

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a **MEETING** of the **SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** held on 13 March 2017 at 2.15 pm

Present

Councillors

F J Rosamond (Chairman)
Mrs C P Daw, Mrs G Doe, S G Flaws,
Mrs B M Hull, T G Hughes, Mrs J Roach,
J L Smith and T W Snow

Apologies

Councillor(s)

Mrs H Bainbridge, Mrs A R Berry and N A Way

Also Present

Councillor(s)

Mrs J B Binks, R J Chesterton, Mrs F J Colthorpe,
Mrs S Griggs, Mrs M E Squires and R L Stanley

Also Present

Officer(s):

Stephen Walford (Chief Executive), Andrew Jarrett (Director of Finance, Assets and Resources), Jenny Clifford (Head of Planning and Regeneration), Nick Sanderson (Head of Housing and Property Services), Simon Newcombe (Public Health and Professional Services Manager), Alan Ottey (Market Manager), Catherine Yandle (Internal Audit Team Leader) and Julia Stuckey (Member Services Officer)

111 APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Cllrs Mrs H Bainbridge, Mrs A R Berry and N A Way.

112 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Mrs S Coffin, Chair of Templeton Parish Council, referring to item 10 on the agenda, said we thank Mrs Clifford for her response to the questions raised regarding outstanding issues emanating from Cleave and Crossparks. We also acknowledge Mr Simon Newcombe's long report from Environmental Health. We have been unable to respond individually to each report at this stage being overwhelmed with present issues but will be responding in writing after our next Parish Council meeting at the end of this month. However, in the meantime we do raise the following general issues:-

We ask whether the matter of a Change of Use for a transfer operation site at Cleave and associated lands to include Crossparks slurry pit has been resolved yet. Has the disc submitted to Council by Cllr R L Stanley been evaluated?

This same activity of facilitating energy producing AD's by the same operator for the purpose of removing and storing liquid digestate waste/fertiliser was recognised by your enforcement officers as requiring specific planning permission in the Pulsards

Enforcement Case. We presume that the land is being re-instated to agriculture now that the three month notice has expired.

Your Planning Committee by approving this enforcement decision endorsed your Enforcement Officers reasons and observations for acknowledging the potential unacceptable nuisance impact of the agents proposed use for importing/storage of digestate. This was for houses within 400 metres of the already excavated slurry lagoon. Your officers further speculated that although the applicant would be able to apply for retrospective planning they did not feel that all/any potential nuisance caused by the slurry/digestate lagoon could be sufficiently mitigated by specific conditions.

We wish to point out that the Crosspark slurry pit has 4 properties nearby (under 100 metres to within 600 metres) whose residents are now all experiencing, since January, adverse reactions to the slurry pit operations on this site. Medical Doctor's reports, Fire reports and hospital A and E reports have and are still being submitted to Mr Winter by residents.

Templeton Parish Council therefore ask why does the unlicensed operation at Crossparks pit and Cleave Farm not constitute a similar nuisance to well-being and quality of life and require planning change of use. Neither Cleave nor Crossparks have an AD on site and the activity of importing from AD's is within the four year limit timeline in which the council can take remedial action?

Templeton Parish Council also ask why your Environmental Health Department categorically refuse to acknowledge the potential for nuisance at Crossparks slurry pit? The danger of fumes from slurry pits are well documented. They have already served a Noise Order on 12 March 2013 which resulted in requests to move the one tractor that was pumping to the opposite side of the pit.

The open topped below ground level agricultural slurry pit at Crossparks was built in 1993 to accommodate and store for a period of six months the slurry produced by the new adjacent building complex housing dairy herd replacements and dry cow unit. This was to facilitate new NVZ regulations that were being brought in nationally. The idea being that due to high rainfall in this area and the best practice guidance for non-pollution of groundwater sources, wells, boreholes and streams this capacity containment would prevent the necessity to spread slurry when tractors and tankers were unable to get on the land and conditions were likely to cause run off and pollution. Thus limited movement activities at the pit and limited periods of nuisance both odour and noise throughout the year.

The nuisance problem has escalated since the operators accommodating imported digestate from outside the parish, district and county on this site. This has caused increased traffic activity and movement at these premises as well as causing a continual odour presence in the nearest property and unpredictable unidentifiable odour invasion of other nearby neighbours properties depending on atmospheric and weather conditions at the time. Also an increased noise nuisance when emptying and filling the pit.

