

Minutes of the meeting of the Regulatory and Support Services Committee held in the Council Chamber, The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Monday 16th February 2015 at 4:30pm

P R E S E N T

Councillor Anna Bailey (Chairman)
Councillor Allen Alderson
Councillor Sue Austen
Councillor Tony Goodge (as Substitute for Councillor Derrick Beckett)
Councillor Lorna Dupré
Councillor Colin Fordham
Councillor Tony Parramint
Councillor Charles Roberts
Councillor Mike Rouse
Councillor Hazel Williams MBE

OFFICERS

Jo Brooks – Director, Regulatory Services
Liz Knox – Environmental Services Manager
Richard Quayle – Director, Support Services
Adrian Scaites-Stokes – Democratic Services Officer

42. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions from members of the public.

43. **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Derrick Beckett. Councillor Tony Goodge substituted for Councillor Beckett for this meeting.

44. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

45. **MINUTES**

It was resolved,

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd January 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

46. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- A project had started to look at cover, including telephone cover, for staff absences to ensure work continued as usual. All Service Leads would be providing information about the arrangements they had in place.
- There would be a Members' seminar held on 24th February on the work of this Committee and on the Transformation Programme and Customer Service.
- An additional Committee meeting would be scheduled for 13th April to consider the Performance Related Pay issue.

47. **PRIVATE SECTOR HOUSING STOCK MODELLING**

The Committee received a report, reference P190 previously circulated, that sought approval to commission a Private Sector Housing Stock Modelling Condition Report from the Building Research Establishment (BRE Ltd).

The Environmental Services Manager advised the Committee that all local authorities had a duty to understand their housing stock condition, which lead to appropriate strategies being undertaken. The last survey had been undertaken in 2009, so the information needed updating. This had previously involved a physical survey of over 900 houses, the cost of which had been £60K. Since then a new way of obtaining relevant information had become available via a stock modelling service. Currently 223 other local authorities used this as it was value-for-money. The modelling gleaned information from a number of different sources, which enabled an estimation of rating hazards. It also had cost benefits allowing capital and resources to be focussed.

It was suggested that a health impact survey be carried out at the same time and if the modelling survey was undertaken alongside Cambridge City Council there would be a slight reduction in costs.

Councillor Anna Bailey highlighted that this could provide a £30K saving form the budget.

Councillor Hazel Williams, as the Environmental Health Champion, had been delighted to take part in considering this option and had been very impressed with the information that could be provided, which was better than before. The end product would be a better result for the Council.

Councillor Lorna Dupré asked what the Council would be getting from the 25-year licence, whether Cambridge City Council were happy to join this Council with this scheme, whether the information gathered would be sufficient for legislative purposes and whether using an Access database would prevent loss of any functionality with the information.

The Environmental Services Manager explained that the licence covered the information extracted via the service but at the end of the year the licence would not continue. Cambridge City Council would sign up to do a joint

modelling exercise. The information provided would be sufficient to inform the Council's Housing Strategy and highlight priority areas. The Council's Information Technology department would be involved with the database to ensure its functionality.

It was resolved:

That the Environmental Services Manager be authorised to Commission BRE Ltd to carry out Private Sector Housing Stock Modelling Condition.

48. **TEEP ASSESSMENT OF RECYCLING SERVICES**

The Committee received a report, reference P191 previously circulated, that considered the compliance of the Council's comingled recycling collection service with the requirements of the revised Waste Framework Directive.

The Waste Services Team Leader advised the Committee that the issue was very involved and related to the revised European Union directive, which required all countries to have separate collections of different materials. 'Separate collections' was open to interpretation and the reprocessors in the United Kingdom had challenged the UK law interpretation, which stated comingled recycling collections were acceptable. The subsequent judicial review had found in favour of the UK Government.

Local authorities had to do 'separate collection' of materials unless it met a necessity test and the Technically, Environmentally and Economically Practical (TEEP) test. An assessment had been completed on this Council's scheme against these tests:

- Necessity test – the material collected went to Amey Cespa, who assessed the material received and pass it through their recycling facility before re-analysing the resultant materials. These reprocessors were happy to accept the results, as tests showed this material was good enough;
- Technically practical – the system had been used by this Council and others had been reviewed and there were no problems technically;
- Environmentally practical – if the Council were to change and collect different materials separately then this would require more vehicles, use of more fuel and less materials would be collected. Therefore it was not environmentally practical;
- Economically practical – multiple variations on how materials could be collected had been considered. The conclusion was that any option would be substantially more expensive, which was not economically viable.

