

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2024 at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

Present: Councillor Phil Fellows (Chair); Councillors D Green, Austin, Bright, Britcher, Currie, d'Abbro, Davis, Farooki, Kup, Manners, Packman, Pope, Wing and Worrow

In Attendance: Councillors J Bayford, Dennis, Keen, Whitehead, Wright and Yates

23. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Paul Moore, substituted by Councillor Manners.

24. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Whitehead declared a pecuniary interest on agenda item 10 (Land at Shottendane Road).

25. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Under minute item 11 (Cabinet Member Presentation), one of the responses by Mr Mike Humber should read "the Council had not charged residents for a bin replacement as yet."

Subject to the above amendment, Councillor Kup proposed, Councillor Austin seconded and Members agreed the minutes to be a correct record of the extraordinary Panel meeting held on 21 November 2023.

26. MINUTES OF EXTRAORDINARY MEETING

Councillor Britcher proposed, Councillor Austin seconded and Members agreed the minutes to be a correct record of the extraordinary Panel meeting held on 6 December 2023.

27. LAND AT SHOTTENDANE ROAD

Bob Porter, Director of Place introduced the report and made the following comments:

- The purpose of the proposals was to enable the delivery of affordable homes in Thanet;
- This would contribute towards the delivery of 548 homes that Cabinet agreed to deliver each year for the next four years;
- Land for potential delivery of homes was put forward in the Local Plan;
- The Local Plan process would need to be concluded that would include any identified land for new housing developments;
- Gypsy and Traveller Communities: TDC study identified five transit and seven permanent sites to be established;
- The Council had legal obligations to provide the traveller communities with facilities;
- Government directed that these facilities be included in the Local Plan;
- No decision about the specific sites had been made;
- Four sites might be forwarded to the Planning Committee for decision;
- These applications should not have detrimental impact on the local surroundings;

- The sites should have access to health and education facilities;
- Any applications submitted outside the Local Plan process would be to be assessed using the four criteria;
- The proposals in the officer report were recommendation a public consultation on any proposals and the consultation would include traveller representatives;
- A road network was being proposed to support new housing development. Cabinet would be asked to approve the disposal of a piece of land to Kent County Council for road network construction.

Councillor Whitehead, Deputy Leader of Council and Cabinet Member for Housing only spoke on the part of this item that referred to the consultation relating to Shottendane. She made comments as follows:

- It is exceptionally important that we consider this evening what we are discussing, and what we are not discussing;
- It is recommended that the Overview and Scrutiny Panel consider the contents of this committee report and make any recommendations that it would like Cabinet to take into account when considering the matter at its meeting on 25 January 2024;
- The proposed recommendations to the Cabinet are:
 1. To conduct public consultation with the Gypsy and Traveller community and neighbouring residents about the proposal to establish a number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches on land off of Shottendane Road (area shown in annex 6 to the report).
 2. Subject to the outcome of the consultation, submit an application for outline planning permission for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Pitches on the land marked 1aii in annex 5 to the report.
- This was a proposal to recommend to Cabinet that a consultation be undertaken with residents and Travelling community to consider the potential of a managed site on land we own at Shottendane;
- This was not a new idea, but choosing to consult on it and asking for input from local resident input and the Travelling community was new;
- The discussion was about the legal requirement to plan for sites for the Gypsy and Traveller community. This task was not optional. It was a legal requirement, as well as a moral requirement;
- The Council had a legal duty to plan for appropriate sites for members of the Gypsy and Traveller community. In spite of this lack of provision being a longstanding issue, and an important one, there were currently no sites identified in the district;
- The Portfolio Holder for Housing was determined to address this need and the need to bring communities together in understanding, respect and discussion;
- Cabinet was determined to identify and provide sites that work, in size and design, to ensure that accommodation needs were met and simultaneously supporting the local community through comprehensive consultation. The proposed engagement will be key to this and we actively welcome involvement at all stages of this process;
- What was being considered at this Panel meeting was the consideration of a suggestion of a consultation on providing a site. That was the only issue before Members. If Members and residents wanted to discuss issues surrounding site provision or concerns, that was exactly what a consultation was for; there would be no point to providing it otherwise.

