

Minutes of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee
held at Riverside, Lowestoft on **Thursday, 6 September 2018 at 6.00pm**

Overview & Scrutiny Committee Members Present:

Councillors A Cackett (Chairman), G Elliott, L Gooch, P Light, J Murray, K Robinson, K Springall, C Topping, M Vigo di Gallidoro and N Webb

Cabinet Members in attendance

Councillor M Rudd - Cabinet Member for Community Health and Safety
Councillor G Catchpole - Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships

Officers present

C Ames (Business Manager, Sentinel Leisure Trust), K Blair (Head of Operations), J Catterwell (East Suffolk Communities Officer), S Everett (Managing Director, Sentinel Leisure Trust), D Gallagher (Director - IMS), T Snook (Service Manager – Commercial Partnerships), N Wotton (Democratic Services Manager) and S Davis (Democratic Services Officer)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / SUBSTITUTES

Apologies were received from Councillors T Gandy and J Smith.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Cackett declared a local Non Pecuniary Interest in item 6 – Annual 2017/18 Partnership Report on Sentinel Leisure Trust as she was a Member of the Trust.

Councillor J Murray declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest in item 6 - Annual 2017/18 Partnership Report on Sentinel Leisure Trust as she had been appointed to the Trust's Board of Directors and Active Waveney Sports Partnership.

3 MINUTES

RESOLVED

- (a) That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 June 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
- (b) That, subject to the incorrect date in the header being amended, the Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 July 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, RESPONSES OF THE CABINET TO ANY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OR REPORTS OF ANY DISCUSSIONS WITH THE CABINET

There were no announcements on this occasion.

5 ANNUAL COMMUNITY SAFETY REPORT

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Community Health and Safety to introduce the report.

The Cabinet Member asked the Committee to consider the Annual Community Safety Report which provided a progress update on the East Suffolk Community Safety Partnership Plan 2017-2020, together with information on funded projects and work that also supported the delivery of the Police and Crime Commissioner and Suffolk Police key priorities.

The Committee was reminded that it was a statutory requirement for Local Authorities to work in partnership with the Police and partners to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour. This was achieved through the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) where “responsible partners” such as the Local Authority, Fire and Rescue Service, Clinical Commissioning Group, Probation and the Police worked collaboratively in partnership. A joint Suffolk Coastal and Waveney Action Plan complimented the Police & Crime Commissioners Police and Crime Plan for Suffolk. In addition, the CSP Chairman, supported by the Community Officer took a lead on East Suffolk Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHR’s). It was noted that, in the last three years, Waveney had one homicide, whereas Suffolk Coastal had had two with their first review being held up as good practice, and East Suffolk was now leading on its third DHR. The Suffolk Countywide DHR protocol had recently been updated to reflect good practice based on the West Suffolk and East Suffolk practical experience of DHR’s.

The Cabinet Member referred to and explained about County Lines which was the supply of Class A drugs from urban hubs to county hubs using mobile phones as deal lines. It was noted that these continued to be a key threat for Suffolk especially as the gangs targeted vulnerable adults and children and could impose high levels of violence, including the use of weapons and firearms, to intimidate and control members of the group and associated victims. The Cabinet Member explained that the East CSP held a joint workshop with partners in July 2018 to discuss County Lines issues and concerns and to also develop a local Action Plan to raise awareness and keep communities safe from this threat. Members were informed that most incidents occurred in Ipswich although incidents had been also been reported in Lowestoft and there was a meeting scheduled in a couple of weeks to see what could be done to prevent any further activity in this area. It was also clarified that there tended to be a link with sexual trafficking.

NB Councillors P Light and M Vigo di Gallidoro arrived at 6.15pm.

