COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL

3rd September 2026 at 2.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Clough (in the Chair)
Councillors Aisthorpe, Charlesworth, Crofts (substitute for Swinburn), Hudson, and Wilson.

Officers in attendance:

- Levi Anderson-Jordan (Environmental Strategy and Sustainability Manager)
- Liz Brummer (Deputy Section 151 Officer and Head of Finance)
- Paul Caswell (Head of Community Safety, Environment Economy, and Infrastructure)
- Charlotte Dring (Assistant Director Housing and Communities)
- Gary Edwards (Head of Waste and Operational Services)
- Diane Halton (Associate Director of Public Health)
- Spencer Hunt (Assistant Director Safer and Stronger Place)
- Lisa Logan (Head of Open Space)
- Beverly O'Brien (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)
- Eve Richardson Smith (Head of Legal and Deputy Monitoring Officer)
- Joanne Robinson (Assistant Director Policy Strategy & Resources and Statutory Scrutiny Officer)

Also in attendance:

- Councillor Sawkins (Portfolio Holder for Safer and Stronger Communities)
- Councillor Augusta (Park Ward Councillor)
- PC Darian Hullett (Humberside Police)

There was one member of the press and two members of the public present.

SPC.12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors K. Batson, Russell and Swinburn for this meeting.

SPC.13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest for this meeting.

SPC.14 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting of the Communities Scrutiny Panel held on 2nd July 2026 be approved as a correct record.

SPC.15 QUESTION TIME

There were no questions from members of the public for this meeting.

SPC.16 FORWARD PLAN

The panel received the current forward plan, and members were asked to identify any items for examination by this panel via the pre-decision call-in procedure.

RESOLVED – That the forward plan be noted.

SPC.17 TRACKING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF SCRUTINY

The panel received a report from the Statutory Scrutiny Officer tracking the recommendations of the Communities Scrutiny Panel and tracking the Full Council Decisions that were relevant to this panel.

At SPC.28, Mrs O'Brien explained that performance measures would continue to be submitted quarterly outside of meetings to monitor the effectiveness of CCTV investment.

At SPC.21, One Member noted that due to historic delays in receiving the Food Poverty Plan felt it should remain on tracking. However, the Panel were content that it had been included on the panel's work programme and that it would be received at the November scheduled meeting.

Mrs O'Brien explained that SPC.29, the PCC Control Room site visit was postponed due to low initial registration and data protection issues, but she would try to reschedule as the panel were still interested in this happening.

At SPC.35 (Antisocial Behaviour & Youth Justice): The panel agreed that this sat more appropriately under the Children and Lifelong Learning Scrutiny Panel. This transfer would be proposed to the Executive Scrutiny Liaison Board on 09 October 2026.

The panel also considered the Full Council budget amendments and the updates they had received. The panel expressed serious concerns regarding delays to trials that were supposed to be funded in this financial year specifically "skip-it" events, alleyway clearances, and hardship funds.

A panel member objected to the report's suggestion that Cabinet could unilaterally choose to carry forward delayed amendment funds into 2027/28. The Chair was disappointed that the "skip-it" and alleyway clearance trials had been delayed and would now be implemented in the cold, wet, and dark winter months (October/November) The Chair noted a severe lack of timely communication from officers regarding project delays and logistics, despite repeated enquiries.

RESOLVED – That tracking items SPC.19, SPC.21, SPC.30, SPC.8, be removed and the remaining item be noted.

SPC.18 QUARTER 1 2026/27 COUNCIL PLAN PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE REPORT

The panel considered a report from the Portfolio Holder for Safer and Stronger Communities that provided information and analysis of the Council's performance and financial position at the end of Quarter one 2026-27 April to June 2026.

RESOLVED – That the quarter 1 2026/27 Council Plan Performance and Finance Report be noted.

SPC.19 HOUSEHOLD WASTE DELIVERY PLAN

The panel considered a report from the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure providing an update on the delivery plan for the introduction of weekly household food waste collections from Spring 2027.

