

---

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP OVERVIEW AND  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE,  
HELD ON TUESDAY, 17TH JUNE, 2025 AT 7.30 PM  
IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM - TOWN HALL, STATION ROAD, CLACTON-ON-SEA,  
CO15 1SE**

<b>Present:</b>	Councillors Steady (Chairman), Barrett (Vice-Chairman), Codling, Davidson, Doyle, Goldman and Griffiths
<b>Also Present:</b>	Councillor Placey (except item 7)
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Keith Simmons (Assistant Director (Corporate Policy & Support) & Deputy Monitoring Officer), Michael Carran (Assistant Director (Sport, Culture & Health)) (except items 6 and 7), Nikki Nepean (Elections & Member Support Manager) and Bethany Jones (Democratic Services Officer)
<b>Also in attendance via MS Teams:</b>	Becky Turner (Dental Contracts and Transformation Manager) (except items 6 and 7), Michael Hattrell (SNEE ICB) (except items 6 and 7), Professor Nick Barker (Deputy Chief Dental Officer) (except items 6 and 7) and Pat Popat (Dental Hygienist) (except items 6 and 7)

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies for absences were received from Councillor Ferguson (with no substitution) and Councillor Oxley (with Councillor Goldman substituting).

**2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee, held on Tuesday, 15 April 2025, be approved as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Steady (Chairman) noted under Minute 5 below for the public record that he knew Pat Popat as he had 2 dentists within the Brightlingsea Ward.

**4. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 38**

No Questions on Notice pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 38 had been submitted by Members for this meeting.

**5. BRIEFING NOTE - NHS DENTAL COMMISSION**

Councillor Steady (Chairman) noted for the public record that he knew Pat Popat as he had 2 dentists within the Brightlingsea Ward.

The Committee heard that the Integrated Care Board (ICB) had recently refreshed its five-year NHS dentistry vision and strategic priorities. A 2-year delivery plan had been

---

agreed from 2025 to 2027, building on priorities and areas of work which the Committee were previously updated on in September 2024.

Suffolk and North East Essex's (SNEE) vision for what they wanted to achieve was:

- to improve access to high quality oral healthcare
- to reduce oral health inequalities
- to improve the oral health of the population
- to build stability and resilience across the NHS dental services
- to integrate dental services with other healthcare providers/partners

The strategic priorities were:

1. Oral Health education and prevention for children, young people, and adults
2. Support and development of the whole dental workforce
3. Improved access to oral healthcare
4. Further development of Level 2 (intermediate care) services
5. Development of Secondary care (hospital) services
6. Integration – dental service integration and collaboration
7. Building of Clinical leadership, engagement, and collaboration

Members were made aware that examples of projects either planned or underway in the next 2 years, aligned with the strategic priorities 1 to 3 above were detailed in the body of the briefing note.

The Committee was told that an additional 20,500 Units of Dental Activity (UDAs) had been commissioned from practices in the Tendring area and the number of people seen by dental practices increase by 6,799 in 2024/25.

### **Oral Health Improvement Programme:**

Members were reminded that Essex County Council led on the commissioning of the oral health improvement programme and worked in partnership with the ICB.

The Committee was informed that supervised toothbrushing “actively brushing” was taking place with children aged 3 – 5 years in 15 early years settings across Tendring. An additional 20 early years setting across Colchester and Tendring were commissioned to undertake supervised toothbrushing until March 2027. Nationally, 23 million toothbrushes would be donated over the next 5 years to support the programme, alongside educational materials with a public-facing children's oral health campaign. 31 early years settings, childminders and primary schools in Tendring would be targeted.

Members also heard that young people oral health champions who encouraged good oral health among their peers were in place in 17 primary schools across Colchester and Tendring.

Staff at 4 care homes in Colchester and Tendring had been trained in general oral health and 2 had been accredited as Life Long Smiles care providers. More homes were being encouraged to join the scheme.

#### **Dental Workforce:**

Work was being continued to support and develop the dental workforce. As part of that, 5 posts had been recruited across 10 practices in SNEE as part of the national Dental Recruitment Incentive Scheme, with 1 dentist recruited in North East Essex. The recruitment of a post in Frinton was ongoing.