- What was not up for discussion at this meeting and will never be discussed in this Chamber, is whether or not Travellers have a right to live in Thanet because they do. They have a right to be part of the local communities, to have access to schools, services, healthcare, to be part of our lives, be considered, accepted and respected and not be demonised, caricatured, abused and stereotyped
- The discussion about the proposal for a consultation with residents and with the Travelling community was in fact specifically a discussion about the right of all residents to be heard.

Mr Fisher, Mr Thomas and Mr Rawf spoke under Public Speaking and made the following comments:

- The public only came to know about these proposals through a leaflet;
- Residents were not happy as they had not been consulted;
- The presence of such a site would cause a drop in property prices for the houses in that neighbourhood;
- The Council could consider Dane Park, where there is an acre of land that was owned by the Council which could be allocated for such a site;
- Members could also consider Hoverport site and not the piece of land in Garlinge;
- It was important for the Council to identify a site for Travellers and wherever such a site was located there were bound to be complaints;
- Currently the Council was having to use more resources to move travellers away from illegal sites.

Bob Porter and Councillor Whitehead responded as follows:

- The report before the Panel was not about a planning application, but the proposals to have a public consultation before sending out information to residents about the consultation and conducting the actuarial consultation exercise;
- Officer would consider all available sites;
- The Council would consider all alternative sites around the district and they would be reviewed against some set criteria;
- If the Local Plan identified sites, then those would be sites to be considered;
- The Council called for sites during the Local Plan process. However, no sites were put forward by land owners.

Members then asked questions and made comments as follows:

- One Member said that previous experience of other local Councils who tried to set up similar site ended up experiencing friction between residents and the traveller community;
- It was important for the Council to listen to views from both the local residents and the travellers' community;
- Another Member said that there was a need to identify a site, but not the one that had been identified in the committee report;
- They further said that this piece of land had been farmed by the family for generations and it was not cited in the Local Plan as suitable for setting up the travellers site;
- One Member advised the meeting that debate on any issues should never end up with personal attacks and apologised to Councillor Whitehead for the personal attacks she had experienced;
- They further said that this was agricultural land and there was no funding that had been identified to develop the site;
- The Member asked what the Cabinet plans were for the sites and they further said that the Garlinge site would most likely be expanded as the Council would struggle to find new sites;

- The Member asked why the traveller community's needs had not been included in the Local Plan in the first place;
- Another Member said that it was not useful to talk about what happened to other Councils in London many years ago and it was not good leadership to whip up emotions on this subject. Members were reminded to adhere to the Nolan Principles of Public Life;
- Another Member asked what would constitute a successful scheme;
- One Member said that they were pleased that the Council was now finally addressing the issue of traveller sites in the district. The Council had been neglecting its statutory duty;
- Incursions being experienced in Thanet were caused by the absence of statutory sites for travellers;
- Another Member asked what the acreage for traveller sites should be if one was to conduct a ten year forecast;
- It was also important to preserve arable land;
- One Member said that there was a travellers' community that had been living in Central Harbour Ward in Ramsgate for the last three years and had integrated well with the local communities. They had a long history in Kent;
- Another Member asked what the process would be for communicating with the public to reassure them about the process for identifying traveller sites. They further asked if there were any other sites under consideration like the Hoverport;
- One Member advised the meeting that the Council was about to start the Local Plan review process. Any updated Local Plan would not pass without the traveller sites identified in it;
- It was therefore important to identify a number potential sites;
- Had the Council been in discussion with the travellers?
- Would the traveller community be paying tax once they get settled at the sites?
- How many families of the traveller community had been identified?
- At what point would the Council identify funding for the development of sites once a decision on those sites was made?

Bob Porter and Councillor Whitehead responded to Member comments and questions as follows:

- The Council would consider all viable sites and these would be considered against set criteria;
- Garlinge site was not in the Local Plan. However, the decision for sites was still some way off;
- The Council had written to government regarding the issue of agricultural land as only government could give direction on such matters;
- Smaller sized sites would be managed more successfully and success was measured by how well integrated the sites would be with existing communities and the natural environment;
- The sites would also need to be financially viable;
- Officers had held discussions with the traveller community;
- There was national guidance on forecasting demand for traveller sites in a given area. This information could be shared with Members of the Panel after the meeting;
- Previously during the development of the current Local Plan, a public call for sites did not yield any success as no sites were put forward by land owners;
- The council looked at its own land and realised that the options were limited;
- The consultation process had not yet been designed. This process had to be open and transparent;
- There was still a decision to be made on the size of the sites. Currently the Council was in discussion with the travellers;

- Government preferred that Council identified sites first before consideration of funding;
- Residential caravans paid tax or business rates. More detail on this would be sourced and shared with Members;
- Currently the land that had been identified was Council land. Planning applications would be submitted for the sites, once the process reached that stage.

