on leads in the area instead (Q4) - Time Restriction - more likely to be obeyed (Q9)
Sunnymead			No Response
<u>Sports Clubs</u>			
Bradninch Bowling Club			No Response
Bradninch Cricket Club			No Response
Crediton Bowling Club			No Response
Crediton Rugby, Football Club			No Response
Cullompton Rangers FC	Yes		I think 4 (Q6) - Professional dog walkers will probably want a minimum of 6 dogs (Q7)
Cullompton Rugby Club			No Response
Cullompton Taekwondo Club			No Response

Devon Countrywide access Forum	Yes		<p>We advise as much consistency as possible is required so that dog owners become aware of restrictions and are confident in walking their dogs in other areas. We note that the neighbouring authorities of East Devon and Teignbridge have set a limit of six so it is appropriate that Mid Devon should propose the same number. It is not clear whether professional dog walkers have been considered and whether these are currently licenced by the authority as this is a growing business sector (Q6) - When seeking to put a dogs on leads restriction in public spaces, the Forum advises that there is a need to consider a fair balance between rights of owners and non-dog owners, particularly in urban areas where the restrictions can be extensive. This could have the effect of forcing dog owners into cars to go to rural areas with public rights of way and other public space not affected by restrictions. Alternatively, owners may ignore the legislation if they believe it to be unreasonable. Dog owning is important to health and wellbeing and the major reason why people go out. More consideration needs to be given to providing areas where dogs can legitimately be let off lead (Q7) - Many dog walkers are unaware even of the existence of dog control orders, and even less the specific details of restrictions. People are particularly unaware that dog fouling applies to all public land. In its response to a consultation on the refreshed Country Code, we suggested Social media and influencers, citizenship education in schools and clear graphic messages. These suggestions would apply equally here. Publicity and information about dogs on leads should emphasise to people that dogs should be kept on a short lead in the vicinity of livestock to protect stock from potential injury and disease (Q10) - Several members are dog owners and/or landowners with farm dogs (Q11) - Some members do (Q12)</p>
Elmore AFC			No Response
Exeter & District Lawn Tennis League			No Response

Heathcoat Cricket Club			No Response
Mid Devon Indoor Bowles Centre			No Response
Morebath Cricket Club			No Response
Newton St Cyres Golf Course			No Response
Petroc Fitness Centre			No Response
Rackenford Club			No Response
Sampford Peverell & Tiverton Cricket Club	Yes		6 is too many. Suggest 3-4 as maximum (Q6)
Tiverton Borough Bowles Club			No Response
Tiverton Bowling Club			No Response
Tiverton Rugby Club			No Response
Tiverton Sword Fencing Club			No Response
Tiverton Town Football Club			No Response
Tiverton WestEnd Bowling Club			No Response
WGA Golf Course			No Response
Unknown Stakeholder responses	Yes		Should be no more than 3 (Q6) - Or lower (Q6) - 2 (Q6) - At all times (Q9) - fines rather than education (Q10)

This page is intentionally left blank

Equality Impact Assessment Form and Action Table 2015

(Expand the boxes as appropriate, please see guidance)

"I shall try to explain what "due regard" means and how the courts interpret it. The courts have made it clear that having due regard is **more than having a cursory glance** at a document before arriving at a preconceived conclusion. Due regard requires public authorities, in formulating a policy, to give equality considerations the weight which is **proportionate in the circumstances**, given the potential impact of the policy on equality. It is not a question of box-ticking; it requires the equality impact to be **considered rigorously and with an open mind.**"

Baroness Thornton, March 2010

What are you completing the Impact Assessment on (which policy, service, MTFP reference etc.)?

PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER - DOGS

Version

2

Date

1 July 2021

Section 1 – Description of what is being impact assessed

The impact of a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO), if made and in force. The PSPO would place certain requirements and prohibitions on the public when using certain public spaces in the Mid Devon District.

Section 2A – People or communities that are targeted or could be affected (taking particular note of the Protected Characteristic listed in action table)

All members of the public would be required to abide by the PSPO, if made and in force. The PSPO does contain exemptions in Clause 10 which would exclude any person who:

1. is registered as blind, sight or hearing impaired under the National Assistance Act 1948, or any other legislation;
2. has a disability which affects his mobility, manual dexterity, physical coordination, or ability to lift, carry or otherwise move everyday objects, in respect of a dog trained by a registered charity and upon which he relies for assistance;
3. is using a working dog for purposes of law enforcement, military duties or statutory emergency services (search and rescue); or
4. is using a working dog for agricultural activities or exempt hunting as set out in Schedule 1 of the Hunting Act 2004.

Section 2B – People who are delivering the policy or service

Policy proposed by Street Scene and Open Spaces. If made and in force, the PSPO will be enforced by Council Officers (Street Scene) and the police.

Section 3 – Evidence and data used for the assessment (Attach documents where appropriate)

A review of Guidance highlighted the specific impact of a PSPO on members of the public with certain protected characteristics i.e. disability.

https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/10.21%20PSPO%20guidance_06_1.pdf

Two public consultations were undertaken concerning the proposed terms of the PSPO and asking for comments on the PSPO's impact.

Section 4 – Conclusions drawn about the equalities impact (positive or negative) of the proposed change or new service/policy:

It is clear that the requirements and prohibitions suggested within the PSPO were going to have a direct impact as described above, and so the PSPO was drafted to allow any persons with the disability protected characteristics to be exempt from Order.

The purpose of an equality impact assessment is to ensure that our services, policies and practices do not directly, indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally discriminate against the users of our services or our staff. Where a negative impact is found, we will mitigate the impact through the development and implementation of equality improvement plans.

If you have identified any negative impacts you will need to consider how these can be mitigated to either reduce or remove them. In the table below let us know what mitigation you will take. (Please add rows where needed)

Identified issue drawn from your conclusions	Actions needed – can you mitigate the impacts? If you can how will you mitigate the impacts?	Who is responsible for the actions? When will the action be completed?	How will it be monitored? What is the expected outcome from the action?
Age			
Different approaches and mechanisms are required for engaging with and representing, people of different ages, in particular children and young people.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disability			
Different approaches and mechanisms may be required for engaging with and representing, people with a range of disabilities depending on their individual needs.	The exemptions contained within section 10 of the draft PSPO fully mitigate the impacts identified.	Environment and Enforcement Manager	Complaints should be monitored to ensure Council Officers responsible for enforcement have regard to the exemptions in practice.
Gender Reassignment			
It is very important that the specification does not discriminate against those who are or have undergone gender reassignment who currently use the service or may wish to use it in the future.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marriage and Civil Partnership			
No issues identified	N/A	N/A	N/A

Pregnancy and Maternity			
It is very important that the specification does not discriminate against those who are pregnant, who use the service or who wish to use it in the future.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Race (including ethnicity or national origin, colour, nationality and Gypsies and Travellers)			
It is very important that the specification reflects the particular needs of people from all backgrounds who currently use the service or may wish to use it in the future.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Religion and Belief			
It is very important that the specification reflects the particular needs of people irrelevant of their religions and beliefs who currently use the service or may wish to use it in the future.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sex			
It is very important that the specification reflects the particular needs of people irrelevant of their sex who currently use the service or may wish to use it in the future.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sexual Orientation			
It is very important that the specification reflects the particular needs of people irrelevant of their sexual orientation who currently use the service or may wish to use it in the future.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Other (including caring responsibilities, rurality, low income, Military Status etc)			
<p>Rurality</p> <p>It is important that the service is able to engage with and represent individuals who live in rural areas and / or have limited access to public transport.</p>	<p>The specification requires the Provider to meet the needs of all people in Mid Devon, to have a presence in local communities and ensure that communication plans reflect the rurality of Mid Devon.</p> <p>The Provider is required to ensure that the service represents the diverse population of Mid Devon and that reasonable adjustments are made to all services / activities to ensure individuals are able to access the service.</p> <p>Operational commissioning of the service will ensure that the service is being delivered according to the service specification and quality standards and will take account of customer feedback.</p>	<p>Environment and Enforcement Manager</p>	<p>Complaints and/or comments should be monitored to ensure compliance.</p>

Section 6 - How will the assessment, consultation and outcomes be published and communicated? E.g. reflected in final strategy, published. What steps are in place to review the Impact Assessment?

Published with the Policy, also the Committee and Cabinet Reports. The assessment will be taken into account by Members in making the final decision about whether to make the PSPO in the recommended form.

Completed by:	Vicky Lowman
Date	01.07.2021
Signed off by:	
Date	
Compliance sign off Date	
To be reviewed by: (officer name)	
Review date:	

This page is intentionally left blank

ENVIRONMENT PDG 13 JULY 2021:

PERFORMANCE AND RISK OUTTURN REPORT FOR 2020/21

Cabinet Member Cllr Bob Deed
Responsible Officer Chief Executive, Stephen Walford

Reason for Report: To provide Members with the outturn on performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for 2020/21.

RECOMMENDATION: That the PDG reviews the performance and risks and feeds back any areas of concern.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: Corporate Plan priorities and targets are effectively maintained through the use of appropriate performance indicators and regular monitoring.

Financial Implications: None identified

Legal Implications: None

Risk Assessment: If performance is not monitored we may fail to meet our corporate and local service plan targets or to take appropriate corrective action where necessary.

Equality Impact Assessment: No equality issues identified for this report.

Climate Impact Assessment: A number of performance indicators are either directly or indirectly related to our corporate ambition to reduce carbon emissions. Monitoring the performance of these can help evaluate impact of Council interventions as well as guide future decisions on spend and investment.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Corporate Plan was approved by Cabinet on 16 January 2020 and runs from April 2020 until March 2024. This is the first annual report against the current Corporate Plan. The attached KPI appendices cover the entire financial year. Progress is monitored throughout the year by reporting against the declared Aims for each Priority identified.

1.2 In terms of the priorities for the coming year, the Cabinet will be focused on embedding a recovery from the pandemic, while trying to ensure that delivery against the corporate plan is back on track. As members will see from the KPI report, there are a number of areas that have been dramatically affected by the pandemic and it will be important to understand where these are inevitable and understood 'blips' on a trajectory, where they might be structural changes caused by what's occurred in the last year, and most importantly how to get

delivery back on track wherever possible to ensure that corporate aims can be met.

2.0 Environment Appendix 1

Aim - Increase recycling rates and reduce the amounts of residual waste generated

- 2.1 The final result for the recycling rate for the year was just below target at 53.5% compared to 53.12% last year. The residual waste was above target at 379.8Kg last year's final result was on target at 365Kg per household.
- 2.2 The waste service has experienced significantly increased levels of recycling and residual waste during lockdown periods, waste arisings have increased by 1975.57 tonnes compared to last year. All our near neighbours also saw an increase in residual waste per household. The service was also adversely affected by staff absences and constraints at the start of the pandemic.
- 2.3 Both measures for missed collections are better than target at 0.02% of all collections for the second year running.
- 2.4 The number of households paying for the chargeable garden waste service exceeded the target of 11,100 customers. An increase of 16.45% compared to the previous year; this is the largest increase since 2017/18.
- 2.5 Altogether a good set of results, the priority for 2021/22 is the three weekly waste collection trial which is due to start in July for three months. This will establish whether this is viable and how much of an improvement it might lead to in terms of recycling rates and a corresponding fall in residual Kg per household. Recycling rates need to significantly increase, so further work is likely to be needed to explore ways in which this could be achieved.

Aim - Encourage "green" sources of energy supply new policies and develop plans to decarbonise energy consumption in Mid Devon

- 2.6 At an extraordinary meeting of Full Council on 26 June 2019, Members voted unanimously to support an ambitious cut in carbon emissions; to aim for Mid Devon to become carbon neutral by 2030.
- 2.7 The Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan were approved by Cabinet on 1 October 2020. The Climate and Sustainability Specialist started on 1 March 2021.
- 2.8 The Council has secured more than £310,000 of Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme grant to fund the installation of energy efficiency and cost-saving measures at its three leisure centres.
- 2.9 The Council will also receive an additional £38,000 in the form of two grants from Salix, which is administering the government funding. These two grants are specifically to assist the development of a Heat Decarbonisation Plan to 2030 (£18,000) and £20,000 for skilled project support on the delivery of our Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme that will be rolled out to the leisure

centres. All three funding schemes will help the Council take valuable steps closer to realising its ambition to become carbon neutral by 2030.

3.0 Homes Appendix 2

Aim - Deliver more affordable housing and greater numbers of social rented homes

3.1 No new council houses were built during 2020/21 but one right to buy property was bought back. However in March the Council announced plans to build more than 50 new council houses between 2021 and 2024. For 2021/22 a target of 17 has been set.

3.2 None of the targets for housing delivery have been met but it must be recognised that the Covid pandemic increased the challenges during 2020/21 with the industry being completely shut down during the first period of lockdown. In this light the number of completions should be viewed favourably.

Aims - Work with Community Land Trusts and other organisations to deliver homes retained in perpetuity for local need Support the establishment of Community Land Trusts in partnership with Parish Councils and other local bodies

3.3 Two Community Land Trusts were assisted during 2020/21 meeting the target.

Aim - Work with landlords to ensure the quality of homes in the private rented sector

3.4 Empty homes brought back into use were once again above target at 101 (138 last year).

Aim - Support and grow active tenancy engagement

3.5 A tenant survey was successfully completed with a response rate of 34%. Work is continuing on analysing the results and developing an action plan.

3.6 Staff continued to provide a high level of support to tenants while working from home during the pandemic. Repairs staff were redeployed to maintain corporate assets while non-urgent work was suspended during the first lockdown but have been working fairly normally throughout the remainder of the year. The teams received a lot of positive feedback from customers.

Aim - Work with local stakeholders to initiate delivery of the new garden village at Culm

3.7 Two stakeholder forums were held remotely during 2020/21, in August and September, on the Building with Nature accreditation and the Connecting the Culm project.

4.0 Economy Appendix 3

Aims - Identify strategic and tactical interventions to create economic and community confidence and pride in the places we live. This includes a continued focus on Town Centre Regeneration

Develop and deliver regeneration plans for all 3 main towns in partnership with Town and Parish Councils, private and third sector and communities Promote the regeneration of our Town Centres by working with landlords and property developers to improve and increase the supply of quality housing

- 4.1 Progress has been made on both the Tiverton Town Centre and Cullompton Town masterplans during 2020/21 with stage 2 consultations for both scheduled for 2021/22.
- 4.2 The Council's own retail properties have good occupancy rates with only three vacancies across the portfolio in Tiverton, one of which has been recently let subject to contract.
- 4.3 The number of empty business units across the district have reduced during 2020/21 and the number of business rate accounts has increased, although this is partly due to small businesses registering for the first time in order to secure grant funding. This is an encouraging sign of business resilience, however the next 6-9 months will be the test as national support mechanisms unwind and economic activity rebalances to its own level.
- 4.4 The Council has administered £36M of Covid grant funding to businesses over the course of the pandemic along with £2M of new rate reliefs. This was an enormous amount of work undertaken by staff from Revenues, Growth and Economic Development, redeployed Leisure staff and Finance.
- 4.5 Growth and Economic Development and Public Health staff have worked hard to help businesses and retail areas to open safely when they were allowed after the periods of lockdown.

Aim - the creation of South West Mutual Bank and seek opportunities to encourage new branches being opened in areas that aren't well-served by existing banking services providers

- 4.6 A meeting was held in December 2020 by the Deputy Chief Executive and the Cabinet Member for Finance with SW Mutual Bank's Director to receive an update on progress. Clearly, the prevailing Covid19 challenges have slowed down previously identified actions and delayed key milestones, however, at the conclusion of the meeting it was agreed that a quarterly progress update report would be provided in the future.

5.0 Community Appendix 4

- 5.1 In addition to the business grant funding referred to above the Council has £534,410 funding specifically to help adversely affected individuals through

Hardship funding and Self Isolation payments. For the latter the Council had 263 applications up to March 2021; 104 were paid (£52k), 144 rejected and 15 were awaiting assessment.

Aim - Secure decent digital connectivity for all of Mid Devon

- 5.2 Town centre Wi-Fi projects are proposed to be delivered in 2021.

Aim - Seek opportunities to address public health issues and disparities to improve the health and wellbeing of everyone in Mid Devon

- 5.3 Despite the Leisure centres being closed for several periods during the pandemic a few people were still referred under the various schemes and started in the Autumn. These programmes will continue in 2021/22.
- 5.4 During the closures Leisure staff were redeployed to other services including Street Scene, Planning, Housing, grant payments and NFI work. During the first lockdown some were working on the Shielding project and later with community testing at EVLC and vaccinations at LMLC.

6.0 Corporate Appendix 5

- 6.1 The Planning KPIs are all on target or better than target which, bearing in mind both the vacancies in key areas and the relatively undiminished volume of applications, is a significant success.
- 6.2 The responses to FOI requests have been 100% on time for two years.
- 6.3 The Council's own industrial units had 100% occupancy rates at the end of the year.
- 6.4 Collection rates for Council tax and NNDR are only slightly below target which is a real achievement during a pandemic when no formal recovery took place.
- 6.5 The Devon and Somerset Metro Board reached an important milestone in February, submitting a Strategic Outline Business Case to the Department for Transport to reopen stations at Cullompton and Wellington. This is a crucial step forward in the process of implementing improvements to the rail network including the provision of these new stations.

7.0 Risk

Some risk scores have increased due to the Covid 19 pandemic especially as regards financing, homelessness and the economic outlook.

- 7.1 The Corporate risk register is regularly reviewed by Group Managers and Leadership Team and updated as required.

7.2 Risk reports to committees include strategic risks with a current score of 10 or more in accordance with the Risk and Opportunity Management Strategy. (Appendix 6)

7.3 Operational risk assessments are job specific and flow through to safe systems of work. These risks go to the Health and Safety Committee biannually with escalation to committees where serious concerns are raised.

8.0 Recommendations

8.1 That the PDG reviews the performance and risks and feeds back any areas of concern.

Contact for more Information: Catherine Yandle Operations Manager for Performance, Governance and Health & Safety email: cyandle@middevon.gov.uk

Circulation of the Report: Leadership Team and Leader

Corporate Plan PI Report Environment

Monthly report for 2020-2021
Arranged by Aims
Filtered by Aim: Priorities Environment
For MDDC - Services

Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators:

No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

* indicates that an entity is linked to the Aim by its parent Service

Corporate Plan PI Report Environment

Priorities: Environment

Aims: Increase recycling and reduce the amount of waste

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Residual household waste per household (measured in Kilograms) (figures have to be verified by DCC)</u>	365.00	362.0	34.3	63.0	93.8	126.5	154.7	184.4	216.6	248.3	276.3	314.8	344.7	379.8	Darren Beer	(April - March) A 3.42% increase compared to previous year; The lockdown period has contributed to this rise due to residents creating more residual waste to be disposed

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: 10 June 2021 18:08

Page 159

Corporate Plan PI Report Environment

Priorities: Environment

Aims: Increase recycling and reduce the amount of waste

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
																of from home. (LD)
Number of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) Issued (Environment)	17	No Target	0	0	4	4	4	5	10	10	10	10	10	10	Darren Beer	(March) Lockdown restrictions during March have reduced the occurrence of offences (LD)
% of Household Waste Reused, Recycled and Composted (figures have to be verified by DCC)	53.12%	54.5%	52.6%	53.7%	54.3%	54.3%	54.3%	55.4%	54.8%	54.6%	54.0%	53.7%	53.2%	53.5%	Darren Beer	(March) Waste arisings have increased by 1975.57 tonnes compared to last year with 1214.19 of those tonnes being recyclables the remaining 761.27 tonnes are residual waste which is encouraging however if the waste hierarchy is

Page 160

Corporate Plan PI Report Environment

Priorities: Environment

Aims: Increase recycling and reduce the amount of waste

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
																applied an emphasis on prevention and reuse would reduce waste arisings as well as residual waste. (LD)
<u>Number of Households on Chargeable Garden Waste</u>	10,007	11,100	10,007	10,837	10,928	11,088	11,154	11,245	11,251	11,176	11,232	11,315	11,501	11,653	Darren Beer	(March) An increase of 16.45% compared to the previous year; this is the largest increase since 2017/18. (LD)
<u>% of missed collections reported (refuse and organic waste)</u>	0.02%	0.03%	0.01%	0.02%	0.02%	0.01%	0.01%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	Darren Beer	(March) Missed collections for refuse/organic are 0.01% under the annual target (LD)
<u>% of Missed Collections logged (recycling)</u>	0.02%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	Darren Beer	(March) Missed collections for recycling

Page 161

Corporate Plan PI Report Environment

Priorities: Environment

Aims: Increase recycling and reduce the amount of waste

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
																collections are 0.01% under the annual target (LD)

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: 10 June 2021 18:08

Page 162

Corporate Plan PI Report Climate Change

Monthly report for 2020-2021
 Arranged by Aims
 Filtered by Aim: Priorities Climate Change
 For MDDC - Services

Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators:

No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

* indicates that an entity is linked to the Aim by its parent Service

Page 163

Corporate Plan PI Report Climate Change
Priorities: Climate Change
Aims: Green Sources of Energy

Performance Indicators																
Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Electric Car Charger Units</u>	n/a	8	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	Jason Ball, Andrew Busby	(Quarter 4) Between 5 and 15 high potential locations identified. Options report submitted for Cabinet 13 May 2021 in order to empower officers to secure funded installations. (CY)

Corporate Plan PI Report Climate Change

Priorities: Climate Change

Aims: Green Sources of Energy

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>New Solar Initiatives</u>	n/a	250	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	211	n/a	n/a	251	n/a	n/a	251	Jason Ball, Andrew Busby	(Quarter 4) 37 customers have now been accepted for solar panel installations and 8 for retrofit batteries (CY)
<u>Electric Car Charger usage</u>	n/a	2,000	11	58	139	399	762	994	1,248	1,342	1,513	1,603	1,712	1,867	Jason Ball, Andrew Busby	(March) Year finished slightly below target after effects of lockdowns earlier in the year (CY)

