



**MEETING** : OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
**VENUE** : COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD  
**DATE** : TUESDAY 16 SEPTEMBER 2025  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

**PLEASE NOTE TIME AND VENUE**

This meeting will be live streamed on the Council's Youtube page:

<https://www.youtube.com/user/EastHertsDistrict>

**MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

Councillor David Jacobs (Chair)

Councillors D Andrews, P Boylan, E Buckmaster, R Carter, N Clements,  
N Cox, C Horner (Vice-Chairman), S Marlow, S Nicholls, Smith,  
M Swainston, G Williams, D Woolcombe and J Wyllie

**Substitutes**

Conservative Group:	Councillors A Holt and G Williamson
Green Group:	Councillors V Burt, V Smith and S Watson
Labour Group:	Councillor C Redfern
Liberal Democrat Group:	Councillor R Townsend
Reform:	Councillor G McAndrew

*(Note: Substitution arrangements must be notified by the absent Member to Democratic Services 24 hours before the meeting).*

**CONTACT OFFICER: PETER MANNINGS**  
**01279 502174**  
[PETER.MANNINGS@EASTHERTS.GOV.UK](mailto:PETER.MANNINGS@EASTHERTS.GOV.UK)

## **Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

A Member, present at a meeting of the Authority, or any committee, sub-committee, joint committee or joint sub-committee of the Authority, with a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) in any matter to be considered or being considered at a meeting:

- must not participate in any discussion of the matter at the meeting;
- must not participate in any vote taken on the matter at the meeting;
- must disclose the interest to the meeting, whether registered or not, subject to the provisions of section 32 of the Localism Act 2011;
- if the interest is not registered and is not the subject of a pending notification, must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days;
- must leave the room while any discussion or voting takes place.

## **Public Attendance**

East Herts Council welcomes public attendance at its meetings and meetings will continue to be live streamed and webcasted. For further information, please email [democraticservices@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@eastherts.gov.uk) or call the Council on 01279 655261 and ask to speak to Democratic Services.

The Council operates a paperless policy in respect of agendas at committee meetings and the Council will no longer be providing spare copies of Agendas for the Public at Committee Meetings. The mod.gov app is available to download for free from app stores for electronic devices. You can use the mod.gov app to access, annotate and keep all committee paperwork on your mobile device.

Visit <https://www.eastherts.gov.uk/article/35542/Political-Structure> for details.

### **Audio/Visual Recording of meetings**

Everyone is welcome to record meetings of the Council and its Committees using whatever, non-disruptive, methods you think are suitable, which may include social media of any kind, such as tweeting, blogging or Facebook. However, oral reporting or commentary is prohibited. If you have any questions about this please contact Democratic Services (members of the press should contact the Press Office). Please note that the Chairman of the meeting has the discretion to halt any recording for a number of reasons, including disruption caused by the filming or the nature of the business being conducted. Anyone filming a meeting should focus only on those actively participating and be sensitive to the rights of minors, vulnerable adults and those members of the public who have not consented to being filmed.

## AGENDA

1. Apologies

To receive apologies for absence.

2. Minutes - 10 June 2025 (Pages 5 - 19)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2025.

3. Chair's Announcements

4. Declarations of Interest

To receive any Members' Declarations of Interest.

5. Review of Resident Permit Zone Policy (Pages 20 - 31)

6. Scrutiny of Registered Providers' Communications Methods (Pages 32 - 42)

7. Waste Collection Contract Interim Progress Report - Verbal Update

8. Feedback from the Executive

9. Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Draft Work Programme (Pages 43 - 48)

10. Urgent Items

To consider such other business as, in the opinion of the Chairman of the meeting, is of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration and is not likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information.

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,  
WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD ON TUESDAY  
10 JUNE 2025, AT 7.00 PM

---

PRESENT: Councillor D Jacobs (Chair)  
Councillors E Buckmaster, R Carter,  
N Clements, A Holt, C Horner, S Marlow,  
S Nicholls, Smith, M Swainston,  
D Woollcombe and J Wyllie

ALSO PRESENT:  
  
Councillors B Crystall, B Deering and  
J Dumont

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Michele Aves	- Committee Support Officer
Carol Bulloch	- Systems and Support Manager
James Ellis	- Director for Legal, Policy and Governance and Monitoring Officer
Peter Mannings	- Committee Support Officer
Brian Moldon	- Director for Finance, Risk and Performance
Ben Wood	- Director for Regeneration, Customer and Commercial Services
Neil Wright	- Shared Service Manager – Benefits

72 APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR

It was proposed by Councillor Swainston and seconded by Councillor Nicholls, that Councillor Horner be appointed Vice-Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the 2025/26 civic year. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED** – that Councillor Horner be appointed Vice-Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the 2025/26 civic year.

73 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Andrews and Cox. It was noted that Councillor Holt was substituting for Councillor Andrews.

74 MINUTES - 4 MARCH 2025

Councillor Nicholls proposed and Councillor Swainston seconded, a motion that the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2025 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED** – that the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2025, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

75 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair welcomed Members to the first meeting of the new civic year, and he welcomed anyone watching on the webcast. The Chair welcomed Councillor Smith to his first meeting of the committee. He also welcomed back Councillor Wyllie.

Members were reminded to use their microphones as the meeting was being webcast.

76 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

77 REFRESHED LEAF PRIORITIES AND ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2024-25

---

Councillor Crystall, Leader of the Council, submitted a report that provided Members with an update in respect of performance against LEAF priorities over the 2024/25 year, and the proposed amended LEAF priorities for the 2025/26 year onwards.

Councillor Crystall said that the first corporate plan was presented to council in February 2024. He said that this document had been refreshed with some amendments. He welcomed comments, suggestions and questions from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor E Buckmaster asked for clarification to the changes in the Annual Report, and he asked for some of the important examples. Councillor Crystall said that there was an addition in the first section of the corporate plan which was to strive to achieve excellent customer service.

Members were advised about a further addition which was to engage the community in local government reorganisation. The Leader said that under the environmentally focussed section, there was an addition which was maximising the positive environmental impacts of the delivery of the new waste contract.

The Leader explained that there was a modified section marked as new, which was encouraging residents to play their part in supporting local wildlife and improving our natural environmental and supporting the delivery of the Hertfordshire Nature Recovery Strategy. Lastly, he said that there was a new item under the heading acting with the community, entitled creating a new long asset management plan based on community values.

Councillor Crystall advised that there were modifications to wording where policies were originally being developed and now being implemented. Councillor Wyllie asked what the council would be doing differently to achieve excellent customer service.