The panel uncovered a major contractual issue under a historical waste-to-energy contract signed in 1999. Mr Anderson-Jordan explained that Newlincs agreed, while not contractually obligated to, that they would waive their gate fee for the food waste disposal. This meant the Council would only have to pay the gate fee for the end destination disposal point (likely a biodigester), alongside the transport, handling and infrastructure costs of managing the food waste when it arrived at Newlincs. This would be a significant cost saving to the Council and should mean that disposal of food waste worked out cheaper than the disposal at the Energy from Waste Plant.

Two panel members were concerned about the lack of a formal environmental net-gain analysis. They argued that transport emissions from hauling food waste to a regional digester, combined with double gate fees, could result in a net-negative environmental and financial outcome, contradicting the spirit of the legislation. The panel requested that Officers look at a full system impact on the environment before making a decision on whether it was needed to write to

government to share their concerns on the current household waste delivery scheme.

RESOLVED –

1) That the Household Waste Delivery Scheme be noted.

2) That the panel receives a report a analysing the environment impact the Household Waste Delivery.

SPC.20 PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) – NUISANCE VEHICLES

The panel considered a report from the Portfolio Holder for Safer and Stronger Communities that proposed the introduction of a new borough-wide Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) to tackle persistent anti-social behaviour linked to nuisance vehicles.

One Member asked for some clarification on the expectations of having this PSPO. They asked whether it would be different to ringing 999 and getting an officer to come catch a crime currently happening. PC Hullett explained that one of the reasons for pursuing the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) was to address gaps in the current legislation. Under Section 59 powers, which were commonly used in parks and open spaces, the offence must be witnessed by an officer in uniform. This created challenges where enforcement activity was undertaken by plain-clothes officers or through the use of drone technology. There was currently some legal uncertainty as to whether evidence gathered by a drone could be considered as an offence having been witnessed by an officer, reflecting the fact that technology had evolved more quickly than the legislation. The PSPO provided an additional enforcement option and helped bridge this gap. The intention was not to replace existing police powers. Where appropriate, Section 59 powers, seizure powers, prosecutions, and traffic offence reports would continue to be used. However, the PSPO provided a useful alternative in circumstances where those powers could not be utilised.

One member shared concerns around the points made regarding targeted enforcement, intelligence gathering and focused operations. They believed that there also needed to be an element of randomness in the approach. They thought that introducing a degree of unpredictability created an additional deterrent. They were not overly convinced that relying solely on targeted days of action would be as effective as intended. A combination of intelligence-led activity and random enforcement operations would provide a stronger and more effective approach. Mr Caswell explained that they undertook targeted days of action, but enforcement should also form part of our day-to-day business. There were two key points he highlighted. Firstly, they needed to be very careful in relation to direct surveillance. Secondly, there was a range of enforcement powers available to us in addition to the proposed PSPO. These powers could be particularly useful where there were groups that gathered and facilitated unlawful riding activity. It was important to recognise that we could not apply multiple punitive sanctions for the same offence. However, where a Section 59

warning was issued, a Fixed Penalty Notice may also be available depending on the circumstances.

One Member asked whether they had looked at what other boroughs were doing and incorporated the solutions they've used into this. Mr Caswell explained that they worked closely with neighbouring police forces and councils, including learning from approaches adopted elsewhere, and the South Bank task group had also been examining this issue in detail. PC Hullett and colleagues had been gathering and analysing intelligence and incident data to inform the proposal. It was therefore important to develop a robust evidence base, including intelligence gathering, public consultation, engagement with key stakeholders, and detailed analysis of incident data. Equally important was ensuring that any PSPO introduced would be actively enforced.

A Member asked what could be done differently going forward to rebuild public confidence and encourage residents to continue reporting these incidents. How can we reassure residents that reporting such behaviour was worthwhile and that the information they provided would lead to meaningful action where appropriate. Mr Caswell explained that their approach included the development of a comprehensive communications plan involving both Police and the Council communications teams. The aim was to ensure that clear and consistent messages were provided to residents about the action being taken to address nuisance vehicle issues. There were, of course, limitations where live investigations were concerned, as we could not share information that could compromise ongoing enforcement activity. However, we could do much more to keep the public informed about the work that was taking place.

RESOLVED – That the recommendations stated within the report be supported be the panel.

SPC.21 DOMESTIC ABUSE PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY 2026-2030

The panel considered a report from the Portfolio Holder for Safer and Stronger Communities that presented the Domestic Abuse Partnership Strategy 2026-2030. This report is due to be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 16th September 2026 and has been submitted to this panel for pre-decision scrutiny.

A member requested confirmation that the strategy remained gender-inclusive. Officers confirmed male victims were fully accommodated with separate, dedicated provision, while remaining alert to coercive control dynamics such as malicious counter-reporting.

Concerns were raised about democratic oversight, stating that annual reporting to Council was insufficient for a new, high-stakes public health strategy. The panel believed it would be beneficial if they were to request more frequent progress updates and direct early input into the upcoming Strategy Action Plan.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET -

1) That the recommendations stated within the report be supported.

2) That Officers establish a reporting process to provide the Communities Scrutiny Panel with more frequent progress updates on the Domestic Abuse Strategy 2026-2030, including opportunities for the Panel to consider and comment on the associated Action Plan as it was developed.

SPC.22 QUESTIONS TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER

There were no questions for the Portfolio Holder at this meeting.

SPC.23 CALLING IN OF DECISIONS

There were no formal requests from members of this panel to call in decisions of recent Cabinet and Portfolio Holder meetings.

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 3.50 p.m.

NORTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL
www.nelincs.gov.uk

COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY PANEL - SPECIAL

17th September 2026 at 2.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Clough (in the Chair)
Councillors Aisthorpe, K. Batson, Charlesworth and Wilson.

Officers in attendance:

- Levi Andersonjordan (Environmental Strategy and Sustainability Manager)
- Carolina Borgstrom (Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure)
- Gary Edwards (Head of Waste and Operational Services)
- Sara Hemming (Transformation Manager)
- Dee Hitter (Assistant Director Environment)
- Beverly O'Brien (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)

Also in attendance:

- Councillor Callison (Portfolio Holder for Environment, Tourism and Culture)
- Councillor Mayne (Portfolio Holder for Waste, Recycling and Energy)
- Councillor Augusta (Park Ward Councillor)
- Councillor P.Batson (South Ward Councillor)

There were no members of the press or public present.

SPC.24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received for this meeting from Councillors Hudson and K.Swinburn.

SPC.25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest for this meeting.

SPC.26 ENVIRONMENT BUDGET AMENDMENT PROJECTS

The panel considered a report from the Portfolio Holder for Waste, Recycling and Energy and Portfolio Holder for Environment, Tourism and Culture presenting the findings of the discovery and feasibility work undertaken in relation to the Environment Budget Amendment Projects approved by Full Council in February 2026.

Pest Control Review

A Member asked whether, in addition to working with Anglian Water on rodent control and sewer baiting, the Council could also work with social landlords. They noted that social landlords managed large numbers of properties, gardens and alleyways where rat problems were frequently reported, and suggested that these organisations should share responsibility and contribute to efforts to tackle infestations. Ms Hitter agreed that the Council could engage with social landlords as part of the work on pest control. They explained that tackling rodents required a dual approach by addressing rats in the sewer network through work with Anglian Water, while also dealing with above-ground issues such as waste, gardens and alleyways that provided habitats for pests. Simply carrying out sewer baiting would not solve the problem unless these surface-level issues were addressed as well. Ms Hitter said that further engagement with social landlords could be explored, but the current focus was on discussions with Anglian Water and the Council's proposed sewer baiting work. They also noted that any independent sewer baiting activity required permission from Anglian Water and could create liability risks if damages were caused to sewer infrastructure.

A Member then asked what evidence the Council currently had about the extent and location of rodent activity across the borough. They referred to the report's statement that a robust evidence base was needed to identify infestation hotspots and wanted to know whether any hotspots or patterns of rodent activity had already been identified. Ms Borgstrom explained that the Council had some information from pest-related complaints, but rodent issues were often recorded as part of broader environmental, housing, or business complaints, making hotspot identification difficult. Anglian Water was willing to work with the council but required evidence of specific infestation hotspots before targeted action could be taken.

Large Item Waste Collection

A Member expressed concern that the operational capacity of 20 collections per day would only cover a fraction of the 13,000 eligible households over the 9-month trial, potentially leading to complaints if eligible residents were turned away. The panel wondered whether this could be mitigated if communications clearly managed public expectations by framing the service as a 9-month trial or running until the budget was exhausted. Ms Borgstrom stated that the service was intended as an offer for those who need it, the expectation was not that every eligible resident would use it. The trial would help measure local demand, with uptake elsewhere typically ranging from 10-20%.

Extra Large Wheelie Bins

The panel discussed the issues Officers raised with the budget amendment, relating to procurement and logistic challenges around 1100-litre bins. They proposed that they replaced the single 1100-litre bin offer with up to three 360-litre domestic-style extra-large wheelie bins, which were safer to handle, compatible with standard vehicle hoists, already available in Council stock and easier to store. To prevent abuse by commercial builders or fly-tippers, members suggested introducing a strict penalty clause (up to £1,000) in the hire contract to cover the cost of removing prohibited materials. One Member liked the idea but had concerns that if a bin was left unattended and misused by someone else, the resident who hired it could be held responsible.

Skip It

A Councillor expressed disappointment that the trial was occurring during colder, darker months, which may reduce resident turnout. Ms Borgstrom explained that scheduling events during the summer holidays placed unsustainable pressure on existing street cleansing and waste staff due to peak tourism and seasonal maintenance demands.

The panel asked that Officers liaised with Ward Councillors when the Skip It events were organised to help promote the events taking place in their wards.

Dog Fouling

A Member argued for maintaining the targeted clean-up and enforcement resource, noting that dog fouling remained a top concern for residents, particularly around schools and parks. It was noted that dog fouling on pavements historically spiked during winter when owners avoided walking their dogs on wet grass. The panel suggested that the trial focused on high-priority hotspots and included clear signage in parks pointing towards the nearest bin, encouraging owners to carry waste further. Ms Borgstrom explained that the Council aimed to provide bins where needed, provided they could be managed safely and effectively. As dog fouling remained an issue, the trial should continue to gather evidence and inform future solutions.

The panel asked that Officers share data on the time of year when dog fouling was reported the most.

RESOLVED –

1) That Officers liaise with Ward councillor when the Skip It events were organised to help promote the events taking place in their wards.
2) That Officers share data on the time of year when dog fouling was reported the most.

Although the Panel supported some of the recommendations in the report, they agreed to remove recommendation 4 and recommend the following additional and amended recommendations to Cabinet for consideration:

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET –

1) Notes the progress made to date, including the initial delays in developing implementation plans following Full Council approval in February 2026, and approves the continuation of the trials and the carry forward of allocated Transformation Reserve funding into the next financial year as required to deliver the approved objectives.

2) Approve the continuation of the Pest Control Service Review and Sewer Baiting Programme, including ongoing benchmarking, data analysis and partnership discussions with Anglian Water, with a further report to be presented setting out recommended delivery options and any associated procurement requirements.

3) Approve the use of Council Tax Support as the eligibility threshold for the trial, noting that this reflects the data lawfully available to the Council, and support further consideration of a targeted, data-led phased implementation, enabling officers to balance affordability, operational capacity and the objective of reducing fly-tipping while maximising the impact of the available funding.

4) That due to technical difficulties with the 1100 litre bins and capital costs, residents be offered up to 3x 360litres bins instead of the 1100 litre bins.

5) Endorse the proposed data-led methodology for the delivery of the five Skip It events and note the progression of initial events in East Marsh and West Marsh, subject to the necessary statutory, regulatory, landowner and operational approvals being obtained.

6) Note the effectiveness of the current dog fouling response arrangements and see that the budget amendments be carried on with to clear away hotspot areas and use data to inform where the money be spent.

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 4.00 p.m.

Crime and Disorder Committee

8th October 2026 at 2.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Wilson (in the Chair)
Councillors Aisthorpe, K. Batson, Charlesworth, Crofts (substitute for Swinburn), Russell.

Officers in attendance:

- Laura Booth (Head of North East Lincolnshire PDU, National Probation Service)
- Paul Caswell (Head of Community Safety)
- Sarah Lumley (Public Health Programme Manager - Substance use)
- Harriet Malkin (Deputy Service Director – Safeguarding and Disability)
- Bev O'Brien (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)
- Eve Richardson Smith (Head of Legal and Governance)
- Joseph White (Deputy Service Director – Inclusion)

Also in attendance:

- Chief Inspector Kate Duffield (Humberside Police)
- Councillor Freeston (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Renewal, Delivery and Place Leadership
- Councillor Bonner (Ward Councillor)

CDC.1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Clough, Swinburn and Hudson.

CDC.2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest in relation to any items on the agenda.

CDC.3 COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP UPDATE

The committee considered a report from Chief Superintendent Sharon Philpott that provided an overview of findings of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP's) Joint Strategic Intelligence Assessment (JSIA), including performance data and emerging threats and antisocial behaviour and criminal damage in our parks and open spaces.

The Committee's discussion highlighted that residents' perceptions of anti-social behaviour were influenced by how safe they felt, rather than solely by actual incidents. It was recognised that people could feel concerned by groups of young people even when no wrongdoing was taking place, and that individual tolerance levels varied. The partnership stated that it had worked to promote consistent, positive messages, share information on local harms and available resources, and engage directly with residents through door-to-door conversations to better understand community concerns.

One Councillor asked how an independent observer would have assessed the partnership's effectiveness over the nearly 30 years since the legislation was introduced in 1998, and whether its overall record would have been viewed as a success, a failure, or a combination of both. Mr Caswell explained that the partnership had evolved and progressed over time rather than remaining static. It was noted that, although there was no statutory audit requirement, plans were underway to commission an independent review of the Community Safety Partnership and its priorities. The importance of external scrutiny was emphasised, and it was explained that regular reporting to the committee formed part of this accountability. The response also highlighted that partnership working across the Humber was strong and that, despite being a smaller organisation, local agencies worked closely together and effectively solved problems collaboratively. It was further acknowledged that independent assessment would help identify areas for improvement, and discussions were ongoing to support this process.

A Councillor discussed the critical importance of reporting and noted that residents often experienced long wait times when using the 101 non-emergency service. Mr Caswell emphasised that incidents needed to be reported to enable accurate problem profiling. Councillors had received briefings on reporting processes, and a guidance document was to be circulated outlining how residents could report crime and anti-social behaviour and access the appropriate services. Officers acknowledged this but emphasised that alternative reporting channels, including online portals and anonymous Crimestoppers submissions, must be promoted.

A Councillor praised the partnership's work in St James Square, noting that long-standing problems with drinking and drug use had been reduced and the area had been reclaimed for positive community use. The Councillor then raised a concern regarding drug houses, sharing a

case where drug dealing resumed within hours of a police raid and noting that local CCTV evidence was not collected from neighbours. Officers explained that closure orders often formed part of complex, long-term investigations into organised crime groups and agreed that timely intelligence on post-raid activity was important.

RESOLVED – That the Community Safety Partnership update be noted.

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 15.41 p.m.