Page 164

Aims: Biodiversity

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Corporate Tree Planting Scheme</u>	n/a	Develop corporate tree planting scheme by end 20/21	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	No	Jason Ball, Andrew Busby	(2020 - 2021) Post the national restrictions volunteers have now met again on the allocated area of land adjacent to Morrison's in Tiverton with a date on planting expected to be early in the New Year and Property Services also

Corporate Plan PI Report Climate Change

Priorities: Climate Change

Aims: Biodiversity

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
																met Sustainable Crediton who are looking to plant trees at the end of January 2021 Cllr Slade has allocated Tiverton Tree Team £500 from his Mayor's Community Fund (CY)
<u>Community climate and biodiversity grants</u>	n/a	Funding agreed is first stage	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	No	Jason Ball, Andrew Busby	(2020 - 2021) Following a meeting with Mid Devon District Council, members of the St Lawrence Community Group and Sustainable Crediton have joined forces to take over planting up the flower beds on St Lawrence Green with pollinator friendly varieties. (CY)

Page 165

Aims: Retro-fitting measures

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Corporate</u>	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	Jason Ball,	(2020 - 2021) Carlu Close

Corporate Plan PI Report Climate Change

Priorities: Climate Change

Aims: Retro-fitting measures

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Renewable Energy Projects</u>															Andrew Busby	solar PV project has been completed and the hydro project is a live planning application at present. (CY)
<u>ECO Flex</u>	n/a	600						424	550	637	744	818	909	1,032	Simon Newcombe	
<u>Housing Assistance Policy</u>	n/a	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	5	5	5	Simon Newcombe	
<u>Home Improvement Loans</u>	n/a	5	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	5	n/a	n/a	10	Simon Newcombe	(Quarter 4) As we are coming out of lockdown we are seeing a rise in enquiries which in turn leads to loans sanctioned. This is a great result given the difficulties of the last year. (TW)

Page 166

Aims: Other

Corporate Plan PI Report Climate Change

Priorities: Climate Change

Aims: Other

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Community Schemes</u>	n/a		n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	Jason Ball, Andrew Busby	(Quarter 4) The C&S Specialist will enable community groups to promote sustainability activities and resources on the new climate website. (CY)
<u>Council Carbon Footprint</u>	n/a	19,000	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	19,439	Jason Ball, Andrew Busby	(Quarter 4) LED lighting and new boiler installation in Phoenix House, Carlu Close solar PV (CY)

Page 167

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: 10 June 2021 18:07

This page is intentionally left blank

Corporate Plan PI Report Homes

Monthly report for 2020-2021
 Arranged by Aims
 Filtered by Aim: Priorities Homes
 For MDDC - Services

Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators: No Data Well below target Below target On target Above target Well above target

* indicates that an entity is linked to the Aim by its parent Service

Page 169

Corporate Plan PI Report Homes

Priorities: Homes

Aims: Deliver Housing

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Net additional homes provided</u>	n/a	393	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	335	Jenny Clifford, Simon Newcombe	(2020 - 2021) The annual target has not been met. However, house completions have been sustained notwithstanding the challenges that the Covid-19 pandemic has placed on the construction industry. (TP)
<u>Self Build Plots</u>	n/a	5	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	6	n/a	n/a	6	Jenny Clifford	(Quarter 3) Three custom and self build plots were permissioned in October 2020 on three sites. (TP)
<u>Gypsy & Traveller Pitches</u>	n/a	2	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	1	Jenny Clifford	(Quarter 4) 1 pitch implemented in January 2021. Planning permission has been granted for 5 pitches as part of mixed development at Pedlarspool, Crediton. (TP)
<u>Number of affordable</u>	133	94	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	30	Jenny	(2020 - 2021) Evidence shows that some

Corporate Plan PI Report Homes

Priorities: Homes

Aims: Deliver Housing

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>homes delivered (gross)</u>															Clifford	delivery of Affordable Housing has been sustained on site allocations, but delivery overall has been impacted by the challenges the Covid 19 pandemic has placed on the construction industry. (TP)
<u>New Social Rent Council Houses</u>	26		n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	Andrew Busby, Simon Newcombe	(Quarter 4) We have converted 2 additional properties and bought back 2 RTB properties during the year (CY)
<u>Number of Homelessness Approaches</u>	n/a	721 for 2019/20	n/a	n/a	125	n/a	n/a	289	n/a	n/a	433	n/a	n/a	587	Simon Newcombe	

Page 170

Aims: Community Land Trusts

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Community Land Trusts Assisted</u>	n/a	2	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	2	n/a	n/a	2	Jenny Clifford	(Quarter 4) Two CLTs have been assisted in the period 2020 - 2021 (Chawleigh Community Trust and Sampford Peverell Community Land Trust). (TP)

Aims: Private Sector Housing

Corporate Plan PI Report Homes

Priorities: Homes

Aims: Private Sector Housing

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Deliver homes by bringing Empty Houses into use</u>	138	72	1	9	26	31	34	44	59	60	71	78	88	101	Simon Newcombe	
<u>Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) investigations</u>	n/a	100%						100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	92%	93%	Simon Newcombe	(February) 8 HMO enquiries received 5 have had initial investigation carried out. Covid restrictions, lack of resources and additional workload mean that not all HMO enquiries have been progressed. (TW)
<u>Landlord engagement and Support</u>	n/a	9	n/a	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	8	n/a	n/a	12	n/a	n/a	14	Simon Newcombe	(Quarter 4) Pin point and social media post (TW)

Page 171

Aims: Council Housing

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>% Complaints Responded to On Time</u>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Simon Newcombe	
<u>Tenant Census</u>	n/a		n/a	n/a	34%	n/a	n/a	34%	n/a	n/a	34%	n/a	n/a	34%	Simon Newcombe	
<u>% Emergency Repairs</u>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	Simon Newcombe	

Corporate Plan PI Report Homes

Priorities: Homes

Aims: Council Housing

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Completed on Time</u>																
<u>% Urgent Repairs Completed on Time</u>	100.0%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.1%	Simon Newcombe	
<u>% Routine Repairs Completed on Time</u>	99.3%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.4%	99.8%	100.0%	100.0%	99.5%	97.5%	100.0%	100.0%	Simon Newcombe	
<u>% Repair Jobs Where an Appointment Was Kept</u>	98.9%	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.8%	100.0%	99.0%	99.7%	100.0%	100.0%	99.3%	99.6%	100.0%	99.0%	Simon Newcombe	
<u>% Properties With a Valid Gas Safety Certificate</u>	99.82%	100.0%	99.6%	99.4%	98.9%	98.9%	99.2%	99.4%	99.5%	99.5%	99.5%	99.4%	99.9%	99.4%	Simon Newcombe	

Page 172

Corporate Plan PI Report Economy

Monthly report for 2020-2021
 Arranged by Aims
 Filtered by Aim: Priorities Economy
 For MDDC - Services

Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators:	No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
-------------------------	---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

* indicates that an entity is linked to the Aim by its parent Service

Corporate Plan PI Report Economy

Priorities: Economy

Aims: Incubator and start-up space

Performance Indicators																Group Act Manager	Officer Notes
Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act			
<u>Incubator and Start-up space</u>	n/a	Target not yet set as initial work required													Jenny Clifford	(February) Scoping exercise to understand requirements has been affected by staff redeployment into COVID-19 response work and will not now take place until later in 2021. (JC)	
<u>Sites for Commercial Development</u>	n/a	2						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Keith Ashton, Andrew Busby	(March) Kingmills/Simmons Place footprint for other sites. (CY)	

Aims: Improve and regenerate our town centres

Performance Indicators																Group Manager	Officer Notes
Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act			
<u>Number of business rate accounts</u>	3,241	3,250	3,104	3,112	3,123	3,137	3,149	3,339	3,340	3,349	3,347	3,355	3,356	3,356	Dean Emery		
<u>Business Rates RV</u>	n/a		£45,355,994	£45,388,169	£45,354,679	£45,377,354	£45,470,574	£45,519,079	£45,519,379	£45,564,477	£45,584,367	£45,584,392	£45,577,552	£45,601,082	Dean Emery		
<u>Empty Business Properties</u>	n/a							267	258	304			250	244	Dean Emery		
<u>Tiverton Town Centre Masterplan</u>	n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		Jenny Clifford, Adrian Welsh	(2020 - 2021) Projects associated with the masterplanning work have been	

Corporate Plan PI Report Economy

Priorities: Economy

Aims: Improve and regenerate our town centres

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
																considered by Cabinet in order to prepare for possible funding opportunities. Informed by this work a Community Renewal Fund bid has been submitted. Stage 2 consultation on the masterplan is programmed for Autumn 21. (JC)
<u>Cullompton Town Centre Masterplan</u>	n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		Jenny Clifford, Adrian Welsh	(2020 - 2021) The draft masterplan was agreed for public consultation at the May 21 Cabinet meeting. Stage 2 public consultation is due to commence in June 21. (JC)
<u>Pannier Market Regular Traders</u>	n/a	Varies from 75 to 80% depending on the day							77.7%		77.0%	41.0%	35.7%	34.7%	Adrian Welsh	(March) Social distancing limitations and pandemic were still issues over this period. Early signs are encouraging following the 12 April 21 reopening and work continues to attract more traders to the market. (CY)
<u>West Exe North and South</u>	n/a		n/a	n/a	13	n/a	n/a	13	n/a	n/a	13	n/a	n/a	13	Keith Ashton, Andrew Busby	(Quarter 4) 92%, 1 unit vacant (CY)

Page 174

Corporate Plan PI Report Economy

Priorities: Economy

Aims: Improve and regenerate our town centres

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Fore St Tiverton</u>	n/a		n/a	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	4	n/a	n/a	4	Keith Ashton, Andrew Busby	(Quarter 4) 80% 1 vacant unit, let STC (CY)
<u>Market Walk Tiverton</u>	n/a		n/a	n/a	13	n/a	n/a	13	n/a	n/a	14	n/a	n/a	14	Keith Ashton, Jason Ball, Andrew Busby	(Quarter 4) 93% 1 vacant unit, some interest being shown (CY)

Aims: Community Land Trusts

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Act Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Community Land Trusts Assisted</u>	n/a	2	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	2	n/a	n/a	2	Jenny Clifford	(Quarter 4) Two CLTs have been assisted in the period 2020 - 2021 (Chawleigh Community Trust and Sampford Peverell Community Land Trust). (TP)

Aims: Digital Connectivity

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Act Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Digital connectivity</u>	n/a	>24 Mbps	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a		Adrian Welsh	(Quarter 4) Town centre wifi projects are still proposed to be delivered in 2021. (CY)

This page is intentionally left blank

Corporate Plan PI Report Community

Monthly report for 2020-2021
 Arranged by Aims
 Filtered by Aim: Priorities Community
 Filtered by Flag: Exclude: Corporate Plan Aims 2016 to 2020
 For MDDC - Services

Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators:

No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

* indicates that an entity is linked to the Aim by its parent Service

Page 177

Corporate Plan PI Report Community

Priorities: Community

Aims: Health and Wellbeing

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Annual Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Action Plan</u>	n/a	12												12	Simon Newcombe	(March) Completed 20/21 Action Plan and project spend summary approved at May 2021 CSP Board meeting. Covid adjusted core project plan fully delivered and updated 21/22 plan

Corporate Plan PI Report Community

Priorities: Community

Aims: Health and Wellbeing

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
																approved. (SN)
<u>Safeguarding standards for drivers</u>	n/a	100%						100%					100%	100%	Simon Newcombe	(February) Training has been delivered remotely/online during pandemic. All scheduled training completions due to end of Feb 2021 have been completed for those drivers retaining a licence (SN)
<u>Mental Health First Aiders</u>	n/a	5	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	Matthew Page	(Quarter 4) Refresher training has been provide for 2 staff and plans are in place to offer training to increase numbers in 21/22 (CY)
<u>National and regional promotions</u>	n/a	5	0	1	1	1	2	3	4	5	5	5	6	7	Simon Newcombe	(March) HHSRS national review (TW)

Page 178

Aims: Community Involvement

Corporate Plan PI Report Community

Priorities: Community

Aims: Community Involvement

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>% of complaints resolved w/in timescales (10 days - 12 weeks)</u>	94%	90%	100%	100%	96%	91%	94%	93%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	Lisa Lewis	(March) 32 closed at 1st check 39 closed at 2nd check (RT)
<u>Number of Complaints</u>	313		5	21	45	64	97	122	145	163	184	211	230	273	Lisa Lewis	(March) Actual number reported (CY)

Page 179

Aims: Leisure Centres

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Health Referral Initiative starters</u>	n/a	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	Corinne Parnall	(March) covid-19 (K)
<u>Health Referral Initiative completers</u>	n/a	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Corinne Parnall	(March) covid-19 (K)
<u>Health Referral Initiative</u>	n/a	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Corinne Parnall	(March) covid-19 (K)

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: 10 June 2021 18:07

Corporate Plan PI Report Community

Priorities: Community

Aims: Leisure Centres

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>conversions</u>																

Printed by: Catherine Yandle **SPAR.net** **Print Date: 10 June 2021 18:07**

Page 180

Corporate Plan PI Report Corporate

Monthly report for 2020-2021
 Arranged by Aims
 Filtered by Aim: Priorities Delivering a Well-Managed Council
 For MDDC - Services

Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators: No Data Well below target Below target On target Above target Well above target

* Indicates that an entity is linked to the Aim by its parent Service

Page 181

Corporate Plan PI Report Corporate

Priorities: Delivering a Well-Managed Council

Aims: South West Mutual Bank

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>South West Mutual Bank</u>	n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		Andrew Jarrett	(October - March) A meeting was held in December 2020 by the Dep CE and the Cabinet Member for Finance with SW Mutual Bank's Director to receive an update on progress. Clearly, the prevailing Covid19 challenges have slowed down previously identified actions and delayed key milestones, however, at the conclusion of the meeting it was agreed that a quarterly progress update report would be provided in the future. (CY)

Aims: Commercial Opportunities

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Tiverton Other</u>	n/a		n/a	n/a	8	n/a	n/a	8	n/a	n/a	8	n/a	n/a	8	Keith Ashton,	(Quarter 4) 100% Occupancy (CY)

Corporate Plan PI Report Corporate

Priorities: Delivering a Well-Managed Council

Aims: Commercial Opportunities

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
															Andrew Busby	
<u>Industrial Units Cullompton</u>	n/a		n/a	n/a	15	n/a	n/a	14	n/a	n/a	14	n/a	n/a	15	Keith Ashton, Andrew Busby	(Quarter 4) 100% Occupancy (CY)

Aims: Other

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Sickness absence %</u>	3.27%	2.78%	n/a	n/a	2.17%	n/a	n/a	1.99%	n/a	n/a	1.89%	n/a	n/a	2.10%	Matthew Page	(Quarter 2) Short term sickness has considerably reduced due to a combination of the new sickness policy but also the impact of COVID-19 and WFH (as well as the need for staff to self isolate) (CY)
<u>Appraisals completed</u>	75%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	97%	Matthew Page	(October - March) Deadline has been moved to the 31 March 2021 due to the

Page 182

Corporate Plan PI Report Corporate

Priorities: Delivering a Well-Managed Council

Aims: Other

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>New Performance Planning Guarantee determine within 26 weeks</u>	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	Jenny Clifford, Eileen Paterson	(Quarter 1) COVID-19 (RP)
<u>Major applications overturned at appeal (over last 2 years)</u>	2%	10%	n/a	n/a	4%	n/a	n/a	5%	n/a	n/a	4%	n/a	n/a	5%	Jenny Clifford, Eileen Paterson	
<u>Major applications overturned at appeal % of appeals</u>	10.00%		n/a	n/a	0%	n/a	n/a	0%	n/a	n/a	0%	n/a	n/a	0%	Jenny Clifford, Eileen Paterson	(Quarter 4) Target less than 10% (RP)
<u>Minor applications overturned at appeal (over last 2</u>	0%	10%	n/a	n/a	0%	n/a	n/a	0%	n/a	n/a	2%	n/a	n/a	2%	Jenny Clifford, Eileen Paterson	

Page 183

Corporate Plan PI Report Corporate

Priorities: Delivering a Well-Managed Council

Aims: Other

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
<u>years)</u>																
<u>Minor applications overturned at appeal % of appeals</u>	13%		n/a	n/a	0.25%	n/a	n/a	0.25%	n/a	n/a	1.73%	n/a	n/a	1.66%	Jenny Clifford, Eileen Paterson	
<u>Response to FOI Requests (within 20 working days)</u>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Catherine Yandle	
<u>Working Days Lost Due to Sickness Absence</u>	8.12days	7.00days	n/a	n/a	1.41days	n/a	n/a	2.61days	n/a	n/a	4.18days	n/a	n/a	5.80days	Matthew Page	
<u>Staff Turnover</u>	n/a	14.0%	n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a		n/a	n/a	12.7%	n/a	n/a	15.0%	Matthew Page	(Quarter 4) We are in line with the sector in terms of staff turnover (CY)
<u>% total Council tax collected - monthly</u>	98.50%	98.50%	10.72%	19.37%	28.02%	36.82%	45.54%	54.55%	64.10%	73.26%	80.75%	91.27%	94.34%	96.96%	Dean Emery	
<u>% total NNDR collected - monthly</u>	99.20%	99.20%	10.09%	16.52%	31.01%	38.88%	47.90%	55.45%	62.86%	70.21%	77.03%	84.56%	90.94%	96.81%	Dean Emery	(August) COVID effect and no formal recovery. Better to compare actuals in prev yr and work out the

Page 184

Corporate Plan PI Report Corporate

Priorities: Delivering a Well-Managed Council

Aims: Other

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Group Manager	Officer Notes
																value down c £104,190 (DE)

This page is intentionally left blank

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Report for 2021-2022

Filtered by Prefix: Exclude Risk Prefix: OP, PR, EV

Filtered by Flag: Include: * Corporate Risk Register

For MDDC - Services

Filtered by Performance Status: Exclude Risk Status: Low

Not Including Risk Child Projects records, Including Mitigating Action records

Key to Performance Status:

Mitigating Action:	Milestone Missed	Behind schedule	In progress	Completed and evaluated	No Data available
--------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------

Risks:	No Data (0+)	High (15+)	Medium (6+)	Low (1+)
--------	---------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-----------------

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Climate Change Declaration The implications to the Council's strategic, budget and medium term financial plans are not yet fully explored and understood. This introduces an increased level of uncertainty. Impact of climate change on the financial viability of the Council.

Service: Climate Change

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
Completed and evaluated	Climate and Sustainability Specialist	Appointment commenced in March 2021	Catherine Yandle	30/04/2021	30/04/2021	Fully effective (1)
In progress	Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan	Was approved by Cabinet on 1 October 2020. The Handbook needs completing and publishing	Catherine Yandle	09/12/2020	30/04/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Completed and evaluated	Consideration by the Environment PDG	This PDG has been tasked with considering the Council's own policy response (s) to the Climate Change Declaration made at Full Council on 26 June 2019.	Catherine Yandle	19/07/2019	30/04/2021	Fully effective (1)
Completed and evaluated	Devon Climate Emergency – Tactical Group	MDDC are part of the tactical group for the climate emergency that has strategic	Catherine Yandle	18/05/2020	30/04/2021	Fully effective (1)

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: 30 June 2021 11:13

Page 187

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6						
Mitigating Action records						
Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
		links to our own plans.				
In progress	Net Zero Advisory Group	This was approved by Cabinet on 23 April 2020 terms of reference to be progressed for the group, membership confirmed and first meeting held remotely.	Catherine Yandle	18/05/2020	30/04/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Current Status: High (20)		Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High		Current Risk Likelihood: 4 - High		
Service Manager: Jason Ball, Catherine Yandle						
Review Note: The new Climate and Sustainability Specialist is now prioritising work streams for future consideration.						

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Commercial Land supply Insufficient diversity in commercial land provided to meet changing business needs

Service: Planning

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Business and landowner engagement	Continued brokering of sites and identification of creative opportunities to meet business demands can be very effective in addressing this risk	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	07/04/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Call for sites	Call for sites (and subsequent site assessment) in connection with the next Local Plan will assist in understanding of site availability in order to effectively plan for employment needs across the new local plan period.	Jenny Clifford	07/04/2021	07/04/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Behind schedule	Incubator/Flexible workspace project	This project should help identify opportunities to help the delivery of new flexible workspace	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	07/04/2021	Action required(3)
In progress	Plan for recovery	Develop a recovery plan/ strategy in conjunction with partners	Jenny Clifford	12/05/2020	07/04/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Current Status: Medium (10)		Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High		Current Risk Likelihood: 2 - Low		

Service Manager: Jenny Clifford

Review Note: Position has not changed since last review in that Local Plan adoption provides allocated employment sites. Work has also started to plan for employment needs over the next local

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

plan period with the recent call for sites.

Incubator/flexible workspace project requires intelligence to better understand and plan for business need. This work has been delayed due to required focus on business grants and recovery planning.

Risk: Coronavirus Pandemic The risk to MDDC's ability to conduct business as usual

Service: Governance

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
Completed and evaluated	Business Continuity Planning (BCP)	BCPs have been reviewed. Regular updates are being obtained from Public Health England and the Local Resilience Forum. Fortnightly meetings of managers and Leadership Team via Skype.	Catherine Yandle	06/03/2020	07/04/2021	Fully effective (1)
In progress	Financial and Economic effects monitoring	To ensure that local authorities including MDDC are reimbursed in full for the Covid 19 response by Central government. At present we have been given approx. £1.2M to date in extra funding in 4 tranches.	Catherine Yandle	13/05/2020	07/04/2021	Satisfactory (2)

Current Status: High (15)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Service Manager: Simon Newcombe

Review Note: Response continually monitored in the light of developments with the new Covid variant. Vaccination programme success has enabled score to be reduced. Community response has been stood down.