Councillor Crystall said that a council would always strive to achieve excellent customer service. He said that the corporate plan provided a focus for how Officers behaved, and the kind of things that they treated as the most important.

Councillor Dumont said that the council was seeking to achieve a nationally recognised accreditation or award known as customer service excellence. He said that Officers had recently engaged with an assessment body, and an internal audit and assessment which involved collating information about systems and processes, and this was due to be completed by the end of June.

Members were advised that this information would be reviewed by the accreditation body for review and audit. The Council would be informed after this whether the accreditation standard had been met.

Councillor Nicholls expressed a concern regarding inclusivity in customer services. She cited an example of a resident who did not have access a computer and had struggled to get answers to a council tax support query by telephone. She asked if there was a drive to making the digital service more comprehensive to free up telephone capacity for people who struggled online.

The Director for Regeneration, Customer and Commercial Services said that the general direction of travel was to address more queries digitally to free up more time for the complex queries to be handled face to face in the reception with customer services. He said that the number of digital contacts had increased significantly and face to face contacts had decreased. Members were



advised that the customers coming into receptions had more complex needs, and the time spent dealing with customers face to face had remained unchanged albeit with fewer customers. He said that the time spent with customers face to face was still important to the council.

Councillor Swainston asked if there was a confidence that everything was being done to advertise how to contact the council, be it online or through any other means. Councillor Crystall said that even though every attempt was made to get information across, the council could never reach everyone, and the council could never be confident that enough had been done.

Councillor Woollcombe asked if there could be more detail in respect of ideas regarding engaging with the community on the topic of local government reorganisation. He talked about community forums and asked about a schedule for town hall meetings in communities across Hertfordshire.

Councillor Crystall said that there was a draft timetable, and recommendations had to be submitted to the government by 28 November 2025. He said the county councils and the 10 districts and boroughs had submitted interim initial proposals in March.

Councillor Crystall said that business models were being developed for the different potential proposals for 2, 3 or 4 unitary councils. He said that councils were still waiting for clarity on an outline from central government in terms of details for consultation. He said a public consultation could be due in September, and this was reliant on discussions due to take place before then in respect of financial modelling in terms of financial performance or the different models.

Councillor Clements said that as resources were quite limited, which matters would be given a lesser priority or removed to make way for new priorities in the corporate plan. He referred to the current reception opening hours

and asked about digital inclusion and what this would mean for people who struggled to access services online and needed face to face support.

Councillor Crystall said that some items were removed from the plan as projects were completed. He said that budget setting was a process, and this was always going to be challenging. He said that as regards the opening of the offices to the public, everything had to be considered as part of the budget setting process, and some matters would be removed as things Members would not support.

Councillor Crystall said that it was important to say that he did not feel that the council would end up in a situation where offices would be closed to residents. The Director for Regeneration, Customer and Commercial Services reiterated his point about the data and fewer people coming to reception but with more complex needs.

The Director for Regeneration, Customer and Commercial Services said that cutting hours back further would be a false economy. He advised that conversations were ongoing with community-based partners about co locating and referred to the offices in Bishop's Stortford only being used two days a week.

Councillor Dumont reiterated that he was keen to avoid the impression being drawn that the council was looking to reduce access for vulnerable residents who could not communicate with the council without coming to the offices.

Councillor Buckmaster referred to the metrics in terms of trends in homeless households. He referred to the leasing of 5 self-contained flats in Hertford, and the upward trend in the number of homeless households. He asked if the 5 self-contained flats were sufficient to address that situation. Councillor Crystall referred to wider national political issues that were driving that trend, which was outside of the council's control. He said that all the council could do was match the demand as best it could.

The Director of Regeneration, Customer and Commercial Services responded to a question from Councillor Nicholls regarding the website rating (govmetric) and the viewing figures for the new website since this was launched 5 years ago. He said that there was now little in the way of meaningful data and a different approach was being explored in the different platform called engage HQ.

Councillor Horner said that he was pleased to see that the forward plan was much more populated than it had been previously. He talked about the Local Cycling, Walking and Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and EV Chargers. He said that stimulating EV charging to increase the number of EV vehicles on the roads. He also mentioned homelessness and the importance of increasing the availability of affordable living accommodation.

Councillor Crystall said that the tender for EV chargers was launched in November 2024. The Director for Regeneration, Customer and Commercial Services said that once the tender process had completed, an update would follow outside of the meeting. He said that the number of homes delivered by the council in 2024/25 was really good.

Councillor Jacobs referred to an apparent disconnect between the actions under section (f) in respect of delivering the cultural strategy, and whether these actions would help the council be fairer and more inclusive. He referred to the delivery the cultural strategy and whether this made East Herts fairer and more inclusive.

Councillor Crystall referred to the Arts in East Herts programme and said that being fair and inclusive could mean a lot of things. He said that this programme was a way of bringing people together who would not normally be involved in those activities. Councillor Dumont said that the services that the council provided tied in with the aspiration of providing the best possible customer service for residents and to be as efficient as possible.

Councillor Buckmaster emphasised the importance of enabling people to have access to arts and culture. He said that some aspects of arts and culture could be exclusive only to those who could afford it.

Councillor Nicholls proposed, and Councillor Clements seconded, a motion that performance over the 2024/25 year be reviewed, and Members review the proposed amended LEAF priorities for 2025/26 and make any recommendations for Executive or Council to consider.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED** – that (A) performance over the 2024/25 year be reviewed; and

(B) Members review the proposed amended LEAF priorities for 2025/26 and make any recommendations for Executive or Council to consider.

## 78 COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME

The Director for Finance, Risk and Performance submitted a report that updated members on the work undertaken so far in respect of the Council Tax Support Scheme, and in respect of consultation with both the public and the Major Precepting Authorities in respect of proposed changes to the Council's Council Tax Support Scheme with effect from 1 April 2026.

The Director of Finance, Risk and Performance said that the current scheme commenced in 2013, when it moved from a government scheme to a local scheme. He said that at that time, central government passported 90% of the cost in the form of funding to the council to administer the new council tax support scheme.

Members were reminded that the scheme had to be approved by the Council each year as part of the budget process. The Director of Finance, Risk and Performance said the scheme had not changed much since it was introduced in 2013, and pensioners could get up to 100% support, and working aged people could get up to 91.5% support.

The Director of Finance, Risk and Performance said that new scheme for 2026/27 would involve a move to a banded scheme. He said that the main benefit of the banded scheme for an individual was that their income could fluctuate up and down within the band without a reassessment.