The Panel agreed that the following officer recommendations be forwarded to Cabinet:

1. To conduct public consultation with the Gypsy and Traveller community and neighbouring residents about the proposal to establish a number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches on land off of Shottendane Road (area shown in annex 6).
2. To dispose of part of the land at Shottendane Road (areas marked as 1b and 2b on annex 5) to KCC for the proposed Major Road Network (Inner Circuit) improvements and a linked sustainable drainage scheme.

The Panel also noted that proposals for the provision of housing on the wider Shottendane Road site could only be considered, following the assessment of all land submitted to the council as part of the 'Call for Sites' and the completion of the current review of the Thanet Local Plan.

The Panel rejected the officer recommendation that "Subject to the outcome of the consultation, submit an application for outline planning permission for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Pitches on the land marked 1aii in annex 5."

Councillor Green proposed, Councillor Fellows seconded and Members agreed that the Council hold-off consultation until the Council had looked at all its holdings to identify more suitable sites and that would then be followed by a full and transparent public consultation.

28. CABINET MEMBER PRESENTATION - BACKGROUND TO THE COUNCIL'S PARKING STRATEGY REVIEW

Councillor Keen, Cabinet Members for Neighbourhoods gave a presentation to the Panel and made the following comments:

- The request for a parking strategy review was proposed by Councillor Crittenden and Full Council agreed the proposal;
- This would be a district wide review to establish the view of service users and then get down to the detail of what needed to be done for the district;
- Council draw up a brief that was used for the tender to secure a consultant for the review;
- The intention was to make the review as broad as was possible, bearing in mind that parking had to support the economics growth for Thanet;
- Significant investments were coming into the district and the Council needed to be prepared for that;
- The review would look at the daytime and night time economic activities in the district and aligning with Net Zero Strategy, the Local Plan and government policy like the Green Agenda;
- The review would take into consideration the changes in shopping habits that were emerging with more online shopping and delivery of purchases to residents' homes;
- The four week review would start on 29 January 2024. A councillor consultation was planned for 30 January 2024 with the public consultation starting on 5 February 2024;

- Public consultation meetings would be both in-person and online;
- The Comms team would work alongside the delivery of the Strategy and Action Plan;
- The tender for the review was put out in August 2023 and awarded in December 2023. Twelve companies had submitted bids for this tender;
- It was important for the public to take part in this review through the consultation process.

Members asked questions and made comments as follows:

- One Member asked if this review was going to be backed by the Joint Transportation Board;
- Would cyclists and other road users be part of the consultation process?
- Was the four week consultation period long enough for this piece of work?
- A significant amount of what TDC would do after the review depended on KCC, the Highways Authority. With this in mind, how was the Council going to engage KCC?
- There currently was no budget associated with this review process. How were the review results going to be implemented?
- Some Members understood that KCC was going to take back responsibility for the Decrim reserves. Was that still going ahead?
- One Member said that they welcomed the approach that would see the public being consulted on the current situation regarding parking in the district. What level of autonomy did TDC have over residents parking schemes?
- Could parking schemes have their own budgets in order to fund their own activities?
- Would this review give residents an opportunity to give feedback regarding yellow lines?
- There was a need to enforce the strategy once the review had been concluded. There was therefore a need for a recommendation for robust recruitment of enforcement officers.

Penny Button, Head of Neighbourhoods and Councillor Keen responded to Member questions and comments as follows:

- KCC were the Highways Authority and they would be engaged as part of the review process;
- TDC would also engage KCC when the draft Strategy has been produced;
- This stage of the review was about understanding what residents wanted;
- The new strategy would give the Council a road map for planning for the long term future of the Decrim fund;
- KCC had not made a final decision on whether they were taking back all income from parking;
- With regards to residents' schemes; not everyone wanted them;
- It was also important to look at the issue of parking on pavement options for some areas. There were opportunities for generating income;
- The Council also ought to consider on street cycling;
- The new strategy would be used to lobby KCC on issues related to parking and traffic management;
- The Portfolio Holder agreed that effective enforcement would make the strategy a success.