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Culm Garden Village Possible discontinuance of Government funding support

Service: Planning

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Funding opportunities	Lobby for the creation of further funding opportunities and for further rounds of the garden communities capacity funding	Jenny Clifford	03/02/2021	10/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Further bids for capacity funding	To continue to secure external funding to support the project	Jenny Clifford	29/03/2019	10/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)

Current Status: Medium (12)

Current Risk Severity: 4 - High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Service Manager: Jenny Clifford, Adrian Welsh

Review Note: Bid submitted for 20/21 round of capacity funding. Currently awaiting outcome. Further future bid opportunities unknown at this stage and will be announced by Government in due course.

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Cyber Security Inadequate Cyber Security could lead to breaches of confidential information, damaged or corrupted data and ultimately Denial of Service. If the Council fails to have an effective ICT security strategy in place.

Risk of monetary penalties and fines, and legal action by affected parties

Service: I C T

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
Completed and evaluated	Email and Protective DNS	ICT have applied the all levels of the government secure email policy, which ensures secure email exchange with government agencies operating at OFFICIAL. PSN DNS has been configured at the Internet gateway, which ensures the validity of websites and blocks known sites.	Lisa Lewis	06/06/2019	29/06/2021	Fully effective (1)
Completed and evaluated	Information Security Policy in place, with update training	Information Security Policy on LMS (online policy system) included in induction.	Catherine Yandle	22/10/2015	29/06/2021	Fully effective (1)
In progress	Regular user awareness training	Staff and Member updates help to reduce the risk	Catherine Yandle	03/01/2019	29/06/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Completed and evaluated	Technical controls in place	Required to maintain Public Sector Network certification	Lisa Lewis	03/01/2019	29/06/2021	Fully effective (1)

Current Status: High (20)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 4 - High

Service Manager: Lisa Lewis

Review Note: External penetration testing occurred in May - mitigation plan pending. Two cyber audits in progress, one with DAP and one with localdigital.gov.uk an arm of MHCLG. Results will inform appropriately prioritised Cyber and Disaster Recovery plan to be completed by the Autumn.

Notification/emails to staff/members about phishing and other risks are circulated regularly.

Email and Protective DNS - conforming with government secure email policy.

Early mitigation plans around password management and multi-factor authentication have commenced, but this is likely to incur training requirements for officers/members as we change

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: 30 June 2021 11:13

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

business practices.

Risk: Economic Development Service The macro economic position might necessitate a reactive response, impacting on the Council's resourcing and reducing its ability to deploy resources as planned.

Service: Growth, Economy and Development

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Distribution and processing of Gov business support funding.	To assist businesses during the Covid19 pandemic and to help sustain them during this time of national restrictions.	Adrian Welsh	12/05/2020	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Hardship funding	To support individuals/households but also crucial for self employed and furloughed staff as a result of the pandemic.	Adrian Welsh	12/05/2020	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Recovery plans	Work underway in partnership with other Devon and regional partners to develop economic recovery plans to assist positive outcomes on local economy.	Adrian Welsh	12/05/2020	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Current Status: High (25)		Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High		Current Risk Likelihood: 5 - Very High		

Service Manager: Adrian Welsh

Review Note: The pandemic has had a critical impact on the local, national and global economy. Officer resource has been prioritised to issuing business grant support. Whilst recovery planning work takes place with our partners, our ability to contribute is less than we would want as a result of the grant work prioritisation.

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Economic Strategy Failure to deliver projects/outcomes in Economic Strategy

Service: Growth, Economy and Development

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Continue to seek out existing and new funding opportunities	To assist in ensuring adequate funding for delivery of COVID19 economic recovery work.	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	partnership working	Continue to work closely with delivery partners to gain advance warning of difficulties so as to seek to mitigate and also to develop joint responses to COVID economic recovery	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Project Management	Continue rigorous project management, monitoring and reporting of economic development projects	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Recovery Plans	Recovery Plans will be put in place to aid recovery.	Adrian Welsh	12/05/2020	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Review and re-prioritisation	Part of review of projects for Year 2 actions and a review of the likely impacts on the economy of the pandemic. This will consider maximising investment through external funding and prioritising officer time.	Adrian Welsh	31/01/2020	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)

Current Status: High (20)

Current Risk Severity: 4 - High

Current Risk Likelihood: 5 - Very High

Service Manager: Adrian Welsh

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: 30 June 2021 11:13

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Review Note: Although a review of the strategy was programmed for Q1 2021, this has had to be moved back following the further period of national lockdown and resultant business support requirements. The review will be informed by emerging 'Team Devon recovery work'. This work will also be informed by national economic predictions and forecasts once a better idea of the implications to the economy of the emerging vaccination programme are known.

Risk: Funding Insufficient resources (including funding) to deliver growth aspirations of Corporate Plan.

Service: Growth, Economy and Development

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Actively pursue funding opportunities through Levelling Up Agenda/Shared Prosperity Fund	Work currently being undertaken to be in a state of readiness as opportunities become available	Adrian Welsh	03/02/2021	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Lobbying	Officers will continue to review funding opportunities and seek opportunities to work closely with local partners and the HotSWLEP to seek additional funding support for key infrastructure.	Adrian Welsh	12/05/2020	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Officers have reprioritised work programmes to explore new funding opportunities	End of European funding sources	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)

Current Status: High (16)

Current Risk Severity: 4 - High

Current Risk Likelihood: 4 - High

Service Manager: Adrian Welsh

Review Note: Given ongoing constraints on resource and the scale of the challenges to the GED team at this time there has been need to carefully prioritise project delivery. Funding opportunities are actively being pursued.

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: GDPR compliance That the Council cannot demonstrate that we are complaint with GDPR requirements.

Service: Governance

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	IDOX Records Handling Plan	To utilize IDOX bulk data handling tool across the Council services using Uniform	Catherine Yandle	01/03/2019	19/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Completed and evaluated	Records Management Action Plan	To improve identified issues with records management	Catherine Yandle	15/06/2018	19/05/2021	Fully effective (1)

Current Status: Medium (12)

Current Risk Severity: 4 - High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Service Manager: Catherine Yandle

Review Note: GDPR awareness among staff is good. Some refresher training will be organised in Q2 21/22 .

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Health and Safety Inadequate Health and Safety Policies or Risk Assessments and decision-making could lead to Mid Devon failing to mitigate serious health and safety issues

Service: Governance

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Risk Assessments	Review risk assessments and procedures to ensure that we have robust arrangements in place. Risk training sessions in place.	Catherine Yandle	28/05/2013	10/01/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Risk assessments	Group Managers receive monthly automated reminders to update any outstanding risk reviews	Catherine Yandle	20/09/2019	10/01/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Current Status: Medium (10)		Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High		Current Risk Likelihood: 2 - Low		
Service Manager: Catherine Yandle						
Review Note: Covid Secure RAs have been updated in the light of latest national lockdown and mitigations re new variants of the virus. Guidance updated.						

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Homelessness Insufficient resources to support an increased homeless population could result in failure to meet statutory duty to provide advice and assistance to anyone who is homeless.

Service: Housing Services

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
Completed and evaluated	Multi-skilled Staff	Due to an increase in homelessness approaches more applicants with complex needs are coming through the system that require far greater staff attention than normal. In order to mitigate this, staff are expanding their training around mental health, drug and alcohol awareness, and safeguarding, in order to create a more multi-skilled and adaptable workforce. This may require a greater allocation of resources as homelessness increases.	Claire Fry	21/12/2020	09/04/2021	Fully effective(1)
Completed and evaluated	RSI funding	The number of homeless approaches and the number of rough sleepers in the District are both likely to increase as a result of the economic instability and the current outbreak of Covid19. Our	Claire Fry	21/12/2020	09/04/2021	Fully effective(1)

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6						
Mitigating Action records						
Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
		success in obtaining up to £6,400 in RSI funding to deliver services during the cold weather means that we can adapt to this increased caseload and better carry out early intervention and prevention options to aid rough sleepers and prevent returning to the streets.				
Completed and evaluated	Staff Support	Officers are trained and knowledgeable and the structure of Housing Options team reviewed to build resilience.	Claire Fry	22/06/2017	09/04/2021	Fully effective(1)
Completed and evaluated	Temporary Accommodation	With the rise in homelessness applicants, the overall cost of homelessness provisions will increase and therefore there is a need to make use of existing stock as temporary accommodation, as opposed to more costly alternatives such as bed and breakfast.	Claire Fry	21/12/2020	09/04/2021	Fully effective(1)
Current Status: High (16)		Current Risk Severity: 4 - High		Current Risk Likelihood: 4 - High		
Service Manager: Claire Fry						
Review Note: This area of work is high-risk due to the fact that we anticipate increasing numbers of						
Printed by: Catherine Yandle			SPAR.net		Print Date: 30 June 2021 11:13	

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

people approaching us as homeless due to the ongoing economic impact of the pandemic. In addition, those presenting may be distressed and therefore their responses to our officers may be inappropriate, which can cause stress. Further, there are risks associated with rough sleeping during the pandemic, however, we have obtained further funding from MHCLG which supports work with rough sleepers and the Housing Options Team has necessary skills, knowledge, and experience to enable them to prevent and manage homelessness efficiently and effectively.

Risk: Information Security Inadequate data protection could lead to breaches of confidential information and ultimately enforcement action by the ICO.

Service: Governance

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
Completed and evaluated	Awareness and Training	Attend team meetings and other meetings such as Tenants Together to provide training and answer questions on request. Articles in the Link on an ad hoc basis. Annual Information Security training is mandatory for all network computer users	Catherine Yandle	09/08/2019	19/05/2021	Fully effective (1)
In progress	Breach notification	Security breaches are logged via the helpdesk and monitored for developing trends. Training and advice is offered in response to items logged.	Catherine Yandle	09/08/2019	19/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)

Current Status: Medium (12)

Current Risk Severity: 4 - High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Service Manager: Catherine Yandle

Review Note: Awareness among staff is good. Some refresher training will be organised in Q2 21/22 . New Member training took place on 1 June 21

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Infrastructure delivery Inability to deliver, or delay in delivering, key transport infrastructure to unlock planned growth

Service: Growth, Economy and Development

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Close working with Devon Country Council (delivery partner) over the HIF schemes	DCC is the delivery partner for the Council's HIF highway infrastructure project. Close working is taking place in order to ensure risks of project delay or cost escalation are reduced. DCC is undertaking robust project management of the projects. These actions seek to ensure the projects remain on track and any problems are raised at an early stage allowing for corrective action.	Jenny Clifford	13/01/2021	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Close working with Homes England over the HIF schemes	Grant fund agreements over the HIF funding to deliver 2 highway infrastructure schemes. These include a range of requirements and project milestones. Close liaison with Homes England is taking place via monthly project update meetings and quarterly monitoring returns. This ensures Homes England is updated on both projects, is aware of issues as they arise and any corrective actions can be taken- for	Jenny Clifford	13/01/2021	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6						
Mitigating Action records						
Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
		example seeking the revision of project milestones to reflect the latest project programme.				
In progress	Partnership working	Close working with delivery partners to attempt to mitigate risks.	Adrian Welsh	12/05/2020	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Partnership working with infrastructure providers and statutory bodies	Reduce risk of delays and communication.	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	target funding opportunities	To seek to bring forward delivery	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Current Status: High (16)		Current Risk Severity: 4 - High		Current Risk Likelihood: 4 - High		
Service Manager: Adrian Welsh						
Review Note: We are working closely with Homes England on both HIF scheme and looking to mitigate project risks as and when they occur. The Cullompton Relief Road has now been granted planning permission. Cabinet will be considering at its 13 May 2021 meeting the potential for a Levelling Up Fund bid to help bring forward the Cullompton Relief Road scheme. The SOBC for Cullompton Railway Station has been submitted to the DfT and has been well received. Further announcements from DfT expected imminently.						

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Overall Funding Availability Changes to Revenue Support Grant, Business Rates, New Homes Bonus and other funding streams in order to finance ongoing expenditure needs.

Service: Financial Services

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Engaging in commercial activities	To provide additional revenue streams	Paul Deal	28/09/2017	20/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Medium term planning	Latest gap approximately £3M A range of options are being considered but Covid, business rates and uncertainty over fair funding review make the situation extremely challenging	Paul Deal	28/09/2017	20/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	We continue to work with managers to reduce costs and explore new income streams	To close the budget gap and maintain services	Paul Deal	07/02/2019	20/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Current Status: High (15)		Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High		Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium		

Service Manager: Paul Deal

Review Note: Latest forecast budget gap £3M shortfall based on prudent assumptions, that forecast could be impacted by the covid pandemic and changes in National funding.

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Reduced Funding - Budget Cuts We are subject to continuing budget reductions. If we concentrate on short term cost savings, it may increase long term impact of decisions

Service: Financial Services

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Business Plans	Service Business Plans are reviewed each financial year with suggestions for revised performance targets based on budget to be agreed by Cabinet Member and PDG.	Andrew Jarrett	28/05/2013	20/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Identify Efficiencies	Taking proactive steps to increase income and reduce expenditure through efficiencies, vacancies that arise and delivering services in a different way.	Andrew Jarrett	28/05/2013	20/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Completed and evaluated	Reserves	Cabinet have taken the decision to recommend a minimum general reserve balance of 25% of Net annual budget.	Andrew Jarrett	28/05/2013	20/05/2021	Fully effective (1)
Completed and evaluated	Set Budget	Each year as part of the budget setting process, members are consulted via PDGs in time to evaluate savings proposals, ahead of the November draft budget.	Andrew Jarrett	28/05/2013	20/05/2021	Fully effective (1)

Current Status: Medium (12)

Current Risk Severity: 4 - High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Service Manager: Paul Deal

Review Note: Balanced budget set for 21/22, work continues on closing the forecast budget deficit for 22/23 onwards.

Service managers have been asked to consider how savings or spend to save projects in their areas may help to reduce this deficit.

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Reputational damage - social media impact of reputational damage through social media is a significant risk that warrants inclusion on the Authority's risk register.

Service: Communications

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Monitoring social media	Two members of the communications team monitor the main corporate social media accounts on a rota basis. Alerts are also set up so the team receives notification of comments and can respond as appropriate. This is monitored in office hours only and the team does not provide 24 hour monitoring or a call out function. The Comms Team also works with other local authorities and takes part in social media training with other local authorities as the opportunities arise budgets permitting.	Jane Lewis	05/06/2019	30/06/2021	Satisfactory (2)

Current Status: Medium (10)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 2 - Low

Service Manager: Jane Lewis

Review Note: A new SM governance group has been formed. SM will also be included in LMS and a database of those who access will be kept. IT have been contacted to put SM access on the leavers list too.

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Right to Buy - Re-investing Receipts in New Affordable Rented Homes : Failure to deliver an appropriate housing programme to provide new social rent Council housing may result in existing housing stock not being replaced at an adequate rate to offset RTB sales. This may also result in payment of interest to MHCLG on any unspent, ring-fenced 1-4-1 RTB receipts and have longer term impact on the overall financial health of the HRA over a 30-year plan period.

Service: Housing Services

Mitigating Action records

No Mitigating Action records found.

Current Status: Medium (12)

Current Risk Severity: 4 - High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Service Manager: None

Review Note: We have submitted to MHCLG a detailed programme for delivering additional social rent homes over 21/22. The final scope of this programme will depend on on-going negotiations with MHCLG on potential extension to RTB receipts due to be spent in 20/21 (due to Covid etc) as well as 21/22 receipts already assigned in the programme. Going forward, the plan will be informed by a new Housing Strategy. The desired outcome being shaped is to have in place rolling 3-year RTB receipt/housing stock programme set at a minimum 100% stock replacement rate (based on average rates of RTB sales, reviewed annually). This will allow for receipts to be allocated to an identified and approved future development/redevelopment scheme or buy-back opportunity at date of receipt for utilisation over the required 3-year utilisation period, thereby mitigating the risks.

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: S106 Agreement Inability of the legacy systems to provide a full overview of the 'trigger points' for all of the s106 agreements

Service: Planning

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	S106 improvement project	A S106 improvement project is taking place to build a new system that will be able to effectively manage the process and provide better visibility over the information on S106 agreements and monies held/spent/expected.	Jenny Clifford	04/10/2019	07/04/2021	Satisfactory (2)

Current Status: High (15)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Service Manager: Jenny Clifford

Review Note: Review of processes around S106 agreements continues to advance, but slower than initially intended due to resource availability and impact of COVID-19.

Governance arrangements have been agreed.

The enquiries part of project management system is now live, monies reconciled against the financial system and data migration has been taking place in batches. Reporting on funds by Parish and catchment for public open space is available with air quality shortly. Further stages of the project will be completed through to late 2021

The Infrastructure Funding Statement published December 20 reports on S106 monies collected and spent for 19/20 and will be updated annually for the previous financial year. It also identifies and prioritises the infrastructure the Council intends to fund through S106 agreement/ Community Infrastructure Levy (report to Cabinet 3rd December 2020).

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: SPV - 3 Rivers - Failure of the Company This will depend on Economic factors and the Company's success in the marketplace commercially.

For MDDC the impacts will be:

3 Rivers are unable to service and repay the loan from MDDC

Not receiving the forecast additional income

Not supporting corporate objectives.

Service: Financial Services

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
Completed and evaluated	Cabinet	Monthly meetings with Cabinet ambassadors and monthly update to Cabinet on progress with the recommendations action plan and projects.	Catherine Yandle	09/11/2020	20/05/2021	Fully effective(1)
Completed and evaluated	Regular monitoring	The Board of 3 Rivers deliver a half yearly report to the Cabinet which provides an update on their delivery against their business plan. We charge interest to them at a commercial rate in order to maintain an "arms-length" relationship and the interest provides some mitigation to the outstanding principal.	Andrew Jarrett	30/05/2019	20/05/2021	Fully effective(1)

Current Status: Medium (12)

Current Risk Severity: 4 - High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Service Manager: Paul Deal

Review Note: No further impairments to the loans anticipated based on the newly approved business plan.

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: SPV 3 Rivers Reputational Impact That 3 Rivers' reputation is damaged by the actions of the council, threatening the long-term success of the company and potentially threatening the operational activity of the company through increased costs, reduced revenues, staff retention, or future claims against the council.

Service: Governance

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Work with Members	Sustained work with elected members to ensure that the necessary balance is struck between constructive challenge and debate, without bringing the company or its activity into disrepute. Awareness raising relating to the roles of the council's scrutiny committee in assuring governance outcomes, the audit committee providing assurance on risk and mitigation, and the cabinet in its decision-making as shareholder. Use of external advice when necessary to provided added assurance.	Stephen Walford	11/11/2020	20/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)

Current Status: High (15)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Service Manager: Stephen Walford

Review Note: The most recent audit notes that members need to strike a balance between governance and oversight that assures, and continued intervention that will commercially hinder. With governance matters now addressed, this risk sits predominantly with the actions of members who must work to balance the need for process checking, challenge and assurance, with the desire to use the company as a tool for political disagreement. As much as it might be (a point of political disagreement), the audit position is clear that such interventions are not beneficial to the company in commercial terms, and therefore unlikely to be in the long-term interests of the council in seeking to achieve its strategic objectives.

With monthly updates at Cabinet continuing, alongside regular auditing, members have structurally embedded a range of mechanisms to give confidence in the governance, oversight and assurance process. The reputational risk from members bringing the company into disrepute is therefore very much in individual members' hands.

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: SPV Governance Arrangements - 3 Rivers Not being able to demonstrate robust challenge and decision-making.

Service: Governance

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	External Review	Several recommendations have been made. All have been approved between Cabinet, Audit and Scrutiny. Action Plan is in place and progress is steady.	Catherine Yandle	06/07/2020	28/06/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Completed and evaluated	Included on AGS	This issue has been included on the Annual Governance Statement Action Plan so we do not lose sight of the issue throughout the year.	Catherine Yandle	15/07/2019	28/06/2021	Fully effective(1)
In progress	Openness and Transparency	Regular reports to Cabinet in open session where possible. Need to balance commercial interests with Nolan principles.	Catherine Yandle	20/05/2019	28/06/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Current Status: Medium (10)		Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High		Current Risk Likelihood: 2 - Low		

Service Manager: Catherine Yandle

Review Note: The Action Plan is due for completion by the end of June 2021

Corporate Risk Management Report - Appendix 6

Risk: Tiverton Pannier Market Failure to maximise the economic potential of Tiverton Pannier Market

Service: Growth, Economy and Development

Mitigating Action records

Mitigation Status	Mitigating Action	Info	Responsible Person	Date Identified	Last Review Date	Current Effectiveness of Actions
In progress	Continue to retain and prioritise market budget	To ensure most efficient use of resources	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	continue to work with traders on promotion	To increase footfall.	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Implement and review market strategy	Implementation of strategy will increase market's financial success and help fulfill its function as a key driver for the town.	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
In progress	Masterplan Implementation	To realise benefits from the Masterplan to increase visibility of market and increase footfall.	Adrian Welsh	10/06/2019	06/05/2021	Satisfactory (2)
Current Status: Medium (12)		Current Risk Severity: 4 - High		Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium		

Service Manager: Adrian Welsh

Review Note: Plans to maximise economic potential of the pannier market are being reviewed to reflect the current challenges and future opportunities arising from changing retail habits as a result of the pandemic. The newly appointed Market Manager will play a pivotal role in delivering these plans.

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment PDG
13th July 2021

REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN 2020/21

Cabinet Member Cllr Andrew Moore
Responsible Officer Deputy Chief Executive (S151): Andrew Jarrett

Reason for Report: To present the Revenue and Capital Outturn figures for the financial year 2020/21.

RECOMMENDATION(S): That **Environment PDG** notes the report and feeds back any areas of concern

Relationship to the Corporate Plan: The financial resources of the Council impact directly on its ability to deliver the Corporate Plan prioritising the use of available resources carried forward from 2020/21. The Outturn Report indicates how the Council's resources have been used to support the delivery of budgetary decisions. All future spending will be closely linked to four key priority areas identified in the 2020 – 2024 Corporate Plan.

