

## **ROSC – Scrutiny sub-committee**

**23 March 2016**

In Attendance:

A Chesterman  
G Michaelides  
N Pace  
S Roberts

S Hulks

### **Update**

Responses to the questions posed by the sub-committee had been received and these had led to some further queries.

Comment was made that one size does not fit all and individual circumstances should be considered. However, another point of view was that the process for debt recovery was publicised on the Council's website, it was reasonable and logical and that debtors ignored this at their own peril.

Members commented that there might be mental health issues or alcohol dependency. They queried how it was known whether a resident was vulnerable and they felt that it was dangerous to have one approach for all.

They said that a small debt could escalate.

It was noted that some other councils had reduced the use of Enforcement Officers and instead used other methods. Luton Borough Council was on such authority and Members asked for a representative to be invited to attend a meeting.

It was felt that the ideal approach would be to show empathy to residents, to be cost effective and to collect as much revenue as possible.

Members asked if there was a Good Practice Protocol.

Members also queried where the money collected as costs went. If £3 was paid to the court, who received the other £104?

One Member commented that there needed to be consequences to non-payment. There need to be investigation into the few that were vulnerable.

Members asked for a sample set of costs/debts, outcomes and the impact of the courts.

Next meeting date to be confirmed.