Members were advised that this process would mean that the council would not have to carry out regular reassessment activity and gave assurance to individuals in avoiding weekly or monthly reassessments. The Director of Finance, Risk and Performance said that the scheme that would be brought forward later in the year for approval would aim to be a cost neutral scheme and there would be public consultation later this year once this process was completed.

The Director of Finance, Risk and Performance said that the scheme was still being finalised and might fluctuate slightly, and one of the recommendations that went to Executive on 3 June 2025 had changed to reflect that. Members were advised that the final proposed scheme would be signed off by the Director of Finance, Risk and Performance and the Executive Member for Financial Sustainability for consultation.

The Director of Finance, Risk and Performance said that the matter would come back to Full Council for final approval around November 2025, with a proposal for a new council tax support scheme for 2026/27 following consultation.

Councillor Nicholls said that there was only one option for changing the system and she asked if this was based upon examples from councils that had already adopted a similar scheme and had this been a success and had there been any issues encountered.

The Shared Service Manager (Benefits) said that he had been extensively in contact with the other Hertfordshire Benefits Teams in respect of council tax support and the scheme had been very successful. He said the current scheme needed to be simplified and a lot of the working age recipients of council tax received universal credit and there was a monthly reassessment of their award.

Members were advised that Officers changed their council tax support award, which as well as being a piece of work for benefits staff also required the charge payer to be rebilled and new instalment plans set up.

The Shared Service Manager (Benefits) said that the means tested scheme was incompatible with some of the changes in the general benefits arena. The changes would simplify the scheme and make it fairer and would also cut down on administration and assist with collection rates.

Councillor Marlow asked what kind of savings might be made and where would these savings go, i.e. back to the council or to the government. The Shared Service Manager (Benefits) said that there would not be saving in the context of the scheme itself. He advised that the saving that might be generated was from less resources required within the benefits team to administer the actual reassessment of cases. Members were advised that the saving hopefully would be around improved collection rates for the council.

Councillor Horner welcomed a number of aspects of the proposed changes. He expressed a concern that where there was banding, there would be a regressive tendency on the margins of the council tax bands.

Councillor Horner asked about the amount in the scheme for the housing element of universal credit being disregarded. He urged Officers to specifically consult the agencies who supported residents who were on benefits and asked if there was a calculator for the public to be able to compare how the changes would affect particular groups.

The Shared Service Manager (Benefits) said that universal credit housing costs were not taken into account in respect of the assessment of council tax support. He said that there was a mechanism where officers evaluated the award of universal credit, and the same would apply to the banded scheme.

The Shared Service Manager (Systems, Support and Control) added that as modelling was still underway, Officers could add or remove certain disregards if required, and Officers also had some flexibility in respect of extending the council tax bands. She referred to moving the 20% cut off slight to something in the region of 15%. Members were advised that a consultant had been engaged to assist with the consultation, and some of this consultation would be digital.

Councillor Carter said that it made sense to have a simpler system, which would be easier to understand. She expressed a concern about residents who were going to lose their entitlement and asked about transitional protection for those who experience exceptional hardship. She asked if there was a possibility of tapering the transition to avoid a sudden shift in the system for council tax support.

Councillor Holt asked for some clarity in respect of new modelling of different case scenarios if more households qualified than expected. He asked about the exceptional hardship fund, and whether this was the same as the exceptional hardship scheme which was already implemented by the council.

The Director of Finance, Risk and Performance said that the hardship scheme was the same as the exceptional hardship scheme, and he could come back to Members re that funding in due course.

The Shared Service Manger (Systems, Support and Control) said that as regards modelling, there would be a range of modelling starting with the 100% entitlement down to also reducing the liability of that officers used for assessment.

The Director of Finance, Risk and Performance said that he could not comment on whether a transitional protection was possible for those who experience exceptional hardship. He said that Officers had noted that and look to incorporate this consideration into the modelling of scenarios.

Councillor Buckmaster said that scheme should be straightforward so that residents could understand the reasoning for why their benefits had changed. Councillor Jacobs said that the paper should explore some worked examples for when the consultation was due to commence.

Councillor Jacobs referred to the newly agreed protocol and the undertaking that the Executive to come back to Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the points that had been raised.

Councillor Nicholls proposed, and Councillor Swainston seconded, a motion that the Council Tax Support Scheme be considered and Members comments be provided to the Executive Member for Financial Sustainability for his consideration.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.



**RESOLVED** – that (A) the Council Tax Support Scheme be considered; and

(B) Members provide comments to the Executive Member for Financial Sustainability for his consideration.

79 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee Support Officer submitted the work programme report and Members were invited to consider and determine the work programme going forward. The Committee Support Officer mentioned the workshops that had been held in June 2024 and March 2025, and various topics had been added to the work programme.

The Committee Support Officer reiterated that there should be discussions or emails between Members and the chair to define those topics via scrutiny proposal forms to avoid these matters slipping further during the civic year.

The Director for Legal, Policy and Governance said that some of these topics had been on the work programme from the previous civic year. He reiterated that Officers needed to know which aspects of affordable housing and sustainable transport Members wanted to explore.

The Director for Legal, Policy and Governance said that Officers needed to pull information together and take this through Leadership Team before final amendments were made for reports to Overview and Scrutiny Committee. He said that scrutiny proposals forms should be submitted by the end of June for the meeting of the Committee in September.

Councillor Carter said that she had suggested the topic of sustainable transport following a report submitted back in 2017. She referred to recommendations made then and whether there had been progress since then.

Councillor Carter asked if there was a way for members to see a list of which topics the committee had consider over the last 5 years or so. Councillor Jacobs said that he would talk to the Committee Support Officer about this outside of the meeting.

Councillor Wyllie asked about the position of the Scrutiny Officer that had supported Members when he was previously on the committee. The Committee Support Officer explained that there was no Scrutiny Officer and he and a colleague shared the workload of supporting the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Nicholls said that she would do a scrutiny proposal form in respect of affordable housing or housing associations and accountability. Councillor Swainston said that some helpful documents had been circulated about the function of the scrutiny committee and some training information. She asked if this could be sent out again for the benefit of the new members of the committee.

Councillor Swainston proposed, and Councillor Carter seconded a motion that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programme be agreed. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED** – that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programme in Appendix 1 be agreed.

80 URGENT ITEMS

There was no urgent business.

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm

Chairman .....