Financial Implications: Good financial management and administration underpin the entire document. A surplus or deficit on the Revenue Budget will impact on the Council's General Fund balances. The Council's financial position is constantly reviewed to ensure its continued financial health.

Legal Implications: None.

Risk Assessment: Regular financial monitoring information mitigates the risk of over or underspends at year-end and allows the Council to direct its resources to key corporate priorities. Members will be aware that the Council continues to face a financially difficult and uncertain future. As such, the Strategic Risk Register (monitored by Audit Committee) includes a specific risk relating to this issue:

Equality Impact Assessment: No equality issues identified for this report.

Impact on Climate Change: No impacts identified for this report.

1 Executive Summary

1.1 This report contains information relating to the Council's overall financial performance for the 2020/21 financial year. The Outturn figures included are provisional and subject to external audit; the findings of which are to be reported to Audit Committee in September this year.

1.2 Monitoring the Budget is an important part of the Council's performance management framework. The aim is to keep a tight control on spending on services within a flexible budget management framework.

1.3 The Revenue Outturn position for the financial year 2020/21 is as follows:

- The General Fund (GF) Revenue Outturn position for 2020/21 is a net overspend of £65k as shown in **Appendix 1**. The table below assumes this transfer.

- The HRA is a “Self-Financing” account for the Council’s Housing Landlord function, which is budgeted to “breakeven” (net of approved transfers to/from HRA Reserves). The HRA Outturn for 2020/21 is a net underspend of £94k as shown in **Appendix 2**.

2020/21 Revenue Outturn Position	31 March 2020 £k	In year movement £k	31 March 2021 £k
General Fund Reserve	2,251	(65)*	2,186
Housing Revenue Account Reserve	2,000	0	2,000

* Pre Audit

- 1.4 Members should note that officers have also identified areas where the carry-forward of some unspent budgets where it will be beneficial to help mitigate the impact of financial pressures and commitments in 2021/22. These are proposed to be transferred into Earmarked Reserves. These are identified within the individual service summaries and within **Appendix 3**.
- 1.5 2020/21 has been an exceptional year for all Councils. The financial effects of Covid-19 have been material with significant variances in expenditure incurred and funding received. The Council has lost income across Council Tax, Business Rates and Service Fees and Charges and has incurred additional spend in providing support to businesses and local communities. It has however been largely compensated by a wide variety of additional grant and compensation schemes. **Appendix 4** summarises the additional funding received by the Council, some of which has been passed directly onto struggling businesses and residents, others have helped offset the additional pressures experienced by the Council itself.
- 1.6 The Capital Outturn position for 2020/21 is an underspend of £29,907k with the vast majority carried forward as shown in Section 6. A summary is included within **Appendix 5**.
- 1.7 A summary of the Council’s Treasury Management year end position is shown in Section 7.

2 Introduction

- 2.1 Members of the Environment PDG should note that the Outturn report is fundamentally a set of management reports that show the year-end position on all service areas. The Finance Team then have to turn these management reports into the statutory financial statements which are subject to a wide number of complex accounting rules that often significantly change the final picture of a service’s financial position for the year. However, it is important to note that the bottom-line profit or loss for the year remains constant.
- 2.2 Members will be aware from previous experience that the position can change between “in-year” projections and the final Outturn position, mainly due to demand-led service costs and income levels. The budget monitoring process involves a regular review of budgets. Budget Holders, with support and advice from their Accountants, review the position and update their forecasts based on currently available information and knowledge of service requirements for

the remainder of the year. As with any forecast there is always a risk that assumptions and estimates will differ from the eventual outcome.

- 2.3 During the budget setting process, Budget Holders / Accountants continue to ensure that Revenue Budgets are set on a robust basis and take a prudent view of the likely levels of income and expenditure.

3 Covid-19

- 3.1 All aspects of life in 2020/21 have been dominated by the Covid-19 Pandemic. Just prior to the start of the financial year (20 March 2020) the country was put into full lockdown. Throughout the year, there have been various degrees of restriction which affected people's movement and businesses ability to trade. As a response, the Authority has delivered a wide range of support: from providing Business Rates Relief and Grant Support Payments to supporting the most vulnerable in society through the Community Shielding Hub, the Track and Trace scheme and Vaccination Centres.

- 3.2 The Council's finances has been materially impacted by this. Significant additional grant income of circa £40,000k was received to enable the Council to provide this vital support. Conversely, the closure of the leisure centres and reduction in the use of our car parks due to the retail closures and the work from home guidance has significantly reduced the income collected. This has been partially offset through the Government's Income Compensation Scheme, which replaced up to 75% of the loss, after authorities have absorbed the first 5% loss.

- 3.3 Staff were also materially impacted, with a work from home where possible in place throughout the year. Over 100 staff were furloughed and a further 27 were redeployed to help those most vulnerable through the Community Shielding Hub and assisting with and making our leisure centres available as Lateral Flow Test and Vaccine Centres.

- 3.4 Despite this, our financial position has remained robust and our Revenue Outturn position is very close to Budget, at £65k or 0.56% overspent. Each aspect of the overall finances are covered across the following sections.

- 3.5 Appendix 4 provides a summary of the additional Covid-19 related funding received by the Council during the year. The Council treats these funds differently depending on the control it has over the funds.

- Some of the funding, such as the Business Rates Reliefs are directly passported to Businesses through the claim scheme the Council has put in place. As such the Council is only acting as an "Agent" for this funding and therefore has no control over it. Any unclaimed funding is to be returned to Government. These funds are not included within the "funding" of the Council and any unspent element is held as a creditor on the Balance Sheet
- The Council has greater control over other aspects of the additional funding, such as the generic Support Grant tranches and Income Compensation. Here the Council is acting as a "Principal" and therefore can retain unspent elements. These are therefore recognised as "funding"

for the Council and any balance is proposed to be held in Earmarked Reserves

- 3.6 The unspent balances on the additional grant funding received has been rolled forward to enable its distribution in 2021/22. In addition, the Government have legislated that the collection fund deficits will be smoothed over three years and have provided grant funding to smooth the cash flow implication of this. Therefore £3,411k have been transferred to reserves and will unwind over that three year timeframe.
- 3.7 The effects of Covid-19 will continue into 2021/22 and probably beyond. In the medium term, external income levels will need to return to pre-pandemic levels, as without this, it will be necessary for the service budgets within the MTFP to be adjusted in future years.

4 The General Fund Reserves

- 4.1 The General Fund Reserve is the major Revenue Reserve of the Council. It is increased or decreased by the surplus or deficit generated on the General Fund in the year. This reserve held a balance of £2.251m at the start of the year. In 2020/21 the final £65k deficit generated in year is proposed to be transferred to this Reserve leaving a balance of £2,186k. If this is approved, the General Fund Reserve will still remain above the recommended minimum level of £2,000k as required by Cabinet agreement on 16 January 2020.
- 4.2 Detailed budget monitoring reports were provided to both senior managers and Members throughout 2020/21. This monitoring focused on significant budget variances (+/- £20k), including any remedial action where necessary leading to an estimated overall Outturn position. The final written monitoring report considered by the Cabinet gave a detailed position as at 31 December 2020 and predicted an end of year deficit of £89k for the General Fund. Therefore the final position improved by £24k.
- 4.3 The table below shows the overall Budget, Actual and Variance, summarised for 2020/21.

Financial Summary for 2020/21	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	2020/21 Variance £
Total Net Cost of Services	11,386,408	11,033,222	(353,186)
Other Income and Expenditure	138,036	7,132,112	6,994,076
TOTAL BUDGETED EXPENDITURE	11,524,444	18,165,333	6,640,889
TOTAL FUNDING	(11,524,444)	(18,100,397)	6,575,953
Net Income and Expenditure	0	64,937	64,937

- 4.4 As described above, there have been some significant variances at an individual service level. A detailed explanation of these key variances is shown in Appendix 1, service by service. This report highlights the major movements to enable Members to appreciate the more significant trends within each service area. Appendix 1 also provides a summary of the key variances at individual service level to enable full transparency of the position.

- 4.5 In addition to the General Fund Reserve, the Council holds a number of Earmarked Reserves (EMRs) where service underspends are kept so that they can be used to help fund anticipated future expenditure commitments. The net movement of £6,559k to these reserves and the end of year balances held on them are shown in Appendix 3.
- 4.6 As described above, a significant amount of the funding transferred to EMR is due to the smoothing of the Collection Fund Deficit over the next three years. In addition, significant additional Covid-19 related grant funding has been received which has also been transferred to EMR to help mitigate future financial pressures.
- 4.7 The Council (in common with other public bodies) continues to face a difficult financial climate, therefore, it is prudent to retain robust balances to smooth the potential effect to the tax payer of further cuts. The level of Earmarked Reserves in this report further supports the forward planning of the organisation. This approach to financial management will help to deliver our corporate priorities during the short to medium term whilst mitigating the effect of any future cuts in Government funding as we move towards becoming a self-financing organisation.

5 Housing Revenue Account (HRA)

- 5.1 This is a ring-fenced reserve in respect of the Council’s housing landlord function. It is increased or decreased by the surplus or deficit generated on the HRA in the year. For 2020/21 the Outturn is a net surplus of £94k and Members are requested to approve a transfer to HRA reserves to bring this to zero.
- 5.2 Some of the key variances within this surplus are explained in paragraph 5.4 and the effect of it on the HRA balance is shown below.

HRA Balance

HRA Reserve Summary	£k
HRA balance @ 31/03/2020	(2,000)
Budget saving achieved in 2020/21	(94)
Net transfer to HRA ring-fenced reserves	94
HRA balance @ 31/03/2021	(2,000)

- 5.3 Given the positive closing financial position delivered in 2020/21, it is recommended to transfer a sum of £94k into the ring-fenced HRA reserves. Inclusive of budgeted contributions, this has resulted in a net contribution to the Housing Maintenance Fund of £923k. The above position leaves the HRA balance of £2,000k untouched as at 31 March 2021.
- 5.4 Main budget variances during 2020/21 giving rise to the figure of £94k include:
 - £390k salary savings relating primarily due to Covid-19 and a delay in commencing developments;
 - £471k savings due to reduced maintenance and overheads as a result of Covid-19;

- £416k reduced income and recharges for the above reduced maintenance works;
- £624k settlement of a contract dispute; and
- £336k additional contribution to the Major Repairs Reserve above budget

For further details, please see the HRA Outturn Summary for 2020/21, which is attached as Appendix 2 to this report.

- 5.5 The Outturn includes a number of accounting entries 'below the line' that don't affect the revenue position for the HRA, such as Depreciation. For presentational purposes these items have been excluded from the report. Members should note that these items will be shown in full in the Statement of Accounts.
- 5.6 In addition to the above, the HRA holds a number of Earmarked Reserves. The movements on these during 2020/21 and their closing balances are shown on Appendix 3. This money is effectively "ring fenced" and will be held to meet expenditure on projects during 2021/22 and beyond.

6 The Collection Fund

- 6.1 Mid Devon is a Collection Authority for Council Tax and National Non-Domestic Rates, and as such, is required to produce a Collection Fund Account for the Mid Devon area. The Council collects Council Tax on behalf of Devon County Council, Devon Fire and Rescue Service, Devon & Cornwall Police and the Town/Parish Councils.
- 6.2 The Council Tax collection rate for 2020/21 was 97.0% (98.5% in 2019/20). This demonstrates how our Revenues section has consistently been effective in collecting the annual charge in extremely challenging economic times. This resulted in a collection deficit of £1,109k for the year, with Mid Devon's share of this amounting to £92k.
- 6.3 The National Non-Domestic Rates collection rate was 96.8% for 2020/21 (99.2% in 2019/20). Again, this demonstrates how our Revenues section has consistently been effective in collecting the annual charge in extremely challenging economic times. This resulted in a collection deficit of £9,135k for the year, with Mid Devon's share of this amounting to £3,570k.
- 6.4 As highlighted in above, additional Section 31 Grant of £3,411k has been received to smooth the implication of these deficits over 3 years in line with MHCLG legislative requirements.

7 Capital Outturn

- 7.1 A Capital Outturn summary is attached as Appendix 5 to this report. The revised Capital Budget for 2020/21 amounted to £36,961k. At the year-end only £7,054k had been spent leaving the Capital Programme underspent in total by £29,906k. It is important to recognise the difference between a Revenue and Capital under spend; Revenue is an under spend against a cash budget, Capital is an under spend against an outline approval. Therefore this does not necessarily result in a cash balance to carry forward, instead it

generally leads to a lower Capital Financing Requirement (in essence lower borrowing).

- 7.2 Capital Receipts of £376k (this includes general useable Capital Receipts and ring-fenced replacement homes Capital Receipts) were applied to finance the programme with the balance of the expenditure met by a combination of borrowing, external grants and contributions from reserves.
- 7.3 As shown in Appendix 5, there are capital projects totalling £26,041k which have not been completed as at the 31 March 2021. This planned expenditure, therefore, needs to be rolled forward to be included in the 2021/22 Capital Programme. These schemes will continue to be funded as before through a mix of unspent Capital Grants, Capital Earmarked Reserves or Prudential Borrowing. In addition there is £248k relating to Disabled Facilities Grant (including £72k related to HRA), £244k relating to Right to Buy, £128k for Major Repairs to Housing Stock and £114k HRA Renewable Energy that will remain in reserves for future prioritisation.
- 7.4 The Capital Receipts Reserve (note this includes general useable Capital Receipts and ring-fenced replacement homes Capital Receipts) is used to part fund the Capital Programme - the movement on this account for the year is given below:

Capital Receipts Reserve Summary	£k
Balance at 1 April 2020	(5,157)
Sale of Council Houses (10)	(847)
General Fund Sales	(97)
Pooling of Housing Capital Receipts to Government	227
Capital Receipts applied in year	376
Balance at 31 March 2021	(5,498)

Note – the remaining balance of £5.498m is committed in order to fund any slippage, specific projects in ICT and Private Sector Housing and to balance the Capital Medium Term Financial Plan.

- 7.5 The Capital Earmarked Reserve has been set aside from Revenue to fund capital projects; the balance on this reserve now stands at £255k having reduced by the £46k required to fund the 2020/21 Capital Programme. The remaining balance is committed to fund any slippage and to balance the Capital Medium Term Financial Plan.
- 7.6 The Council also holds New Homes Bonus which can be used for either Revenue or to support future Capital Programmes, the balance held at 31 March 2021 is £3,061k; again much of this remaining balance is committed to funding any slippage and to balance the Capital Medium Term Financial Plan.

8 Treasury Management

- 8.1 A review of the 2020/21 investment performance, including the details of interest payable, are included within the separate 2020/21 Treasury Outturn Report was on the Cabinet agenda for 6th July 2021

- 8.2 During the year, the Council maintained an average balance of £21.3m of internally managed funds. These internally managed funds earned interest of £124k giving an average rate of return of 0.25%. The comparable performance indicator is the 3 month LIBID rate¹, which was 0.015%.
- 8.3 As at the 31 March 2021, the Council had short term cash investments totalling £17,500k. In addition, the Council held £5m invested in Churches, Charities and Local Authorities (CCLA) Property Funds earning dividends of £206k (4.13%) in 2020/21.
- 8.4 The Authority holds a 100% interest in 3 Rivers Development Limited, a private limited company engaged in construction in the Mid Devon area. The Authority advances funds to the Company to facilitate operations with the intention that they are repaid from the proceeds of the sale of the developments.
- 8.5 During the year ended 31 March 2021, a net £1,102k was loaned to the Company and total loan value at this date was £10,163k. During the year £496k interest was received by the Authority in respect of these loans.
- 8.6 These loans are subject to overarching management review on a regular basis with any impairments made reported within both the periodic monitoring reports and in the year-end financial statements. The year-end review, carried out in compliance with IFRS 9 Financial Instruments, concluded that no further impairments above and beyond the £790k impairment made in 2019/20 in respect of one of the project loans and the working capital loan was necessary.

9 Conclusion

- 9.1 Members are asked to note the Revenue and Capital Outturn figures for the financial year 2020/21.

Contact for more information:

Andrew Jarrett
01884 23(4242)
ajarrett@middevon.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Circulation of the Report:

Cllr Andrew Moore
Leadership Team

¹ The London Interbank Bid Rate (LIBID) is the average interest rate at which major London banks bid for eurocurrency deposits from other banks in the interbank market.

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

	Budget 2020/21 £	Actual 2020/21 £	Variance 2020/21 £	Net contributions To / (From) Earmarked Reserves 2020/21 £	Net General Fund Impact 2020/21 £
Community Development	138,290	165,300	27,010	0	27,010
Corporate Management	1,648,161	1,648,332	171	0	171
Car Parks	(632,962)	(117,826)	515,136	0	515,136
Customer Services	751,285	644,636	(106,649)	21,670	(84,979)
Environmental Services	836,070	725,035	(111,035)	83,564	(27,471)
Finance and Performance	744,000	838,649	94,649	(280)	94,369
Grounds Maintenance	567,810	474,906	(92,904)	(15,565)	(108,469)
General Fund Housing	315,520	58,134	(257,386)	212,253	(45,133)
Human Resources	513,490	409,164	(104,326)	37,000	(67,326)
I.T. Services	983,650	966,712	(16,938)	3,455	(13,483)
Legal and Democratic Services	1,052,350	968,498	(83,852)	74,080	(9,772)
Planning and Regeneration	1,240,550	670,770	(569,780)	585,835	16,055
Property Services	734,240	410,552	(323,688)	296,751	(26,937)
Revenues and Benefits	499,200	45,159	(454,041)	59,935	(394,106)
Recreation and Sport	434,750	1,961,013	1,526,263	250,884	1,777,147
Waste Services	1,989,480	1,901,495	(87,985)	(80,288)	(168,273)
ALL GENERAL FUND SERVICES	11,815,884	11,770,528	(45,356)	1,529,295	1,483,938
Net recharge to HRA	(1,481,630)	(1,440,130)	41,500		41,500
Statutory Adjustments (Capital Charges)	1,052,154	702,824	(349,330)	224,602	(124,728)
NET COST OF SERVICES	11,386,408	11,033,222	(353,186)	1,753,897	1,400,710
					0
Finance Lease Interest Payable	48,340	109,926	61,586		61,586
Interest Charged Between GF and HRA	(49,000)	(43,528)	5,472		5,472
Interest Receivable / Payable on Other Activities	439,878	95,568	(344,310)		(344,310)
Interest Receivable on Investments	(568,322)	(764,906)	(196,584)		(196,584)
Transfers into Earmarked Reserves (see Appendix 3)	2,597,050	6,972,759	4,375,709	2,037,700	6,413,409
Transfers from Earmarked Reserves (see Appendix 3)	(1,369,370)	(2,844,015)	(1,474,645)	(38,976)	(1,513,621)
Net Contribution to/(from) New Homes Bonus Reserve	(960,540)	(981,467)	(20,927)		(20,927)
Contribution to Collection Fund Smoothing Reserves*	0	3,411,251	3,411,251	304,040	3,715,291
Revenue contribution to fund 2020/21 Capital Programme	0	1,176,524	1,176,524	(1,176,524)	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	11,524,444	18,165,333	6,640,889	2,880,137	9,521,026
FUNDED BY:-					
Business Rates					
National Non-Domestic Rates	(3,312,727)	(1,583,404)	1,729,323		1,729,323
S31 Grant associated with Covid-19 Reliefs*	0	(4,868,479)	(4,868,479)	3,171,340	(1,697,139)
National Non-Domestic Rates (Surplus)/Deficit	0	(191,808)	(191,808)		(191,808)
Business Rates Benefit from Devon Pool	(150,000)	(167,727)	(17,727)		(17,727)
Council Tax					0
Council Tax - (Band D at £208.84)	(6,064,827)	(6,064,827)	0		0
Collection Fund Surplus*	(112,000)	(128,165)	(16,165)	239,911	223,746
Unringfenced Grants					0
New Homes Bonus Grant	(1,418,190)	(1,418,189)	1		1
Rural Services Delivery Grant	(466,700)	(466,695)	5		5
Other Grants	0	(8,103)	(8,103)		(8,103)
Covid-19 Related Funding					0
Covid-19 Grant	0	(1,183,857)	(1,183,857)		(1,183,857)
Covid-19 Income Compensation Scheme	0	(2,019,144)	(2,019,144)		(2,019,144)
TOTAL FUNDING	(11,524,444)	(18,100,397)	(6,575,953)	3,411,251	(3,164,702)
NET INCOME AND EXPENDITURE	0	64,937	64,937	6,291,388	6,356,324

* These lines have been included to transparently show the additional Section 31 Grant received in respect of reduced NNDR and Council Tax income, the majority of this has been placed in an EMR to be released to cover the 2020/21 deficit

that will be released over 3 years in line with MHCLG legislative requirements.

