

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Date and Time:** Tuesday 6 December 2022 at 7.00 pm

**Place:** Council Chamber

**Version 2**

### **Present:**

Dorn (Chairman), Smith (Vice-Chairman), Axam, Butcher, Butler, Coburn, Davies, Farmer, Wildsmith and Woods

### **In attendance:**

Cockarill, Bailey (virtual), Forster and Lamb (virtual)

### **Officers:**

Mark Jaggard	Executive Director Place
Graeme Clark	Executive Director Corporate and S151 Officer
Kirsty Jenkins	Executive Director Community
Daniel Hawes	Planning Policy & Economic Development Manager
Christine Tetlow	Principal Planner & Programme Manager
Matt Harris	Policy Planner
Claire Lord	Committee Services Officer

## **56 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of 8<sup>th</sup> November 2022 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

## **57 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies had been received from Councillor Engström, (substituted by Councillor Lamb).

## **58 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations were made.

## **59 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman informed Councillors of the proposed change to the date of the January meeting. There had been a request to move the next meeting to 17 January 2023 to allow officers to produce a complete budget, given the likely late

government announcement of the finance settlement. Councillors agreed to the proposal.

## **60 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE AGENDA)**

Mr Kevin Druce was attending the meeting to participate in agenda item 5, the Sustrans presentation on the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

## **61 SUSTRANS PRESENTATION**

Hart District Council has jointly commissioned, with Hampshire County Council, Sustrans to produce a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for Hart district. Max Longley from Sustrans gave a presentation to the meeting, setting out what a LCWIP is, the process for developing the Plan for Hart, and how it would help to inform the Green Grid Strategy.

Discussion took place around how the network would look and whether it would be concentrated on new developments or more populated areas. It was explained that the purpose of the Plan was to create a network that would enable people to get from their place of residence to local amenities such as schools, shops and leisure facilities.

A question was raised about funding. It was explained that once the LCWIP had been created then there could be Government funding available. It was also explained that there may other grants available in the future, and potentially funding from new future developments.

Questions, were also raised on how opportunities might be scoped across all of Hart, not just Fleet and Yateley/Blackwater.

Members were assured that in making the plan, Sustrans would be working with local stakeholders, Parish and Town Councils, neighbouring authorities and the two local MPs.

## **62 TREASURY MANAGEMENT - MID YEAR REVIEW**

Councillors received an overview of the Treasury Management activities for the 1st half of the year.

Discussion took place around future investments, reviewing the Responsible Investment Policy and whether investment criteria could be included in future reports.

It was confirmed that the Investment criteria could be reviewed in January. Members had requested consideration of ethical/environmental factors and sought clarification about which environmental criteria were used.

Members also asked to see an updated list of investments as 3 (just under half of the total number of investments) had matured,

A query was raised about the increase in Prudential Capital Expenditure. It was explained that this increase was due to the brought forward slippage from 2021/22.

### **63 AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT**

Councillors received the draft Authority Monitoring Report and were advised that it reported on the implementation of the policies in the adopted Hart Local Plan 2032, the progress on the development of Neighbourhood Plans, and the duty to cooperate with other Councils. Councillors were pleased at the comprehensive nature of the report.

Discussion took place around the mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed houses and it was queried how the gap between what was available and what was required could be closed. It was confirmed that this gap was always considered when developers submitted planning applications.

Members asked for clarification around the affordable homes policy and definition. They also asked for feedback on the Traveller DPD and the assessment of care home requirements (ie number or location) . It was agreed that Officers would meet the Councillor separately to discuss these matters.

### **64 COMMUNITY SERVICE PANEL SCRUTINY PANEL FEEDBACK**

The Service Panel had been well attended and productive.

A broad discussion followed the Communities Service Panel, key points noted included CCTV (the lack of Q2 performance measures and delay of transfer to Runnymede), ASB and the sad death on duty of a young PCSO. The meeting noted its condolences.

### **65 CABINET WORK PROGRAMME**

There were no comments.

### **66 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME**

There were no comments on the Work Programme, however, the meeting was informed that some local Hampshire County Councillors had suggested that the Committee may wish to meet with South-East Water to see if lessons could be learnt about how the extensive new water pipe project could have been managed better. It was however acknowledged that this had been a complex

and challenging project and that there had been good liaison between HCC and South East Water which sought to manage the impact of the project to limit the extent of the disturbance, disruption and road closures. It was agreed that representatives from both HCC and South East Water be invited to attend a future meeting of O&S to discuss these points further.

The meeting closed at 8.55 pm