Date .....
------------

# Agenda Item 5

## East Herts Council Report

### Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Date of meeting:** Tuesday 16 September 2025

**Report by:** Councillor Tim Hoskin – Executive Member for Environmental Sustainability

**Report title:** Review of Resident Permit Zone Policy

**Wards affected:** All Wards

### Summary

- This report seeks approval for targeted amendments to both East Herts District Council's (EHDC) Resident Permit Parking Schemes (RPZs) Operational Guidance and EHDC's Resident Permit Parking Policy.
- The proposed changes aim to enhance accessibility, reduce procedural barriers, and better align the guidance and policy with the Council's strategic priorities, including sustainability, air quality, community wellbeing, and economic growth.
- The recommendations are based on public feedback from the 2024 Parking Strategy engagement, independent review findings, and benchmarking against best practice from comparable local authorities.
- The following changes will also better align the Operational Guidance and the Parking Policy.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:**

**(A) Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider and provide comments on the following proposed changes within the Resident's Permit Zone (RPZ) Operational Guidance:**

- **That in relation to the requirement that non-resident parking must exceed 40% occupancy at peak times as a**

**condition for implementing an RPZ, this be reduced to 10% of occupancy at peak times;**

- **That the requirement for there to be sufficient kerb space to enable 75% of households in a proposed area to park one vehicle on-street as a condition for implementing an RPZ, be removed from the guidance;**
- **That in exceptional cases, officers may exercise discretion where local evidence and professional judgement support progression of a scheme.**

## **1.0 Proposal**

1.1 This report proposes targeted amendments to the East Herts District Council (EHDC) Resident Permit Parking Schemes (RPZs) Operational Guidance and the EHDC Resident Parking Policy. These amendments aim to:

- Reduce barriers to RPZ implementation, ensuring greater flexibility and responsiveness to local needs.
- Support the Council's strategic goals around sustainable transport, air quality, and town centre vitality.
- Reflect best practices from comparable councils, as identified in the independent review conducted by Citisense.
- Better reflect the lived experiences of residents in areas with high parking stress.
- Better align the requirements and language between the Operational Guidance and the Resident Parking Policy.

## **1.2 Specific changes recommended:**

- Amendment of the requirement that non-resident parking must be considered in awarding an RPZ scheme, specifically that non-resident parking must exceed 40% occupancy at times of peak demand as a condition for implementing RPZs.

- Current Policy:
  - Operational Guidance: Requires non-resident parking to exceed 40% occupancy at peak times.
  - Resident Permit Parking Policy: Requires that demand for parking exceed supply due to the presence of non-residents' vehicles.
  - Proposed Change: Amend this requirement by reducing the non-resident parking occupancy threshold from 40% to 10% to allow more holistic assessments based on local context, resident feedback, and officer observations. A provision for officer discretion is also recommended to ensure that borderline or exceptional cases can be considered where there is compelling evidence of need.
  
- Rationale:
  - This rigid threshold can prevent necessary schemes in areas with clear parking stress.
  - Other councils, such as Watford and Stevenage, have shifted away from this model in favour of more flexible, context-driven approaches.
  - Supports a more equitable distribution of parking resources, particularly in higher-density, mixed-use neighbourhoods.
  - Remove or reduce, to a minimum of 50%, the requirement that there be sufficient kerb space to enable 75% of households in a proposed area to park one vehicle on-street.
  
- Current Policy:
  - Requires that 75% of households in a proposed zone have on-street parking capacity for one vehicle.
  - Proposed Change: Remove or reduce this requirement to a minimum of 50% to reflect practical constraints in historic, mixed use or high-density areas.
  
- Rationale:
  - Many zones struggle to meet the current 75% kerb space requirement due to constrained street layouts, pre-existing loading restrictions, and competing demands for limited road space (e.g. bus stops, cycle lanes, junction protection).

- o Removing or reducing this requirement reflects the reality of historic, high-density or mixed-use areas where available kerb space does not correlate with the number of households.
- o It supports a more flexible, context-sensitive approach to RPZ design, allowing zones to be tailored to local needs without being constrained by a threshold.
- o This change enables the Council to better manage parking pressure and improve access for residents in areas most affected by congestion and competition for space.
- o It also recognises that not all parts of a zone need to provide parking in order to justify a permit scheme, especially where non-kerbside areas (e.g. shared surfaces, driveways or car-free developments) form part of a wider parking strategy.

1.3 These proposals are grounded in public consultation findings, benchmarking of best practice, and an independent review of EHDC's guidance conducted by Citisense. They aim to ensure the Council's RPZ approach is responsive, inclusive, and aligned with broader strategic objectives, including:

- Improving air quality and reducing carbon emissions by supporting sustainable travel.
- Enhancing local economic vitality by reducing commuter pressure on residential streets.
- Promoting fairness and accessibility for all residents, including those in higher-density areas.

## **2.0 Background**

2.1 EHDC's Resident Permit Parking Schemes Operational Guidance and Resident Permit Parking Policy sets out the criteria for implementing new RPZs and their operational details.

2.2 RPZs are designed to support residents in areas where on-street parking demand exceeds supply, reducing commuter parking and improving the quality of life in residential areas.

2.3 The Council's Parking Strategy (2024) committed to a review of its RPZ approach in response to community concerns about parking availability and enforcement. Public engagement during

the strategy's development revealed support for expanding resident parking and simplifying the process by which new zones are considered.

2.4 In early 2025, Citisense was appointed to independently assess the Council's RPZ Operational Guidance (East Herts RPZ Guidance Review Draft). The review concluded that certain requirements, particularly the 40% non-resident occupancy rule, may unnecessarily restrict the Council's ability to introduce schemes in areas of clear need and can be a barrier to effective parking management.

2.5 There is a current road map to create RPZs based on previous requests from residents and supported by Members (see Appendix A). As the current policy refers to only being able to progress two schemes in any year, due to Parking Service staff resource constraints, the current programme will end in 2028.

2.6 It is possible to begin the process the implementing more RPZs, however that will be contingent on bringing additional resources to the Parking Service to enable public consultation and project management of multiple schemes simultaneously.

### **3.0 Reasons**

3.1 The proposed amendments are driven by a combination of public demand, operational constraints, strategic alignment, and comparative best practice. Each of the specific changes responds to a clearly identified issue in the current guidance.

### **3.2 Amendment of the Operational Guidance to Reduce the Non-Resident Parking Occupancy Threshold from 40% to 10% with Provision for Officer Discretion**

3.3 Current requirement:

- Operational Guidance: The kerb space occupied by non-residents should be greater than 40% at times when parking problems caused by non-residents occur.
- Resident Permit Parking Policy: East Herts Council will prioritise residents' parking needs in primarily residential areas where there is evidence derived from surveys that



demand for on-street parking significantly exceeds supply, due to the presence of non-residents' vehicles.