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Community Development

Code	Community and Development	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	61,170	50,672	(10,498)	-17.2%
2,000	Premises	65,700	62,707	(2,993)	-4.6%
3,000	Transport	0	0	0	0.0%
4,000	Supplies and Services	99,770	82,743	(17,027)	-17.1%
	Total Direct Expenditure	226,640	196,123	(30,517)	-13.5%
7,000	External Income	(88,350)	(30,823)	57,527	65.1%
	Net Direct Expenditure	138,290	165,300	27,010	19.5% (a)
	Total Community and Development Expenditure	138,290	165,300	27,010	19.5%
	Community and Development - Service units				
CD200	Community Development	77,650	71,650	(6,000)	-7.7%
CD300	Tiverton Pannier Market	60,640	93,650	33,010	54.4%
CD305	Market - Electric Nights	0	0	0	0.0%
CD400	Crediton Market Square	0	0	0	0.0%
	Total Community and Development Expenditure	138,290	165,300	27,010	19.5%
				£	£
	Total Expenditure Variation				27,010 (a)
	Major Cost Changes				0
	Major Cost Savings				
CD200	Community Development Grants - saving from claim no longer being made			(6,000)	
CD300	Salaries - delay in appointment of market manager			(8,500)	
CD300	Supplies and services - minor savings from reduced advertising and special events			(5,300)	
					(19,800)
	Major Changes in Income Levels				
CD300	Reduced Market income due to a suspension of Market tolls during Covid-19 lockdowns and a reduction in traders due to shielding			52,500	
					52,500
	Minor Variations				(5,690)
	Total Expenditure Variation				27,010 (a)
	EARMARKED RESERVES				
	Utilised 2020/21				
	Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22				
	Net movement in earmarked reserves				0
	Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves				27,010

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Corporate Management

Code	Corporate	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	1,335,891	1,326,731	(9,160)	-0.7%
2,000	Premises	0	0	0	0.0%
3,000	Transport	3,210	101	(3,109)	-96.9%
4,000	Supplies and Services	184,810	277,800	92,990	50.3%
Total Direct Expenditure		1,523,911	1,604,632	80,721	5.3%
7,000	External Income	124,250	43,700	(80,550)	64.8%
Net Direct Expenditure		1,648,161	1,648,332	171	0.0% (a)
Total Corporate Expenditure		1,648,161	1,648,332	171	0.0%
Corporate Management Service Units					
CM100	Leadership Team	442,690	432,707	(9,983)	-2.3%
CM210	Performance, Governance and Data	86,790	86,901	111	0.1%
CM300	Corporate Fees/charges	356,280	421,001	64,721	18.2%
CM340	Unison	8,830	1,783	(7,047)	-79.8%
CM600	Pension Backfunding	753,571	755,338	1,767	0.2%
CM800	Tiverton Hub	0	(49,397)	(49,397)	0.0%
Total Corporate Expenditure		1,648,161	1,648,332	171	0.0%
				£	£
Total Expenditure Variation					171 (a)
Major Cost Changes					
CM100 /	3RS - Inter Authority / company costs associated with: advice, consultancy engaged, new				
CM300	directorate appointments and some previous work undertaken for the Council.			100,920	
CM300	Bank charges over budget due to greater volume of payments i.e Covid-19 grant payments and				
CM300	greater volume of electronic transactions (less cash transactions)			16,600	
CM300	External audit fees forecast for the year above budget			25,898	
					143,418
Major Cost Savings					
CM100	Salary savings on not filling Director (Operations) post			(45,000)	
CM300	Apprenticeship Levy charges below budget			(10,100)	
CM300	Valuation fees under forecast for the year			(4,600)	
					(59,700)
Major Changes in Income Levels					
CM300	Charge for Bad Debt provision below forecast			(8,300)	
CM800	Grant received relating to Covid-19. This funding relates to expenditure incurred across other Council services			(49,400)	
					(57,700)
Minor Variances					(25,847)
Total Expenditure Variation					171
EARMARKED RESERVES					
Utilised 2020/21					
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22					
Net movement in earmarked reserves					0
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves					171

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Car Parks

Code	Car Parks	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	0	0	0	0.0%
2,000	Premises	213,450	200,859	(12,591)	-5.9%
3,000	Transport	0	0	0	0.0%
4,000	Supplies and Services	67,510	63,489	(4,021)	-6.0%
Total Direct Expenditure		280,960	264,347	(16,613)	-5.9%
7,000	External Income	(913,922)	(382,174)	531,748	58.2%
Net Direct Expenditure		(632,962)	(117,826)	515,136	81.4% (a)
Total Car Park Expenditure		(632,962)	(117,826)	515,136	81.4%
Car Park - Service units					
CP520	Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP)	(71,330)	12,616	83,946	-117.7%
CP530	Amenity Car Parks	12,450	26,320	13,870	111.4%
CP540	Paying Car Parks	(574,082)	(156,762)	417,320	-72.7%
Total Car Park Expenditure		(632,962)	(117,826)	515,136	81.4%
				£	£
Total Expenditure Variation					515,136 (a)
Major Cost Changes					
CP520	Increase in utility costs due to backed Electricity charges & MSCP operating 24 hours			13,000	13,000
Major Cost Savings					
CP540	Resurfacing of Becks Sq not carried out during 2020/21			(30,000)	(30,000)
Major Changes in Income Levels					
CP	Pay and Display Income down across all car parks due to Covid-19			521,980	
CP540	PCN income reductions due to Covid-19			17,480	
Minor Variations					539,460
Total Expenditure Variation					(7,324)
Total Expenditure Variation					515,136 (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES					
Utilised 2020/21					
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22					
Net movement in earmarked reserves					0
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves					515,136

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Customer Services

Code	Customer Services	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	681,700	634,426	(47,274)	-6.9%
2,000	Premises	0	0	0	0.0%
3,000	Transport	1,290	0	(1,290)	-100.0%
4,000	Supplies and Services	68,295	47,098	(21,197)	-31.0%
Total Direct Expenditure		751,285	681,524	(69,761)	-9.3%
7,000	External Income	0	(36,888)	(36,888)	0.00%
Net Direct Expenditure		751,285	644,636	(106,649)	-14.2% (a)
Total Customer Services Expenditure		751,285	644,636	(106,649)	-14.2%
Customer Services - Service units					
CS200	Communications	100,245	79,954	(20,291)	-20.2%
CS900	Central Photocopying	4,530	4,840	310	6.9%
CS902	Central Postage	18,820	17,767	(1,053)	-5.6%
CS930	Customer First Management	162,530	165,106	2,576	1.6%
CS932	Customer First	465,160	376,969	(88,191)	-19.0%
Total Customer Services Expenditure		751,285	644,636	(106,649)	-14.2%
				£	£
Total Expenditure Variation					(106,649) (a)
Major Cost Changes					0
Major Cost Savings					
CS200	Salary savings from delay in recruiting for vacant role			(15,800)	
	Salary savings from delay in recruiting for vacant roles offset by agency. £8.4K of this				
CS932	underspend will go towards the salary overspend on PS960 Caretaking Services			(36,400)	
CS932	Supplies and Services savings on computer software, switch charges and telephones			(14,100)	
					(66,300)
Major Changes in Income Levels					
CS932	DCC grant - backfill Customer Welfare Officer. 12 mth fixed contract (costs falling in 2021/22 will be a contribution to EMR - see below)			(30,000)	
CS932	Job Retention Scheme Funding for furloughed staff			(6,708)	
					(36,708)
Minor Variations					(3,641)
Total Expenditure Variation					(106,649) (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES					
Utilised 2020/21					
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22					
CS932	Contribution to EQ776 DCC grant - backfill Customer Welfare Officer			21,670	
Net movement in earmarked reserves					21,670
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves					(84,979)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Environmental Services

Code	Environmental Services	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	924,480	864,776	(59,704)	-6.5%
2,000	Premises	157,320	110,920	(46,400)	-29.5%
3,000	Transport	38,620	30,353	(8,267)	-21.4%
4,000	Supplies and Services	116,920	113,342	(3,578)	-3.1%
	S106 Expenditure		89,207	89,207	
	Total Direct Expenditure	1,237,340	1,208,599	(28,741)	-2.3%
7,000	External Income	(401,270)	(441,051)	(39,781)	-9.9%
	S106 contributions		(42,513)	(42,513)	0.0%
	Net Direct Expenditure	836,070	725,035	(111,035)	-13.3% (a)
	Total Environmental Services Expenditure	836,070	725,035	(111,035)	-13.3%
	Environmental Services - Service units				
ES100	Cemeteries	(110,150)	(88,984)	21,166	19.2%
ES101	Cemetery Lodge	0	800	800	0.0%
ES110	Bereavement Services	24,850	24,685	(165)	-0.7%
ES200	CCTV Initiatives	6,010	10,287	4,277	71.2%
ES250	Community Safety	6,220	7,875	1,655	26.6%
ES252	Building Safer Community Fund	0	254	254	0.0%
ES260	Food Protection	(1,070)	599	1,669	156.0%
ES270	Water Quality Monitoring	(24,000)	(17,060)	6,940	28.9%
ES354	Private Sector Housing	(11,640)	(15,662)	(4,022)	-34.6%
ES360	Dog Warden	3,990	3,765	(225)	-5.7%
ES361	Public Health	0	0	0	0.0%
ES450	Parks and Open Spaces	62,010	54,465	(7,545)	-12.2%
ES455	Amory Park	13,070	13,932	862	6.6%
ES460	Play Areas	51,040	40,960	(10,080)	-19.7%
ES500	Emergency Planning	7,500	7,400	(100)	-1.3%
ES550	Licensing	(116,460)	(98,132)	18,328	15.7%
ES580	Pool Car Running Costs	1,280	9,044	7,764	606.6%
ES600	Pest Control	5,000	1,494	(3,507)	-70.1%
ES660	Control of Pollution	9,400	(38,771)	(48,171)	-512.5%
ES670	Local Air Pollution	(10,050)	(9,513)	537	5.3%
ES730	Environmental Enforcement	134,280	119,750	(14,530)	-10.8%
ES733	Environmental Health	653,930	570,580	(83,350)	-12.7%
ES740	Licensing Unit	130,860	127,267	(3,593)	-2.7%
PS480	MDDC Footpaths and Railway Walks	0	0	0	0.0%
	Total Environmental Services Expenditure	836,070	725,035	(111,035)	-13.3%
	Total Expenditure Variation			£	£
					(111,035) (a)
	Major Cost Changes				
ES200	Unbudgeted CCTV to be funded from EMR (see below)			6,970	
ES580	Increased vehicle maintenance costs due to aging Pool Cars			6,000	
					12,970
	Major Cost Savings				
ES450	Tree maintenance underspend- reactive work only due to no Tree Office in place and Covid-19 restrictions (see below EMR)			(7,300)	
ES450	Planned maintenance underspend - due to Covid-19 (see below EMR)			(25,480)	
ES450	Works to paddling pools not carried out due to Covid-19 closure (see below EMR)			(30,000)	
ES733	Salary savings due to vacant District Officer for part of the year			(12,380)	
ES733	Salary savings due to vacant posts within Public Health and secondment to DCC			(43,200)	
					(118,360)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Environmental Services

Major Changes in Income Levels		
ES550	Licensing income reduced due to Covid-19	20,000
ES100	Cemetery Income down against budget	23,500
ES200	Income received for CCTV works to be completed by May 21 (see below EMR)	(5,000)
ES733	Grant income received for Covid-19 compliance and enforcement (see below EMR)	(30,976)
		7,524
Minor Variations		
		(702)
SERVICE MOVEMENT BEFORE STATUTORY ADJUSTMENTS		
		(98,568)
ES450	Net S106 receipts and grants (see EMR below) Parks and Open Spaces	31,573
ES460	Net S106 receipts and grants (see EMR below) Play Areas	3,710
ES660	Net S106 receipts and grants (see EMR below) Control of Pollution	(47,750)
Total Expenditure Variation		
		(111,035) (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES		
Utilised 2020/21		
	S106 - Air Quality	(18,048)
	S106 - Public Open Space	(35,283)
	Release from EQ710 to fund Stay Over Stay Safe leaflets	(242)
	Release from EQ710 to fund Projects overspend	(12)
	Release from EQ710 to fund Domestic Homicide Reviews	(1,125)
	Release from EQ710 to fund Crediton Town CCTV Project 2021	(2,000)
	EQ709 - CCTV Works	(6,970)
	Release from EQ756 re fund fleet contract	(1,830)
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22		
	S106 - Air Quality	65,797
	EQ706 - Contribution received for CCTV works during May 21	5,000
	EQ773 - Contribution towards increased tree works for 2021/22	17,300
	EQ779 Paddling pool resin replacement	30,000
	EQ784 - Covid-19 compliance and enforcement grant income	30,976
	Net movement in earmarked reserves before statutory adjustments	83,564
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves		
		(27,471)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Finance and Performance

Code	Finance and Performance	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	574,890	683,754	108,864	18.9%
2,000	Premises	0	0	0	0.0%
3,000	Transport	1,170	95	(1,075)	-91.9%
4,000	Supplies and Services	168,540	160,556	(7,984)	-4.7%
	Total Direct Expenditure	744,600	844,404	99,804	13.4%
7,000	External Income	(600)	(5,755)	(5,155)	-859.16%
	Net Direct Expenditure	744,000	838,649	94,649	12.7% (a)
	Total Finance and Performance Expenditure	744,000	838,649	94,649	12.7%
	Finance and Performance - Service units				
FP100	Accountancy Services	436,790	534,627	97,837	22.4%
FP200	Internal Audit	92,100	91,088	(1,012)	-1.1%
FP300	Procurement	121,580	120,605	(975)	-0.8%
FP400	Purchase Ledger	47,320	18,478	(28,842)	-61.0%
FP500	Sales Ledger	46,210	73,851	27,641	59.8%
	Total Finance and Performance	744,000	838,649	94,649	12.7%
				£	£
	Total Expenditure Variation				94,649 (a)
	Major Cost Changes				
FP100	Agency overspend due to temp Group Manager for Finance (12 Months) & recruitment costs			98,000	
FP100	Spend on Apprenticeship training (off-set by Apprenticeship levy below)			5,000	
FP300	Increased software charges for the tender Procurement system			8,000	
					111,000
	Major Cost Savings				
FP100	Budgeted software update has been delayed to 2021/22 (see below EMR)			(16,720)	
					(16,720)
	Major Changes in Income Levels				
FP100	Apprenticeship levy income to off-set spend above			(5,000)	
					(5,000)
	Minor Variations				5,369
	Total Expenditure Variation				94,649 (a)
	EARMARKED RESERVES				
	Utilised 2020/21				
	EQ748 - Release EMR to off-set additional staff costs			(17,000)	
	Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22				
	EQ749 - Capita Upgrade delayed			16,720	
	Net movement in earmarked reserves				(280)
	Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves				94,369

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Grounds Maintenance

Code	Grounds Maintenance	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	515,050	453,289	(61,761)	-12.0%
2,000	Premises	0	0	0	0.0%
3,000	Transport	86,580	96,607	10,027	11.6%
4,000	Supplies and Services	37,480	12,929	(24,551)	-65.5%
	Total Direct Expenditure	639,110	562,824	(76,286)	-11.9%
7,000	External Income	(71,300)	(87,918)	(16,618)	-23.31%
	Net Direct Expenditure	567,810	474,906	(92,904)	-16.4% (a)
	Total Grounds Maintenance Expenditure	567,810	474,906	(92,904)	-16.4%
	Grounds Maintenance - Service units				
GM960	Grounds Maintenance	567,810	474,906	(92,904)	-16.4%
	Total Grounds Maintenance Expenditure	567,810	474,906	(92,904)	-16.4%
	Total Expenditure Variation			£ (92,904)	£ (92,904) (a)
	Major Cost Changes				
	Additional agency costs - manager post agency filled			13,300	
	Additional fleet maintenance - funded by EMR release			15,565	
					28,865
	Major Cost Savings				
	Salary savings due to vacancies during the year			(64,000)	
	Training delayed due to Covid-19			(9,600)	
	Plants and shrubs now funded by Town Councils			(13,700)	
	Underspend on equipment			(5,300)	
	Reduction in fuel costs - reduced mileage and lower fuel prices			(8,200)	
					(100,800)
	Major Changes in Income Levels				
	Sale of vehicle			(14,650)	
	Furlough grant			(8,715)	
					(23,365)
	Minor Variations				2,396
	Total Expenditure Variation				(92,904) (a)
	EARMARKED RESERVES				
	Utilised 2020/21				
FM100	Release from EQ756 to fund fleet contract			(15,565)	
	Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22				
	Net movement in earmarked reserves				(15,565)
	Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves				(108,469)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

General Fund Housing

Code	General Fund Housing	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	325,730	289,078	(36,652)	-11.3%
2,000	Premises	8,020	12,079	4,059	50.6%
3,000	Transport	12,420	6,284	(6,136)	-49.4%
4,000	Supplies and Services	455,170	411,875	(43,295)	-9.5%
Total Direct Expenditure		801,340	719,315	(82,025)	-10.2%
7,000	External Income	(485,820)	(661,181)	(175,361)	-36.10%
Net Direct Expenditure		315,520	58,134	(257,386)	-81.6% (a)
Total General Fund Housing Services Expenditure		315,520	58,134	(257,386)	-81.6%
General Fund Housing - Service units					
HG320	Housing and Homelessness Advice	147,120	(73,122)	(220,242)	-149.7%
HG345	Rough Sleeping Initiative	0	(49,966)	(49,966)	0.0%
HG350	Community Alarms	(117,340)	(78,885)	38,455	32.8%
HG373	Homelessness and Enabling Team	257,740	225,998	(31,742)	-12.3%
HG376	Ivor Macey House Project	28,000	34,109	6,109	21.8%
Total General Fund Housing Services Expenditure		315,520	58,134	(257,386)	-81.6%
				£	£
Total Expenditure Variation					(257,386) (a)
Major Cost Changes					0
Major Cost Savings					
Savings against Consultancy budget				(35,325)	
Housing Options staffing savings				(29,547)	
					(64,872)
Major Changes in Income Levels					
Income from community alarms was down on budget due to the impact of Covid-19. Officers were unable to visit properties. Included within this figure is £6k Impairment Allowance				30,963	
Rough Sleeping Initiative Grant				(57,701)	
Flexible Homelessness Support Grant				(154,552)	
					(181,290)
Minor Variations					(11,224)
Total Expenditure Variation					(257,386) (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES					
Utilised 2020/21					
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22					
Flexible Homelessness Support Grant				154,552	
MHCLG Rough Sleeping Initiative				57,701	
Net movement in earmarked reserves					212,253
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves					(45,133)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Human Resources

Code	Human Resources	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	444,260	366,743	(77,517)	-17.4%
2,000	Premises	0	0	0	0.0%
3,000	Transport	3,350	800	(2,550)	-76.1%
4,000	Supplies and Services	65,880	48,354	(17,526)	-26.6%
Total Direct Expenditure		513,490	415,898	(97,592)	-19.0%
7,000	External Income	0	(6,733)	(6,733)	0.00%
Net Direct Expenditure		513,490	409,164	(104,326)	-20.3% (a)
Total Human Resources Expenditure		513,490	409,164	(104,326)	-20.3%
HR - Service units					
HR100	Human Resources	343,030	282,761	(60,269)	-17.6%
HR200	Staff Development Training	33,750	457	(33,293)	-98.6%
HR300	Payroll	48,870	47,699	(1,171)	-2.4%
HR400	Learning and Development	53,190	45,680	(7,510)	-14.1%
HR600	Health and Safety Officer	34,650	32,567	(2,083)	-6.0%
Total Human Resources Expenditure		513,490	409,164	(104,326)	-20.3%
				£	£
Total Expenditure Variation					(104,326) (a)
Major Cost Changes					0
Major Cost Savings					
HR100	Salary savings due to vacant posts			(47,000)	
HR100	Computer software budget of £25k for software upgrade not spent (see below EMR)			(25,000)	
HR200	Corporate training underspend due to Covid-19 restrictions (see below EMR)			(30,000)	
					(102,000)
Major Changes in Income Levels					0
Minor Variations					(2,326)
Total Expenditure Variation					(104,326) (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES					
Utilised 2020/21					
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22					
	EQ778 - HFX software upgrade			25,000	
	EQ666 - Customer Improvement programme training			12,000	
	Net movement in earmarked reserves				37,000
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves					(67,326)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

ICT Services

Code	ICT Services	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	579,870	544,228	(35,642)	-6.1%
2,000	Premises	0	0	0	0.0%
3,000	Transport	1,020	292	(728)	-71.4%
4,000	Supplies and Services	403,360	437,983	34,623	8.6%
Total Direct Expenditure		984,250	982,503	(1,747)	-0.2%
7,000	External Income	(600)	(15,791)	(15,191)	-2531.77%
Net Direct Expenditure		983,650	966,712	(16,938)	-1.7% (a)
Total ICT Services Expenditure		983,650	966,712	(16,938)	-1.7%
ICT - Service units					
IT100	Gazetteer Management	74,880	49,969	(24,911)	-33.3%
IT300	Central Telephones	31,000	34,037	3,037	9.8%
IT400	ICT Network and Hardware	65,000	70,702	5,702	8.8%
IT500	ICT Software Support and Maint.	235,430	253,975	18,545	7.9%
IT600	ICT Staff Unit	319,430	339,494	20,064	6.3%
IT700	Cyber Security	41,300	27,287	(14,013)	-33.9%
IT800	Phoenix House Printing	16,300	9,220	(7,080)	-43.4%
IT900	Digital Services	200,310	182,029	(18,281)	-9.1%
Total ICT Services Expenditure		983,650	966,712	(16,938)	-1.7%
				£	£
Total Expenditure Variation					(16,938) (a)
Major Cost Changes					
IT300	Additional BT costs not budgeted - delayed Skype calling			7,500	
IT400	Additional equipment due to Covid-19			12,300	
IT500	Capital project costs moved to revenue - funded by EMR			15,830	
IT600	Staffing and agency costs			5,380	
IT600	Consultancy to support Revs and Bens requirements			18,130	
IT400	Additional broadband width for home working due to Covid-19			2,750	
IT400	Equipment maintenance (Blade Server) not included in budget			2,250	
IT900	Additional software costs			8,300	
					72,440
Major Cost Savings					
IT100	Salary savings due to vacant posts			(22,100)	
IT300	Mobile phones contract delayed - moved to EMR			(5,000)	
IT400	Computer hardware underspend - 8k to EMR			(16,800)	
IT700	ICT Health check underspend due to Covid-19 delays - moved to EMR			(8,960)	
IT800	Reduction in printing due to homeworking			(7,080)	
IT900	Salary savings from delay in recruiting for vacant roles			(29,600)	
					(89,540)
Major Changes in Income Levels					
IT600	Training grant to improve and develop cyber crime awareness			(3,000)	
IT600	Apprenticeship Levy received			(8,400)	
IT700	Cyber phase 3 grant agreement			(2,000)	
					(13,400)
Minor Variations					13,562
Total Expenditure Variation					(16,938) (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES					
Utilised 2020/21					
IT400	Release from EQ655 to fund capital costs to revenue			(2,678)	
IT500	Release from EQ655 to fund capital costs to revenue			(7,400)	
IT500	Release from EQ653 to fund capital costs to revenue			(8,427)	
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22					
IT300	Contribution to EQ759 to fund mobile phone contract			5,000	
IT700	Contribution to EQ655 to fund delayed Pen Testing			8,960	
IT400	Contribution to EQ655 to fund IT Hardware replacement kit			8,000	
Net movement in earmarked reserves					3,455
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves					(13,483)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Legal and Democratic Services

