



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 23 July 2018 at 4.30 p.m.

### **P R E S E N T**

Cllr Anna Bailey (Chairman)  
Cllr David Ambrose Smith (as a Substitute)  
Cllr Elaine Griffin-Singh  
Cllr Carol Sennitt  
Cllr Stuart Smith (as a Substitute)  
Cllr Jo Webber  
Cllr Christine Whelan (as a Substitute)

### **ALSO PRESENT**

Jo Brooks – Director Operations  
James Khan – ECSS Waste Minimisation & Fleet Manager  
Liz Knox – Environmental Services Manager  
Alistair Merrick – Waste Consultant  
Janis Murfet – Democratic Services Officer  
John Steel – Management Accountant  
Jenny Winslet – Senior Environmental Health Officer  
Nick Wyatt – Sustainability Officer

#### **14. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

#### **15. APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies were received from Councillors Sue Austen, Julia Huffer and Chris Morris.

Councillors David Ambrose Smith, Stuart Smith and Christine Whelan attended as Substitute Members.

#### **16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Anna Bailey declared an interest in the following Agenda Items: No 8 (Environmental Strategy), No 9 (Results of the Neighbourhood Recycling Centre Provision Consultation) and No 10 (Quarter 1 Performance Report for the Waste & Street Cleansing Services), being a Director of East Cambs Street Scene Ltd. She said that she would leave the Chamber prior to consideration of these items.

## 17. **MINUTES**

Further to the Minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2018, Agenda Item 12 (Housing Update), page 9, the Chairman requested that the final sentence be amended to read:

‘... The school programme looked fantastic and the fact that some social housing was **going to people in** Band C of the housing register showed that the team was on top of the homelessness problem.’ Whereupon,

It was resolved:

That the minutes of the Regulatory Services Committee meetings held on 24<sup>th</sup> May and 4<sup>th</sup> June 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

## 18. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Members’ attention was drawn to a copy of a flyer ‘Reducing single-use plastics in catering premises.’ Following a suggestion made at the last meeting of Committee, the flyer had been produced and would go out to all relevant businesses in the District.

## 19. **ENERGY COMPANY OBLIGATION (ECO) STATEMENT OF INTENT (SOI)**

The Committee considered a report, reference T52, previously circulated, which informed Members of the criteria agreed by the Cambridgeshire Energy Partnership for the Statement of Intent relating to Energy Company Obligation.

The Sustainability Officer reminded Members that East Cambridgeshire was part of a countywide energy partnership which was originally formed to deliver the Government’s Green Deal programme. The partnership had now been regenerated to provide greater opportunities in terms of attracting funding and developing projects, while allowing the Authorities to tailor projects to meet the specific demands and priorities in their area. A draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) setting out agreed objectives and principles of collaboration for all partners was attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

The ECO government programme was designed to reduce fuel poverty and carbon emissions and the current phase included a ‘flexible eligibility’ mechanism (ECO Flex) by which obligated energy suppliers could fulfil some of their obligations by installing energy saving measures in premises that had been declared eligible by local authorities.

Those local authorities participating in ECO Flex were required to publish a Statement of Intent (SOI), setting out the eligibility criteria they intended to use to identify households that might benefit from the scheme. It was noted that a joint SOI (attached as Appendix 2 to the report) had been developed by the Cambridgeshire Energy Partnership. It specified that to be eligible for support, households would need to meet one of the low income criteria listed, plus either one of the criteria for high heating costs or one for vulnerability to cold.

Proposals had been developed by the Partnership to submit a bid for Warm Home Funding (WHF); this would allow more vulnerable households in Cambridgeshire to have energy efficiency measures installed at low or no cost. The funding obtained via the ECO Flex programme would be used to support the Partnership's application and it was intended to submit the bid before the Round 2a deadline on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2018. The bid would be for an 18 month project running from November 2018 to April 2020, installing first time central heating systems in households in both social and privately owned housing.