#### 3.4 Why this is a barrier:

- It limits the Council's flexibility to act proactively where residents are clearly affected, but the 40% threshold is not met.
- Parking stress is experienced differently across neighbourhoods and is not always captured by a single metric like non-resident occupancy.
- The requirement may overlook other drivers of parking difficulty, such as:
  - Multi-car households competing for limited space.
  - Business, school, or visitor traffic that does not register as "non-resident" under the survey methodology.
  - Displacement from nearby RPZs or high-demand transport hubs (e.g. railway stations).

#### 3.5 Rationale for change:

- Removing this threshold and requirement empowers the Council to assess need using a more holistic and localised evidence base, including public feedback, officer observations, and strategic goals.
- It aligns with the approach taken by comparable local authorities who have moved away from rigid metrics in favour of broader parking management tools.
- It supports the principle of equitable treatment of residents, particularly in higher-density and mixed-use areas where competition for space is acute.

#### 3.6 **Removal or reduction, to a minimum of 50%, of the 75% Kerb Space Provision Requirement from the Operational Guidance**

### 3.7 Current policy issue:

The Operational Guidance currently requires that: There should be sufficient kerb space to enable a minimum of 75% of all households within the proposed scheme area to park at least one vehicle on-street.

### 3.8 Why this is a barrier:

- This standard is difficult to achieve in historic towns, flats, and areas with narrow roads or existing parking restrictions (e.g. loading bays, bus stops).
- It disadvantages higher-density housing areas, where space is inherently constrained and where the benefits of RPZs may be greatest.
- It implies a guarantee of parking availability, which may not be realistic or necessary for the effective functioning of a permit scheme.

### 3.9 Rationale for change:

- Relaxing this requirement allows schemes to be judged on practical need, rather than theoretical capacity.
- RPZs are not intended to guarantee a space for every household, but to manage demand and prioritise residential access in high-pressure areas, such as streets near town centres and transport hubs.
- Flexibility on this point will make it easier to support smaller or irregularly shaped zones that meet local demand but fall short of the 75% target.

## 4.0 Options

Option	Description	Assessment
<b>A. Do nothing</b>	Retain current RPZ thresholds and procedures	Maintains consistency but continues to limit RPZ delivery and does not support the delivery of the

		council's wider environmental and transport goals.
<b>B. Amend only the 40% threshold</b>	Reduce the occupancy requirement of non-residents' from 40% to 10%, retains consultation thresholds and kerb space criteria	Partial improvement; some community-supported schemes may still be blocked.
<b>C. Implement all proposed amendments</b>	Reduce the 40% threshold to 10% and relaxation of the kerb space criteria	Supports wider uptake, enables greater flexibility, and better aligns with local needs and national best practice.

## 5.0 Risks

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Increase in RPZ scheme requests post-amendment	Medium	Medium	Phased implementation and capacity planning

## 6.0 Implications/Consultations

6.1 There are no community safety implications arising from this report.

### Community Safety

Yes

### Data Protection

No

### Equalities

There are no direct equality, diversity, or inclusion implications in this report, however, where schemes are implemented in certain areas this could have a disproportionate impact on individuals or communities. For example, people who have regular carers/ members of their family undertaking caring responsibilities visit their property, who could previously park for free, would now have to acquire visitors permits at a cost to do so. This could have a disproportionate impact on those with

disabilities (for example). In such circumstances we would seek to gather information on the households within the permit area, seek to understand the impact and mitigate where possible (eg. extending concessions such as the current carers permit scheme). An individual equalities impact assessment needs to be undertaken for every area in which a new scheme is implemented.

### **Environmental Sustainability**

Yes, supports reduced car use and improved air quality – Improved management of kerb space will encourage sustainable travel modes and discourage excessive vehicle ownership, contributing positively to the Council's environmental targets.

### **Financial**

Changing the threshold for implementing new schemes could lead to increased costs of implementation, as more areas are keen to investigate them. However there is no specific budget available to support this and therefore funding for new schemes must be identified and approved (eg. through section 106 contributions). No schemes progress unless this is the case. The cost of operating RPZs is funded through the sale of permits and vouchers in accordance with the council's full cost recovery policy.

### **Health and Safety**

No

### **Human Resources**

No

### **Human Rights**

No

### **Legal**

Yes, parking polices form part of the council's Policy Framework at Section 3.2.1 of the Constitution. As such the decision to modify the Operational Guidance is reserved to Council.

### **Specific Wards**

No

## **7.0 Background papers, appendices and other relevant material**

- East Herts Parking Strategy 2024 - [Parking Strategy](#)

- Resident Permit Parking Schemes Operational Guidance - [Appendix A Revised EH RPZ Operational Guidance Nov 2020](#)
- Resident Permit Parking Policy - [Appendix A Revised RPZ Policy Nov 2020](#)
- Independent Review of East Herts' Resident Permit Zone (RPZ) Schemes Operational Guidance by Citisense - [Appendix G East Herts RPZ Guidance Review Draft.pdf](#)
- Appendix A – historical record of RPZ requests

#### Contact Member

Councillor Tim Hoskin - Executive Member for Environmental Sustainability. [tim.hoskin@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:tim.hoskin@eastherts.gov.uk)

#### Contact Officer

Benjamin Wood - Director, Commercial, Regeneration and Customer Services, Tel: 07519 293733. [benjamin.wood@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:benjamin.wood@eastherts.gov.uk)

#### Report Author

Dominique Kingsbury – Parking Services Manager, Tel: 01279 502036 [dominique.kingsbury@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:dominique.kingsbury@eastherts.gov.uk)

## Appendix A

### Historical requests for Resident Permit Zones by location

Location	Town	S106 available?	Possible other funding available?	Status
Park Road	Hertford	No	No	Previous surveys undertaken. Support from residents was evidenced via petition. The 40% threshold for non-resident parking was not met. With changes to operational guidance herein this is likely to lead to the criteria being met. However, without the requisite funding in place, this location is unlikely to be taken forward to the next stage.
Tamworth Road	Hertford	Yes	No	Previous surveys undertaken by Officers. The threshold was not met for considering an RPZ. With changes to operational guidance herein this is likely to result in the location going forward
Gladstone Road	Ware	Yes	No	Informal consultation with residents undertaken in June. However, the total number of responses by household failed to meet the 50% overall

				threshold required to take the scheme forward. Residents may be reconsulted in 12 months
New Road (part)	Ware	No	No	Request from Councillor for RPZ
West Street	Hertford	Yes	No	Previous surveys have taken place and the threshold was not met for considering an RPZ. With changes to operational guidance herein this may not be the case
Stortford Hall Park and Edens Close	Bishop's Stortford	No	Yes – possible support from MAG if we can demonstrate issued caused by airport parking	Request made however we need to obtain evidence on the impact of airport parking. MAG funding will only cover the implementation costs, not the evidence gathering and feasibility stages. Currently we have no identified funding
The Copse and Woodlands	Bishop's Stortford	No	Yes – possible support from MAG if we can demonstrate issued caused by airport parking	Request made however we need to obtain evidence on the impact of airport parking. MAG funding will cover the implementation costs, not the evidence gathering and feasibility stages. Currently we have no identified funding

# Agenda Item 6

## **East Herts Council Report**

### **Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**Date of meeting:** 16<sup>th</sup> September 2025

**Report by:** Councillor Sue Nicholls

**Report title:** Scrutiny of Registered Providers' Communications Methods

**Ward(s) affected:** All

### **Summary**

- This report discusses actions the Overview and Scrutiny Committee proposes to take to review methods used by registered providers of housing in the district, and the effectiveness of these methods, when they communicate with their tenants and customers, elected members dealing with constituent casework and council officers. Having conducted this review, the Overview and Scrutiny will be able to, should they wish, make recommendations regarding registered providers' means of communication to the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods for her consideration.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

- A) Approve the project plan at Appendix 1;**
- B) Approve the establishment of a task and finish group as outlined in the project plan.**

### **1.0 Background**

- 1.1 East Herts is a non-stock holding authority. The council, however, has a duty to allocate homes by means of nominations to registered providers. To aid this, the council maintains a housing register of people eligible and qualifying for access to affordable



rented housing provided by registered providers operating in the district.

- 1.2 There are 40 registered providers operating in East Herts with a total of over 9,700 homes between them.
- 1.3 The council has limited control over how registered providers (also known as housing associations) manage their homes and their communication with their customers, elected members and other stakeholders. Communications are key to resolving issues and the experience of tenants.
- 1.4 The Regulator of Social Housing (RSH) regulates registered social housing providers. The RSH is a stand-alone non-departmental public body of government. The Regulator of Social Housing sets consumer and economic standards for social housing providers and can act if these are breached. Individual complaints about social housing providers can be made to the Housing Ombudsman Service.

## **2.0 Purpose of the Review**

- 2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee have identified a need to scrutinise how registered providers communicate with their customers, elected members and councils and, importantly, how effective or otherwise these methods are. Members have told officers that they have received a considerable number of enquiries from tenants about the difficulty contacting their landlord, with many members experiencing similar problems.
- 2.2 It is worth bearing in mind that registered providers are inspected by the RSH in terms of how they communicate and engage with their customers and other stakeholders, as part of the nationally set Consumer Standards. This exercise is not intended to under the work of the RSH but instead to aid registered providers in reviewing and strengthening their communication processes, recognising the important role elected members and council officers also have in supporting residents.
- 2.3 Implicit in the emphasis placed in the council's Housing Strategy 2022-2027 on providing and enabling '*support for our most vulnerable residents*', is the council's ambition that all registered providers operating in East Herts have excellent customer care

ratings and so the council wishes to support providers to meet this aim through sharing best practice and establishing mechanisms for improved communication where this would benefit customers.

2.4 This scrutiny exercise seeks to examine how registered providers operating within East Herts communicate with their customers and with the council. The aims are to identify:

- areas for improvement by housing associations and/or the council
- examples of best practice that can be shared among housing associations
- potential issues for lobbying national bodies, such as regulators or government, to improve housing association communications.

### **3.0 Progress and Future Steps**

3.1 The project plan is shown as **Appendix 1** to this report and outlines the timeline to deliver the objectives in 2.4.

3.2 Work has commenced. An initial survey of registered providers has been developed and information gathering on current practices and processes, areas of good practice and any gaps has started.

3.3 It is proposed that the information gathered from registered providers will be shared at a task and finish group and for this group to make recommendations to Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It is proposed that to facilitate the development of the task and finish group, Overview and Scrutiny Committee agree a chair and the chair agrees the task and finish group membership and leads the work programme for this group. It is proposed that the task and finish group would consider the information from the register provider and council officer surveys and may request further information from registered providers, council officers or other stakeholders to inform their recommendations as required.

3.4 We anticipate an update report to the Overview and Scrutiny in November with a final report coming to Overview and Scrutiny Committee in January 2026 which will provide an update on the findings and recommendations identified.

3.5 The findings and recommendations will be presented to the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods for consideration.

#### **4.0 Reason(s)**

4.1 This report has been prepared as a direct response to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's wish to review the effectiveness of communication between registered providers, their customers, elected members and the council.

#### **5.0 Options**

5.1 To not undertake a review of potential opportunities for improved communications – NOT RECOMMENDED. The review into registered provider communication is within the remit of Overview and Scrutiny, in line with their role to represent the interests of residents.

#### **6.0 Risks**

6.1 The remit of Overview and Scrutiny is to help review and improve services and functions run by the council and its local partners. Therefore, there is no risk associated with this review.

#### **7.0 Implications/Consultations**

##### 7.1 Community Safety

a) Yes – the purpose of this review is to improve communication and customer experience and therefore would have a positive impact in terms of community safety as would ensure customer concerns are responded to at the earliest opportunity, preventing escalation of issues.

##### 7.2 Data Protection

a) Yes – legislation prohibits disclosure of personal information. Those taking part in this work would be reminded that no personal information should be shared in the process of the review and guidance provided about the depersonalisation of data

- 7.3 Equalities  
a) Yes – the purpose of this review is to improve communication and therefore would have a positive impact on customer service standards. This is particularly important for groups who find communication more challenging. This review will consider equalities issues in the recommendations made.
- 7.4 Environmental Sustainability  
a) None arising directly from this report.
- 7.5 Financial  
a) None arising directly from this report.
- 7.6 Health and Safety  
a) None arising directly from this report.
- 7.7 Human Resources  
a) None arising directly from this report.
- 7.8 Human Rights  
a) None arising directly from this report.
- 7.9 Legal  
a) None arising directly from this report.
- 7.10 Specific Wards  
a) None arising directly from this report.

## **8.0 Background papers, appendices and other relevant material**

6.1 Background Information: None

6.2 Appendices  
**Appendix A** - Project Plan  
**Appendix B** - Questionnaire

### **Contact Member**

Councillor Sue Nicholls, sponsor of review.