Code	Legal and Democratic Services	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	567,200	571,650	4,450	0.8%
2,000	Premises	0	0	0	0.0%
3,000	Transport	17,700	910	(16,790)	-94.9%
4,000	Supplies and Services	512,150	466,534	(45,616)	-8.9%
	Total Direct Expenditure	1,097,050	1,039,094	(57,956)	-5.3%
7,000	External Income	(44,700)	(70,596)	(25,896)	-57.93%
	Net Direct Expenditure	1,052,350	968,498	(83,852)	-5.3% (a)
	Total Legal and Democratic Services	1,052,350	968,498	(83,852)	-5.3%
	Legal and Democratic Services - Service units				
LD100	Electoral Registration	203,830	144,900	(58,930)	-28.9%
LD200	Election costs	0	(1,880)	(1,880)	N/A
LD300	Democratic Rep and Management	366,600	326,036	(40,564)	-11.1%
LD400	Committee Services	124,030	124,533	503	0.4%
LD600	Legal Services	357,890	374,909	17,019	4.8%
	Total Legal and Democratic Services	1,052,350	968,498	(83,852)	
	Total Expenditure Variation			£ (83,852)	£ (83,852) (a)
	Major Cost Changes				
LD600	Legal consultancy fees relating to 3RS Review			33,400	33,400
	Major Cost Savings				
LD100	Budget for boundary review not required until 2021/22			(45,000)	
LD100	Savings on printing and reply paid postage			(15,350)	
LD100	Savings on computer software after not renewing mobile canvasser app			(11,370)	
LD300	Savings on member mileage due to Covid-19			(16,160)	
LD300	Savings on member allowances due to vacant seats			(11,620)	
LD300	Savings on member training and expenses due to Covid-19			(9,790)	
LD600	Delayed expenditure on Computer Software (see EMR contribution below)			(15,080)	
					(124,370)
	Major Changes in Income Levels				
LD100	Reduction to Individual Electoral Reform funding			17,160	17,160
	Minor Variations				(10,042)
	Total Expenditure Variation				(83,852) (a)
	EARMARKED RESERVES				
	Utilised 2020/21				
	Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22				
LD100	Contribution to EQ788, Boundary Review to be completed in 2021/22			45,000	
LD300	Contribution to EQ789, Additional Member Support			14,000	
LD600	Contribution to EQ783, Legal Services Case Management System to be spent in 2021/22			15,080	
	Net movement in earmarked reserves (other than budgeted)				74,080
	Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves				(9,772)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Planning and Regeneration

Code	Planning and Regeneration	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	1,906,180	1,772,630	(133,550)	-7.0%
2,000	Premises	0	5,118	5,118	0.0%
3,000	Transport	43,970	26,854	(17,116)	-38.9%
4,000	Supplies and Services	452,900	630,775	177,875	39.3%
	S106 Expenditure		74,844	74,844	0.0%
	Total Direct Expenditure	2,403,050	2,510,222	107,172	4.5%
7,000	External Income	(1,162,500)	(1,173,008)	(10,508)	-0.9%
	S106 contributions		(128,044)	(128,044)	0.0%
	Grant funding		(538,401)	(538,401)	0.0%
	Net Direct Expenditure	1,240,550	670,770	(569,780)	-45.9% (a)
	Total Planning and Regeneration Expenditure	1,240,550	670,770	(569,780)	-45.9%
	Planning and Regeneration - Service units				
PR100	Building Regulations	(8,140)	(1,621)	6,519	80.1%
PR110	Enforcement	110,370	85,093	(25,277)	-22.9%
PR200	Development Control	246,040	3,871	(242,169)	-98.4%
PR210	Local Land Charges	(19,200)	(43,358)	(24,158)	-125.8%
PR220	Tiverton EUE	55,780	61,908	6,128	11.0%
PR225	Garden Village Project	56,170	25,936	(30,234)	-53.8%
PR300	Environmental Enhancement	0	0	0	0.0%
PR400	Business Development	427,810	367,880	(59,930)	-14.0%
PR401	Reopening High Street Fund	0	11,754	11,754	0.0%
PR402	Cullompton HAZ	0	(62,364)	(62,364)	0.0%
PR411	Business Development Recharge	0	0	0	0.0%
PR420	Tiverton Town Centre Regen Project	0	0	0	0.0%
PR500	Historic Buildings	0	0	0	0.0%
PR600	Forward Planning Unit	270,620	160,466	(110,154)	-40.7%
PR699	Forward Planning Unit Rech	0	0	0	0.0%
PR800	Planning Policy	0	0	0	0.0%
PR810	Statutory Development Plan	99,390	56,783	(42,607)	-42.9%
PR820	Assets of community value	0	82	82	0.0%
PR900	Dangerous Buildings And Trees	1,710	4,339	2,629	153.8%
	Total Planning and Regeneration Expenditure	1,240,550	670,770	(569,780)	-45.9%
				£	£
	Total Expenditure Variation				(569,780) (a)
	Major Cost Changes				
PR200	Supplies and services - overspend from defending appeals, consultancy and advertising of planning applications			98,500	
PR200	Provision for planning appeal costs			35,000	
PR220	Spend on Tiverton EUE - (see EMR release below)			6,128	
PR225	Spend on Garden Village - (see EMR release below)			100,576	
PR400	Love Your Town Grants - (see EMR release below)			27,175	
PR400	High Street Innovator Grants - (see EMR release below)			1,349	
PR400	Spend on Cullompton Town Centre Masterplan - (see EMR release below)			13,587	
PR401	Spend on reopening the High Streets			11,750	
PR600	Consultancy, delivering Gypsy and Traveller pitches on urban extensions(see EMR release below)			7,000	
PR600	Independent review of the draft Cullompton Neighbourhood Plan - (see EMR release below)			3,050	
PR600	Wessex Community Assets support, 4th year of support for community led housing project - (see EMR release below)			3,125	
PR810	Spend on Local Plan - (see EMR release below)			54,893	
					362,133

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Planning and Regeneration

Major Cost Savings		
PR110	Salary savings on role moved to Development Management admin team - (see EMR release below) - (see EMR contribution below)	(17,000)
PR110	Supplies and services savings on enforcement action	(7,600)
PR200	Salary savings from delay in recruiting for vacancies, post moved from Enforcement and staff time charged to HIF projects - (see EMR contribution below)	(31,000)
PR200	Transport savings from reduced mileage claims	(6,000)
PR210	Saving on DCC search fees	(9,650)
PR400	Salary savings from delay in recruiting for vacant roles - (see EMR contribution below)	(28,000)
PR400	Underspend on projects as staff have been working on delivering Covid-19 grant schemes - (see EMR release below)	(78,000)
PR600	Salary savings from delay in recruiting for vacant roles - (see EMR contribution below)	(74,000)
PR810	Saving on GESP membership	(37,500)
PR810	Delay of Crediton Master planning. (See return funds to EMR below to fund spend in 2021/22)	(60,000)
		(348,750)
Major Changes in Income Levels		
PR100	Reduced income due to Covid-19; a reduction in the developer applications with the larger fees although market share of smaller domestic applications has increased	13,000
PR200	S31 Grant receipts - (see EMR contribution below)	(270,500)
PR210	Increased income due to Covid-19 - Suspension of SDLT	(9,500)
PR225	Capacity funding receipt for Garden Village - (see EMR contribution below)	(130,000)
PR400	Reduced income due to Covid-19; a reduction in the developer applications requiring planning performance agreements and pre-app advice	6,000
PR402	Heritage England grant unspent in year on Cullompton HAZ project - (see EMR contribution below)	(62,364)
PR600	Neighbourhood Plan grant receipt, (see EMR contribution below) for spend on 2021 referendum	(20,000)
PR600	LGA grant receipt, (see EMR contribution below) for spend in 2021	(20,000)
		(493,364)
Minor Variations		
		(26,525)
SERVICE MOVEMENT BEFORE STATUTORY ADJUSTMENTS		
		(506,506)
PR200	Net S106 Receipts and Grants (also see EMR below)	(63,275)
Total Expenditure Variation		
		(569,781) (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES		
Utilised 2020/21		
PR200	S106 - Public Open Space	(68,189)
PR220	Release from EQ820 to fund spend on EUE	(6,128)
PR225	Release from EQ824 to fund spend on Garden Village	(100,576)
PR400	Release from EQ728 to fund spend on Cullompton Town Centre Masterplan	(13,587)
PR400	Release from EQ722 to fund Love Your Town Grants	(27,175)
PR400	Release from EQ681 to fund High St Innovator Grants	(1,349)
PR600	Release from EQ698 to fund spend on delivering Gypsy and Traveller pitches	(7,000)
PR600	Release from EQ821 to fund spend on Cullompton Neighbourhood Plan	(3,050)
PR600	Release from EQ741 to fund spend on community led housing projects	(3,125)
PR810	Release from EQ728 to fund spend on Local Plan	(54,893)
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22		
PR200	S106 - Public Open Space	128,044
PR200	Contribution to EQ656/781 S31 grant funding for Cullompton J28 and work to reopen railway station	220,500
PR200	Contribution to EQ782, Planning, testing of national model design codes	50,000
PR200	Planning Improvement Programme	150,000
PR225	Contribution to EQ824, capacity funding received to be spent in future years	130,000
PR400	Contribution to EQ722 for further Love Your Town Grants	30,000
PR402	Contribution to EQ722 to fund spend on Cullompton HAZ	62,364
PR600	Contribution to EQ821 to fund spend on Neighbourhood Plan work	20,000
PR600	Contribution to EQ821 to fund spend on Housing Advisers Programme in 2021/22	20,000
PR810	Returned budgeted transfer to spend on Crediton Masterplan to EQ728 for spend in 2021/22	60,000
	Net movement in earmarked reserves	585,835
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves		
		16,055

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Property Services

Code	Property Services	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	685,420	642,244	(43,176)	-6.3%
2,000	Premises	527,110	581,684	54,574	10.4%
3,000	Transport	34,030	26,346	(7,684)	-22.6%
4,000	Supplies and Services	134,330	143,156	8,826	6.6%
Total Direct Expenditure		1,380,890	1,393,430	12,540	0.9%
7,000	External Income	(646,650)	(982,878)	(336,228)	-52.0%
Net Direct Expenditure		734,240	410,552	(323,688)	-44.1% (a)
Total Property Services Expenditure		734,240	410,552	(323,688)	-44.1%
Property Services - Service units					
PS160	Asset Management	40,000	31,803	(8,197)	-20.5%
PS350	Public Conveniences	50,710	50,697	(13)	0.0%
PS400	Flood Defences and Land Drainage	26,430	14,604	(11,826)	-44.7%
PS600	Street Naming and Numbering	7,830	4,347	(3,483)	-44.5%
PS700	Contract Services - P-Health	10,420	8,609	(1,811)	-17.4%
PS810	Phoenix House	241,380	295,772	54,392	22.5%
PS850	Old Road Depot	38,190	57,217	19,027	49.8%
PS880	Bus Station Maintenance	(15,690)	(15,827)	(137)	-0.9%
PS890	10 Phoenix Lane	(10,690)	(12,293)	(1,603)	-15.0%
PS950	Climate Change	0	(294,861)	(294,861)	0.0%
PS960	Caretaking Services	46,730	57,048	10,318	22.1%
PS970	Office Building Cleaning	62,250	16,646	(45,604)	-73.3%
PS980	Property Services	630,490	593,990	(36,500)	-5.8%
PS990	30/38 Fore Street	(110,970)	(87,768)	23,202	20.9%
PS991	Industrial Units	(119,110)	(112,984)	6,126	5.1%
PS992	Market Walk	(164,730)	(175,217)	(10,487)	-6.4%
PS993	Lowman Green Unit	(10,000)	(8,690)	1,310	13.1%
PS994	Moorhayes Community Centre	0	8,459	8,459	0.0%
PS995	Coggans Well	11,000	(21,000)	(32,000)	-290.9%
Total Property Services		734,240	410,552	(323,688)	-44.1%
				£	£
Total Expenditure Variation					(323,688) (a)
Major Cost Changes					
PS810	Phoenix House additional maintenance costs are funded from EMR (see below EMR) Building cleaning has been outsourced during the year, budget for this costs is within PS970			68,722	
PS810	Office cleaning, additional cleaning measures due to Covid-19 has also impacted on this overspend			30,000	
PS850	Building cleaning has been outsourced during the year, budget for this costs is within PS970			15,000	
PS960	Office cleaning, additional cleaning measures due to Covid-19 has also impacted on this overspend			10,000	
PS950	Caretaking Services salary overspend off-set by £8k within Customer First			42,430	
PS950	Spend from Climate change Grant (see changes in Income)				166,152
Major Cost Savings					
PS160	General underspends on Asset Management maintenance			(12,000)	
PS810	Underspend on specific maintenance projects due to office closures (see below EMR)			(35,000)	
PS970	Office Building Cleaning new external contract, cost now sits within individual building codes			(46,000)	
PS980	Salary savings within Property Services due to vacant posts			(40,000)	
PS995	Specific maintenance underspend (see below EMR)			(30,000)	
					(163,000)
Major Changes in Income Levels					
PS950	Climate change grant funding received (see below EMR)			(337,421)	
PS990	Fore Street flat rental income not achieved			22,000	
PS992	Market Walk reduction in void service charges and void income			(12,000)	
					(327,421)
Minor Variations					
					581
Total Expenditure Variation					(323,688) (a)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Property Services

EARMARKED RESERVES		
Utilised 2020/21		
PS980	Reduced release from EQ756 to fund fleet contract - budgeted release was too high	1,083
PS810	EQ828 - Aircon expenditure - Phoenix House	(13,600)
PS810	EQ837 - Cold water pump and ducting works - Phoenix House	(20,192)
PS810	EQ827 - Meeting room furniture, carpet tiles and internal decoration - Phoenix House	(34,961)
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22		
PS810	Specific maintenance projects Phoenix House	35,000
PS950	Climate Change grant funding	299,421
PS995	Coggans Well high level roof repairs	30,000
	Net movement in earmarked reserves	296,751
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves		(26,938)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Leisure Services

Code	Leisure Services	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	2,003,700	1,899,553	(104,147)	-5.2%
2,000	Premises	1,244,050	852,546	(391,504)	-31.5%
3,000	Transport	8,530	3,814	(4,716)	-55.3%
4,000	Supplies and Services	291,010	189,896	(101,114)	-34.7%
Total Direct Expenditure		3,547,290	2,945,809	(601,481)	-17.0%
7,000	External Income	(3,112,540)	(984,796)	2,127,744	68.4%
Net Direct Expenditure		434,750	1,961,013	1,526,263	351.1% (a)
Total Leisure Services Expenditure		434,750	1,961,013	1,526,263	351.1%
Leisure Services - Service units					
RS100	Leisure Facilities Maintenance and Equipment	513,500	232,198	(281,302)	-54.8%
RS110	Leisure Management and Administration	46,420	24,388	(22,032)	-47.5%
RS140	Exe Valley Leisure Centre	(80,230)	806,491	886,721	1105.2%
RS150	Lords Meadow Leisure Centre	(16,732)	585,702	602,434	3600.5%
RS151	Feasibility	0	8,196	8,196	0.0%
RS160	Culm Valley Sports Centre	(28,208)	304,038	332,246	1177.8%
Total Leisure Services Expenditure		434,750	1,961,013	1,526,263	351.1%
				£	£
Total Expenditure Variation					1,526,263 (a)
Major Cost Changes					0
Major Cost Savings					
Specific maintenance across Leisure Centre not been carried out due to Covid-19 closures					
RS100	(see below EMR)			(280,000)	
RS	Saving across all Leisure utilities budgets due to Covid-19 closures (see below EMR)			(108,000)	
RS	Saving on staffing costs due to carrying vacancies and reduction to casual claims			(77,760)	
RS	Savings against vending supplies following decision to discontinue vending sales			(23,925)	
RS	Savings against operational costs largely due to Covid-19 closures			(91,650)	
					(581,335)
Major Changes in Income Levels					
RS	Reduction in income due to Covid-19			2,585,000	
RS	Loss of vending income following decision to discontinue vending sales			32,886	
RS	Recharge to DCC for Dual Use lower than budget			20,500	
RS	Job Retention Scheme grants received for furloughed staff			(520,404)	
					2,117,982
Minor Variations					(10,384)
Total Expenditure Variation					1,526,263 (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES					
Utilised 2020/21					
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22					
	EQ764 Specific Maintenance projects across Leisure			220,884	
	EQ764 Utility water EMR			30,000	
Net movement in earmarked reserves					250,884
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves					1,777,147

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Revenues and Benefits

Code	Revenues and Benefits	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	699,680	732,893	33,213	4.7%
2,000	Premises	0	0	0	0.0%
3,000	Transport	4,670	3,477	(1,193)	-25.6%
4,000	Supplies and Services	223,620	720,399	496,779	222.2%
	Housing Benefit Payments	11,651,970	12,629,959	977,989	8.4%
	Total Direct Expenditure	12,579,940	14,086,728	1,506,788	12.0%
	Income from Housing Benefit Subsidy	(11,646,970)	(12,610,050)	(963,080)	8.3%
	All other Income	(433,770)	(1,431,519)	(997,749)	230.0%
7,000	External Income	(12,080,740)	(14,041,569)	(1,960,829)	-16.2%
	Net Direct Expenditure	499,200	45,159	(454,041)	-91.0% (a)
	Total Revenues and Benefits Expenditure	499,200	45,159	(454,041)	-91.0%
	Revenues and Benefits - Service units				
RB100	Collection of Council Tax	397,010	394,630	(2,380)	-0.6%
RB200	Collection of Business Rates	(103,370)	(523,527)	(420,157)	-406.5%
RB300	Housing Benefit Admin	117,520	(1,341)	(118,861)	-101.1%
RB340	Local Welfare Assistance Scheme	15,000	15,000	0	0.0%
RB350	Universal Credit Partnership	0	0	0	0.0%
RB400	Housing Rent Allowances	5,000	19,909	14,909	298.2%
RB410	Council Tax Benefit	0	(1,027)	(1,027)	0.0%
RB600	Revenues Recovery Team	68,040	107,653	39,613	58.2%
RB700	NDR - Business Support Grant	0	35,000	35,000	0.0%
RB800	Council Tax Hardship Fund	0	(1,138)	(1,138)	0.0%
	Numerous Cost Centres have been used during the year to hold the various one-off Covid-19 Grants given to businesses. Overall this department has paid out more than £32,000k in 2020/21. All unspent balances have been cleared to reserves to be spent in 2021/22, or returned to Government if not fully claimed.				
	Total Revenues and Benefits Expenditure	499,200	45,159	(454,041)	-91.0%
	Total Expenditure Variation			£ (454,041)	£ (a)
	Major Cost Changes				
	The demand for Housing Benefit in 20/21 was higher than budgeted, see				
	* increased Subsidy received below			977,990	
	Grants paid outside scope to be covered from New Burdens funding			35,000	
	Council Tax Hardship Fund compensation to the C/Tax Collection Fund, please				
	** see grant award detailed below			473,430	
	Major Cost Savings				1,486,420
					0

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Revenues and Benefits

Major Changes in Income Levels		
Increased 20/21 Housing Benefit Subsidy related to increased costs detailed * above	(931,080)	
Overpayment recovery which includes HB Sundry Debtors, recovery from ongoing HB and PDP being recovered at DWP	(73,720)	
19/20 HB Subsidy Adjustment following 19/20 Audit	41,720	
Additional C/Tax Annexe Grant	(7,310)	
Additional CTB and HB admin Grant than budgeted	(23,130)	
Income received from Court Costs and Penalties lower than budgeted	40,910	
Various New Burdens grants from DWP in respect of Housing Benefits - initiatives delivered either within existing resource or to offset additional software costs	(51,300)	
HB New Burdens Grant for Grant administration - Test and Trace and Hardship fund	(51,030)	
Council Tax Hardship Fund Grant Award, related to increased costs detailed ** above	(474,560)	
NNDR New Burdens Grant for Grant administration. (Note £60k to be rolled forward in EMR for continued administration in 21/22 - see below)	(425,000)	
		(1,954,500)
Minor Variations		14,039
Total Expenditure Variation		(454,041) (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES		
Utilised 2020/21		
Release from EQ756 to fund fleet contract	(65)	
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22		
RB200 NNDR New Burdens Grants for 21/22 Grant Administration	60,000	
Net movement in earmarked reserves		59,935
Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves		(394,106)