The Committee also received details of the following funded community projects and work highlighting early intervention, personal safety, good citizenship and positive role model experiences for many children/young people:

- **Lowestoft Rising Interventions Group** which had been formed in 2013 in response to the high levels of anti social behaviour by street drinkers in the Town Centre and had resulted in a reduction of identified drinkers from 35 to about 10-15 depending on the time of year. In addition, the Group had taken on and managed some 120 separate cases with positive results and the current caseload was circa 25 individuals with a mix of homelessness, drugs, alcohol and mental health issues. The Cabinet Member also reported that across the area, there were a number of rough sleepers who were being helped.
- **Government’s PREVENT Strategy/WRAP training** designed to raise awareness of the Prevent Radicalisation Strategy this training had already been delivered to approximately 350 frontline staff and Members, together with external partners including taxi drivers, landlords and the Waveney Pub Watch Partnership.

- **Crucial Crew** which was run by the local rotary clubs and provided learning and advice on young people's personal safety including road safety, internet safety, fire safety, water safety and the consequences of committing ASB. The training had been delivered to over 1000 year 6 pupils.
- **Lowestoft Beach Activities** held in Kirkley, Lowestoft. It was noted that this was the 5th consecutive summer that free beach activities had been held and numbers continued to grow year on year with circa 500 young people attending the event over the course of the summer period. Members were informed that the project would also be in operation for two weeks in November and were invited to let the East Suffolk Communities Officer know if they wished to visit during that time to see some of the activities themselves. It was also explained that, as part of a Fit and Feed project, children were fed the day before so they would be fit enough to attend the activities.
- **Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO's)** automatically replaced Designated Public Place Orders (DPPOs) on 20 October 2017 and a review had concluded that in Lowestoft the PSPO legislation was still used effectively by Police Officers to apprehend street drinkers and to confiscate their alcohol.
- **Domestic Abuse (DA)** funding had been secured for County-wide satellite accommodation and specialist support for victims, with three places secured in Suffolk Coastal and two places in Lowestoft. It was noted that the accommodation had been full since it opened.

NB Councillor M Vigo di Gallidoro left the meeting at 6.25pm.

Members were informed that the Office for National Statistics had shown that offences rose in Suffolk by 18.6% between January 2017 and December 2017 with 52,524 recorded crimes in the County (excluding fraud) compared to the previous 12 months where there were 44,294 recorded crimes. It was noted that all reported crime was now judged against the new assessment of THRIVE which enabled calls to be assessed under threat, harm and risk criteria and this had provided an improvement in accuracy of incidents recorded and was thought to be a factor in the increase of 'assault with less serious injury' incidents.

Suffolk Police had reported that "the key driving factors for the increases included a tighter focus on crime data integrity, new emerging crime categories such as malicious communication offences, more third party reporting and a belief that victims of crime felt confident reporting crimes, particularly those involving the most vulnerable communities and reports relating to sexual offences".

It was noted that Violence against the person (VATP) incidents occurring during the night time economy across major towns in the East accounted for 7% of offences (231). In relation to DA, incidents were better identified during the initial conversation with the victim.

The Police had also advised that the way in which crime and disorder was recorded and the greater focus on crime data integrity had impacted on local crime figures. It was clarified that most statistics were now at County level as it was not possible to get data at Ward Level, however, hotspots had been identified in Beccles, Bungay, London Road South and seasonally also in London Road North.

Whilst crime in the East had decreased by 15% between 2015-16, this reduction was not across all crime categories for example there had been an increase in Violence against the Person and in 2016 it was the most recorded crime across the East. In addition, this year, there had been a County-wide reduction in ASB of 38%, although there had been a significant increase in Beccles, Bungay and Lowestoft, particularly the Montgomery Avenue area which was mainly noise related. There had also been an increase in sexual assault, possibly due to the reclassification and the number of historic cases that had been recorded. In addition, theft and vehicle offences across the County had increased, although some of this could be due to changes in recording and reporting data, or re-classification. Similarly, in the case of burglaries, the classification had changed and there were also seasonal rises.

The Committee received details of Hate Crime and Hate Incidents recorded for Quarter 4 of the 2017/18 financial year for the East Suffolk Policing Command and it was noted that Lowestoft had been a hotspot with 46 crimes reported plus two incidents in Quarter 4. In addition, Beccles had seven hate crimes although no hate incidents.

It was reported that difficulties had been experienced in extracting up to date data from the Suffolk Police new data base system Athena but the situation was now improving and more meaningful data was now available. Communities Team Communities Officers would be trained to access the partnership version of the Athena system in due course.

The Cabinet Member invited questions from the Committee.

Questions from Members

A Councillor referred to the fact that the Government was looking at Hate Crime generally and asked whether this was likely to have an impact on the figures? The Communities Officer responded that it possibly would affect the figures and she referred to the fact that the Police used to have a specific Hate Crime team but this had now been disbanded resulting in difficulty obtaining statistics.

Another Member queried whether the data could be drilled down even further? The Communities Officer responded that she had asked but this level of data was not available. The point was made that this was not helpful and it was suggested that the Police could be asked direct.

A Councillor enquired as to whether the CSP received any funding? The Cabinet Member responded that the Safer Suffolk Fund had some funding which was available for projects but the actual CSP did not have any funding and had to make bids from other pots.

Another Member asked how much funding the CSP brought in from bids annually? The Communities Officer agreed to find out and email Members.

A Councillor referred to the Lowestoft Rising Interventions Group and queried how confident Officers were in the data given? It was noted that, although the actual figure fluctuated, the Police did have a rough idea. The Cabinet Member reminded Members that this was the year end report.

It was also queried whether the 25 homeless people quoted all had problems with drugs and/or alcohol? Members were informed that generally they did have problems although the actual figure changed weekly and did not just relate to Lowestoft. The point was also made that some rough sleepers actually preferred to be on the streets even after treatment so it was not possible to give a definite number.

A Member sought clarification on the number and location of DA accommodation quoted in the report. It was clarified that this was a typing error as there were 23 beds throughout the County which were all filled but every effort was made to try to get housing.

A Councillor queried if this meant there were sufficient beds available? The Communities Officer responded that, at the moment it was felt that there was, however, this was continually reviewed and it could be that in future there was a need to increase the provision.

A Councillor referred to the Hate Crime table on page 21 and pointed out that the total was incorrect as the figures added up to 70 and not 73. It was agreed that this was a typo.

The Councillor also referred to the number of identified hate incidents and suggested that there were likely to be more. The Communities Officer agreed that was likely but stated that these were the figures recorded.

A Member pointed out that this seemed meaningless data given only 4 had been recorded and it happened all the time. The Cabinet Member pointed out that if incidents were not reported to the Police then they could not be recorded.

Another Councillor enquired as to whether any further information was available on the 7 hate crimes recorded in Beccles in 2017-18? The Communities Officer responded that she did not have any details on these. Members were informed that if a neighbourhood dispute arose that was hate related this would now be dealt with by the ASB team as the Hate Crime Service no longer existed. It was explained that because the nature of crime had changed there was now a greater focus on things like cyber crime, County Lines etc.

A Councillor pointed out that the referendum result on Brexit had impacted on hate crime and it was possible that this would resurface nearer to leaving Europe. The Communities Officer acknowledged that this had been a County-wide problem and she confirmed, following a query, that it was likely we would not be prepared for Brexit related hate crime now the service had been wound down.

A Councillor reported that she was concerned that a County Lines incident had occurred in Waveney if the Police would be moving resource more towards the Ipswich area. It was pointed out that the Waveney incident had been dealt with, whereas the incidents in Ipswich had not, and some of the Police would be retained locally under the forthcoming changes. The Cabinet Member reported that there would be 9 Inspectors, 26 Sergeants, 159 PC's and 30 PCSO's together with a target of 18 matched and fully funded PCSO's and that the resource would be moved if needed eg if there was a stabbing. It was also reported that there would be 9 Community Engagement Officers which were not new posts and these would do a lot more community engagement work especially through social media.