We feel it worth noting that the surface of the sealed purpose built digestate storage tanks on AD sites are a minimum of 10 metres+ above ground with a cover. This would ensure that any escaping gaseous emissions from any still potentially active

process within the tank would be released into the atmosphere above normal human height and with increased potential dissipation into the atmosphere. Crossparks pit surface is at a ground level.

It is also worth noting that any standard permit covering digestate storage conditions state that no dwelling can be within 200m otherwise a bespoke permit will need to be granted if sufficient mitigating conditions can be applied.

Templeton Parish Council are confident that we have discharged our responsibilities. We ask if Councillors are confident that your Environmental Health Department have done the same and who will be responsible for any 'nuisance' adverse symptoms presenting that may escalate to a more serious medical health problem.

We question:

Environmental Health have no machinery to measure toxic levels except for a trained sniffer who refuses to supply a rapid response out of hours contact number. State that they have made exhaustive visits in accordance to their own schedule yet cannot respond immediately to any complaints due to pressures of other more important issues. State that they have made extensive document research – we submit brief selection of our publically sourced documents which support the potential for nuisance being experienced by residents.

Either Environmental Health are dismissing our residents as liars or do not attribute any concern as to their human rights to be able to live and enjoy their homes.

Neighbours have been continually told that there is nothing to relate nuisance to adverse health symptoms to Crossparks pit. So what and where is the source of resident's problems? We live in open countryside; we can see Dartmoor in one direction and Exmoor in the other direction.

Thank you for your time and please be assured that until this matter is satisfactorily resolved and our residents are able to live in and enjoy their homes as is their human right we will be continually chasing answers.

Mrs S Faulkner referring to item 10 on the agenda, said I have suffered from obnoxious fumes since mid-January.

I visited Mr Hill at Palm Springs most evenings for two weeks to confirm to him that I could smell obnoxious fumes coming into his house through fire vents and the trickle vents in his windows. He said that it was always worse at night.

On the night of the 5th February I witnessed a large wave of obnoxious fumes in Mr Hills front garden. I was so frightened for Mr Hills life that I phoned 999.

The Fire Service were already alerted to our problem and sent out a specialist in the middle of the night.

On the 8th February we all woke in our home here at Mount Pleasant Farm (approx. 800m from the pit) as the fumes came into our house.

I was by now experiencing increasing symptoms (whereas the rest of the family to varying degrees). Symptoms were sore mouth and lips and throat, fissured tongue, swollen glands, excessive phlegm, irregular heartbeat, pain in chest and considerable tiredness.

I therefore asked other neighbours to visit Mr Hill in the evening, which they did. Most could not smell it, but all had varying degrees of similar symptoms after an hour or so.

On 22 February I woke in the night unable to breath due to excessive phlegm. I felt detached and was hallucinating. My husband and son propped me up and hit my back. I coughed up phlegm which burnt my throat and mouth. My heart was racing and my chest was painful. They phoned 999 and were told that an out of hours Doctor would visit. I did not improve and so decided to go to A and E in the morning. My BP measured 240/101 and I was taken to Exeter by ambulance.

On 25 February my husband and I decided to have a night away. We got in the car which had not been used since we had experienced the obnoxious fumes over the farm on 23 February. The car was full of fumes. I ended up at A and E in Barnstaple.

We then went to live with my daughter. My son stayed at home to look after the farm. On 1st March he woke at 1am with palpitations, burning in his nose and a headache. It was so severe that he fled the house with the dogs. He found that his symptoms settled when he moved to a different area.

Since then he has experienced more palpitations when he 'senses' the fumes around the farm.

Please understand that most of the time we do not smell anything and just experience the symptoms. He is now sleeping in the caravan in our wood where the air is cleaner.

These fumes attack on our bodies seem to occur when there is any activity in the pit and the wind is blowing from the direction of the pit to our farm

My husband and I are still sleeping away from home.

I wish to ask – is Mid Devon sure that it is safe for me and my family to sleep in our home?

Mr G Faulkner, referring to item 10 on the agenda, said the fumes have affected us all. Environmental Health has numerous Doctors reports. My wife has had several episodes of being unable to breath.

Mr Winter has suggested that my wife, without prior notice, be an ignorant witness to the next big stir of the pit. I remember only too well propping her up while she was trying to wretch, beating her back to try to dislodge the phlegm, thinking that any breath could be her last.

I am not at all keen on Mr Winters experiment.

These fumes have caused my dogs to go lethargic. They have since recovered by staying away from the farm as have the goats and chickens and us.

Occasionally the cows are agitated, racing around the buildings for no apparent reason. We have had to put one down for breathing problems and one does not look right.

I am worried about the vulnerable in-lamb ewes, as I myself suffered from the fumes while and after moving the fence.

We have had to test our well water (our drinking water) for fear that the fumes have drifted down the well.

Environmental Health have all along struggled with the idea that if you cannot smell odour – it does not exist.

We have been told by the hospital, A and E, doctors, Public Health England and the Environment Agency that health problems are the responsibility of Mid Devon District Council Environmental Health.

Surely these fumes affecting several families are at the very minimum a nuisance.

The Chairman indicated that these questions would be answered at the agenda item.

113 **MEMBER FORUM**

At the previous meeting of the Committee the Chairman had been asked if he had made any urgent decisions since he had been the Chairman of the Committee. The Chairman stated that he had and that they had been confidential.

The Government were currently looking into Scrutiny at District Council level and the Chairman indicated that he intended to raise this matter at the next meeting for Member discussion.

114 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the last meeting were approved as a correct record and **SIGNED** by the Chairman.

115 **DECISIONS OF THE CABINET**

The Committee **NOTED** that none of the decisions made by the Cabinet at its last meeting had been called in.

116 **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman had no announcements to make.

117 **MEETING MANAGEMENT**

The Chairman indicated that he intended to take item 10 on the agenda before item 6. This was **AGREED**.

118 UPDATE FROM ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ON SPECIFIC ISSUES

Following a question, asked by Miss Coffin during Public Question Time at the previous meeting, the Committee had before it and **NOTED** a report * from the Public Health Manager regarding issues relating to Cleave Farm and Crossparks at Templeton.

The Public Health Manager explained that the report was necessarily detailed in response to a range of points and assertions raised by Miss Coffin regarding investigations made by the Environmental Health team (Public Health Services) at Templeton. Specifically, in respect of potential nuisances and impact upon a private drinking water supply arising from agricultural, farm storage and spreading activities at Cleave Farm and Crossparks.

The officer explained that Environmental Health were the enforcing authority for Statutory Nuisance legislation under the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) 1990. These were essentially reactive powers to investigate complaints of odour, noise, dust and other nuisances. Where a nuisance was proven there were related powers to serve abatement notices requiring action to cease the nuisance and ultimately prosecute in the event of non-compliance.

In order for a statutory nuisance to exist, the nuisance in question must be unlawful (i.e. have no legal authority to occur) and be prejudicial to health or result in an unreasonable interference in another person's use of their land or reduction in amenity or environmental quality. The context required there to be something of a public health element in the consequences of the nuisance.

The law did not make any separate definition of 'rural' or 'urban' nuisance. These were terms referenced by Miss Coffin at the last meeting; however in law a nuisance was a nuisance irrespective of the location. The combination of factors influencing whether a nuisance existed were very much specific to each individual case.

The officer explained that while the burden of proof was based on 'balance of probability' rather than 'beyond reasonable doubt' this was in part because there was no legal threshold or limit of dust, noise or odour that would give rise to a nuisance in every location and circumstance. Nonetheless, the EPA 1990 was still criminal legislation and subject to the scrutiny of a criminal court in respect of any appeal regarding the service of an abatement notice or subsequent prosecutions for alleged breaches of a notice.

He further explained that the response to issues at Cleave Farm and Crossparks could not be considered insignificant and had in fact been heavily weighted in comparison to resources being allocated elsewhere. The terms of legal obligations were set out within the report and required that steps were taken that were reasonably, practicable, a measure that had been met, and arguably exceeded, in respect of this investigation. The reality was that it was becoming increasingly difficult to sustain an above-and-beyond response against the needs of other service priorities and equally important complex cases elsewhere in the district. It was agreed that the residents of Templeton must be treated equally, but by the same token the same service must be provided to all residents district-wide.

Consideration was given to:

- The complexities of proving statutory nuisance;
- The lack of a definitive link between the pit at Crossparks and the symptoms described by residents;
- The lack of proof that the pit was prejudicial to health;
- Consultation with Public Health who had experts in chemical hazards;
- The fact that the gas concerned would be smelt at low level;
- Where there was evidence to do so action had been taken but in the case of the gas there was no clear link;
- The Fire Service had undertaken monitoring but had not found significant levels of gas;
- The most recent contact with Public Health had been on the 3rd March 2017;
- Covering the pit and how this could reduce odour;
- The different types of gases that could be found and those that were likely to be found in a slurry pit;
- Investigations regarding material that had gone into the pit.

Cllr R L Stanley reported that he had been involved in discussions regarding this matter since it had started, initially concerning transport and how the plant was operated and more lately regarding health matters. He had received numerous reports of medical conditions, had been advised of stock death and of a dog that was found to have problems with its blood count.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration informed the Committee that Mid Devon was not the Waste Planning Authority but that the service had been in liaison with Devon County Council and the Environment Agency with regard to whether or not the site was being used as a waste transfer station. They had concluded that the digestate being delivered to the site was not waste and therefore there was no requirement for planning permission.

It was **RESOLVED** that a follow up report be prepared for the next meeting of the Committee.

(Proposed by Cllr Mrs J Roach and seconded by Cllr F J Rosamond)

Note: - Report * previously circulated and attached to Minutes.

**119 CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING AND ECONOMIC REGENERATION
(00:53:19)**

The Committee had before it a report * from the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Regeneration providing an update on areas covered by this remit.

The Cabinet Member outlined the contents of his report, highlighting the following:

- Heart of the SW partnership Productivity Plan
- Business Transformation
- Inward Investment
- Broadband and developments in this area
- Joint procurement for Business Support
- An update on the Mills Project
- LEADER funding
- Town Centre Management
- The Local Plan review
- Community Infrastructure Levy
- The Greater Exeter Strategic Plan
- Neighbourhood Planning
- Garden Village project
- Major project work for the Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension, North West Cullompton Urban Extension and Junction 27 M5
- Housing Land Supply
- Planning Productivity Review
- Performance
- Housing White Paper.

Discussion took place regarding:

- The Heart of the South West Partnership and devolution and the fact that these were separate but would be naturally entwined;
- A draft report from the Chief Executive & Director of Growth providing Members with an opportunity to steer Mid Devon District Council's response to the Heart of the South West Productivity Plan consultation was being discussed at the Economy PDG that week;
- The LEP and allocation of funds;
- Business transformation and how local authority services had been looked at to prevent them being seen as red tape and a barrier to business;
- Inward investment and the fact that the Economic Development Officer was working across different employment areas;
- Broadband and discussions that had taken place with Connecting Devon and Somerset and the private sector regarding rolling fibre optic out to rural areas;
- Joint business support and the pooling of funds and finance that had been drawn down to match it which had significantly increased the amount that could be spent;

- The Mills project which was looking to facilitate a consortium of mill and river bank owners in the provision of hydropower. Discussions had taken place with the Government Minister and this was moving forward;
- LEADER funding and funds that were available to businesses;
- The Local Plan review was on target for submission at the end of March;
- The revised Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule was being submitted with the Local Plan;
- The Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension (EUE) and work being undertaken to provide gypsy and traveller provision;
- Initial tree works being undertaken in advance of works to commence the new junction for the Tiverton EUE;
- Pre-application consultation by the promoters regarding Junction 27 development;
- Infrastructure requirements at Cullompton;
- Housing Land Supply and the Local Plan Submission;

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for his comprehensive report.

Note: - i) Report * previously circulated and attached to the Minutes.

ii) Cllr Mrs J Roach declared a personal interest as the Room 4 U project at Silverton had received LEADER Funding.

120 'CULM' GARDEN VILLAGE - LAND TO THE EAST OF CULLOMPTON. (01:30)

The Committee had before it a briefing paper * from the Head of Planning and Regeneration providing an update on the 'Garden Village'.

The officer outlined the contents of the report, explaining that the Government had asked Councils for expressions of interest for locally-led garden villages, towns and cities under a prospectus issued in March 2016. A report was considered by Cabinet at the meeting of 9th June 2016 in relation to making an expression of interest to the Government for a locally-led garden village on land to the east of Cullompton.

The Local Plan Review identified Cullompton for future strategic growth and proposed to allocate land to the east of Cullompton as a suitable location for this growth. The draft allocation policy was for mixed use development including 1,750 dwellings with at least a further 850 post 2033. In addition, a neighbourhood planning exercise for Cullompton was well underway and was considering spatial allocations including further land to the east of Cullompton in order to support community infrastructure. To get to this stage, the plan had previously been through three separate stages of public consultation with a further one currently underway (until 14th February). The growth of Cullompton had been supported by the Town Council.

