



EAST  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

**REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting of the Regulatory Services Committee held in the Council Chamber, The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely on 10 September 2018 at 4.30 p.m.

**PRESENT**

Cllr Anna Bailey (Chairman)  
Cllr David Ambrose Smith (as a Substitute)  
Cllr Lorna Dupre (as a Substitute)  
Cllr Elaine Griffin-Singh  
Cllr Julia Huffer  
Cllr Chris Morris  
Cllr Stuart Smith (as a Substitute)  
Cllr Jo Webber

**ALSO PRESENT**

Cllr Lis Every  
Emma Grima – Director Commercial  
Adrian Scaites-Stokes – Democratic Services Officer  
Hetty Thornton – Performance Management Officer  
Cathy White – Senior Trees Officer  
Nick Wyatt – Sustainability Officer

27. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

28. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies were received from Councillors Sue Austen, Hamish Ross and Carol Sennitt.

Councillors David Ambrose Smith, Lorna Dupre and Stuart Smith attended as Substitute Members.

29. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Anna Bailey declared an interest in agenda item 6, as she was a Director of East Cambs Street Scene.

30. **MINUTES**

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the Regulatory Services Committee meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

31. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

*Cllr Anna Bailey left the meeting at this point and the Vice Chairman, Cllr Julia Huffer took the Chair.*

32. **NEIGHBOURHOOD RECYCLING CENTRE PROVISION**

The Committee considered a report, reference T88, previously circulated, about the future of neighbourhood recycling centres.

The Sustainability Officer reminded the Committee that the current providers of the bring banks were not willing to carry on doing so. The Committee had seen the results of the original consultation, where three possible options were suggested. The original consultation had been a bit ambiguous so officers had been instructed to consult with the parish councils that had responded. As a result of feedback from this consultation Option 2 was recommended, an in-house service for a limited number of high performing sites. If this option were agreed there would be a cost implication of £6000 plus rental costs of £990. Including the estimated income of recycling credits, this would result in an overall cost of over £4000. Potential costs could increase on those sites, therefore it was recommended that the impact be reviewed after 12 months.

Councillor Julia Huffer queried why rent had to be paid to some parish councils for their bring banks. This should be negotiated so no rent had to be paid. Councillor Elaine Griffin-Singh, in picking up that point, noted that it was not a significant amount of money but if the parish councils wanted that service then it should continue without the Council contributing financially. The Sustainability Officer thought this was historic but could be reviewed.

Councillor Stuart Smith thought that most of the banks took textiles so wanted to know how much income parish councils got from that. The Sustainability Officer reckoned that the amount would fluctuate, though it was much less cost effective than before.

Councillor Lorna Dupre suggested that the review should include information about the rents paid as well as how the sites had performed. With reference to the figures in paragraph 3.11, it was unclear what the figures included for. Were capital and revenue figures included together? If these were the only costs and income then this should be paid off over 3 years. But it was not clear whether there would be any other costs or income. A complete picture of the financial situation was needed. How many recycling credits did the Council

receive and would the Council be losing recycling credits as a result of the proposed changes?

The Sustainability Officer considered this a fundamental issue, though the value of recycling credits had substantially reduced. The Performance Management Officer stated that the current level of recycling credits meant the Council was not taking anything from it. The one-off cost of £6000 was for 20 bring banks with £2322 coming in-house. It might be possible to increase the size of the bring banks providing this was a viable option. The current level of recycling credits could be worked out on the tonnages collected, however it was not cost effective to keep some banks.

Councillor Julia Huffer did not want the abandoned sites to become fly tips so suggested that appropriate signage be installed to inform people where they should go. This must be done properly and the relevant parish councils could be asked to contribute to the costs. Councillor David Ambrose Smith concurred stating that people would still dump rubbish at those sites so signage would be needed. Councillor Lorna Dupre acknowledged that this was important and stressed that the signs had to be official looking conveying the necessary information quickly. Councillor Huffer duly proposed this and this was agreed.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the results of the additional consultation process be noted;
- (ii) That all bring banks be removed across East Cambridgeshire, apart from the ones located in high performing areas, with appropriate signage being installed;
- (iii) That the bring banks located in the high performing areas be reviewed in 12 months' time.

*Councillor Anna Bailey returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair.*

**33. TREE STRATEGY 2018-2028**

The Committee considered a report, reference T89, previously circulated, that detailed the draft Tree Strategy.

The Senior Trees Officer advised the Committee that the Tree Strategy had come about as it was part of the Planning Department's Service Delivery Plan. The Strategy set out clear aims, reflected the Council's Corporate Objectives and met the needs of customers. It would be a 'working document' and demonstrated how the Tree Service linked into national and local policies including the Local Plan. It also followed national, county and district guidance. The Performance Plan within it set out the objectives to be delivered, how it would be measured and the actions to be taken. The actions in the Strategy were colour-coded so users could hone in on the relevant topics. The Action Plan would be reviewed annually, which would be reported via the Service Delivery Plan.

## AGENDA ITEM NO. 4

Councillor Lis Every, the Planning Service Delivery Champion, thought that production of this Strategy was fantastic and would include the key policy challenges. It was easily accessible to lots of different people, which was the result of the tremendous amount of pre-research work completed. It had been carefully thought through and was practical and workable.

Councillor Stuart Smith asked which parish councils had Tree Wardens. The Senior Trees Officer stated that these were dealt with via Parish Clerks and the Wardens were volunteers. Unfortunately there were no resources available to promote this scheme. The volunteers did as much or as little as they wished. Councillor Anna Bailey thought that this could be followed up to gain more volunteers.

Councillor Lorna Dupre strongly supported the use of Information Technology to gather data. How much work do tree surgery companies do for the Council? People did not always know where to go for help so the service ought to be promoted.

The Committee was informed that tree surgeons had done very little and the Council were lucky to have the Open Spaces team on hand if necessary. Other landowners were aided when storm damage was suffered with advice offered. Some information about the service was available on the Council's website and further promotion would be considered.

Councillor Anna Bailey thought the Tree Service was critical to ensure trees in the district were properly valued and the Senior Trees Officer was commended on her work and the production of this comprehensive Strategy. It was acknowledged that the Service had a large workload, particularly relating to Tree Preservation Orders.

Councillor Chris Morris noted that a member of staff had left the Service and questioned how many officers were expected to run the Service in the future. The Senior Trees Officer suggested that two officers was the minimum requirement due to the number of trees in the district and the area that had to be covered.

It was resolved:

That the Tree Strategy 2018-2018, attached at Appendix 1, be approved.

### 34. **FORWARD AGENDA PLAN**

The Committee received its forward agenda plan.

The meeting concluded at 5:07pm.