It was further noted that Sanctuary Housing was also working with the Partnership to include 100 – 150 social housing sector homes across the county, targeting fuel poor residents. Using a combination of ECO Flex and WHF, it was intended that installations for private sector housing would be 100% funded.

Councillor Ambrose Smith asked if charity properties would be included in the scheme and the Sustainability Officer replied that they would not. The Chairman then asked if individual tenants could apply and was advised that they could, if they qualified.

Councillor Webber enquired whether Sanctuary would be allocated a pot of funding for their homes and the Sustainability Officer replied that they had been invited to submit a list which would go forward to Warm Homes Funding. Sanctuary would manage the project but any tenants could contact the Council and they would be taken through the process.

It was resolved unanimously:

- 1) To agree to the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU);
- 2) To note the Energy Company Obligation Statement of Intent (ECO Flex);
- 3) To endorse the submission for the Warm Homes Bid

## 20. **APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT HEALTH & SAFETY ENFORCEMENT POLICY FOR CONSULTATION**

The Committee considered a report, reference T53, previously circulated, that informed Members of the need for the Council to update its Health & Safety Policy in line with the Health & Safety Executive's enforcement policy statement and other minor changes to the Executive's guidance.

The Senior Environmental Health Officer reiterated that the Health & Safety Executive required the Council to have an enforcement policy that was in line with its own enforcement policy statement.

The policy was last updated in 2015 and no responses were received during the 12 week consultation period. As the amendments to this revised policy were of a minor nature, it was therefore suggested that a 6 week consultation period with relevant stakeholders and the general public would provide sufficient time for comment.

The Chairman thought it would be useful to have the tracked changes left in the document so that all could see them and she added that at the County Council, amendments were underlined and new additions to a document were highlighted in bold type. As these amendments were of a very minor nature, she felt that unless any fundamental changes were required, it would be overly bureaucratic to bring the Enforcement Policy to come back to Committee again.

The Chairman duly proposed and the Committee agreed that paragraph 2.1.2 be amended to read:

‘Delegate the authority for agreeing the Policy to the Environmental Services Manager in consultation with the Chairman **and Vice Chairman** of the Regulatory Services Committee **after** the 6 week consultation period.’

It was resolved unanimously:

That the Environmental Services Manager be given delegated authority, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Regulatory Services Committee, to agree the Health & Safety Enforcement Policy after the 6 week consultation period.

*At this point, the Chairman stated that as she was leaving the Chamber before consideration of Agenda Items 8, 9 and 10 and the Vice Chairman was not present, it would be necessary to elect a Chairman for the duration of these items.*

*It was duly proposed, seconded and agreed that Councillor David Ambrose Smith should assume the Chair in her absence.*

*Councillor Bailey left the Chamber and Councillor Ambrose Smith assumed the Chair.*

## 21. **ENVIRONMENT STRATEGY**

The Committee considered a report, reference T54, previously circulated, from which Members were asked to note and approve the Draft Environment Strategy.

The Environmental Services Manager introduced her report by reminding Members that the Strategy was a public facing document which set out what the Council was doing to ensure it provided opportunities for residents, businesses and visitors to contribute to improving the environment and reducing the amount of waste produced across the District.

Successful implementation would be achieved by continuing to work in partnership with residents, businesses, Parish Councils and with East Cambs Street Scene Ltd.

The Council was proud of its achievements over recent years that had had a positive impact on the environment. Following the introduction of the wheeled bin recycling collections, the percentage of waste recycled had risen and as a

result, the Council had moved from 257<sup>th</sup> out of 320 English Councils to 26<sup>th</sup> position.

In April 2018 waste collection and Street Cleansing Services were transferred to East Cambridgeshire Street Scene Ltd and in the first few weeks of transfer, a backlog of fly tipping incidents were cleared. Procedures had been reviewed and implemented to ensure an improved response and clean up times for fly tipping on public land.

Members noted that links to the Council's website were still to be added to pages 11 and 13 of the Strategy document; the percentages in paragraph 2.2 on page 26 required correction, and the formatting on page 42 was to be changed.