The conclusion was that there was no reason to change the collection regime, particularly as more material was being collected than previously. This conclusion could be challenged. A 'peer review' would be undertaken with the other Cambridgeshire authorities and some others with the results being given to the Member Champion.

Councillor Hazel Williams asked whether separating glass would reap a better price. It was noted that there was a massive difference in collection costs, so there was a danger that money could be lost. The Waste Services Team Leader had done some modelling which showed that putting all the materials in together garnered a certain price. The figures for separating out different materials had been checked and this had demonstrated that the additional income would not cover the additional costs incurred. Also, material prices were getting lower so glass alone would not be of great value. All the glass that was currently collected all went to high end use because of its quality.

Councillor Lorna Dupré thought the report was excellent but wanted to know what the percentage of contamination was, how that compared with other authorities, whether the Waterbeach facility performed better than others and whether there was anything the authority could do to improve contamination rates. The Committee was informed that the reproprocessors wanted local authorities to pay to clean up materials but the materials were supplied post-consumer use. The recycling facility was due for a £½ million upgrade which should help. The contamination levels were acceptable to the reproprocessors. The low levels of contamination did not necessarily mean that any facility was good but the Waterbeach one was very modern and very good. The Council were waiting on the Government to hear about an application it had made for further funding on a potential project to increase recycling rates and reduce contamination. More publicity would be needed to remind people to recycle properly in an effort to keep contamination levels low.

The Environmental Services Manager reminded the Committee that the Council was part of the Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Partnership and the Waste Services Team Leader attended their meetings alongside Amey Cespa. It had been revealed that the main contamination comes from the green waste collections.

Councillor Mike Rouse proffered thanks to the Waste Services Team Leader for the report, his knowledge and his professionalism in dealing with this issue.

It was resolved:

- (i) That the conclusions that current services do comply with requirements of the revised Waste Framework Directive be endorsed;
- (ii) That authority be given for minor amendments to the assessment to be made in consultation with the Member Champion for Waste following comments received through the 'peer review' of the assessment.

49. **FORWARD AGENDA PLAN**

The Committee received its forward agenda plan.

Councillor Anna Bailey reminded the Committee of the additional meeting and stated it would consider the Performance Related Pay and Customer Service Transformation issues.

It was resolved:

That the forward agenda plan be noted.

50. **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

It was resolved:

That the press and public be excluded during the consideration of the remaining agenda items no. 10 to 12 because it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during the items there would be disclosure to them of exempt information of Categories 1, 2 and 4 of Part I Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

51. **APPOINTMENTS, TRANSFERS, RESIGNATIONS AND TRENDS**

The Committee received a report, reference P192 previously circulated, that detailed staff appointments, transfers and resignations for January 2015.

Councillor Tony Goodge was concerned about the number of experienced staff that had been lost, as so much value had been lost and it would take years to regain that expertise. 21% of the staff had been lost and how could the Council not miss them.

Councillor Anna Bailey reminded the Committee that the new regime had introduced Service Delivery Plans to improve the service provided and this had received good feedback from the public. Although time would tell, the staff were given backing to take things forward.

Councillor Mike Rouse had confidence in the staff that the Council had to deliver the Council's agenda and provide better services to the public. Although it was sad to see some familiar faces leave, this had given other staff the opportunity to step up.

Councillor Allen Alderson noted that all the feedback had been positive as staff were responding to the new set up. The Council would be working for the better, on the public's behalf.

Councillor Sue Austen would have liked to have been informed when staff were leaving, as no notifications had been received. Councillor Lorna Dupré suggested this could be included in the Chairman's Chat newsletter.

It was resolved:

That the content of the information report be noted.

52. **EXEMPT MINUTES**

Councillor Sue Austen reminded the Committee that she had backed up the Environmental Services manager at the last meeting and it was suggested the words "The taxi trade were very satisfied with the service provided by the Licensing Department" be added to the minutes. This was agreed.

It was resolved,

That the Exempt Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd January 2015, as amended, be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

53. **EXEMPT JOINT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE NOTES**

It was resolved:

That the notes of the Joint Consultative Committee be noted.

The meeting closed at 5:16pm.