Members noted the presentation.

29. HRA BUDGET 2024/25

Matt Sanham introduced the report and said that Cabinet had agreed on an ambitious housing development programme, which now needed to be funded through the annual budget allocation.

Councillor Whitehead made the following comments:

- In order to explain the rent structure and context of the HRA budget further, it was important to look at what was currently being delivered and what needed to be delivered in terms of capacity;
- TDC used two forms of rental rate within the general housing stock; social rent and affordable rent;
- The Council's version of affordable rent was very different from the central government definition, which generally defined affordable rent as being up to 80% of private rental rates. For Thanet, that would be far from affordable. TDC therefore used a dual definition; affordable housing was classed as up to 80% of private rent, but not to exceed Local Housing Allowance rate (which historically for this area never met 80% of the private rental market). Simply, Thanet's affordable housing would never go above Local Housing Allowance;
- The vast majority of the Council's housing stock was at social rent; social rent was a lower rent than affordable rent, and much lower than private market rent;
- At a social rent, a three bed house would cost approximately £452.52 per month; at TDC affordable rent, it would cost approximately £704 per month;
- On the private market, three bed homes were currently renting at between £1,100 and £1,600 per month;

- The current Local Housing Allowance rate for a three bed house was £797.81, meaning that for both forms of rental that TDC offer would be more than covered by housing benefit/universal credit, making both accessible for even the most vulnerable or disadvantaged residents. It was worth noting that the vast majority of individuals who rely on LHA to afford their housing were currently trapped within the private rental market. This was one of the principal reasons for creating and adopting the accelerated delivery programme, as the most disadvantaged residents in terms of housing affordability (and therefore cost of living) were currently within the private sector; to help them the Council had to expand its provision;
- In April the Council was also likely to see a significant increase in the LHA rate; in all likelihood this would mean that even the affordable rental would fall within the mid range of LHA;
- The Council portfolio currently consisted of 3,460 properties; only 165 of these were at an affordable rent; the rest were let at social rent. The vast majority of the residents had access to support with rental costs through housing benefit or the housing element of universal credit, and therefore any increase was covered by benefits in those cases;
- Each year, councils were permitted to raise rents, with the addition of 1% to the Consumer Price Index. This September CPI stood at 6.7%; which meant that Councils were permitted to raise rents by 7.7%. Information received from 19 other Councils regarding their rent increase this year indicated that all were planning a 7.7% increase. The Regulator for Social Housing had confirmed the 7.7% limit for 2024/25;

- Last year Council increased rents across both tenures at 7%; this was a below inflation increase. Two year inflation stands at 16.8%, and TDC was potentially increasing rent by 14.7% across two years. That meant that Thanet was currently 2.1% below inflation over two years, even with a 7.7% increase this year. The Tenant and Leaseholder representatives had been briefed on the potential for a 7.7% increase. They were very supportive as they were aware of the need to

expand and support those residents in the private sector, and also supported further expansion of the Council's in-house temporary housing;

- Although these decisions were made yearly, it was important to remember that they had a cumulative effect. Choosing not to increase rent this year would not only reduce housing funding for this year, but would reduce it in perpetuity, as the Council could not choose to raise the rent to "make up" for it the next year;
- It was also important to remember that this increase, apart from households that receive no assistance with housing benefit or the housing element of Universal Credit, did not come from resident's pockets; it would be paid by the central government, as the increase was still well below the full rate of Local Housing Allowance;
- The Portfolio Holder for Housing had put forward an option that they considered provided the best outcome for both current tenants and all residents in terms of growing housing provision. Increasing at 7.7% across both forms of tenure, but providing a support fund to ensure that any households on a lower income, whose increase was not paid through benefits were not impacted, allowed the Council to support more residents in the private sector, grow the portfolio further, and not disadvantage current tenants. The predicted net cost of this option in 2024/25 was £30k;
- The Council would administer and determine support, assessing those who had no access to benefits and on a low income as eligible for support;
- The fund could be used in a range of ways to support households facing financial hardship.
- It was essential to consider the fact that the most vulnerable residents currently were those who were homeless, struggling to afford private rent, and in insecure tenancies. In only four months the Council had been able to add 123 extra properties to its portfolio to support these residents. However, to continue supporting others in vulnerable positions, it was vital that the portfolio was maintained and grown.