On 2nd January 2017, the Minister had announced that this authority was one of 14 successful bids for garden village status.

Garden villages would be part of a new generation of locally led development to meet local housing need, with a focus on creating attractive, well-designed places. The Government intention was to assist and speed up the delivery of an ambitious high quality, housing programme where strong communities were at the heart of new development.

The authority was already aware that new infrastructure would be required to support development east of Cullompton and had commissioned work on flooding modelling and J28/M5 highway works to accommodate development. The Government's prospectus offered a tailored support package by way of capacity funding, brokerage across Government to unblock issues and access to government funding streams on housing, roads and rail capital programmes. The Government had also offered working with successful Councils to deliver planning freedoms in exchange for housing delivery and this may include ensuring a greater ability to resist speculative residential planning applications.

The additional work that had been commissioned in relation to junction improvements at J28 of the M5 motorway was well underway and had the potential to significantly address the current capacity concerns of the junction and allow for further growth beyond that allocated within the adopted plan. The junction improvements were being designed to increase capacity by 5,000 dwellings and so this formed a logical maximum for future, further growth.

Garden village status was expected to assist in the delivery of the town centre relief road and J28 improvements through financial assistance, opening up the potential for an up-front Government loan in order to deliver the improvements earlier than would be expected if funding was fully reliant upon development. It proposed working in parallel on master-planning and detailed highway improvement design in order to shorten the lead in period to planning permission for the works and their delivery.

The Government's written confirmation of garden village status for the project indicated expected capacity funding which had now been confirmed at £214,000 for 16/17 and 17/18. It was understood that there could be further funding opportunities beyond this dependent upon progress.

Discussion took place regarding the infrastructure required for Cullompton which included schools, relief roads, changes to the motorway junction and health needs.

Note: - Briefing paper * previously circulated and attached to the Minutes.

121 **PLANNING PRODUCTIVITY REPORT (01:45:08)**

The Committee had before it a report * from the Head of Planning and Regeneration updating it on the recent assessment of productivity in the Planning Service.

It was **RESOLVED** that the recommendations within the report be **NOTED** and supported.

(Proposed by Cllr Mrs J Roach and seconded by Cllr T W Snow)

122 UPDATE ON THE TIVERTON TOWN CENTRE MASTERPLAN (01:47:43)

The Committee had before it and **NOTED** a report * from the Head of Housing and Property Services updating it regarding the current position in producing a Tiverton Town Centre Masterplan.

The officer outlined the contents of the report, explaining that the authority as part of its 'Tiverton Regeneration' project initiation document agreed to produce a masterplan for the Tiverton Town centre. The rationale being that the key to delivery of a regeneration project was the development of a masterplan to guide the process and act as a blue print for the development of the area.

An invitation for expressions of interest for the preparation of a vision, regeneration masterplan and outline delivery plan for Tiverton Town Centre had been issued in August 2015. The top scoring 4 consultants meeting the above criteria were invited to prepare a full priced submission. Three were subsequently received and reviewed.

The officer explained that the project would be undertaken in two phases:

Phase 1 involved a comprehensive analysis of Tiverton and in particular the role and function of the town centre and its potential for regeneration and repositioning to foster economic growth.

Phase 2 would include preparation of a draft masterplan document, including publishing the evidence base on the web site. The draft would be subject to 6 weeks of public/stakeholder consultation.

A final masterplan would be prepared following the consultation period for consideration and adoption by Cabinet and Council. The delivery timetable for this was approximately 6 months, being November 2017.

It was intended that the document would be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Discussion took place regarding:

- Development that had already been considered such as the Premier Inn and the moving of the Burma Star Memorial;
- Previous work that had been undertaken to drive regeneration;
- Consultation with the Town Council and local business;
- Previous 'visioning' documents that have been undertaken;
- The importance of the SPD.

Note: - Report previously circulated and attached to Minutes.

123 CAR PARKING UPDATE (02:05:21)

The Committee had before it and **NOTED** a report * from the Director of Finance, Assets and Resources presenting a car parking update after the first 10 months of the new charging strategy.

The officer reminded Members that during 2015/16 the Managing the Environment Policy Development Group had set up an officer and member working group to review the current car park charging policy and then make recommendations on a new one to be implemented on the 1/4/16. This review looked at: usage levels, benchmarked charges against neighbouring Councils, considered more free periods, reviewed concessions, considered economic consequence, etc.