#### **Dental Access:**

The Dental Priority Access and Stabilisation (DPASS) pilot was launched in April 2024 for 18 months. 4 practices in North East Essex had taken part in the pilot, with 1 in Frinton. Over 12,000 appointments had been delivered across SNEE with over 4,000 in North East Essex. A decision regarding future commissioning would be made later this year.

The ICB commissioned an additional 15,413 urgent care appointments in line with the Government's manifesto to increase urgent dental appointments by 700,000 this year. 9 of the practices commissioned to offer those appointments were in the North East Essex area, including 1 in Frinton. A total of 4,466 additional appointments were available in NEE.

Tendring East, South and West had been identified as areas that needed increased access to primary care dental services and had been included in a procurement plan that was currently going through ICB governance. In view of the future proposed ICB structures, they were working with Mid and South Essex ICB on that to ensure any commissioning also aligned with their strategic direction.

Becky Turner, Dental Contracts and Transformation Manager, Michael Hattrell, SNEE ICB and Professor Nick Barker, Deputy Chief Dental Officer were in attendance at this meeting via Microsoft Teams and presented the briefing note to the Committee.

Pat Popat, Dental Hygienist also attended the meeting via Microsoft Teams.

<u>Committee Members' Questions (unless stated otherwise):</u>	<u>Responses by invited guests (unless stated otherwise):</u>
Is there anything being looked into in regard to education for dentists and to look for in the future?	For future planning, it is around changing the contracts, the contracts would be that there is a gradual move from NHS practices going more private and reforming the contract, point 1 would be that the NHS contract would be more attractive, that would help support provision, the second point would be that there is clarity over flexible commissioning which would support outreach services which is being worked on in other areas which can be learned upon with the new contracts. There are two schools within SNEE that train undergraduate hygienists and

	therapists who are also an important part of the dental workforce team. Currently the undergraduate level in Suffolk is aiming to have 72 undergraduates in any given time period.
Is there any more funding from Government coming forward for dentistry?	There is not official funding which becomes part of the issue. There were the 700,000 additional appointments that that Labour Government put in their manifesto, and they have paid attention to dentistry; however, the additional appointments were funded from the current dental budget. In SNEE the entire budget for dentistry is not being spent, mainly because all of the problems that have already been raised. By changing the way the contract works, the aim is that the entire dental budget is spent but there can be clawback money which ICB would not know about until nearer the time (around 3 months) and it makes it difficult to utilise the money.
Would you say that budget administration is a key factor to get the spending of the budgets?	Yes, it is all about working between the commissioners and dental workforce. There will be budget planning, the ICBs from the contract reform that took place two years ago now have the ability to unilaterally claim monies back, particularly the providers that have concurrently year on year not performed to their monies which means that the ICB have the ability to claw back the money and then work with more desirable providers.
With areas of frustrations, where do you think there is progress that is needed, and should Members be worried about 10% under 5-year-olds in Tendring having tooth decay?	<p>In terms of percentage for tooth decay, it is a little bit higher compared to some national levels but there are some reasonings behind these figures. There has been preventative work such as supervised brushing schemes that start at early education. Risk factors do need to be taken into account when looking at the figures.</p> <p>We know that coastal and rural communities have a higher level of disease just because of the nature of those communities. The national supervised toothbrushing scheme puts money into local authorities to invest monies into these schemes. There are various parts of the contracts that key into the NHS 10-year long term plan which is about putting prevention and community-based practice ahead of secondary care.</p> <p>In terms of frustrations, from a commissioner's point of view, ICB share the same frustrations with the providers in the UDA contract. ICB are trying to work with practices to flexibly commission various schemes that have been mentioned. This has massively improved the relationships with a lot of the practices and open conversations are now happening.</p>
The toothbrushes are supplied to the schools and the teachers are left to	Yes, there are 3 clinical providers which has one particularly centred on this. The idea and what has