Members then asked questions and made comments as follows:

28. The proposals in the HRA budget looked solid;
29. Was the Council up to date with rent reviews for non dwelling properties?
30. How were rent reviews done for the garages and shades? Some Members had received some complaints regarding the new rent levels;
31. There were also some issues with some of the garages. It was important for the Council to look after these properties;
32. Another Member said that they welcomed provision for social housing. They further said that a robust social housing programme had financial benefits. Hope many of these houses that had been bought by TDC were now occupied?

Councillor Yates said that he would look into the issue of garages that needed attention.

Bob Porter and Councillor Whitehead responded as follows:

- A thorough review of commercial properties that included garages was conducted last year and it was quite unpopular as rents were increased;
- Officers would come up with information on how many of the new homes had been now occupied;
- The Council was not looking to increase rents for non dwelling properties in 2024/25.

Members noted the report.

30. **PURCHASE OF 7 HOMES AT NORTHWOOD ROAD, BROADSTAIRS FOR AFFORDABLE RENT**

Bob Porter introduced the report and said that the project had been negotiated with the developer. Some of the properties would be acquired on completion. For this property the Council would agree a development agreement with the developer and work with them to completion. The project would move into a surplus in year 13.

Councillor Whitehead made the following comments:

- This item ties in well with the earlier discussion of the HRA budget;
- The Council had a duty to not only look after those residents who were already within the protection afforded by a Council tenancy, but also expand this care to those who were currently trapped within insecure and unaffordable private tenancies;
- The new acquisitions strategy, which as of tonight would have delivered a significant number of homes in five months more than the average annual delivery of 18 homes per year that were delivered over the last ten years. This was a perfect example of how using the HRA and thinking creatively could produce outstanding outcomes for residents;
- With this purchase the Council was not only providing a balanced mix of much needed homes, including three bed houses, but also providing them in St. Peter's Ward, which as with some of the previous acquisitions was a difficult area to access in terms of affordable tenancies;
- Using the new strategy and working consciously to support all of our residents, across housing sectors, had produced an approach that was producing genuinely affordable homes across Thanet;
- The portfolio holder thanked officers wholeheartedly for the level of work that had gone into and continued to go into this project.

Members noted the report.

31. 2024/25 FEES AND CHARGES

Matt Sanham, Head of Finance and Procurement led the discussion and said that inflation levels had decreased and the fees and charges had been reviewed taking into consideration the changes to inflation levels.

Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

- Would the Council consider suspending charges for parking bays during events?
- Event organisers were made to pay for non-paying parking bays. Why was that the case?
- Did the Council keep the profit they received from charging event organisers or was all the income forwarded to KCC?
- There was a need for the Council to review events and come up with a heritage stratum of events so that such events were not charged a high fee.

Matt Sanham and Councillor Yates responded as follows:

- All on-street parking income belonged to KCC;
- Unfortunately, there were instances when event organisers were charged for a full day;
- Cabinet was considering those issues and discussions were on-going;
- The Portfolio Holder would ensure that charges for events would not be increased.

Members noted the report.

32. **DRAFT 2024/25 BUDGET**

Matt Sanham introduced the report and made the following comments:

- The government settlement statement made little difference to the assumptions that had been made by the Council;
- However, the government funding had contributed significantly to the Council budget and had freed up £250k;
- Additional money had therefore been allocated for weed control which would use hot foam;
- The same weed control method would also be used for cleaning graffiti;
- £50K had been set aside for football development for communities and £116k had been set aside for managing the effects of inflation.

Councillor Yates, Cabinet Member for Corporate Resources said that the Council had accumulated reserves which were now at a 10 year high. The focus was on what residents wanted, including a clean environment.

Members asked questions and made comments as follows:

- One Member said that this was a fair and balanced budget. There was a healthy increase to the budget;
- Members thanked officers for drafting the proposals for this balanced budget;
- Members further thanked officers particularly in Chris Blundell and Matt Sanham for the stewardship in the treasury management approaches used since 2016 which had built these reserves;
- Other Members welcomed the proposed cleaning of beaches after summer.

Members noted the report.

33. **TEMPORARY STAFF CONTRACT**

Matt Elmer, Head of Cleansing Services introduced the report and made the following comments:

- This report was about arrangements for temporary staff i.e. agency workers across a number of Council services;
- The current contract was coming to an end in April this year and proposed options were for the future procurement of temporary staff arrangements;
- The current contract was a “call-down” contract and this was therefore not an obligation to spend the total value of the contract. Cabinet had requested a report into the use of temporary staff, which would be forthcoming and also shared with members of Overview and Scrutiny in due course;
- The value of the contract is approximately £1,3m per annum - 80% of which was within Cleansing Services which includes household waste collections, street cleansing and seasonal beach cleansing;
- Members were being asked to comment on the recommendation for Cabinet to agree a competitive procurement approach under the agreed framework.

Members then asked questions and made comments as follows:

- One Member said that this was a big counteract with one contractor. Had the Council looked at other contractors in order to secure the best possible terms?
- What was the procurement process that had identified HR-GO?
- How much agency staff was the Council using for activities that the Council knew would need to be planned for?

- The Council needed to widen its search to recruit to those difficult to recruit roles;
- Members welcomed the review that would be conducted on how the Council used agency workers to deliver services;
- The Council should develop its own bank of staff;
- Another Member asked how many agency staff ended up being permanent TDC staff.

Matt Elmer responded to Member questions as follows:

- Officers were going to investigate the issue raised by Members;
- HR-GO was the first place to go for agency staff. Their staff cover mostly sickness leave. The Council considered two other agencies but HR-GO had the best offer;
- It was difficult for the Council to attract staff for short term roles. That was why agency staff were being used;
- The hourly rate that agency staff were paid was the same rate that Council staff were also paid;
- The best approach to resolve the staffing issue was for the Council to consider a procurement framework.

Councillor Austin proposed, Councillor Wing seconded and Members agreed Option 3, (Further Competition under a Framework for a 3 year contract with a 12 month extension option with a value of approximately £1.3m per annum).

34. DECISION FOR COASTAL & BEACH PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) RENEWAL TO 2027

Tony Marmo, Head of Coastal and Public Realm introduced the report and requested Members to review the proposals in the report and make suggestions for consideration by Cabinet.

Members asked questions as follows:

- Would there be warranted enforcement officers to enforce the conditions of the PSPO?
- What was the area to be covered by the PSPO in addition to the beaches?
- Was there a designated telephone number that the public could call to report incidents?

Tony Marmo and Lisa Collingwood, Beaches Services Manager responded to Member questions as follows:

- Currently there were two enforcement officers and the Council was in the process of recruiting additional staff in the next three months;
- These officers would be trained to issue penalty notices;
- The Enforcement Team would have regular enforcement meetings with Kent Police;
- The Council worked closely with Broadstairs Town Council over the last three years;
- TDC Officers also patrolled Stone Bay area in Broadstairs;
- TDC held discussions with Town Councils on the Council's enforcement activities;
- It was worth noting that resources were low to cover adequately the 19 miles of coastline;
- E-bikes had been introduced to be used by the enforcement team, which would help speed up patrols;
- There was no designated telephone number that the public could call.

Councillor Manners proposed and Councillor Green seconded and the Panel agreed to recommend Option.

35. DRAFT CORPORATE PLAN FOR 2024-28

Hannah Thorpe, Head of Strategy and Transformation introduced the report and said that a public consultation was conducted in December which ran through the Christmas period. The results were now being reported to Council with the final recommendations on the new corporate priorities.

One Member said that the Council ought to learn from the responses received through this residents' survey, to determine who the respondents were, their age groups and find ways of engaging young people and professionals in order to improve the feedback from similar consultations.

Members noted the report.

36. REVIEW OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2023/24

One Member requested for a cabinet member presentation on expenditure for the Ramsgate Port and Harbour.

Another Member requested for a cabinet member presentation on the Council's commercial property assets and how rental reviews were conducted.

One member also added that they would like to know more about how these commercial properties were tendered out and could this review cover a number of years in order to provide a viable context for discussion.

The Chair said that the Leader would be approached to make a presentation to the Panel on what lessons had been learnt regarding the Ramsgate Port and Harbour.

Another Member suggested that the topic regarding the port and harbour would best be covered as a members Briefing session topic.

The Chair also said that the Tourism Working Party would be ready to present their report to the Panel at the 15 February meeting.

Members noted the report.

37. FORWARD PLAN AND EXEMPT CABINET REPORT LIST

Members noted the report.

38. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT, MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION POLICY STATEMENT AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY FOR 2024/25

Members noted the report.

Meeting concluded: 10.02 pm