[sue.nicholls@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:sue.nicholls@eastherts.gov.uk)

### **Contact Officer**

Katherine Gilcreest, Housing Lead, Tel: 01992 532068

[katherine.gilcreest@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:katherine.gilcreest@eastherts.gov.uk)

**Report Author**

Katherine Gilcreest, Housing Lead, Tel: 01992 532068

[katherine.gilcreest@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:katherine.gilcreest@eastherts.gov.uk)

## Scrutiny of Housing Associations' Policies and Procedures Relating to Communication with Customers, Elected Members and Council Officers: Project Plan

---

### 1. Purpose of the Scrutiny Exercise

This scrutiny exercise seeks to examine how housing associations operating within East Herts communicate with their customers and with the council. The aims are to identify:

1. areas for improvement by housing associations and/or the council
2. examples of best practice that can be shared among housing associations
3. potential issues for lobbying national bodies, such as regulators or government, to improve housing association communications.

The findings and recommendations will be presented to the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods for consideration.

---

### 2. Scope of the Review

#### *In Scope*

The review will examine the mechanisms, policies and procedures that housing associations use to communicate with:

- customers (tenants, leaseholders, shared owners)
- elected members
- council officers.

Specific areas to be explored include:

- comments, compliments and complaints arrangements
- out-of-hours and emergency contact arrangements
- how communication channels are publicised by housing associations to their customers and the council
- the role housing associations believe elected members and officers should play in representing or advocating for customers' concerns.

#### *Out of Scope*

The handling of specific individual complaints is excluded from this review.

---

### 3. Methodology

The scrutiny process will follow three phases.

### Phase A – Fact-Finding and Evidence Gathering

- A questionnaire will be issued to all housing associations with properties in East Herts.
- A task-and-finish group will be established to gather further expert evidence (in writing or via in-person/online sessions).

### Phase B – Recommendation Formulation

- Survey results and evidence will be analysed by the task-and-finish group to identify key findings and proposed recommendations.

### Phase C – Reporting

- A report will be presented to Overview and Scrutiny Committee (O&S) containing recommendations for the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods.

## 4. Timeline and Responsibilities

When	What	Lead Responsibility
<b>Aug – Sept</b>	Draft questionnaire for housing associations	Katherine Gilcreest (KG), Assistant Director for Housing and Rupert Brandon (RB), Interim Housing Strategy & Development Lead
	Approve questionnaire	Approval via either (a) email sign-off from Cllrs Horner, Jacobs and Nicholls or (b) decision at O&S on 16 Sept. Approval route to be confirmed by Cllrs Horner, Jacobs, Nicholls
<b>Sept – Oct</b>	Distribute questionnaire and monitor/chase responses	Peter Mannings (PM), Acting Scrutiny Officer
<b>Sept – Dec</b>	Establish task-and-finish group	Approval sought by Cllr Nicholls at O&S on 16 Sept. Membership to be agreed at O&S or immediately thereafter. Report to be drafted by Jonathan Geall (JG), Director for Communities & KG
	Hold three task-and-finish group meetings: 1. gather evidence 2. gather further evidence 3. reflect on evidence and draft recommendations	Members supported by officers; KG & PM to arrange for expert witnesses
<b>Nov</b>	Update O&S on progress (4 Nov meeting)	Cllr Nicholls (or task group chair); report to be drafted by JG & KG; PM to invite Cllr Goldspink
<b>Jan</b>	Task group recommendations considered by O&S	Cllr Nicholls (or task group chair) to present; report to be drafted by JG & KG; PM to invite Cllr Goldspink

## **5. Possible 'Expert Witnesses'**

The O&S Committee and/or the task-and-finish group will finalise who they would like to gather evidence from. At the onset, members have already expressed an interest in the following 'expert witnesses':

- local housing associations, possibly focusing on the two with most stock in East Herts – Clarion and SNG
- the Housing Ombudsman and/or Social Housing Regulator
- a nearby stock-holding local authority
- Citizens Advice East Herts.

## **6. Expected Outcomes**

The scrutiny exercise will result in recommendations approved by the O&S Committee for the consideration of the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods. It is expected that the recommendations will cover, though they will not be limited to:

- ways to improve communication processes between housing associations and customers, elected members and council officers
- best practices for that can be promote across the social housing sector in East Herts by the council
- possible issues that the council may wish to lobby nationally for in relation to regulatory or policy changes that could improve housing association communication.

**Jonathan Geall**

Director for Communities

August 2025



**Questionnaire relating to Communication with Customers, Elected Members and Council Officers**

East Herts Council is seeking to scrutinise the different mechanisms used by Registered Providers to engage with their customers, Elected Members and council officers. The purpose of this review is to:

- identify and share best practice
- identify and develop mechanisms to strengthen relationships between Registered Providers, Elected Members and council officers which support parties to work together to resolve customer issues
- raise awareness of Registered Providers existing communication and complaints channels to prevent unnecessary duplication or escalation
- assist Registered Providers to continually improve their customer service mechanisms and evidence the Regulator of Social Housing requirements in this area.

The first stage of this review is to seek information about current processes and practice from all Registered Providers operating in East Herts, which can be accessed [here \(link to be included\)](#)

We would appreciate your help in providing the information requested. Following receipt of information, a task and finish group will be established to develop recommendations for Overview and Scrutiny Committee which is an important part of the local democratic process representing the interests of residents. More information about Overview and Scrutiny can be found at [Scrutiny | East Herts District Council](#)

Please complete this by Friday 24 October 2025

Thank you in advance for taking the time to provide your feedback. We are aiming to analyse feedback by 7 November 2025 with task and finish groups being arranged during November and December 2025.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact [Katherine.gilcreest@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:Katherine.gilcreest@eastherts.gov.uk)

**Survey Questions**

1. Name of Registered Provider
--------------------------------

2.	Name of person completing survey
3.	Contact details for person completing survey
4.	Please provide details of how your customers report complaints and comments, including links and telephone numbers
5.	Does your organisation currently compile details of preferred contact methods for your customers? How is this information used?
6.	What arrangements do you have for customers who are digitally excluded or have other vulnerabilities making communication more difficult? This could include arrangements such as, local office provision, advice surgeries, proactive visits or other initiatives
7.	Please provide details of your escalation process for complaints, including details of stages and response targets for each
8.	Is your complaints process published and if so, can you provide a link to this?
9.	Do you currently publish information from complaints and compliments and any service changes that have resulted from these?
10.	How do you currently deal with enquiries from Elected Members? Do you have a dedicated communication channel?
11.	Please provide details of your escalation process for enquiries from Elected Members, including details of any stages and response targets for each
12.	Would you be willing to provide a dedicated communication channel for East Herts Council's elected members?
13.	If you do not currently have a dedicated communication channel for Elected Members and believe this could be helpful to your organisation, have you any suggestions about how this could work and the timescales you would propose?
14.	How do you currently deal with enquiries from officers from the council? Do you have a dedicated channel for these enquiries?
15.	If you do not have a dedicated communication channel currently for officers of the council? Do you think this could be beneficial?
16.	Have you any best practice examples of communication with customers, Elected Members or the council which you would like to share which could be useful to other providers?
17.	Would your organisation be willing to provide more information to a task and finish group focused on improving communication? This could include providing more information in terms of your responses and/or attending a meeting to provide your views
18.	If your organisation would like to be involved in further work, who would be the contact for this?