administer that scheme, is that correct?	<p>happened is to organise with Colgate to support with supplying toothpaste and toothbrushes to schools, the teachers will mainly be supervising the children to give a period of time at the beginning of the school day so that the children are able to brush their teeth with a fluoridated toothpaste. There is a lot of evidence behind this scheme which shows a return on investment.</p> <p>There is good engagement with the young children, and they are having conversations with their parents around brushing their teeth. There is a bit of difficulty with the early years as it is difficult to fit the scheme in with the schedule for education.</p>
Do you find Pat, that the number of tooth decay is going down in the surgeries?	(Pat) – My own practices do not have a NHS contract so I do miss out on these schemes; however, a local school has approached the surgeries, and we have managed to source some toothbrushes and supplied the school with some instructions that the children can take home so the partners have something to refer to.
Are there any plans to increase dentist appointments in the area of Harwich?	There will be a paper that is going to the Board meeting on 15 July about the procurement of new dental services and one of the areas is Tendring East, West and North. The ICB have said that within this the ICB will not be looking practices within that area but if there are practices that want to come along to the meeting then they are more than welcome to do that to start those discussions.
Is it necessary to teach children to brush their teeth in schools?	<p>When children come to practices, it is clear that children are not brushing for long enough and at home they do not know how long to brush for. There is also an effective technique to brushing the teeth and the right age-appropriate fluoride toothpaste.</p> <p>The evidence is clear that this scheme can help with the decay in children.</p> <p>With doing this scheme in schools, it starts the conversation around sugar and sugar reduction and children start to understand the amount of sugar they can consume.</p>
Is it correct that there is no plan to have more dentist appointments in Harwich?	No, the ICB will not be excluding any areas. ICB will be looking at Tendring as a broad area, but we would not exclude providers around the area that came forward and said that they wanted to take part in the procurement and make a bid.
Are there any plans for home schooled children?	We try to hit the broadest population and supervised toothbrushing is specifically targeted to people who need it the most based upon the national directive but there would certainly be opportunities on the flexible commission that would look at the fuller population as well which will identify home schoolers and within ICB there is a programme that reaches out to the wider population and is actively showing that they are

	engaging with the schemes.
(Mike Carran) are there any plans to expand the number of champions and life long smiles in schools?	<p>These programmes are commissioned by Essex County Council (ECC) and our colleague Julian links in with them who I can feedback to and say Members are asking for extra information.</p> <p>Some of the programmes across the ICB are being evaluated which will give more evidence to look at different programmes and how they can affect the community and give the drive forward to future funding.</p> <p>The support from a District Council is always useful to turn up to those meetings and give feedback so the ICB can see where people have identified where there are problems.</p>
(Mike Carran) With flexible commissioning, what are the timescales?	<p>Flexible commissioning reflects a number of different schemes, at the moment the ICB have the Dental Priority Access and Stabilisation Service which is running until the end of this year. Child focus dental practice which is another flexible commission. The ICB is conscious that they will be changing as well as the footprint so we are linking with South Mid Essex who will likely be taking over as Greater Essex which have similar but slightly different flexibility. At the moment there is no timescale but there are new flexibly commissioning opportunities.</p>
(Keith Simmons) What is a high-quality oral health care that you are seeking to achieve and what level of reduction in oral health inequalities are you expecting to be able to achieve?	<p>Once the plan is fully published, we can share that with you. In terms of high-quality oral health, it is making sure that there is an NHS dentistry available to people who need it, to go with that is the dental priority access service and we have procurement in the Tendring area. With reducing health inequalities, we are very aware that people who live in higher areas of deprivation are likely to have higher oral health needs so there are strategic commissioning plans when it comes to procurement.</p> <p>More targeted commissioning schemes that will look at areas of greater deprivation and various other risk factors that are commonly known and several oral diseases are directly linked to general diseases so we would look to link in with wider health care professionals.</p>
(Keith Simmons) Do you have figures for adults with active tooth decay within Essex? Are there any figures to show that the access to dentistry is improving in SNEE? Is there an update on the reduction on children's admissions to hospital due to dental decay?	<p>The data is not at hand, but it can be shared at a later date.</p> <p>The adult oral health survey is generally carried out on a 10-year basis and the latest survey had a slightly different format so we would need to have a look and see if that data is available for the decay rating in adults. Children admissions data is hard to come by but what is known is that the toothbrushing scheme is in place to bring that number down and it would be a longer-term database update in order to achieve the</p>

	results wanted.
(Keith Simmons) Are we right in reading that the DPASS appointments within the District are from a surgery in Frinton and is that the same for the additional care appointments?	Yes, that is correct, it is a surgery in Frinton, there is more access in Colchester but there is a surgery in Frinton that offers DPASS and urgent care appointments.
(Keith Simmons) Could Members have the figures for the DPASS appointments and additional urgent care appointments relating to the Frinton surgery?	That can be provided to Members.

The Chairman thanked the invited guests for their help and insight.

It was moved by Councillor Steady, seconded by Councillor Davidson and unanimously:-

**RESOLVED** that the Committee:-

- 1) urges the Portfolio Holder for Partnerships to urge NHS colleagues in providers hospitals to supply the required data around admissions of children and the extent of which that can be attributed to dental decay;
- 2) urges the Portfolio Holder for Partnerships, that with the envisioned merger of the ICB for Greater Essex, that she does everything is within their power to ensure that the health inequalities, particularly with dental health inequalities, are front and centre for the new ICB and at least replicate the good work of the SNEE going forward; and
- 3) urges through the Portfolio Holder for Partnerships that there is development of continued referencing data and extent of any improvement over time and for the actual NHS dental appointments for each year to be provided for children and adults.

**6. REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE - A.1 - COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW OF CLACTON ON SEA, HOLLAND ON SEA AND JAYWICK SANDS**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive which set out the approach to the approved community governance review of Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea and Jaywick Sands to commence on 1 July 2025. Critical to that review was the Terms of Reference for it. A draft Terms of Reference were considered by Council on 26 November 2024 (Minute 75 refers) and, by virtue of the delegation provided to the Chief Executive, those had been revised and were set out in Appendix A of the Officer report. It was intended to publish the final Terms of Reference on 1 July 2025 to trigger the formal commencement of the community governance review.

Members were reminded of the following motion approved at its meeting on 17 September 2024 (Minute 50 refers):

*“That Full Council –  
(1)notes that:*

- 
- a. *Parish and Town Councils are an established and valued form of local democracy with an information role to play in both rural, and urban, areas.*
  - b. *the District currently has 27 Town and Parish Councils with a cumulative electorate of almost 75,000 and that Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea and Jaywick are not currently parished and the cumulative electorate for those areas is almost 45,000. As such, about 62% of residents have one of 27 Town and Parish Councils to represent them and their interests at a very local level. 38% of the District's residents do not have that representation.*
  - c. *between 1891 and 1974, Great Clacton (later renamed Clacton as it also covered Clacton-on-Sea) had its own specific tier of local government, and the area of this tier of local government was expanded in 1934 to take in the then former parish of Little Holland (later renamed Holland-on-Sea).*
  - d. *since 1974, with the abolition of Clacton Urban District Council and creation of this District Council, there has been no distinct Local Council representation for specifically Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea and Jaywick.*
  - e. *it has been more than 25 years since the electors of Jaywick Sands last had the chance to express their view on the issues of a parish for that Town.*
  - f. *the nature/responsibilities of local government has changed over the years and, in recent years, there has been a distinct impetus to devolve power from Whitehall to local councils and communities that will further change that landscape.*
  - g. *the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 devolved the power to take decisions about matters such as the creation of parishes and their electoral arrangements to the District Council for its area, through a process called a community governance review which has, at its heart, engagement with local people in the defined review area and that representations received in connection with the review are taken into by the District Council.*

***(2) requests that proposals for a community governance review of Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea and Jaywick be prepared and submitted to the next ordinary meeting of the Council to enable Council to determine whether to proceed with such a review, the timetable for a review and the resourcing of such a review."***

At its meeting on 26 November 2024 (Minute 75), Council then received the requested report, including draft Terms of Reference, indicative costings assessed at that stage and proposals to establish the Committee as the body that would oversee Community Governance Review matters. Council approved the following having considered that report:

- "(a) being minded to see a community governance review of Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea and Jaywick proceed;*
- (b) hereby determines the following:-*
  - (i) that the draft Terms of Reference for the community governance review, as set out at Appendix A to report A.6, be approved as the basis for that review;*
  - (ii) that the Chief Executive be authorised to adjust the Terms of Reference approved in (b)(i) above to finally be published to reflect the current position as known on 1 July 2024 in relation to matters such as the*



- 
- 2025/26 Parish Precepts and consequential Band D Council Tax amount in each area of the District;*
- (iii) that, subject to (iv) below, Cabinet be requested to include within the recommended budget for 2025/26 the minimum sum of £48.4k to fund consultation and other expenses in respect of the community governance review and thereby authorise Officers to incur expenditure to undertake the review following approval of the budget;*
  - (iv) that Officers be requested to monitor the anticipated costs to deliver the review, including postage charges; to update the likely cost of the review; and to inform Cabinet to enable the sum in (c) above to be updated as necessary;*
- (c) that the terms of reference for the Community Leadership Overview and Scrutiny Committee be expanded, as set out in Appendix B to report A.6, to include a reference power to consider and oversee community governance reviews and to submit a final recommendation to Council following the conclusion of the review (including any proposal to discontinue the review in any particular part of the review area based on responses received);*
- (d) that Council approves the delegation of functions for community governance reviews, as set out in Table 1, within this report (A.6), to be included within Part 3(X), Schedule 2 Non-Executive Executive functions for Full Council; and*
- (e) that the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make the necessary changes to the Constitution to implement the Council's decision."*

Since the above approval, the draft terms of reference had been updated to identify key demographic data around the entire review area, add an extra year to the projected electorate in the review areas (and District Council Wards) to ensure there was a five year forecast at the start of the review, updated precept levels and Band D Council Tax requirements for 2025/26 for the existing Parish and Town Councils in the District and the list of stakeholder groups to be consulted in the review.

In addition, there had been a specific meeting for all District Councillors representing Wards in the review area to discuss the proposed review, who should be consulted during the review and different views on the idea of (a) Town Council(s) for the review area. There was an interactive element to the briefing meeting for District Councillors and the summary of the points that were identified in that interactive session is set out at Appendix B to this report.

Separately, there had been meetings of Clacton Town Board (representing businesses, education providers, health providers and voluntary sector organisations in the Town) and Tendring Together (being an event co-ordinated by 'Community Voluntary Sector Tendring') with a range of community and voluntary organisations working in the review area. In addition, a stall was held at the Sports Conference organised by this Council on 19 May 2025 for organisations involved in sport and activity provision in the District (including the review area). From those events the list of stakeholder organisations had been expanded and contact details obtained.

The terms of reference included the following text:

*“The District Council would expect there to be a minimum number of responses from the population to trigger a draft recommendation for parish arrangements to be made in the review area. This number would be 5% of the electors involved. A greater level of support would be expected for such a draft recommendation to be made a final recommendation.*

*If more than one option is supported at the draft or final recommendation stage then the support from the local electorate for those options will be measured against one another to determine whether the trigger point has been achieved.”*

Those words were in the original draft approved by Council on 26 November and had remained in the revised set out at Appendix A to the Officer report.

The reference to minimum levels of support was not explicitly referenced in the 2007 Act or the statutory guidance mentioned in the Officer report. However, they were included as a means of reassurance to the public that this whole exercise had not simply been predetermined and their say on the matter was important.

Members also heard that the legal framework which the proposals for the community governance review of Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea and Jaywick Sands had been prepared was set out in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. Tending), had the power to determine such matters as whether to parish an area, to amend parish areas, to change electoral arrangements for parish councils and to remove moribund parishes following a process defined as a community governance review.

In this case, a community governance review had been instigated by the relevant principal council (this Council). In undertaking community governance reviews, principal councils are required, by section 100(4) of the 2007 Act, to have regard to this guidance which was issued by the Secretary of State, under section 100(1) and (3), and the LGBCE under section 100(2) of the same Act. Due regard had been given to that guidance in the preparation of this report. The full guidance was available through the link later in this report.

At Full Council on 26 November 2024 (Minute 75 refers), in addition to approving a community governance review for Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea and Jaywick Sands, it was decided that this Committee would have the oversight role for community governance reviews undertaken by this Council. Community Governance reviews were defined as non-executive functions within the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) Regulations 2000 (as amended). Formal decisions around amending the Terms of Reference for the Review, approving final recommendations and any related Order were matters retained for Council.

The approved allocation of responsibilities in respect of community governance reviews between Council, this Committee and the Chief Executive were set out in Table No. 1 below:

**Table No. 1**

**Part 3 Schedule 2 - Responsibility for Council (Non-Executive) Functions**

<b><i>Functions relating to community governance reviews</i></b>	<b><i>Sections of Part 4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007</i></b>	<b><i>Functions being retained by Council, or delegated to Community Leadership Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee (CL OSC) or the Chief Executive (CX)</i></b>
<i>Duties relating to community governance reviews.</i>	<i>Section 79</i>	<i>Council</i>
<i>Functions relating to community governance petitions.</i>	<i>Sections 80, 83 to 85</i>	<i>Council</i>
<i>Functions relating to terms of reference of review.</i>	<i>Sections 81(4) to (6)</i>	<i>Council</i>
<i>Power to undertake a community governance review.</i>	<i>Section 82</i>	<i>Council</i>
<i>Functions relating to making of recommendations.</i>	<i>Sections 87 to 92</i>	<i>CL OSC to provide recommendation on sections 87 to 92 to Council</i>
<i>Duties when undertaking review.</i>	<i>Section 93 to 95</i>	<i>CX</i>
<i>Duty to publicise outcome of review.</i>	<i>Section 96</i>	<i>CX</i>
<i>Duty to send two copies of order to Secretary of State and Electoral Commission.</i>	<i>Section 98(1)</i>	<i>CX</i>
<i>Power to make agreements about incidental matters.</i>	<i>Section 99</i>	<i>CL OSC to provide recommendation on section 99 to Council</i>

These costs mentioned in the Officer report were determined in autumn 2024 and had been reassessed taking account of the revised costs of, mainly, mailing costs following increases in charges by Royal Mail on 7 April 2025 (of between 2.4-3.0%). The combined outcome of adjustments to the costs associated with the community governance review was that the overall cost had increased by £5,000 from £48,000 to £53,000. In addition, it was proposed that a sum of £10,000 be provided to facilitate the engagement with specialist bodies (such as the Society of Local Council Clerks) to support the review as needed. Lastly, as there currently was no contingency in respect of this project, it was proposed to create a contingency figure of £5,000. The contingency would hopefully enable any further increase in Royal Mail charges during the review to be absorbed. As such, the total budget for the community governance (with the £5,000 contingency) would be £68,000 rather than the £48,000 originally approved. One of the recommendations sought to address that point. In this way, electors and stakeholders in the review area could receive information from the Council, access to independent views on the subject could be secured and any unforeseen costs could be met within a revised budget for the review. Obviously, any unused funds could be reallocated by the Council at the end of the review.

<b>Questions from Members of the Committee:</b>	<b>Answers by Officers:</b>
---	-----------------------------

Can residents afford a Town Council for Clacton regarding the Council Tax?	The figure is within the Officer report with the average cost of Parish Councils in Tendring that Council Taxpayers are paying.
Could the consultation document say individual prices for each band in each area of Tendring for their Council Tax?	That could happen. The drafts of some of the materials already includes reference to the average cost of Band D so it would not take much to adjust that. Council Tax will go up next year anyway and LGR will need to harmonise the Council Tax rates across Braintree, Colchester and Tendring if they are the 3 that come together so it is hard to foresee what the impact of that will be for the Council Tax rates.

It was moved by Councillor Steady, seconded by Councillor Doyle and unanimously:-

**RESOLVED** that the Committee:-

- (a) endorses the approach proposed to the community governance review of Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea and Jaywick Sands set out;
- (b) provide such comments on the revised Terms of Reference for the review as the Committee considers necessary ahead of their publication on 1 July 2025;
- (c) determine to meet on the following dates for the purposes of overseeing the community governance review:  
  
Monday, 20 October 2025  
Monday, 16 March 2026 (replacing the scheduled meeting on 10 March 2026);  
and
- (d) recommend to Cabinet that the funding for the community governance review be increased to £68,000 based on the revised costings, the inclusion of up to £10,000 of support through the Society of Local Council Clerks and provision of £5,000 contingency.

7. **REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (CORPORATE POLICY AND SUPPORT) - A.2 - WORK PROGRAMMING – INCLUDING MONITORING OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY OF FORTHCOMING DECISIONS**

The Committee considered a report of the Assistant Director (Corporate Policy & Support) which provided an update on its approved Work Programme for 2024/25 (including progress with enquiries set out in its Work Programme), feedback to the Committee on the decisions in respect of previous recommendations from the Committee in respects of enquiries undertaken and a list of forthcoming decisions for which public notice had been given.

Members were reminded that the Council had commissioned the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny (CfGS) to undertake an 'Overview & Scrutiny Development Review' in 2021 as a way of further improving that function at the Council. Two relevant recommendations arising from that review had been:

***“Further strengthening the annual process for developing work programmes for each O&S committee - Engaging Members, Officers, partners and the public to prioritise the topics for review. This could include a selection criteria to identify appropriate topics for the work programme. Currently the work programme is also the last item on the agenda at O&S meetings, we would recommend bringing it to the beginning, so it can be given greater priority and benefit from more considered discussion, rather than being subject to the inevitable end of meeting fatigue.***

***Reviewing how the recommendations are made and how impact is measured – This could include putting the ‘recommendations monitoring report’ at the beginning of agendas to orientate O&S towards outcomes-focused meetings, alongside an emphasis on finding strong recommendations from questioning to present to Cabinet (or partners) as improvement or challenge proposals.”***

The inclusion of the matters set out in the “purpose of this report” section above sought further re-enforcement of the inter-relationship of the matters referred to. As such, it had been designed to further support consideration of work programming of the Committee and contribute to addressing progress with the Corporate Plan.

The detailed matters relating to the following matters had been set out in the relevant Appendix identified:

- (1) Work Programme for 2024/25 approved by Full Council on 6 August 2024 – Appendix A;
- (2) feedback to the Committee on the decisions in respect of previous recommendations from the Committee in respects of enquiries undertaken –Appendix B; and
- (3) a list of forthcoming decisions for which notice had been given since publication of the agenda for the Committee’s last meeting –Appendix C

In considering work programming matters, the Committee was further reminded of the other recommendations from the CfGS review undertaken in 2021:

***“Considering greater use of task and finish groups – This more informal type of O&S can allow improved cross-party working and detailed investigation of a single issue focussed on producing substantive recommendations.***

***Improved agenda planning and management - Committees should focus on one or two substantive items per agenda to allow for cross-cutting themes to be properly identified and explored, and different insights brought to bear on critical issues.***

***Considering how to engage the public in the work of O&S - This could include O&S going on more site visits in the community, inviting the public to offer ideas for work programmes, and greater use of social media channels for resident input and communicating the progress and impact of scrutiny work.***

***A clearer focus on democratic accountability - Scrutiny of Cabinet Members should form a key part of the work programme, providing an opportunity to hold the Leader and portfolio holders to account for delivery of the corporate plan and any other issues O&S feel is important.”***

---

The Community Leadership Overview and Scrutiny Committee was one of two overview and scrutiny committees established by the Council to specifically focus on the following areas of Council work (as detailed in Article 6.02(i) of the Council's Constitution):

*"To perform the role of Overview and Scrutiny and its functions in relation to*

- *Community Leadership developing the external focus of overview and scrutiny on "district-wide" issues' (and where appropriate sub regional, regional and national issues), in particular through collaborative work with local partner authorities, providers, stakeholders and members of the public.*
- *Approval of discrete researched and evidenced reviews on the effectiveness of partnership operating in the area with particular focus on:*
  - *Community Safety*
  - *Health and Well-being*
  - *Economy, Skills and Educational Attainment*
- *Community engagement, development and empowerment*
- *Economic Development, Regeneration and Freeport East*
- *Leisure and Tourism (except matters relating to budgets)*
- *Planning & Building Control and Strategic Planning (including the Local Plan)*
- *Emergency Planning*
- *To scrutinize/review the outcomes and implications for the Council of its financial support to community organisations and also from its receipt and use of funds received from local partner organisations.*

*The Community Leadership Overview & Scrutiny Committee will also act as the Council's designated "crime and disorder committee" for the purposes of Section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 and will have the power –*

- (a) to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities[\*] of their crime and disorder function;*
- (b) to make reports or recommendations to the local authority with respect to the discharge of those functions.*

*\*- "The responsible authorities" means the bodies and persons who are responsible authorities within the meaning given by section 5 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (c.37) (authorities responsible for crime and disorder strategies) in relation to the local authority's area.*

---

*In fulfilling that function the Community Leadership Overview & Scrutiny Committee will have the power (whether by virtue of section 9F(3) or 21(2) of the Local Government Act 2000 or regulations made under section 9JA(2) or 32(3) of that Act or otherwise) to make a report or recommendation to the local authority with respect to any matter which is a local crime and disorder matter in relation to a member of the authority.*

*The crime and disorder committee shall meet to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible authorities of their crime and disorder function as the committee considers appropriate but no less than once in every twelve month period.”*

The Constitution provides for the two overview and scrutiny committees to submit a work programme to full Council for approval. Rule 7 of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules sets out the position as follows:

*“Each Overview and Scrutiny Committee will submit a work programme for the year ahead and a review of the previous year’s activities to the full Council for approval. In addition it will be responsible for co-ordinating and prioritising its work programme on an ongoing basis.*

*In preparing, co-ordinating and prioritising its programme, each Overview and Scrutiny Committee will take into account:-*

- *The General Role and Principles of undertaking its functions, as set out in Part 2 Article 6;*
- *the planned work on the preparation of elements of the Budget and Policy Framework;*
- *provision for budget scrutiny and scrutiny of the Treasury Management Strategy, as appropriate;*
- *the need for statutory timetables to be met;*
- *the expressed wishes of the members of the committee;*
- *requests from the Cabinet to carry out reviews and/or suggestions from the liaison meetings held under the Cabinet Overview & Scrutiny Protocol; and*
- *requests from Members and/or Group Leaders in accordance with Rule 8.”*

In considering the Work Programme of enquiries, the Committee must have regard to the Corporate Plan 2024-28 and the themes of that Corporate Plan are:

- Pride in our area and services to residents
- Raising aspirations and creating opportunities
- Championing our local environment
- Working with partners to improve quality of life
- Promoting our heritage offer, attracting visitors and encouraging them to stay longer
- Financial Sustainability and openness

During the discussion of this report, it would be possible to receive an update of the work of the Task & Finish Groups established by the Committee, namely:

- Joint working with Parish and Town Councils; and
- Youth Provision for School Age Children outside of school

### **Work Programme – 2025/2026 Municipal Year**

Officers were continuing the process of developing the Committee's Work Programme for 2025/26. This would involve seeking suggestions from:-

- Members;
- the Leader of the Council and Deputy Leader of the Council (through a joint meeting under the Cabinet/Overview & Scrutiny Protocol with the Chairman of the two Overview and Scrutiny Committees, which will also involve the Chief Executive, the Corporate Director (Law and Governance) and the Assistant Director (Corporate Policy & Support);
- Management Team;
- Town and Parish Councils, partner agencies and community groups; and
- The public.

The Committee should be aware, that at present the Democratic Services Team were preparing to launch a consultation with the aim to capture the residents' and stakeholders' ideas as to what they think both Overview & Scrutiny Committees should be spending their time on.

The Democratic Services Team would also start talks with both the Chairmen of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees about the creation of the Scrutiny Annual Report for the year 2024/25.

Officers would then collate the replies received that were relevant to the Committee, associating suggestions with a corporate plan theme, identifying information sources and possible invitees and what might be the benefit of the enquiries. That collation would then be firstly discussed with the Chairman of the Committee and then by the Committee at an informal meeting, which would be arranged in due course.

The proposed Work Programme for 2025/26 together with the annual review of the work undertaken by the Committee during 2024/25 would be formally submitted to the Committee for its approval at a Special Meeting.

The Work Programme for 2025/26, as recommended by the Committee, together with the annual review of the work undertaken by the Committee during 2024/25, would then be submitted to Full Council for its approval.

The Committee also had an update on suicide rates across the District that Tendring had the 37<sup>th</sup> highest suicide rate per 100,000 population among local authorities in England and Wales.

It was unanimously:-



**RESOLVED** that the Committee:

- a) notes the progress with enquiries set out in its Work Programme 2024/25, plus any feedback to the Committee on the decisions in respect of previous recommendations and the list of forthcoming decisions;
- b) invites oral updates on the work of the two Task and Finish Groups established by the Committee (as referenced in the Work Programme at Appendix A of the Officer report):
  - (i) Joint working with Parish and Town Councils; and
  - (ii) Youth Provision for School Age Children outside of school.
- (c) notes the arrangements that are being made for the Committee to consider and decide in due course its Work Programme for 2025/26; and
- (d) agrees that a Special Meeting of the Committee be held on Tuesday 29 July 2025 to enable the Committee to approve the Work Programme for 2025/26 together with the Annual Review for 2024/25.

The meeting was declared closed at 9.11 pm

**Chairman**