A query was raised as to where numbers would be deployed across Waveney? It was noted that Lowestoft would have 1 Inspector, 4 Sergeants, 29 PC's and 4 PCSO's with Halesworth and Leiston having 1 Inspector, 2 Sergeants, 8 PC's and 3 PCSO's.

A Councillor asked which area Beccles and Bungay would come under? It was noted that it would be included in the Halesworth area. The Communities Officer agreed to email Members a copy of the Police changes document she had been referring to. Further clarification was sought on this point and it was agreed that this would be investigated.

NB Subsequent to the meeting, it has been confirmed that Beccles and Bungay would come under the Lowestoft area and not Halesworth as reported at the meeting.

There being no more questions, it was moved, seconded and unanimously

RESOLVED

That the Annual Community Safety report be noted and the Communities Officer find out how much funding the CSP brought in from bids annually.

NB Councillor Rudd and the East Suffolk Communities Officer left the meeting at 6.40pm.

6 ANNUAL 2017/18 PARTNERSHIP REPORT ON SENTINEL LEISURE TRUST

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships to introduce the report.

The Cabinet Member asked Members to consider the Annual Partnership Report for the Sentinel Leisure Trust which operated several leisure services on behalf of Waveney District Council and Great Yarmouth Borough Council, together with various other commercial activities. It was noted that the report gave an overview of the performance to date, highlighted key achievements and detailed future plans. The Cabinet Member stated that he met with Trust Managers and Directors regularly and the quarterly Joint Board meeting went through finances, operational issues, Key Performance data and future plans.

The Committee was informed that, over the past 12 months, the Partnership had worked towards resolving a number of concerns such as Beccles Quay ownership, pool plant at Bungay Pool and Gym (BPG), ongoing refurbishment/improvement of BPG, temporary huts at Lowestoft promenade, impact of Oulton Broad Parish Council and Lowestoft Town Council, amongst others. The Board's focus for the next 12 months was to resolve concern regarding the Council's medium to long term asset maintenance programme for leisure stock, drive forward improvement at BPG, deliver projects to support the Council's budget gap and focus on improving the health of local residents.

The Partnership continued to operate and deliver projects in accordance with the East Suffolk Business Plan including an expansive programme of activity delivered in partnership with ECCH, JPH and local doctors including wellness referral, social prescribing, Lowestoft Ogogo project, cardio rehabilitation adult weight management, stroke referral, cystic fibrosis referral and many more. In addition, the Forward Project Register had identified a number of projects that could result in a significant growth in income for the Partnership. The Trust had also made significant progress as Waveney District Council's (WDC) representative on the Halesworth Campus project over the past 12 months as well as delivering key play projects in Carlton Colville and on Lowestoft Seafront.

In relation to the financial performance of the Trust, it was noted that the Council had received the payment of a management fee for 2017/18, however, the living wage costs not being mitigated and the changes in VAT partial exemption had resulted in the management fee being reduced over the past 3 years. In addition, the net financial position of each WDC service showed that the services had operated at a net loss of £150,295 and had been subsidised from the Trust's profit distribution from other commercial activities. The Committee was informed that the Trust's accounts were currently with the auditors but once complete would be shared with the Council.

The Committee received highlights of the Trust's performance against 2016/17 targets, business growth over recent years and "Added Value" schemes.

In relation to the Joint Risk Register for the Partnership, it was noted that areas for review over the coming months were:

- Ensuring robust maintenance planning for the leisure assets
- Ensure appropriate forward budgets for maintaining and investing in the leisure assets
- Developing a project to ensure the long term sustainability of Bungay Pool and Gym
- Whole scale review of commercial opportunities to support the budget deficit at the Council.

In addition, the Trust and Partnership had recently reviewed and refreshed the strategic plan for the next 5-10 years and details were received of the new vision and the following agreed set of aims and objectives:

- 1) To improve health and wellbeing by creating a positive sporting habit that enables customers to succeed.
- 2) To manage our facilities by striving for excellence through continuous improvement and market leading innovation.
- 3) To deliver sporting and leisure education programmes that are innovative and dynamic to help people reach their career goals.
- 4) To continually improve our financial position through business growth, facility development, asset growth and sharing our expertise through consultancy.
- 5) Support WDC to deliver relevant corporate targets and objectives
- 6) To achieve our charitable objectives through reinvestment of our success.
- 7) To empower and maintain a dynamic, ambitious and professional workforce.

The Committee received details of some key commercial growth opportunities in local and national projects that the Trust was undertaking including:

- Strategic Partnership with East Coast Community Health including projects such as palliative care, diabetes management, mental health referral, stroke rehabilitation, fall's prevention, cardiac care over the next 12 months.
- Exploring options for business growth and redevelopment at Bungay Pool and Gym
- Review of Beach Hut sites and opportunities for new sites
- Review of moorings at Oulton Broad and scoping new opportunities
- Review of the operation at Dip Farm
- Partnership with Leisure United and the Football Association to deliver football scholarship programmes in their park life 3G football sites across England (potentially 100 sites).
- Lawn Tennis Association project across all 4 tennis sites to attract capital to deliver an improvement plan
- Support Beccles Wasps Football Club with their 3G project at Common Lane.

The Cabinet Member invited questions from the Committee.

Questions from Members

A Councillor queried if there was an update on Great Yarmouth Borough Council's (GYBC) proposals to demolish and rebuild the Marina Centre? The Trust's Managing Director responded that, whilst he could not go into any commercial detail, he could report that GYBC had completed Phase 1 relating to costings of the project and had now moved onto Phase 2 which included looking at sustainability and the Trust was engaged in that process.

The Councillor followed up by asking if the Trust had made a profit on running this activity and whether there was any risk or burden to the Trust which in turn could affect Waveney District Council's finances? Members were informed that the Trust received a management fee to run the Marina Centre as well as the Phoenix Pool in Bradwell. The Managing Director reported that, whilst he could not go into great detail, he could report that whilst the Centre continued to be loss making for GYBC, the subsidy had been cut in half through the Trust's operational performance. The Cabinet Member pointed out that the Trust was bigger than just Waveney because it also supported private businesses not connected with Waveney and it should be running these areas profitably with profits used to off-set any Waveney costs.

A query was raised as to whether there was any risk to Waveney District Council by spreading out to other enterprises elsewhere? The Head of Operations reported that this was something they were always aware of and discussed regularly with the Trust. He added that, whilst there could be a scenario where this might occur, he was confident in the due diligence the Board carried out. He also explained that Great Yarmouth had reduced their costs considerably so if a risk could be managed and taken on, it could be subsidised. Members noted that new operations were looked at quarterly to see if there was sufficient reward to offset any risk.

A Councillor queried how many children had taken advantage of the free swimming sessions funded by Waveney District Council and if they would have to pay in future if they wished to go again? It was noted that this project had been considered a success in that it had given children an opportunity that they might not otherwise have. Members were informed that 1044 children had taken up the sessions at Bungay Pool with 1066 at Waterlane. It was confirmed that they would have to pay in future if they wanted to swim again.

Clarification was sought in relation to the future of Adventure Island and Raw Soccer as it was rumoured that it would be turned into a gym. Members were reminded that it was one building with two existing operations, one was the Adventure Island soft play area and the other side was Raw Soccer. The Trust's Managing Director reported that Members had been written to about the possibility of it being redeveloped into a gym in the future as part of the Trust's ongoing strategy in looking at risk, although there were no plans to do so at the moment.

Whilst it was acknowledged that there was major competition in the leisure industry, the point was made that Members did not want the Trust to invest in something that would not pay off and Waveney was also involved in the nearby Waterlane facility. The Business Manager referred to the recently refurbished climbing wall which had proved popular with 1200 casual users and 35 full paying members which will increase as the users progress and pass the tests. In addition there had been 23 climbing wall parties involving 281 children, including 9 parties in July alone. Members noted that income over the last five months had been £3.5K per month which meant that if this rate of use continued the wall would generate £45.5K annually.