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Waste Services

Code	Waste Services	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	2,716,320	2,778,108	61,788	2.3%
2,000	Premises	311,450	308,020	(3,430)	-1.1%
3,000	Transport	875,710	911,548	35,838	4.1%
4,000	Supplies and Services	669,540	579,587	(89,953)	-13.4%
	S106 Expenditure		0	0	
	Total Direct Expenditure	4,573,020	4,577,263	4,243	0.1%
7,000	External Income	(2,583,540)	(2,675,768)	(92,228)	-3.6%
	Net Direct Expenditure	1,989,480	1,901,495	(87,985)	-4.4% (a)
	Total Waste Services Expenditure	1,989,480	1,901,495	(87,985)	-4.4%
	Waste Services - Cost Centres				
FM100	Fleet Management	96,280	130,070	33,790	35.1%
WS650	Street Cleansing	449,720	402,904	(46,816)	-10.4%
WS700	Refuse Collection	460,370	273,793	(186,577)	-40.5%
WS710	Trade Waste Collection	(169,920)	(276,459)	(106,539)	-62.7%
WS725	Kerbside Recycling	605,070	843,386	238,316	39.4%
WS750	Waste Management Staff Unit	273,400	261,102	(12,298)	-4.5%
WS770	Unit 3 Carlu Close	274,560	266,700	(7,860)	-2.9%
	Total Waste Services Expenditure	1,989,480	1,901,495	(87,985)	-4.4%
	Total Expenditure Variation			£ (87,985)	£ (a)
	Major Cost Changes				
FM100	Agency - manager post covered by agency			34,500	
WS650	Salary savings due to vacancies - offset by agency spend			18,350	
All Codes	Additional fleet maintenance - funded by EMR release			31,800	
WS650	Additional bins funded by EMR release			8,650	
WS700	Agency costs - offset by salary savings			54,320	
WS700	Clinical waste charges			4,590	
All Codes	Vehicle Damage			37,420	
WS725	Agency overspend			152,000	
WS725	Plant and repairs overspend - spare motor and parts for baler - funded by EMR			7,400	
WS725	Additional bins funded by EMR release			26,500	
WS725	Printing overspend on WEEE mailshot - funded by grant			11,500	
WS725	Fuel stock overspend due to increased rounds			11,700	
WS725	Additional salary costs			5,500	
WS725	WEEE Advertising costs funded by EMR release			4,300	
WS725	Weighing scales for EU paperwork funded by EMR release			3,690	
				412,220	

GENERAL FUND REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Waste Services

Major Cost Savings		
FM100	Salaries savings due to vacancy - offset by agency spend	(43,780)
WS650	Salary savings due to vacancies - offset by agency spend	(59,230)
WS650	Reduction in fuel costs - reduced mileage and lower fuel prices	(9,500)
WS700	Reduction in printing and postage	(6,030)
WS700	Reduction in chemicals and materials	(2,920)
	Uninsured losses - historical refund. Waste Transfer Station roller door damage 2019. Costs recovered from Hitchcocks insurance	(4,820)
WS700	Salary savings due to vacancies - offset by agency spend	(76,700)
WS700	Reduction in fuel costs - reduced mileage and lower fuel prices	(44,320)
WS710	Salary and agency underspend due to vacancies and revise schedules	(18,600)
WS710	Reduced car allowances	(2,600)
WS710	Equipment underspend. More items in stock	(7,570)
WS710	Bad debt provision not required	(5,800)
WS710	Reduced waste disposal charges due Covid-19 closures	(72,100)
WS725	Recycling credits - voluntary groups - offset against income reduction	(36,880)
WS725	Training underspend due to Covid-19	(3,840)
WS725	Recycling haulage fees	(8,500)
WS750	Salary savings due to vacancies - offset by agency spend	(4,280)
	Uninsured losses - historical refund. Waste Transfer Station roller door damage 2019. Costs recovered from Hitchcocks insurance	(9,625)
WS770	Specific project maint structural works not carried out (see below EMR)	(15,000)
		(432,095)
Major Changes in Income Levels		
FM100	Shared Transport Manager post delayed due to Covid-19	20,000
	Fees and Charges reduced - Grand Western Canal on reduced rate and partial year	7,740
WS650	2019-20 Increased Landfill Shared Savings	(41,800)
WS700	Increased garden permits	(59,200)
WS700	Sale of vehicle	(2,500)
WS700	Sale of wheelie bins	(15,180)
WS700	Increased bulky waste collections	(7,250)
WS710	Reduced income from trade due to Covid-19	15,400
WS710	Internal trade waste charges to services	(20,340)
WS725	Reduced income due to price volatility - Recycling materials	64,000
WS725	Recycling credits - voluntary groups - offset against income reduction	36,090
WS725	Recycling credits increased	(65,750)
All Codes	Job Retention Scheme Funding for furloughed staff	(21,210)
WS725	WEEE grant	(13,280)
		(103,280)
	Minor Variations	35,170
	Total Expenditure Variation	(87,985) (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES		
Utilised 2020/21		
WS725	Release from EQ758 to fund baler repairs	(10,000)
WS725	Release from EQ757 to fund WEEE livery	(4,300)
WS725	Release from EQ745 to fund weight scales for EU paperwork	(3,690)
WS725	Release from EQ744 to fund waste containers	(26,500)
WS650	Release from EQ744 to fund waste containers	(6,500)
FM100	Release from EQ756 to fund fleet contract	(31,798)
	NHB release for Carlu water containment	(12,500)
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22		
WS770	Structural works to Transfer Station	15,000
	Net movement in earmarked reserves	(80,288)
	Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves	(168,273)

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Code	Housing Revenue Account	2020/21 Budget £	2020/21 Actual £	Variance £	Variance %
1,000	Employees	2,891,590	2,457,477	(434,113)	-15.0%
2,000	Premises	197,320	162,982	(34,338)	-17.4%
3,000	Transport	256,060	203,270	(52,790)	
4,000	Supplies and Services	7,532,960	8,452,618	919,658	12.2%
	Total Direct Expenditure	10,877,930	11,276,347	398,417	3.7%
7,000	External Income	(13,323,780)	(13,768,574)	(444,794)	-3.3%
	Net Direct Expenditure	(2,445,850)	(2,492,226)	(46,376)	1.9%
5,000	Internal Recharges	1,481,630	1,440,130	(41,500)	-2.8%
6,500	Capital Charges	964,220	958,496	(5,724)	-0.6%
	Total Indirect Expenditure	2,445,850	2,398,626	(47,224)	1.9%
	Total HRA Expenditure	0	(93,600)	(93,600)	(a)
	Income				
SHO01	Dwelling Rents Income	(12,366,750)	(12,324,685)	42,065	-0.3%
SHO04	Non Dwelling Rents Income	(595,720)	(558,651)	37,069	-6.2%
SHO07	Leaseholders' Service Charges	(21,640)	(26,290)	(4,650)	21.5%
SHO08	Contributions Towards Expenditure	(29,220)	(141,047)	(111,827)	382.7%
SHO10	H.R.A. Investment Income	(53,000)	(64,885)	(11,885)	22.4%
SHO11	Miscellaneous Income	(7,350)	(19,082)	(11,732)	159.6%
	Services				
SHO13A	Repairs and Maintenance	4,099,980	3,529,631	(570,349)	-13.9%
SHO17A	Housing and Tenancy Services	2,323,670	2,683,609	359,939	15.5%
	Accounting entries 'below the line'				
SHO29	Bad Debt Provision Movement	53,000	53,374	374	0.7%
SHO30	Share of Corporate And Democratic Costs	299,040	290,628	(8,412)	-2.8%
SHO32	H.R.A. Interest Payable	1,115,180	1,070,854	(44,326)	-4.0%
SHO34	H.R.A. Transfers to earmarked reserves	2,072,410	1,711,723	(360,687)	-17.4%
SHO36	Financing of capital expenditure	964,220	1,319,183	354,963	36.8%
SHO37	Capital Receipts Reserve Adjustment	(26,000)	(13,000)	13,000	-50.0%
SHO38	Major Repairs Allowance	2,260,000	2,596,285	336,285	14.9%
SHO42	Accumulated absences adjustment	0	(38,873)	(38,873)	0.0%
SHO45	Renewable Energy Transactions	(87,820)	(162,374)	(74,554)	84.9%
	Total HRA Expenditure	0	(93,600)	(93,600)	
	Total HRA Expenditure Variation			£	£
					(93,600) (a)

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN SUMMARY 2020/21

Major Cost Changes		
SHO13A	Staffing vacancies and delay in redevelopment team commencing	(389,870)
SHO13A	Standby contracts ending	(45,000)
SHO13A	Saving on redevelopment overhead budget	(73,230)
SHO13A	Non-employee savings in Planned Maintenance	(211,180)
SHO13A	Non-employee savings in Responsive and Voids Maintenance	(207,210)
SHO13A	Savings on vehicle overheads (including vehicle sales, car allowance and fuel charges for personal use)	(52,890)
SHO13A	Reduced DLO recharge for revenue and capital works due to impact of Covid 19	173,280
SHO13A	Demand for Disabled Facilities Works below budget principally due to Covid 19	57,710
SHO13A	Demand for Private Sector Disabled Facilities Works below budget this was due to Covid 19	185,380
SHO13A	External Cleaning contract spend	23,340
SHO17A	Underspend against the sewage works budget	(50,000)
SHO17A	Underspend against the communal roads budget	(21,000)
SHO17A	Warden services underspend	(28,380)
SHO17A	Various underspends on the Environmental Works budget	(14,410)
SHO17A	Underspend on debt recovery actions	(13,220)
SHO17A	Anti-Social-Behaviour budget underspend	(13,360)
SHO17A	Car Allowance underspend against budget	(15,440)
SHO17A	Shop maintenance budget underspend	(25,490)
SHO17A	Computer Software budget underspend	(14,690)
SHO17A	Salary saving across Tenancy Services	(16,840)
SHO17A	Training budget underspend	(15,440)
SHO17A	Contract dispute-settlement and associated legal costs [total cost £669,120 charged against a £45,210 expense budget]	623,910
SHO17A	Tenant Involvement expenditure below budget	(13,180)
SHO17A	Insurance excess provision unspent	(10,000)
ALL	General Fund recharge below budget	(41,500)
SHO32A	Interest payable below budget	(44,330)
SHO38	Contribution to the Major Repairs Reserve is above budget as the accounting requirements allow a transfer equal to the depreciation charge for the year	336,290
		83,250
Major Changes in Income Levels		
SHO01	Overall Dwelling Rent budget below budget due to slight shortfall in social rents and bad debt write-offs in Q4	42,070
SHO04	Garage rent income below budget	40,950
SHO08	The workforce have been able to conduct rechargeable works that have not been impacted by Covid-19, this has aided in the shortfall in other areas impacted by the pandemic	(111,830)
SHO10	Investment Income above budget	(11,890)
SHO11	Sundry Income above budget	(11,730)
SHO45	Government contribution for furloughed staff salaries	(29,060)
SHO45	Renewable Energy Transactions	(74,550)
		(156,040)
	Minor Variances totalling	(20,810)
	Total HRA Expenditure Variation	(93,600) (a)
EARMARKED RESERVES (memorandum account)		
Transferred/(Utilised) 2020/21		
	£	£
		0
	Affordable Rent Surplus utilised for capital purposes	
	Renewable Energy Fund utilised from the reserve for capital	(135,504)
	Housing Maintenance Fund transferred for capital expenditure	(225,183)
	Budgeted transfer to the Renewable Energy Fund	89,000
	Budgeted transfer to the Affordable Rent reserve	87,000
	Budgeted transfer to the Housing Maintenance Fund	1,190,632
	Budgeted transfer to the Loan Premium Deficit reserve	705,778
		1,711,723
Proposed contribution c/fwd to 2021/22		
	Affordable Rent Surplus	63,130
	Renewable Energy Fund	73,374
	Housing Maintenance Fund final transfer	(42,904)
		93,600
	Net movement in earmarked reserves (other than that shown as part of main HRA Summary)	93,600
	Total Expenditure variation after Earmarked Reserves	0

GENERAL FUND AND HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT EARMARKED RESERVES SUMMARY 2020/21**EARMARKED RESERVES AT 31 March 2021**

Total Miscellaneous General Fund Reserves	Cost Centres	B/F 31/3/20	(Cont To Emr)	Utilisation of EM	Transfers	C/F 31/3/21
Capital Earmarked Reserves	EQ650	(301,165)	0	46,000	0	(255,165)
NNDR Reserve	EQ659	(720,759)	(3,475,380)	150,500	0	(4,045,639)
New Homes Bonus Reserve	EQ653	(3,498,874)	(1,418,190)	1,855,733	0	(3,061,331)
Other GF Revenue Reserves	Cost Centres	B/F 31/3/20	(Cont To Emr)	Utilisation of EM	Transfers	C/F 31/3/21
Capital EMR PSH Grants	EQ652	(305,220)	0	52,090	0	(253,130)
Economic Development EMR	EQ654	(101,000)	0	0	0	(101,000)
ICT Projects Reserve	EQ655	(23,446)	(316,960)	10,078	0	(330,329)
Cullompton Rail Station	EQ656	(40,000)	(120,500)	0	0	(160,500)
Flood Defence Ashleigh Park Bampton	EQ657	(67,000)	0	0	0	(67,000)
Phoenix Lane PC's Conversion	EQ658	(38,000)	0	0	38,000	0
Gen Reserves - Support for 2021-22 budget	EQ660	0	0	0	(223,746)	(223,746)
High St Innovator Payment	EQ681	(1,859)	0	1,349	0	(510)
Emr Corp Training	EQ666	0	(12,000)	0	0	(12,000)
Car Park Machine Replacement	EQ686	(6,000)	(3,000)	0	0	(9,000)
Gypsies and Travellers	EQ698	(7,000)	0	7,000	0	0
Cred Market Square Resurfacing	EQ699	(20,000)	0	0	0	(20,000)
Community Dev Tap Fund Contr (CD200)	EQ701	(4,306)	0	0	0	(4,306)
Community Dev Seed Grant Fund (CD200)	EQ702	0	0	0	0	0
Community Dev Pct Money (CD210)	EQ703	0	0	0	0	0
Pannier Mkt Clock Tower Repair (CD300)	EQ704	0	0	0	0	0
Cemetery Grave Shoring Equip (ES100)	EQ705	(553)	0	0	553	0
Multi-Story Planned Works (CP520)	EQ706	(80,000)	(5,000)	80,000	0	(5,000)
Resurfacing Amenity Car Parks (CP530)	EQ707	(58,352)	0	12,670	0	(45,682)
Struct Surfacing P&D Car Parks (CP540)	EQ708	(2,600)	0	0	0	(2,600)
CCTV Initiatives Tiv TC Proj (ES200)	EQ709	(6,970)	0	6,970	0	0
Community Safety Partnership (ES256)	EQ710	(14,702)	0	3,379	0	(11,324)
P Sector Housing (ES354)	EQ711	(24,524)	0	0	0	(24,524)
PSH - Rogue Landlord Grant	EQ712	(43,027)	0	0	0	(43,027)
Parks & O Spaces Shelter Maint (ES450)	EQ713	(42,381)	0	0	0	(42,381)
Parks & O Spaces Tree Inspection (ES450)	EQ714	(25,426)	0	0	0	(25,426)
Air Quality Monitoring (ES660)	EQ716	(2,708)	0	0	0	(2,708)
Ground Maintenance Service (GM960)	EQ717	(12,663)	0	0	12,663	0
Corp Training (HR200)	EQ718	(8,515)	0	0	0	(8,515)
ICT Staff Unit Training (IT600)	EQ719	(2,550)	0	0	0	(2,550)
District Elections (LD201)	EQ720	0	(25,000)	0	0	(25,000)
Elected Members Training (LD300)	EQ721	(15,000)	(5,000)	0	0	(20,000)
PR400 Economic Development	EQ722	(97,000)	(92,364)	27,175	(100,000)	(262,189)
Land Charges Software Licence (PR210)	EQ723	(5,000)	0	0	0	(5,000)
New Burdens Grant Fund - LLC	EQ724	(19,263)	0	0	0	(19,263)
LABGI Local Auth Bus Grow Init (PR400)	EQ725	(12,051)	0	0	0	(12,051)
Brownfield Shared Plan DCLG (PR600)	EQ726	(36,263)	0	0	0	(36,263)
Forward Planning GESP Post 18M (PR600)	EQ727	0	0	0	0	0
Statutory Development Plan (PR810)	EQ728	(476,704)	(100,000)	70,370	0	(506,334)
Custom Build Grant (PR810)	EQ729	(76,277)	0	0	0	(76,277)
Community Housing Fund	EQ741	(111,485)	0	3,125	0	(108,360)
Homelessness Support	EQ742	(307,498)	(154,552)	101,660	0	(360,390)
Rough Sleeping Initiative	EQ743	(33,984)	(57,701)	0	0	(91,685)
Replacement Waste Containers	EQ744	(75,000)	0	33,000	0	(42,000)
Waste Options Report	EQ745	(18,980)	0	3,690	0	(15,290)
Food Protection	EQ746	(14,550)	0	0	0	(14,550)
Brexit Reserve	EQ747	(32,847)	0	0	0	(32,847)
Finance Additional Staff Costs	EQ748	(17,000)	0	17,000	0	0
Finance System Improvements	EQ749	0	(16,720)	0	0	(16,720)
Fleet Contract Fund	EQ756	(329,647)	(799,600)	345,343	0	(783,904)
Livery Wraps -Waste Vehicles	EQ757	(26,600)	0	4,300	20,600	(1,700)
Recycling Baler Repairs	EQ758	(10,000)	0	10,000	0	0
Mobile Phone Contract	EQ759	(5,000)	(5,000)	0	0	(10,000)
Waste Infrastructure	EQ769	(1,250,000)	(777,700)	0	0	(2,027,700)
Cs Replacement Scanners	EQ770	(10,000)	0	0	0	(10,000)
Industrial Unit Specific Maint	EQ771	(20,000)	0	0	0	(20,000)
Coggans Well Roof Repairs	EQ772	(6,240)	(30,000)	0	6,240	(30,000)
Tree Works	EQ773	(10,000)	(17,300)	0	0	(27,300)
Planning Legal Expense Reserve	EQ774	(100,000)	0	0	0	(100,000)
Building Control Emr	EQ775	(17,000)	0	0	0	(17,000)
CS Cust Welfare Officer B/Fill	EQ776	0	(21,670)	0	0	(21,670)
C/Tax Smoothing Reserve	EQ777	0	(239,911)	0	0	(239,911)
Hfx System Upgrade - HR	EQ778	0	(25,000)	0	0	(25,000)
Play Area-Paddling Pool Resin	EQ779	0	(30,000)	0	0	(30,000)
Housing Advisers Programme	EQ780	0	(20,000)	0	0	(20,000)
J28 Cullompton	EQ781	0	(100,000)	0	0	(100,000)
Plan-Test Nat Model Des Codes	EQ782	0	(50,000)	0	0	(50,000)

GENERAL FUND AND HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT EARMARKED RESERVES SUMMARY 2020/21
EARMARKED RESERVES AT 31 March 2021

Legal Case Management System	EQ783	0	(15,080)	0	0	(15,080)
C-19 Compliance & Enforce Grant	EQ784	0	(30,976)	0	0	(30,976)
Climate Change Grant	EQ785	0	(299,421)	0	0	(299,421)
Carlu Close Specific Projects	EQ786	0	(15,000)	0	0	(15,000)
21-22 Cont'D Nndr Grants Admin	EQ787	0	(160,000)	0	100,000	(60,000)
Boundary Review	EQ788	0	(45,000)	0	0	(45,000)
Member Srv Additional Staffing	EQ789	0	(14,000)	0	0	(14,000)
Planning Improvement Programme	EQ790	0	(250,000)	0	0	(250,000)
Post Covid-19 Income Recovery	EQ791	0	(300,000)	0	0	(300,000)
PR400-Street Name Post Replace	EQ802	(20,000)	0	0	0	(20,000)
MHCLG Covid-19 General Grant	EQ809	(38,976)	0	38,976	0	0
Capacity Funding- EUE	EQ820	(22,047)	0	6,128	0	(15,919)
Neighbourhood Planning Funding	EQ821	(20,500)	(20,000)	3,050	0	(37,450)
Culm Garden Village Project	EQ824	(678,145)	(130,000)	155,936	0	(652,209)
Flood Projects (PS400)	EQ826	(32,400)	0	0	0	(32,400)
Phoenix Hse Replace Fire Panel (PS810)	EQ827	(91,000)	(35,000)	34,961	15,000	(76,039)
Phoenix Hse Meeting Rm Aircon (PS810)	EQ828	(20,000)	0	13,600	0	(6,400)
Old Road Depot (PS850)	EQ829	(10,000)	0	0	0	(10,000)
Property Serv MS Op Vehicle (PS980)	EQ830	(12,000)	0	0	12,000	0
Recycling Vehicle Refurb (WS725)	EQ833	0	0	0	0	0
Waste Response Costs (WS)	EQ834	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance MMI (CM300)	EQ835	(86,278)	0	0	0	(86,278)
Members iPad (LD300)	EQ836	(8,275)	0	0	0	(8,275)
Property Maint Reserve	EQ837	(773,376)	(395,000)	419,192	0	(749,184)
GF Shops (PS)	EQ838	(237,000)	0	30,000	0	(207,000)
Equipment Sinking Fund	EQ684 & EQ750-755 & EQ839	(510,379)	(194,200)	29,220	54,900	(620,459)
Maintenance Sinking Fund	EQ685 & EQ763-768	(497,968)	(333,584)	0	0	(831,552)
Plant Sinking Fund	EQ760-761	(222,500)	(34,360)	0	63,790	(193,070)
Total Other GF Revenue Reserves		(7,353,035)	(5,296,599)	1,520,261	0	(11,129,373)

Section 106	Various	(1,639,818)	(193,841)	230,889	0	(1,602,771)
--------------------	----------------	--------------------	------------------	----------------	----------	--------------------

Developers Contributions - Open Space Maintainer	Cost Centres	B/F 31/3/20	(Cont To Emr)	Utilisation of EM	Transfers	C/F 31/3/21
Dev Cont Linear Park	EQ638	(42,638)	0	4,170	0	4,170
W52 Popham Close Comm Fund	EQ640	(14,090)	0	1,950	0	1,950
W67 Moorhayes Com Dev Fund	EQ641	(13,403)	0	1,630	0	1,630
W69 Fayrecroft Willand Ex West	EQ642	(33,360)	0	4,620	0	4,620
W70 Developers Contribution	EQ643	(39,758)	0	6,650	0	6,650
Dev Cont Winswood Crediton	EQ644	(31,478)	0	3,080	0	3,080
Total Developers Maintenance Reserves		(174,727)	0	22,100	0	(152,627)

Total Developers Contributions / s106 Funds		(1,814,545)	(193,841)	252,989	0	(1,755,398)
--	--	--------------------	------------------	----------------	----------	--------------------

TOTAL GENERAL FUND EARMARKED RESERVES		(13,688,379)	(10,384,010)	3,825,482	0	(20,246,906)
--	--	---------------------	---------------------	------------------	----------	---------------------

Net movement into General Fund Earmarked Reserves = (TREM)

(6,558,528)
6,558,528

0

HRA Earmarked Reserves	Cost Centres	B/F 31/3/20	(Cont To Emr)	Utilisation of EM	Transfers	C/F 31/3/21
HRA Sewage Treatment Plant works	EQ691	(30,000)	0	0	0	(30,000)
Renewable Energy Fund E.M.R.	EQ692	(674,243)	(162,374)	135,503	0	(701,114)
HRA Affordable Rent Surplus	EQ693	(48,800)	(150,130)	0	0	(198,930)
Housing Maintenance E.M.R.	EQ694	(14,198,285)	(1,190,632)	268,088	0	(15,120,829)
HRA Premium Deficit for PWLB loan	EQ696	(2,810,527)	(705,778)	0	0	(3,516,306)
Total HRA EARMARKED RESERVES		(17,761,856)	(2,208,914)	403,591	0	(19,567,178)

Net movement into HRA Earmarked Reserves = (HOTREM)

(1,805,323)
1,805,323

0

GRAND TOTAL OF MDDDC EARMARKED RESERVES		(31,450,234)	(12,592,924)	4,229,073	0	(39,814,085)
--	--	---------------------	---------------------	------------------	----------	---------------------

GENERAL FUND & HRA GRANTS RECEIVED SUMMARY 2020/21

Grants Credited to Taxation & Non-Specific Grant Income

Name of Grant	Amount Received £	Amount Paid Out £	Amount Remaining £
Covid-19 Additional Scheme (ARG)	(2,377,393)	2,360,496	(16,897)
NDR Business Support Grant	(1,129,000)	1,129,000	-
Economic Vulnerability & Hardship	(107,440)	98,100	(9,340)
Covid-19 Income Compensation Scheme	(2,019,144)	N/A	N/A
New Homes Bonus	(1,418,189)	N/A	N/A
Covid-19 Non-Ringfenced Grant	(1,157,619)	N/A	N/A
Rural Services Delivery Grant	(466,695)	N/A	N/A
Other Non-Ringfenced Grant	(8,103)	N/A	N/A
Subtotal	(8,683,583)	3,587,595	(26,238)

N.B. Where the Amount Paid Out is N/A this is because the grant was not paid to external beneficiaries, but rather utilised to cover the Council's in-year expenses or earmarked for future purposes.

Grants Credited to Services

Name of Grant	Amount Received £
Corporate Management	
Grant for Tiverton Hub Costs	(22,652)
DCC Covid-19 Costs Across Services	(49,400)
Environmental Services	
Section 106	(65,797)
General Fund Housing	
Flexible Homelessness Support Grant	(154,552)
Rough Sleeping Initiative	(120,305)
Planning & Regeneration	
Section 106 - Public Open Space	(128,044)
MHCLG Garden Village Project	(130,000)
MHCLG Section 31 Development Management	(270,500)
Historic England Grant	(97,901)
Property Services	
Climate Change Grants	(337,421)
Revenues and Benefits	
MHCLG 2020/21 Business Support	(170,000)
BEIS 2020/21 November Lockdown	(166,800)
NDR Cost of Collection Grant	(110,909)
DWP Council Tax Admin Grant	(169,402)
DWP Housing Benefit Admin Grant	(68,483)
Rent Allowances	(12,351,203)
Council Tax Hardship Fund	(474,560)
BEIS 2020/21 Business Support	(76,500)
DWP Resource Management Grant	(51,300)
Test & Trace Hardship Fund	(51,030)
Other grants (various services)	(139,953)
Covid-19 Job Retention Scheme (Furlough)	(594,687) <i>(see below)</i>
Subtotal	(15,801,400)

Capital Grants Receipts in Advance

Name of Grant	Amount Received £
Affordable Housing	(407,885)
Disabled Facility Grant	(570,600)
Subtotal	(978,485)

Total Grants Received (Gross)	(25,463,468)
--------------------------------------	---------------------

Covid-19 Job Retention Scheme (Furlough)

Service Area	Amount Received £
Customer Services	(6,708)
Grounds Maintenance	(8,715)
HRA	(29,060)
Property Services	(8,590)
Recreation & Sport	(520,404)
Waste Services	(21,210)
Subtotal	(594,687)

Grants Where The Council Acts As Agent

Name of Grant	Amount Received £	Amount Paid Out £	Amount Remaining £
NDR Business Support Grant	(22,580,000)	19,890,000	(2,690,000)
Covid-19 National Scheme (LRGS)	(1,461,564)	1,005,923	(455,641)
Covid-19 Tier 2 Open	(615,429)	612,783	(2,646)
Covid-19 Tier 2 Closed	(172,401)	124,879	(47,522)
Covid-19 Tier2/3 Pub	(64,000)	53,000	(11,000)
Covid-19 Lockdown 3 Closed	(4,383,000)	3,081,000	(1,302,000)
Covid-19 Lockdown 3 Addendum	(4,489,089)	3,162,785	(1,326,304)
Self Isolation Payments	(110,496)	56,500	(53,996)
Subtotal	(33,875,979)	27,986,869	(5,889,110)

Code	Scheme	Adjusted Capital Programme 2020/21	Total Actual Spend to 31/03/21	Variance to 2020/21 to budget	Slippage to be carried forward to 2021/22	To Earmarked Reserve	Notes
		£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	
General Fund Projects							
Leisure							
CA642	Reception infrastructure review - All sites	120,000	0	-120,000	120,000		This project will slip to 22/23
CA643	All Leisure Etarmis - Security Swipe - (linked to security project)	30,000	0	-30,000	30,000		This project will slip to 22/23
Phoenix House							
CA487	Etarmis - Security Swipe - (linked to security project)	50,000	0	-50,000	50,000		This project will slip to 22/23
CA488	Boiler replacement & controls	90,000	83,836	-6,164			Project complete
General Car parks							
CA489	MSCP Capital Project - Phase 2	589,000	681,670	92,670			}
CA709	MSCP improvements (refer to Matrix condition report)	133,000	133,000	0			} As per Cabinet report Aug 2019 this overspend has been met by
CA718	MSCP-Top Deck surfacing	120,000	122,000	2,000			} Revenue EMR's
MDDC Depot Sites							
CA830	Carlu Close - Interceptor upgrade	10,000	0	-10,000			This project is under £20k Dimimimis & has therefore been charged to Revenue
CA833	Carlu Close - Water containment for Water Transfer Station	80,000	0	-80,000			This project is under £20k Dimimimis & has therefore been charged to Revenue
CA831	Carlu Close - Solar PV options	18,000	32,081	14,081			Project complete
Play Areas							
CA472	Open Space Infrastructure (incl Play Areas)	50,000	0	-50,000	40,000		Required budget slipped to 2021/22
CA632	Play area refurbishment - Amory Park Tiverton	49,000	0	-49,000	74,000		Required budget slipped to 2021/22. Additional £25k NHB from CA628
CA628	Play area refurbishment - West Exe Recreation Ground Tiverton	50,000	74,782	24,782	0		Project Complete - This project has been be funded in total by S106. £25k NHB to be redirected to CA632 & £25k NHB to be redirected to CA648
CA647	Play area refurbishment - Glebelands Cheriton Bishop	0	34,586	34,586	0		Project Complete - This project has been be funded in total by S106.
CA648	Play area refurbishment - Chestnut Drive Willand				25,000		Required budget slipped to 2021/22. £25k NHB from project CA628 slipped to fund this scheme
MDDC Shops & Industrial Units							
CA583	Market Walk - Flat roof replacement	30,000	0	-30,000	30,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
Other Projects							
CA491	Fire Dampeners - Corporate sites	80,000	0	-80,000	80,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA485	GP Practice NHS Hub Building	2,175,000	0	-2,175,000	2,175,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22 -MDDC loan contribution now due towards end of scheme
CA490	West Exe South - Remodelling - additional parking spaces	90,000	0	-90,000	90,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA473	Land drainage flood defence schemes - St Marys Hemyock	50,000	0	-50,000	50,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA420	Land drainage flood defence schemes - Ashleigh Park Bampton	87,000	0	-87,000	87,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA574	Fore Street Flats refurbishment	47,000	0	-47,000	47,000		This project will slip to 22/23
CA476	Tiverton Cemetery - Infrastructure extension	47,000	49,349	2,349			Project complete

Code	Scheme	Adjusted Capital Programme 2020/21 £000's	Total Actual Spend to 31/03/21 £000's	Variance to 2020/21 to budget £000's	Slippage to be carried forward to 2021/22 £000's	To Earmarked Reserve £000's	Notes
CA576	Tiverton Town Centre improvements	140,000	0	-140,000	140,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA832	Land acquisition for operational needs	1,000,000	0	-1,000,000	1,000,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
HIF Schemes							
CA719	Cullompton Town Centre Relief Road (HIF) bid	3,884,000	324,589	-3,559,411	3,605,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA720	Tiverton EUE A361 Junction Phase 2 (HIF) (bid)	284,000	120,976	-163,024	166,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
Economic Development Schemes							
CA582 *	Hydro Mills Electricity Project	680,000	0	-680,000			This Project is already included in the 21/22 Capital Programme, the total forecast cost is £800k proposed to be funded by borrowing, unless any other external grant funded sources can be secured.
ICT Projects							
CA492	Final phase of Desktop estate replacement/refresh	50,000	2,220	-47,780	48,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA456	CRM replacement	175,000	0	-175,000	175,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22. This will be cloud based and highly likely to be revenue in nature. It is envisaged that Yr1 costs will be circa £193k.
CA433	Unified Communications/telephony	74,000	0	-74,000	66,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22 (£8k charged to Revenue in 20/21)
CA425	Server farm expansion/upgrades	84,000	0	-84,000	74,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22 (£10k charged to Revenue in 20/21)
CA437	Digital Transformation	33,000	0	-33,000	33,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22. High likely to be Revenue in nature.
CA480	Lalpac Licensing System replacement	80,000	0	-80,000	80,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22. To be considered in conjunction with the CRM Project (CA456).
Other General Fund Development Projects							
CA493	Other projected 3 Rivers Borrowing	2,399,000	0	-2,399,000	2,399,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA462	3 Rivers Scheme - Riverside Development (rear of Town Hall) Tivertc	3,923,000	1,317,827	-2,605,173	2,605,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA486	3 Rivers scheme - Knowle Lane, Cullompton	8,002,000	0	-8,002,000	8,002,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA581	Post Hill, Tiverton	3,605,000	969,429	-2,635,571			This project spend relates to acquisition of land. Scheme build cost are detailed in the forward 21/22 Capital programme extending into the life of the MTFP
CA483	3 Rivers Scheme - Threwstones, Tiverton	23,000	0	-23,000			Project complete
CA484	3 Rivers Scheme - Orchard House, Halberton	446,000	0	-446,000	446,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
		28,877,000	3,946,344	(24,930,656)	21,737,000	0	
Private Sector Housing Grants							
CG201	Disabled Facilities Grants-P/Sector	572,000	370,918	-201,082		176,000	} This underspend will remain in DFG EMR in CGU }
CG208	Wessex Reinvestment Trust Grants Scheme	75,000	100,000	25,000			
		647,000	470,918	(176,082)	0	176,000	
Total General Fund Projects		29,524,000	4,417,262	(25,106,738)	21,737,000	176,000	

Code	Scheme	Adjusted Capital Programme 2020/21	Total Actual Spend to 31/03/21	Variance to 2020/21 to budget	Slippage to be carried forward to 2021/22	To Earmarked Reserve	Notes
		£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	
HRA Projects - Existing Housing Stock							
CA100	Major Repairs to Housing Stock	2,561,000	1,937,512	-623,488	495,000	128,000	Remaining budget of £495k slipped to 2021/22. The remaining £128k will remain in the MRA EMR
CA111	Renewable Energy Fund	250,000	135,503	-114,497		114,000	Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA150	27A Broad Lane, Tiverton	0	27,896	27,896			Additional unit converted by DLO - funded by 1:4:1 Receipts & HMF
CA153	22A Brewin Road, Tiverton	0	35,266	35,266			Additional unit converted by DLO - funded by 1:4:1 Receipts & HMF
CG200	Home Adaptations - Disabled Facilities	314,000	242,291	-71,709		72,000	Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
Housing Development Schemes							
CA146	HRA Regeneration Scheme 1	2,000,000	0	-2,000,000	2,000,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA145	RTB Buyback 103 Queensway	0	159,995	159,995	0		RTB Buyback - funded by 1:4:1 Receipts & HMF
CA147	Affordable Housing/Purchase of ex RTB	500,000	0	-500,000	0	244,000	Balance of budget following two RTB's (CA145 & CA149) will remain in EMR
CA124	Queensway (Beech Road) Tiverton (3 units)	287,000	2,915	-284,085	284,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA141	Round Hill Tiverton- Site	1,500,000	0	-1,500,000	1,500,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
CA148	RTB Buyback 16 Somerville Park	0	0	0	0		
CA149	RTB Buyback Flat 5 Blagdon Place	0	95,619	95,619	0		RTB Buyback - funded by 1:4:1 Receipts & HMF
HRA Other Projects							
CA126	Sewerage Treatment Works - Washfield	25,000	0	-25,000	25,000		Remaining budget slipped to 2021/22
Total Housing Revenue Account Projects		7,437,000	2,636,997	(4,800,003)	4,304,000	558,000	
2020/21 CAPITAL PROGRAMME GRAND TOTAL		36,961,000	7,054,258	(29,906,742)	26,041,000	734,000	

Code	Funding Stream	Adjusted Capital Programme 2020/21 £000's	Total Actual Funding to 31/03/21 £000's
General Fund Projects			
9801	S106 & Affordable Housing Contributions	50,000	124,070
9990	General Capital Reserve	138,000	60,985
9701	Govt Grant (DCLG passported from DCC)	647,000	485,469
9727	New Homes Bonus (GF)	1,751,000	888,856
9957	Private Sector Housing Grants EMR	0	14,936
9980	Contribution from existing Useable Capital Receipts	307,000	51,970
9942	Borrowing	24,888,000	2,317,083
9954	Other Capital Grants Unapplied	20,000	0
9990	Economic Development EMR	80,000	14,985
9958	Heritage Enterprise Grant Bid	600,000	0
9990	ICT EMR	50,000	32,190
9990	Other EMR	140,000	174,640
9959	HIF Funding	853,000	460,503
Total General Fund Projects		29,524,000	4,625,687
HRA Projects			
9980	Useable Capital Receipts	1,125,000	242,291
9710	MRA Reserve	2,561,000	1,952,077
9727	New Homes Bonus (HRA)	21,000	0
9980	UCR 1:4:1 replacement homes	836,000	111,477
9990	Renewable energy EMR	250,000	135,503
9990	Housing Maintenance Fund	1,047,000	240,168
9990	Affordable rents surplus EMR	72,000	0
9801	S106 & Affordable Housing Contributions	0	0
9990	HRA EMR	25,000	14,913
9704	Home England Grant	0	14,556
9942	Borrowing	1,500,000	0
Total HRA Projects		7,437,000	2,710,986
2020/21 CAPITAL PROGRAMME GRAND TOTAL FUNDING		36,961,000	7,336,672

Role of programming panel

- i) To oversee the workloads of the six bodies to ensure efficiency of the scrutiny and policy development process;
- ii) To co-ordinate requests for reviews referred to it by the Cabinet or the Council which do not fall within the remit of any one group; and
- iii) To resolve any disputes between groups.

(MDDC Constitution page 124, section 2a)

Aim – coordination of work programme

Scrutiny Committee Terms of Reference:

Page 254

- to approve work programme in consultation with the Programming Panel
- to refer those matters which fall within the remit of the Scrutiny Committee, the Policy Development Groups or the Audit Committee, to the Programming Panel for allocation
- to respond to reasonable requests from the Cabinet to develop or review policy not within the remit of any Policy Development Group

(MDDC Constitution page 125, section 3c)

“Effective work programming is the bedrock of an effective scrutiny function”

Centre For Governance and Scrutiny, The Good Scrutiny Guide

Remits

Scrutiny: contribute to the development of Council policies and also hold the Cabinet to account for its decisions... to review existing policies, consider proposals for new policies and suggest new policies. (MDDC Constitution page 20 section 7a)

PDGs: to review existing policies, consider proposals for new policies and suggest new policies.... The Policy Development Groups act as the overview function, developing and reviewing policy. (MDDC Constitution page 22 section 8.1a)

Audit

Provide independent assurance of the adequacy of the risk management framework and the associated control environment including (from the perspective of the Council) those partnership or joint working arrangements the Council has with other bodies and how their risk management and controls might impact the Council;

Page 257

Provide independent scrutiny of the authority's financial and non-financial performance to the extent that it affects the authority's exposure to risk and weakens the control environment;

Oversee the financial reporting process.

(MDDC Constitution page 26, section 9.1)

Community

Any matters that impact on the health, safety and wellbeing of people (e.g. air quality, pollution, noise), Public health, Environmental Health (e.g. food standards, water quality), Leisure, Grants funding, Town and Parish fund updates, Presentations from grant funded organisations, Safeguarding children and vulnerable adults, Community engagement and consultation, Equalities, Health and Safety, Town and Parish Councils (charter), Anti-social behaviour, Community safety, Digital transformation – broadband, Local welfare assistance, Benefits, Presentations from local interest groups such as Drink Wise Age Well, Youth Services, Older Persons strategy, Updates from the clinical commissioning group, RIPA, Targeted families

Economy

Economic Development, Inward Investment, Business support and development, Tourism, Town Centres, Markets, local and national economy, Town Team updates, CCTV, Car Parking, Business Rates updates, Commercial units property updates, Night time economy (could include references to licencing and anti-social behaviour), Funding bids and updates, High Street Innovation Fund, Project updates on heritage projects, arts projects and food and drink projects which link to the local economy.

Environment

Waste collection and Recycling, Street cleaning, Trade Waste, Clinical Waste, Climate change, reduction of carbon footprint, Parks and Open Spaces, Cemeteries, Trees, environmental enforcement (vehicles, animal control, fly tipping, fly posting), flood defence and drainage, clocks and monuments, street naming and numbering, public conveniences, Grounds maintenance – grass cutting.

Homes

Council Housing, Housing Strategy, Housing policies, Neighbourhood and tenancy management, tenant involvement, homelessness prevention, housing needs and allocations, housing enabling, HRA budget, HRA capital programme and planned maintenance, Building maintenance, Devon Home Choice, Asbestos management, Community Housing support, Update on affordable housing projects, Updates on legislative changes or guidance from the HCA, Private Sector Homes, Bringing back empty homes into use, Disabled Facility Grants.

(MDDC Constitution page 22, section 8.2)

Questions/ideas

ENVIRONMENT PDG WORK PLAN 2021-2022 -

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Theme	Officer Responsible	Comments
18th May 2021				
13th July 2021				
	Start Time of Meetings To decide the timings of the PDG for the remainder of the municipal year			
	Election of Chairman To elect a Chairman for the municipal year			
	Election of Vice Chairman To elect a vice Chairman for the municipal year			
13.07.21 3.08.21	Tree Policy To receive the 5 yearly review of the Tree Policy		Andrew Busby	
13.07.21 3.08.21	Public Spaces Protection Order To receive the Public Spaces Protection Order after public consultation and recommend adoption to Cabinet.		Vicky Lowman	
13.07.21	Climate Change Action Plan Update To receive an update on actions taken for the Climate Change Action Plan		Jason Ball	

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Theme	Officer Responsible	Comments
13.07.21	Revenue and Outturn Report To consider a report of the Deputy Chief Executive (S151) presenting the Revenue and Capital Outturn report, previously considered by Cabinet on 6 th July 2021		Andrew Jarrett	
13.07.21	Performance and Risk Outturn Report To consider a report of the Operations Manager for Performance, Governance and Health & Safety providing Members with an update on the performance against the Corporate Plan and local service targets for 2020/21. Previously presented to the Cabinet on 6th July 2021.		Catherine Yandle	
13.07.21	Work Plan To receive the current work plan for the Environment PDG. Members to agree and discuss additional items that they would like added to the work plan		Clare Robathan	
7th September 2021				
7.09.21 28.09.21	Draft MDDC Litter Strategy To receive the MDDC Litter Strategy		Darren Beer	

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Theme	Officer Responsible	Comments
7.09.21 28.09.21	Resource and Waste Management Strategy for Devon and Torbay To receive and approve the Resource and Waste Management Strategy for Devon and Torbay following public consultation		Darren Beer	
7.09.21 28.09.21	Contracted Out Enforcement Duties Group to receive a report from the Group Manager for Street Scene and Open Spaces on the options to engage an external contractor for additional littering and dog fouling enforcement duties in the district.		Darren Beer Darren Beer	
7.09.21 Page 265	Work Plan To receive the current work plan for the Environment PDG. Members to agree and discuss additional items that they would like added to the work plan		Clare Robathan	
2nd November 2021				
2.11.21	Draft Budget		Andrew Jarrett	
2.11.21	Work Plan To receive the current work plan for the Environment PDG. Members to agree and discuss additional items that they would like added to the work plan		Clare Robathan	

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Theme	Officer Responsible	Comments
11th January 2022				
11.01.22 3.02.22	Bereavement Services Fees and Charges To receive the annual review of Bereavement Services Fees & Charges		Andrew Busby	
11.01.22	Budget To review revised draft budget changes identified and discuss any further changes required in order for the Council to move towards a balanced budget for 2022-2023		Andrew Jarrett	
11.01.22	Work Plan To receive the current work plan for the Environment PDG. Members to agree and discuss additional items that they would like added to the work plan		Clare Robathan	
8th March 2022				
8.03.22	Chairman's Annual Report		Clare Robathan	
8.03.22	Work Plan To receive the current work plan for the Environment PDG. Members to agree and discuss additional items that they would like added to the work plan		Clare Robathan	