## East Herts Council Report

### Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Date of meeting:** Tuesday 16 September 2025

**Report by:** Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Report title:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Draft Work Programme

**Ward(s) affected:** (All Wards);

### Summary

- This report considers topics for inclusion in the Committee's Draft Work Programme. By establishing a work programme of topics for scrutiny Members are better able to plan their future workload, with an agenda which is focussed, maximising the efficacy of the scrutiny process by taking a longer term, strategic view of the issues facing the council.
- A suggested list of topics is detailed in **Appendix A**.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**(A) That the work Programme at Appendix 1, be agreed.**

#### 1.0 Background

1.1 **Appendix 1** sets out the Draft Work Programme which may be reviewed at any time. Members are reminded to complete the scrutiny proposal form when putting forward an item for the draft work programme.

1.2 A key function of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is to hold the Executive to account for its decisions, to review existing policies and consider proposals for new policies. In doing so, it will act as the Executive's critical friend in the process. The principle power of scrutiny is to influence policies and decisions made by the Council. Its aim should be to achieve positive outcomes for local people by undertaking a thorough targeted

examination of the council's services and procedures and make recommendations for improvement.

- 1.3 It has no formal powers to make changes but where a recommendation is made to the Executive, the Executive is required to respond to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee if it decides not to accept a recommendation and the rationale for that decision. The Centre for Governance and Scrutiny (CfGS) recommends that the Executive has to respond to any recommendation within two months.

## **2.0 Update**

- 2.1 Topics for scrutiny at the following meetings are detailed in Appendix 1.

- 4 November 2025
- 20 January 2026
- 10 March 2026

- 2.2 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee met for a workshop on Thursday 27 March 2025, to discuss potential topics for scrutiny on the work programme for 2025/26. The Executive were invited to attend to share any upcoming matters they may have that the Committee might like to scrutinise.

- 2.3 The following topics are in the work programme for possible scrutiny in 2025/26, albeit some topics need to be refined via a scrutiny proposal form:

- Affordable Housing
- Sustainable Transport
- Development Management and Community Forums
- Task and Finish Group - grounds maintenance contract
- Local Government Reform
- Anti-Racism Charter and the Equalities Strategy

- 2.4 All new up and coming strategies and policies will automatically be added to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programme, and Members of Overview and Scrutiny can then

consider whether they wish to look at these as part of the work programme.

### **3.0 Reason(s)**

3.1 Members are welcome, and encouraged, to submit a scrutiny proposal at any time. This form is available in the Microsoft Teams channel and provides Officers with sufficient information to assess if it is appropriate for scrutiny and to ensure that specific questions are addressed. A Scrutiny Flowchart is also available which explains the processes involved in submitting a Scrutiny Proposal Form. Democratic Services will then liaise with Officers and the Chairman to consider the best way forward to address the subject and complete the scoping document.

### **4.0 Options**

4.1 The work programme will be kept under review by the Committee throughout the coming year.

### **5.0 Risks**

5.1 The establishment of an Overview and Scrutiny Committee is enshrined in the Local Government Act 2000 (Section 9). The 2000 Act obliges local authorities to adopt political management systems with a separate Executive. Various sub sections of the 2000 Act set out the powers and duties for Overview and Scrutiny Committee including the right to investigate and make recommendations on anything which is the responsibility of the Executive. Legislative provisions can also be found in the Localism Act 2011 (Schedule 2) with options to retain or re-adopt a “committee system” Section 9B.

5.2 Potential risks arise for the council if policies and strategies are developed and / or enacted without sufficient scrutiny. Approval of an updated work programme contributes to the mitigation of risk (and Call-Ins) by ensuring key activities of the council are scrutinised.

### **6.0 Implications/Consultations**

#### **Community Safety**

No

**Data Protection**

No

**Equalities**

No

**Environmental Sustainability**

Yes - the proposed Work Programme envisages the Overview and Scrutiny Committee receiving reports on the progress of the council's environmental strategies.

**Financial**

No

**Health and Safety**

No

**Human Resources**

No

**Human Rights**

No

**Legal**

Yes - scrutiny is enshrined in statute (the Local Government Act 2000 as amended by the Localism Act 2011)

**Specific Wards**

No

7.0 Background papers, appendices and other relevant material

7.1 **Appendix 1** - Summary of Topics

**Contact Member:** Councillor David Jacobs, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.  
[david.jacobs@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:david.jacobs@eastherts.gov.uk)

**Contact Officer:** James Ellis, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Tel: 01279 502170.  
[james.ellis@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:james.ellis@eastherts.gov.uk)

**Report Author:** Peter Mannings, Committee Support Officer,  
Tel: 01279 502174.  
[peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk)

### Programme of Proposed Scrutiny Topics

Topic	Corporate Objectives (LEAF)	Questions/concerns	Scrutiny Approach (Bulletin, Report, rapid review or task and finish group)	Background Notes / Officers' comments	Reporting timeframe
Cross Party Working Group – Grounds Maintenance Contract			Report		4 November 2025
Affordable Housing			Report		4 November 2025
Sustainable Transport			Report	Topic is to be narrowed down via a scrutiny proposal form; the topic will be delayed to November 2025 if a form is not submitted by the 16 September meeting.	4 November 2025
Community Forum and Development Management Forum Update		Development Management and Community Forums and how they can impact positively in the engagement process with both residents and developers	Report	To be presented once there is a full year of DM Forum meetings	4 November 2025
Local Government Reform			Report	Scrutiny Proposal Forms submitted by Cllrs E Buckmaster and G McAndrew	Date?
Anti-Racism Charter and the Equalities Strategy					