A Member referred to the activities carried out in the south of the district and in particular the Halesworth activities which she felt had been well received.

A query was raised as to the future direction of the Oulton Broad Yacht Club? The Business Manager reported that the Parish Council and a number of clubs had approached the Trust asking for help to run the water sports centre. It was noted that Suffolk County Council held the Head Lease and a licence was required to obtain Royal Yacht Association accreditation as a senior person was needed on site before additional activities could be operated such as paddle boarding. Following discussions with the Parish and County Council, the Trust was a Tenant at Will but it was hoped that in future the Trust could hold the Head Lease with the Parish Council.

Clarification was sought as to whether the proposed extended range of activities at the Yacht Club could also be transferred to the beach in designated zoned areas? The point was made that unfortunately the beach had quite a severe tide which meant there was a high risk so it was unlikely to be used for water sports generally. The Business Manager reported that the Trust was currently creating a partnership with local Royal Lifeguard Society to see if they could use the Broad in winter, possibly with the assistance of the RNLI. He concluded that the Trust wanted a focus on lifesaving in winter as well as engaging water sports.

A query was raised as to whether an analysis of users had been undertaken to provide any demographic information? The Business Manager reported that the Trust looked at catchments to see what areas were missing and this year the Trust had looked at geographical demographics but he had not had a chance yet to overlay this with last year's social demographic information in order to see if there were any barriers.

Clarification was sought as to whether the Trust was working with community teams in relation to NEET's? It was noted that the Trust worked in several ways to support NEET'S eg through core projects and supporting the Community Teams who shared their demographics especially relating to health eg the Lowestoft Ogogo project targeted certain wards. Members were informed that money had been found to extend the project for two years and it would hopefully be rolled out to rural areas in future.

A Member queried if a list of activities was available at Tourist Information Points? The Trust's Managing Director reported that, where it was felt there was a town angle, activities were advertised in brochures with varying degrees of success, whereas with the Beach Huts offer it was a great opportunity to sell weekly rentals. He pointed out that Oulton Broad TIC was manned by Trust staff so they advertised and promoted activities anyway. He added that the Trust had tried a number of schemes and sometimes they worked. Members noted that the Trust had been more targeted in promoting Beach Huts this year.

A Member thanked the Trust for its support of Beccles Wasps then queried their involvement with Dip Farm? The Cabinet Member responded that Dip Farm offered Pitch and Putt and Football activities on a daily basis, however, increasing competition from professional golf courses such as Rookery Park, Browston Hall and Caldicott had resulted in a loss on the golf side, hence why options for the site including whether to close it were being considered.

Clarification was sought as to how Dip Farm was advertised and promoted and if a Sports Provision Strategy was needed? The Head of Operations responded that a Strategy would be drawn up over stages but, whilst better marketing could arrest some of the loss Dip Farm was making, it would make a loss of £70K next year which could not continue, therefore, the Asset Management Team was looking at alternative uses of the site. Members noted that the facility

was advertised on FaceBook, Twitter, in the local press, caravan camps and various websites. The point was made that private clubs now offered similar deals and prices and they no longer had dress codes so people tended to visit them rather than Dip Farm. In addition, some local caravan parks now offered small pitch and putt facilities to keep guests on site. The Chairman stated that now she was aware that Dip Farm had a FaceBook page she would share the link to promote it and urged the rest of the Members to do the same.

A Member asked if it was possible to see a display about Dip Farm in the Waterlane Centre and to also be able to book and pay to play in advance? It was noted that there was only a poster advert and it was not possible to pay anywhere else but at Dip Farm upon arrival.

A Member queried if Crazy Golf or anything similar might be an option at Dip Farm? The Trust's Managing Director pointed out that there was a Crazy Golf facility next to East Point Pavilion and they tended to be in high footfall areas. He added that he was sure the Council's Asset Team would look at all future options for the site to make the best use of the asset.

Concern was expressed at what would happen once the Council's merged to become East Suffolk? Members were reminded that currently Places Leisure operated facilities in the Suffolk Coastal area and Sentinel Leisure in Waveney and there were no plans at present to merge management of the facilities. The Service Manager – Commercial Partnerships pointed out that a benefit of having two companies operating facilities was the creation of some element of competition and ability for the Council to compare performance. He added that Sentinel was a growing Trust whereas Places Leisure was a nation-wide operator.

Clarification was sought on whether Suffolk Coastal and Places Leisure used Pulse? It was noted that they did use Pulse Design and Build when looking at the redevelopment of facilities such as Leiston and Felixstowe and a business case was currently being developed for the Bungay Pool and Gym which would be considered by Cabinet.

A query was raised as to whether Suffolk Coastal received profit back from Places Leisure? It was confirmed that they did receive profit back in a similar way to which Waveney received profits from the Sentinel Leisure Trust. The Service Manager – Commercial Partnerships reported that the cost to provide for facilities was £350K per annual and the aim was normally that a redevelopment would be cost neutral. He added that the Sentinel Leisure Trust was doing a good job running properties which earned money for Waveney.

Clarification was sought as to whether East Suffolk Members should be looking at Places if they were not making any profit? The Service Manager - Commercial Partnerships indicated that the Council needed to look at the type of facilities available, the risk and the benefits to the Council. The Trust's Managing Director explained that as they were a charity they could bring in wider schemes that added value and he pointed out that different operating models could still bring in different value to the Council. He added that he felt both Places Leisure and Sentinel did a good job operating the different types of facilities. The Cabinet Member pointed out that the cost of operating leisure facilities was high as they included not only operational costs but also capital investment and mortgages so there was a need to look at what the Council owned and try to change costs to profits. He added that the redevelopment of the Bungay Pool and Gym was an exciting prospect especially given future housing developments would increase the population using the facilities. Members were informed that the Bungay redevelopment would be a different offer/design of pool to that available at Waterlane and it was hoped that the plans would go to Cabinet in the next 4-5 months. The Service Manager – Commercial Partnerships pointed out that Suffolk Coastal had invested in Leiston even though it was unlikely

to make any money because it would provide facilities for the benefit of the community so it was not possible to compare like for like.

Reference was made to the Dip Farm Facebook page which it was felt to be quite good and a query was raised as to whether there was a café on site and if it would be worth investing in the site with for example Crazy Golf rather than selling it off? The Cabinet Member reported that there was not a café on site and the facility was already losing money because unfortunately there was nothing unique about Dip Farm. He pointed out that people did not tend to use Crazy Golf in the winter and stressed that no decisions had been made regarding the future of the site in terms of selling it off or redeveloping it for housing.

The Chairman pointed out that there were Crazy Golf World Championships so people did play it all year round and she suggested that if there was a good course available then more people would play. The Trust's Managing Director pointed out that most courses were in areas with high footfall with passing trade whereas Dip Farm was in a rural area.

A Member pointed out that the Facebook page was four years old and it only had 113 followers so it seemed that it was not very well promoted. The Trust's Business Manager reported that details of facilities were shared on other sites.

Another Member asked if there were any refreshments available on site as this might encourage visitors and they then spent more money? The Trust's Business Manager reported that there was a vending machine at Dip Farm. The Director – IMS reported that over the years many options had been looked at in relation to this site and he reminded Members that a Coastal Pathfinder Bid had even been submitted to build a pavilion at the site but this had not been successful. The point was also made that Dip Farm did not have a good frontage so had never really appealed to a wider audience. A Member referred to the fact that she was aware that students preferred playing at Rookery Park because it was a better course. She suggested that glamping might be the answer.

There being no further comments, it was moved, seconded and unanimously

RESOLVED

That the 2017/18 Annual Performance report of the Sentinel Leisure Trust be received.

7 CURRENT POSITION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee received a report regarding the current position of its Work Programme which was provided at each meeting in order for it to be continually reviewed. This was a 'rolling' Work Programme with suggestions for scrutiny identified by Members throughout the year.

In relation to the review of the Asset Management Service, the point was made that new staff had recently been appointed and a new programme was being purchased to log all the assets which would hopefully be compatible with the HRA system so it was difficult to see at the present time what needed reviewing.

The Chairman reported that she had asked that the update on Fire Risk Assessments and Action Plans for St Peter's Court be covered in the Annual Review of St Peter's Court Fire Safety scheduled for the December meeting.

It was noted that the redevelopment of the Chalets at Jubilee Parade South in Lowestoft would hopefully be coming forward in November.

The Chairman also reported that a date for the joint meeting with Suffolk County Council to scrutinise the decision making process to possibly close the Lowestoft Records Office was still being sought. A request was made that this meeting be held in the evening and substitutes be arranged to ensure that as many Members as possible attended and that Parish Councils also be informed of the meeting details as stakeholders. Clarification was sought as to whether a declaration of interest should be made if a Member had signed the petition or was Chair of a Town Council. The point was made that this review was purely about the County Council's decision making process rather than the actual decision itself but it was agreed to get a steer from the Monitoring Officer.

Reference was made to the outstanding vacancy on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Chairman reported that this should be filled at the next Full Council meeting.

The Chairman asked Members for their recollection of the reasons the Car Parking and Public Conveniences reviews had been suggested. In relation to car parking, a Member stated that he thought it had been raised to get an update on 1 hour free parking following information being given to Members on Fees and Charges at a previous meeting. With regard to the public conveniences, it was agreed that nothing much had moved on since the previous update, however, concern was expressed that there did not appear to be much provision for the disabled.

In light of the lack of clarification on the reasons behind the suggested reviews and given the amount of work already scheduled and the number of outstanding reviews still to be programmed, the Chairman suggested that Information Bulletins be requested in relation to Asset Management, Car Parking and Public Conveniences and Members could then consider if a full report was necessary.

NB Councillor Elliott left the meeting at 8.05pm.

Members received and agreed the tabled proposed remit for the Simultaneous Scrutiny Committee with Suffolk Coastal on Coastal Partnership East to be held on 25 October 2018.

The Committee received a tabled copy of a Scoping Form from Councillor Gooch in relation to Littering and Poor Recycling in Waveney and it was agreed that this would be added to the Work Programme and scheduled for the 3 January 2019 meeting. Concern was expressed from a Member that they had seen separate bins being put into one dust cart which negated the point of asking residents to separate out their waste in the first place.

Members were reminded the following reviews had also been suggested subject to scoping forms being received:

- Councillor Elliott – Dog Fouling
- Councillor Light – Blue Bins
- Councillor Gandy – Education

Reference was made to the second resolution of item 5 of the minutes of the Scrutiny Meeting held on 14 June 2018 relating to Anglian Water and it was queried whether there was any update. The Chairman reported that she had spoken to the Head of Planning and Coastal

Management and he had confirmed that Anglian Water could not be a statutory consultee but they were normally consulted as much as possible. In relation to a Committee Member's suggestion at that meeting that a feature be included in the Residents Magazine on easy management of gardens and driveways, the Chairman stated that she thought an item on litter had been included in the In Touch magazine as well as highlighting oil recycling etc. It was reported that there was a day at the Recycling Centre planned for bringing hazardous waste shortly and the point was made that this was not advertised enough. A suggestion was made that if skips were placed on roads similar to other countries then that would get rid of flytipping. Members noted that food was recycled at Suffolk Coastal so it was possible the Lowestoft Centre might change in future.

There being no further discussion, it was moved, seconded and

RESOLVED

1. That the current position of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Work Programme, as amended above, be agreed.
2. That the proposed remit for the Simultaneous Meeting of the Waveney District Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Suffolk Coastal District Council's Scrutiny Committee on 25 October 2018 in relation to Coastal Partnership East be approved and recommended to Suffolk Coastal's Scrutiny Committee.

The meeting was concluded at 8.10pm

Chairman