After an extensive consultation process, reported at all of our 34 car parks and advertised in the local press and at the Council offices, the main changes made to the new charging policy were:

- The removal of the £1 tariff for 5hrs parking in the 3 long stays
- But freezing the £2 tariff for all day parking
- Introducing a 30 min free period during the evening and freezing the overnight charge at a £1
- Extending the free period at Westex and Phoenix House to 30 minutes
- Introducing a 30 mins free period at William Street and Wellbrook Street
- Reducing Sunday and Bank Holiday charges to £1

It was then estimated that if vends (15/16) remained at the same level for 2016/17 the new charging policy would generate circa £141k more income from the Council's 10 pay & display car parks.

The officer explained that when evaluating the impact of a new charging policy for any product, it was often made harder, as other variables may well have direct/indirect effects/consequences. This was particularly relevant to car parking. Variables such as weather, the economy, fuel prices, provision of alternative parking, availability and range of shops, level of ad hoc concessions granted, road closures, etc. would also affect usage levels and hence income generated.

The Committee had previously received information with regard to the first 6 months of 2016/17 relating to both income received and vends purchased.

The officer informed Members that income from car parking had increased across the board to the region of £59k to date and a projected increase of over £70k for the year. In some car parks vends had decreased but they had increased in others. The officer assured Members that car parking statistics would be carefully monitored and that it was necessary to ensure that car parking prices did not have a negative effect on the town centres. There were no proposed changes to parking fees for the coming year.

The Tiverton Town Centre and Market Manager highlighted footfall data for Tiverton within the report, explaining that it was recorded on every market day as a management measure for identifying problems and good news. Nationally performance figures just released had shown an increase in footfall of 2.2% for the previous year. He reported that measuring footfall was a key element of measuring

the success of the towns. To date there was not enough data to undertake year on year comparisons for Tiverton. The officer further explained that electronic methods for recording footfall could be very expensive, particularly over three towns.

Discussion took place regarding:

- Peaks in footfall which had been on Saturdays in 2016 when events had been held in the market;
- The impact that weather can have on footfall;
- Data that was available regarding ticket vends and ticketing.

It was **RESOLVED** that an update regarding car parking be received in six months' time.

(Proposed by the Chairman)

Note: - Report previously circulated and attached to Minutes.

124 **PERFORMANCE AND RISK (02:22:35)**

The Committee had before it a report * providing an update on performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for 2016-17 as well as providing an update on the key business risks.

The Audit Team Leader outlined the contents of the report.

Discussion took place regarding:

- The use of agency staff at Waste Management to cover for sickness and holiday absence;
- Policy for dealing with gas safety checks and the fact that an external meter could be fitted to properties, if required, where tenants did not allow access for checks;
- The risk regarding disability and issues if an officer should decide to hide a disability;
- The asbestos register;
- The increasing risk to IT security and a Member briefing on the subject, which had been poorly attended;
- Homelessness and the increased risk.
- The cost of dealing with homelessness, what that funding is spent on and what alternative provision might be possible to improve the situation.

It was **RESOLVED** that a report be prepared for the next meeting of the Committee regarding homelessness.

(Proposed by the Chairman)

Note: - Report * previously circulated and attached to Minutes.

125 SAFEGUARDING UPDATE 02.41.00)

With regard to a Safeguarding incident that had been discussed by the Committee at a previous meeting the Chief Executive confirmed that the former tenant involved in the case had now moved away and that the property had been re-let. The new tenant had settled in well and neighbours were satisfied with the actions taken.

Neighbourhood teams had received training and understand the need to report any safeguarding issues. Officers in the Housing Service dealt regularly with all aspects of safeguarding, received refresher training and had nominated officers as workplace representatives, in accordance with the Corporate Policy.

They worked in partnership with other agencies and would refer issues to the appropriate organisation, if necessary.

Following the conclusion of this case and the appreciative enquiry, there was now a much closer working relationship with Social Services and had since hosted a joint meeting which gave frontline staff on both sides opportunities to meet and discuss how they went about their work, any specific issues of concern etc. There was another such meeting planned shortly.

Discussion took place regarding the lack of evening working taking place, the need for the authority to take ownership of issues and the importance of services working together.

It was **AGREED** that information would be provided to Members regarding actions that were taken following a report of a Safeguarding incident to ensure that transitional movements for a handover from one service to another were taken.

126 IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Local Enforcement Plan
Safeguarding

(The meeting ended at 5.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN