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

Present:	Councillors Steady (Chairman), Barrett (Vice-Chairman), Alexander, Codling, Doyle, Griffiths and Oxley
In Attendance:	Lisa Hastings (Corporate Director (Law & Governance) & Monitoring Officer), Keith Simmons (Assistant Director (Corporate Policy & Support) & Deputy Monitoring Officer), Nikki Nepean (Elections & Member Support Manager), Katie Koppenaal (Democratic Services Officer) and Bethany Jones (Democratic Services Officer)

19. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Davidson, with no substitution appointed and Councillor Ferguson, for who Councillor Alexander was appointed as her substitute.

20. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

It was unanimously **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday, 23 September 2025, be approved as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Griffiths sought clarification as to whether Ward Councillors representing areas subject to the Community Governance Review, referenced in Minute 23 below, were required to declare an interest in that item. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that a formal declaration was not required in respect of that item.

Subsequently, there were no declarations of interest made by Councillors in relation to any item on the agenda for this meeting.

22. 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.

23. REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (CORPORATE POLICY AND SUPPORT) - A.1 - COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Members of the Committee were reminded of the approved terms of reference for the Community Governance Review of Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea and Jaywick Sands and its implementation up until the point of the current meeting. Further to this, the Committee was advised of the outcome of the Phase I consultation exercise (Stage 2 in

the Terms of Reference Timeline) as part of that Review (including the expenditure that had been incurred to date). Taking account of that outcome, the Committee had been invited to approve the basis of the Phase II consultation (Stage 4 in the Timeline) around the creation of separate Parishes for the three separate communities within the review area. In preparation for the Phase II consultation, information had been sought from by the Essex Association of Local Councils around the base costs of possible Local Councils for the three separate areas and the outcome of discussions with the Ward Councillors had shaped the proposed boundaries for three Parishes to then be consulted upon.

It was reported that the Community Governance Review (CGR) for Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea, and Jaywick Sands had begun on 1 July 2025, as a consequence of the publication of the Terms of Reference for that Review.

By way of chronology around governance for the CGR, the following provided a timeline:

- 21 October 2024 – Motion at Full Council seeking a report setting out the process for undertaking a CGR in the review area.
- 15 November 2024 – Report to, and approval from, Full Council for the CGR to be undertaken based on draft Terms of Reference, designation of the Community Leadership Overview and Scrutiny Committee as the oversight Committee for the CHR and authorisation of the Chief Executive to update the Terms of Reference and publish these on 1 July 2025.
- 20 December 2024 – Approval of funding of £48K by Cabinet to meeting the anticipated costs of the CGR (subject to a review being undertaken to ensure this would be sufficient).
- 17 June 2025 – Report to and decision of the Community Leadership Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the proposed commencement of the CGR and reference to the Cabinet in respect of an increase in the budget for the CGR to £68K. The Committee also approved a date for its review of the outcome of the first stage of consultation and preparation for the next phase. This was originally scheduled for 20 October and was, subsequently, rearranged to 17 November 2025.
- 27 June 2025 – Decision of Cabinet to accept the revised budget for the CGR and authorise expenditure of up to £68K on the CGR.
- 1 July 2025 – Formal decision of the Chief Executive to publish the Terms of Reference for the CGR and thereby commence the review process.

The Committee heard that through the review to the Council could determine whether new parish or town councils should be created for those areas, which, collectively, were currently the only unparished parts of the District. Together, they included around 30,000 properties, 44,000 registered voters and many other stakeholders (including voluntary and community organisations) in the review.

Consultation & Engagement

It was reported that consultation and engagement with the general public and stakeholders had commenced on 1 July 2025. On this date the dedicated webpage had been launched on the Council's website. This domain had offered detailed information on the consultation and had provided the approved Terms of Reference. The web page had also provided links to consultation surveys for each of the three areas and had

provided details of public meetings to be held in each of the three areas covered by the review.

As part of the communications plan for the CGR, pull up banners had been produced providing a QR code specific to the area in which they had been placed. The QR code linked directly to the consultation pages and surveys. When the pull-up banners had been placed in the designated sites, there had also been leaflets and paper surveys about the CGR. In addition, each banner placement had a ballot box, with the intention of receiving completed consultation surveys. Those sites were:

- Sunspot Jaywick, Brooklands, Jaywick
- Holland-on-Sea Public Hall, Frinton Road, Holland-on-Sea
- Pier Avenue Council Office, Pier Avenue, Clacton-on-Sea
- Town Hall, Station Road, Clacton-on-Sea

Those locations had been checked on a weekly basis where submitted survey forms were collected and blank forms and leaflets replenished.

It was further reported that landscape banners advertising the CGR had been attached to railings in areas of high vehicular use in Holland-on-Sea, Clacton-on-Sea and Jaywick Sands. There had additionally been a banner displayed on the railings of the Town Hall in Clacton-on-Sea. Those banners held the same branding, CGR message and QR codes.

Members heard that press releases had been issued and a campaign on social media and local press began with regular advertising of the CGR emphasising the request for people to have their say. All communications had been branded to help reinforce recognition of the image and thus the consultation within communities. The media plan had continued through July, August and September with regular advertisements and pushes to maximise reach and responses.

Local shops and businesses in the review area had been approached to display leaflets and posters advertising the CGR and encouraging residents to have their say. Many premises had accepted the material and had displayed it during the Phase I consultation.

The Committee was informed that an email to 22,806 electors within the CGR area had been sent, which detailed the consultation, where to get further information and how to have their say. That had been followed by a letter to 30,000 households within the area. That contact followed the same basic format and content as the stakeholder communication.

As referenced in the CGR communications and web information on the CGR, four public meetings had been held during Phase I of the CGR consultation. Those meetings had been held as follows:

Date	Time	Location
Monday 28 July	6:30PM – 7:30PM	St Johns Church Hall, Great Clacton, St Johns Road, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 4BP
Tuesday 29 July	6:30PM – 7:30PM	Sunspot, Business Centre, Jaywick

		Sands, Brooklands, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 2JG
Wednesday 30 July	6:30PM – 7:30PM	Essex Hall, Town Hall, Station Road, CO15 1SE
Thursday 31 July	7:00PM – 8:00PM	Holland Public Hall, 137-139 Frinton Road, Holland-on-Sea, CO15 5UR

Timeline

It was reported that the Terms of Reference for this Community Governance Review had referenced an original timeline. The Stage 3 process (consideration of the Phase I consultation) had required more time than originally envisaged and, on that basis, the Committee had been invited (in the recommendations to report A.1) to agree to a revised timeline.

Financial Position

Members were informed that a budget of £68,000 had been allocated for the Community Governance Review. The costs incurred to date had been summarised below:

Newspaper Adverts/Online	£1,080.00
Letters to households	£22,446.95
Freepost postage charge	£2,426.60
Banner Signs	£455.00
Look Magazine	£504.00
Commissioned work with community groups	£4,825.00
Social media Paid for Posts	£178.75
Public Meetings/Miscellaneous costs	£113.98
TOTAL (so far)	**£33,030.28**

It was reported that on the basis that the phases of consultation had required the vast majority of costs to be incurred, and the Council had completed one of the two main phases of consultation, there had been good reason to believe that the costs of the review could be contained within the budget referred to. That had been dependent upon the second phase of the consultation mirroring the consultation and engagement approach from the first consultation, which had formed the basis of one of the recommendations to the Committee.

Questions by Members:	**Answers:**
Could you please provide further clarification regarding the "special expenses" associated with "Open Space, Playgrounds, and Recreation" costs incurred within the review area referred to in the report?	(Keith Simmons) Tendring District Council currently bears the cost of maintaining those public spaces within the designated unparished area, and such expenses would typically fall under the responsibility of a Parish Council. As such, these specific 'special expenses' were applied currently to Council Tax payers solely in the unparished area. In the event that these areas became parished, the associated District Council

	maintenance costs would need to reflect the actual costs relevant for the new Parish/Parishes and so Council Tax amounts for those new Parishes would be different to now. In addition, there may be certain of these costs that could be the subject of asset transfers from the District Council and so could, again, lead to differences in Council Tax from now.
What would be the potential impacts of constructing the proposed 900 new homes within the designated area of West Clacton and Jaywick Sands in terms of the Community Governance Review? Specifically bearing in mind the number of Councillors allocated to that area.	(Keith Simmons) The Terms of Reference incorporate electorate projections through to 2029/30. Based on the most reliable guidance from the Council's planning department, anticipated growth is approximately 200 individuals. This projection has been carefully considered in relation to the overall number of Councillors. It underscores the importance of conducting periodic Community Governance Reviews, as the population within the area is expected to increase over time.
For the areas that appear not to receive delivery of Look Magazine, what methods were used to engage with those residents?	(Keith Simmons) To some extent, there is an element of differential coverage, which is why Phase I of the consultation employed a wide range of communication methods. We made a concerted effort to ensure broad coverage, including the use of extensive printed materials. We would take this issue into account in the Phase II consultation.
Given the geographical distance from Jaywick, would it have been more appropriate to include residents living at the top of Jaywick Lane and along St Johns Road within the Parish of Clacton-on-Sea, rather than within the Jaywick area?	(Keith Simmons) A range of options was carefully evaluated in relation to this matter. Feedback has been received from residents via the Ward Councillors, indicating a general preference for the proposed approach. However, it has been clearly communicated throughout these discussions that if residents express opposition without offering viable alternatives, the outcome may be that the area remains unparished.
Is there a nationally established framework for determining comparator-based costs? I am referring to significant differences in the number of electors, as well as in staffing costs and hours, between proposed parishes and	(Keith Simmons) No, there isn't a national indicator, which is why we are collaborating with the Essex Association of Local Councils. While we have not yet received the specific details, they are in the process of providing us with

some of the existing ones.	baseline cost estimates. It's important to note that each parish council operates differently, as they shape their services to meet the unique needs of their local communities.
What impact will the establishment of a unitary authority have on the process, or is that still unclear?	(Keith Simmons) There remains a significant degree of uncertainty regarding the financial outlook for the Council. This includes not knowing the detailed outcome of the UK Government's Fairer Funding Review. Until the review concludes, it is difficult to assess its implications for this Council (both in the immediate term and over the next two years) and the local provision of adult and child social services and highways. A key area of concern is the unknown impact of disaggregation costs, which could lead to varying levels of service demand across three to five potential unitary authorities. This variability makes it challenging to determine the appropriate level of council tax to be set, particularly in relation to critical services such as those adult and children's social care and highways maintenance. While some degree of alignment between the existing districts is anticipated, this process has yet to be fully realised.
Should the consultation prove successful, would there be scope to establish a shadow council comprising current councillors from the relevant areas?	(Keith Simmons) Subject to a positive outcome from the consultation, the Essex Association of Local Councils (EALC) has offered its support in helping to establish the necessary policies and services. Consideration will also be given to any potential roles for existing councillors in the period from any decision to establish new parishes to the point these parishes came into being. Interim Parish Council positions will be in place from 1 April up to new parish councillors being elected. The interim Parish Council could look at adopting interim policies and overseeing the appointment of an interim Parish

	Council Clerk.

It was moved by Councillor Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Codling and **RESOLVED** that the Committee:

(a) notes the content of the report in so much as it reminds it of the approved terms of reference for the Community Governance Review of Clacton-on-Sea, Holland-on-Sea and Jaywick Sands and its implementation to this point;

(b) notes the outcome of the Phase I consultation exercise (Stage 2) in the Terms of Reference Timeline) as part of that Review (including the expenditure occurred to date), comparator information around the base costs of Local Councils for the three separate areas and the outcome of discussions with the Ward Councillors that has shaped the proposed boundaries for the three possible Parishes;

(c) approves the basis of the Phase II consultation for the Review around the draft recommendations set out and involving the creation of separate Parishes for the three communities utilising the same engagement approach as adopted in the Phase I consultation;

(d) notes that further information has been commissioned from Essex Association of Local Councils in respect of Councillor numbers on the three possible new Parish Councils and indicative base costs for such Parish Councils and, together with Council Tax base information for the three areas concerned, this case be advised to consultees in the Phase II consultation and the level of Council Tax at Band D this would equate to, to fund those base costs; and

(e) approves the revised timeline for the remaining elements of the Review as follows:

	Original Timeline	**Revised Timeline**
Stage 3: Consideration of submissions received and draft Recommendations and prepared	**October 2025**	**October - November 2025**
Stage 4: Draft Recommendations are published – consultation on them	**1 November 2025 – 31 January 2026**	**1 December 2025 – 28 February 2026**
Stage 5: Consideration of submissions received, and Final Recommendations are prepared and published; interested parties informed	**February 2026**	**March 2026**
Recommendation and draft Order submitted to Council	**March 2026**	**April 2026 (or May 2026 if the Council Meeting was itself changed)**
Application of Decision and reasoning and interested parties informed. Copy of	**As soon as practicable thereafter**	**As soon as practicable thereafter**

Order with map(s) placed on deposit and notification as required.		

24. REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (CORPORATE POLICY AND SUPPORT) - A.2 - WORK PROGRAMME - INCLUDING MONITORING OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY OF FORTHCOMING DECISIONS

Members had before them its approved Work Programme for 2025/26, feedback to the Committee on the decisions in respect of previous recommendations from the Committee in respect of enquiries undertaken and a list of forthcoming decisions for which public notice had been given.

Members had been invited to reappoint its existing Task and Finish Groups, whilst also considering consolidating these into a single, unified Task and Finish Group.

The Committee's Work Programme for 2025/26, as approved by Full Council at its meeting held on 14 August 2025, included the continuation of the work of the "Joint Working with Town and Parish Councils" Task and Finish Group and the "Provision of out of School Organised Activities and Events" Task and Finish Group. That Work Programme had set out an aspiration for the final report of those Task and Finish Working Groups to be submitted to the Community Leadership Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in December 2025. To facilitate this, Members were advised that the membership of those Task and Finish Working Groups had been required to be determined at this meeting.

A list of the nominations for each of the Task and Finish Groups had been circulated as follows:

Joint Working with Town and Parish Councils
- Councillor Steady
- Councillor Ferguson
- Councillor Sudra

Provision of out of School Organised Activities and Events
- Councillor Barrett
- Councillor Oxley

It was reported that following the last meeting of the Community Leadership Overview and Scrutiny Committee, held on 23 September 2025, it had been agreed that the Crime and Disorder (Familial Violence/Abuse) Task and Finish Group would not be reappointed and that any further matters relating to such matters would be reported directly to the Committee.

Members were reminded that it had been previously proposed that, considering the limited number of nominations, a single Task and Finish Group be established. That group would allocate dedicated time periods to conduct enquiries and draw its membership from the volunteers listed above.

The Committee was informed that Officers had recently convened with colleagues from Thanet District Council to discuss their ADSO award-nominated initiative focussed on strengthening engagement with the local college and facilitating the recruitment of T-Level students into the Democratic Services Team. The collaborative effort had aimed to enhance educational partnerships and support early career pathways into Local Government. A summary of the meeting outcomes had been provided as Appendix D to the main report (A.2).

It was reported that there had been discussions between Officers and the new Integrated Care Board (ICB) as well as KonectBuses to explore the opportunity of senior staff from each service attending the Community Leadership Overview and Scrutiny Committee in January 2026.

It was moved by Councillor Oxley, seconded by Councillor Griffiths and unanimously **RESOLVED** that the Committee:-

(a) notes its approved Work Programme for 2025/26 (Appendix A) together with the feedback to the Committee on the Executive's decisions made in respect of previous Committee recommendations (Appendix B), and the list of forthcoming decisions (Appendix C);

(b) notes the remaining contents of the report including the informal notes of an Officers' meeting with Thanet District Council regarding an insight into their T-Level programme;

(c) authorises the Assistant Director Corporate Policy and Support, in consultation with the Committee's Chairman, to determine means for pursuing the enquiries to be allocated to Task and Finish Groups, and to appoint to Task and Finish Groups and to make arrangements for the Task and Finish Groups so established to meet; and

(d) notes the prospective opportunities detailed by officers in relation to the attendance of staff from the new Integrated Care Board and KonectBuses at its January 2026 meeting.

The meeting was declared closed at 8.38 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank