

## **EXECUTIVE**

**28 NOVEMBER 2019**

**Present:**

Councillors G Hook (Leader), Dewhirst (Deputy Leader), J Hook, Connett, Jeffries, MacGregor, Taylor and Wrigley

**Members in Attendance:**

Councillors Goodman-Bradbury, Keeling and Purser

**Officers in Attendance:**

Sarah Selway, Democratic Services Team Leader & Deputy Monitoring Officer  
Trevor Shaw, Senior Planning Officer  
Phil Shears, Managing Director

**90. MINUTES**

Minutes of the meeting on the 31 October 2019 were approved and signed as a correct record.

**91. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**92. EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN**

**RESOLVED** that the Executive Forward Plan be noted

**93. BUDGET MONITORING – REVENUE & CAPITAL AND TREASURY MANAGEMENT MID YEAR REVIEW**

The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services presented the report to update Members on the budget at the end of October 2019 and the treasury management lending list. He advised that there were uncertainties with funding for the Council going forward particularly with regards to the proposal to abolish New Homes Bonus and what would replace it, and the impact of changes with Business Rates. He highlighted the variations and brought Members attention to the waste saving sharing agreement with Devon County Council and the successful bids for the Rough Sleeper Initiative and Warm Homes Fund.

In response to a non-Executive Member, the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services clarified that the Rural Skip Service was a service that the residents valued, details regarding Section 106 Monies for individual Parishes could be made available for Ward Members and the pre-application advice income was additional funding that supported the planning service.

The recommendation was proposed by Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services and seconded by the Portfolio Holder for Waste Management & Environmental Health.

**RESOLVED** that:-

- (1) the revenue budget variations as shown at appendix 1 be approved;
- (2) the updated capital programme as shown at appendix 2 be approved; and
- (3) the updated lending list as shown at appendix 3 be noted.

**RECOMMENDED** to Council:

- (4) to note the mid-year review of treasury management at appendix 4.

#### **94. EXISTING AND FUTURE PLANNING POLICIES TO MEET THE CHALLENGES OF CLIMATE CHANGE**

The Portfolio Holder for Climate Change Emergency and Housing presented the report to consider the call-in of Executive regarding the fourth resolution of 8 October 2019 from Overview and Scrutiny Committee. She clarified that the Council was committed to do all it legally could to meet the climate change challenges. The various policies in the local plan would be informed by robust evidence and there would be a full consultation on the local plan and the policies to be contained within it. Following the call-in the wording of recommendation four had the following wording added 'including low carbon policy formulation and related quantification developed....'.

The Portfolio Holder for Climate Change Emergency and Housing commented following the outcome of the consultation on the Local Plan that within legal requirements all the relevant local plan policies coming forward should address the issue of low carbon/carbon neutral development.

The Senior Planning Officer stated that the government was currently undertaking a Future Homes Standard consultation which would hopefully result in a stronger national remit.

The report was proposed by the Portfolio Holder for Climate Change Emergency and Housing and seconded by the Portfolio Holder for Planning.

**RESOLVED** that the approval of a suite of policies to be prepared through an update of the Local Plan to meet Climate Change challenges including low carbon policy formulation and related quantification developed in consultation with local experts and interest groups, such as Action on Climate in Teignbridge

## **95. PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (FOR DOG CONTROL)**

The Portfolio Holder for Waste Management and Environmental Health presented the report to consider the findings of the Review Group on the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for dog control. He thanked Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Review Group for their work on this.

He commented that with regards to recommendation four from Overview & Scrutiny regarding licensing individual dog walkers and that all dogs should have a license, the proposal was that the Review Group should look to further investigate how this would operate and the costs involved and report back to Executive in due course.

Members welcomed the measures to engage with irresponsible dog owners and that Town and Parishes should be encouraged to put up signage to reiterate the regulations of the PSPO.

The recommendation was proposed by Portfolio Holder for Waste Management and Environmental Health and seconded by

**RESOLVED** that the following be approved:-

- (1) In relation to the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for Responsible Dog Ownership under ss59 to 75 of the Anti-Social Crime and Policing Act 2014, the number of dogs that any one person can walk at any one time remain at 6, as agreed by Council on 14/1/19 Justification There is insufficient evidence to reduce this number to less than 6.
- (2) The seasonal dog exclusion areas on beaches remain as 1 April to 30 September, as agreed by Executive on 4 December 2018. Justification: There is no evidence to suggest the date should be altered to 1 May; there are plenty of beaches that can be used all year round; and the restrictions relate to an area of most beaches but not all of them.
- (3) The use of body cameras by Community Enforcement Wardens is not progressed. Justification There is no evidence to suggest that body cameras would be beneficial. No member of staff has requested a body camera, they all have work mobiles with the capability to record footage, the additional expense cannot be justified and it would be better allocated towards publicity campaigns.
- (4) In response to the DEFRA Animal Welfare Regulations consultation, the Council respond by suggesting that dog walking individuals who are walking other peoples' dogs (by collecting the dogs from their owners

house and returning them) either voluntarily or for a fee should be licensed.

Justification, Individuals who do not have a residence based business such as those who provide a dog walking service only should be licensed. District Councils currently administer animal welfare licences, and fees are retained by these Councils.

The review group also considered that an option was that all dogs should require a licence. This would be a new control.

Justification

It was considered that there was merit in all dogs being licenced. It was noted that all dogs were required to be microchipped and it was considered that while dogs were being microchipped they could be licensed. The suggested increased licensing administration could also be undertaken by District Councils.

These matters required further consideration by the Review Group.

- (5) Insurance Regulations are the responsibility of businesses to ensure they are adequately insured for their business, and this issue be included in the issues to be reviewed by the Group in its 12 month review.
- (6) The Council undertake a publicity campaign to encourage members of the public, Town and Parish Councils to engage with offending and irresponsible dog owners, and assist the Council in upholding the regulations of the Public Safety Protection Order.
- (7) The Review Group continue to undertake a review of the PSPO following 12 months of its implementation as set out in the Group's terms of reference.

The meeting started at 10.00 am and finished at 10.40 am.

Chairman