Councillor Whelan thanked the Environmental Services Officer for all her work on the document, but said that it seemed to her to be more like a plastics strategy. She asked whether there were any plans to include the conservation of resources or to add in flooding, as the latter was particularly important to this area. The Environmental Services Manager replied that the Strategy was a first draft and could be added to; the points raised could be examined and included on an 'as and when' basis.

Councillor Smith expressed his appreciation that the Strategy contained references to dog fouling and fly tipping, saying that these two issues were a particular problem in Haddenham.

In response to a question from Councillor Webber about how zoning was calculated, the Waste Consultant explained that it went back to the Environmental Protection Act. The more populated areas of the District, such as Ely, Soham and Burwell would be in Zone 1; Zone 2 would include some parts of Ely, and the smaller villages would fall within Zone 3. Parish Councils would also have a role to play in the process.

Councillor Whelan enquired about the numbers of households requesting a second blue bin. The Sustainability Officer replied that 582 requests had been received since April 2018. Given that there were approximately 34,000 – 36,000 households in the District, this did not appear to be a very high number, but the initiative was still in its very early stages.

Councillor Ambrose Smith commented that while the indication was that second blue bins were going to the higher performing areas such as Burwell and Ely, the lower priority areas should be encouraged to participate in the scheme. The Director, Operations added that it was being promoted as much as possible; she believed it would gather momentum and she was very pleased with the results.

Councillor Smith asked about the numbers of bins being kept in stock and the Director assured Members that there were plenty because between 10 and 15 requests were being received each day.

It was resolved unanimously:

That the draft Environment Strategy and associated action plan be approved.

## 22. **RESULTS OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD RECYCLING CENTRE PROVISION CONSULTATION**

The Committee considered a report, reference T55, previously circulated, regarding the future provision of neighbourhood recycling centres in the light of a full kerbside recycling service being offered in the District, including additional wheelbins for dry recyclates.

The Sustainability Officer reminded Members of the background to the issue, saying that the contractors providing the bring bank services wished to pull out because it was uneconomic for them to continue. A limited service was still being provided but the Council had been given notice that it would soon cease.

It was noted that the current cost to the Council for this service was £15,398.48 per annum, and following the introduction across the District of kerbside recycling, the tonnage of recyclates being recovered from bring banks had fallen substantially.

Members had therefore requested an options appraisal regarding future provision, including a consultation exercise with residents. Paragraph 3.7 of the report set out the three questions:

- Option 1 – Should the Council remove all bring banks except textiles at the earliest opportunity?
- Option 2 – Should the Council provide an in-house combined service to a limited number of sites using ECDC banks and vehicles?
- Option 3 – Should the Council provide an in-house combined service at all sites using ECDC banks and vehicles?

Consultees were also asked if they would be prepared to contribute to the increased cost of providing the service in house, if Option 2 or 3 was selected.

The outcome of the consultation showed that the majority of consultees agreed with more than one option and of the nine Parish Councils that responded, seven confirmed that they were not prepared to commit funds to retaining a bring bank. Littleport Parish Council had requested that irrespective of the consultation outcome, all bring banks in Littleport be removed.

The Director, Operations said she was unsure about the right questions having been asked as the responses received presented a somewhat confusing picture. She suggested that the Sustainability Officer should undertake another piece of work and approach the Parish Councils who had responded to ascertain whether they wanted to retain the bring banks and were willing to pay for them.

Councillor Ambrose Smith concurred, adding that if Ward Members could also be consulted everyone would have an appreciation of the costs. Officers could then bring another report to Committee which would help Members to make an informed decision.

It was resolved unanimously:

- 1) That the results of the consultation be noted;
- 2) That the Sustainability Officer consult further with the Parish Councils who responded to the consultation and that a further report is brought to the September meeting of the Regulatory Services Committee.

23. **QUARTER 1 PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR THE WASTE AND STREET CLEANSING SERVICES**

The Committee considered a report, reference T56, previously circulated, which provided the Quarter 1 (April to June 2018) performance report for the delivery of the waste and street cleansing services by East Cambs Street Scene Ltd (ECSS) after the insourcing of the services on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018.

The Director, Operations said that while some inroads had been made into improving the service, the first quarter provided an opportunity to review the team, policies and procedures. It also gave the crew a voice to make known their views before new and better ways of working were implemented.

She had inherited an under resourced and demoralised crew with very few records, policies or procedures, and those that were in place were mainly inaccurate. However, she saw this as a positive because it meant that she had a clean sheet from which to introduce, implement and monitor best practice with ambitious stretch targets that were far higher than those required by Veolia.

A supplementary note setting out an updated overview of outstanding service requests as at 20<sup>th</sup> July 2018 was tabled at the meeting.

The Director continued, saying that she was as disappointed as Members that the figures were woefully inadequate. However, things were already improving and small but significant differences were starting to show. Underlying issues were now being addressed and new and better ways of working were being introduced to improve the service to residents and make the District beautiful once more.

This first quarter was disappointing but not unsurprising, and she hoped to be nearer the ambitious stretch targets she had set the services for the second quarter.

Councillor Ambrose Smith asked if the operatives were reporting the functions that other partners were not fulfilling and if this was communicated upwards. The Director replied that the crews reported directly to the Assistant Manager; they had daily round sheets and there was provision for such detail to be included on them. Both she, the ECSS Waste Minimisation & Fleet Manager and the Assistant Manager would have no hesitation in highlighting any issues.

The Waste Consultant reminded the Committee that it would take a bit of time to put right the current unstructured work process, but it would be achieved.

Councillor Whelan was pleased to see that issues had been identified and were being addressed and she asked how ECSS compared with other waste services. The Waste Consultant said that each company had its own methods but the high performing companies tended to base their stretch targets on the same criteria.

Councillor Whelan next raised the issue of working practices, saying that pre-7.00am, some crews were blocking roads when collecting the waste, and this was causing problems for people setting off for work etc. The Waste Consultant replied that the workforce would need to be re-educated regarding their relationship with customers; The Waste Minimisation & Fleet Manager was very experienced in handling such matters and he would be happy to hear of any issues. Councillor Webber added that she thought the service was 100% better and that the crews did make an effort to let people come past their vehicles. The public should be encouraged to report any problems, but via the self-service system rather than phoning in.

Councillor Griffin Singh wished to know who was now dealing with the removal of graffiti and the Director said she was looking at which service it should go to. At the moment it fell within the remit of Waste, but it was an issue of antisocial behaviour and links had been built with the Police. She wondered whether Housing should co-ordinate it under the Community Safety umbrella, with the Depot removing the graffiti, as Community Payback Teams, who currently dealt with it, were not always the most reliable.

The Chairman thanked the Director for putting the document together, and there being no further comments or questions,

It was resolved:

That the progress made to date to consolidate and begin to improve the services being delivered; and the enhanced management arrangements put in place by the Director – Operations to accelerate the improvement progress within ECSS, be noted.

*At this point, Councillor Bailey returned to the Chamber and resumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.*

## **24. ANNUAL REPORTS OF REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES**

The Committee considered a report, reference T57, previously circulated, regarding the Annual Reports from appointed Council representatives on the activities and manner in which funding is spent by the outside bodies within the responsibility of the Regulatory Services Committee.

Councillor Whelan enquired about the issues encountered by RECAP. In the absence of Councillor Huffer (the Council's representative on the RECAP Board), the Director stated that the local authorities had pooled their resources to ensure that waste was disposed of as cost effectively as possible. There had been some problems with AmeyCespa in connection with contaminated recycling.

Councillor Whelan next asked how other Members knew what was happening with the outside bodies. The Democratic Services Officer explained that now the annual review had been completed, the Outside Bodies Booklet would be published on the Council's website and the link circulated to all Members and Service Leads.

It was resolved:



That the Annual Reports from appointed Council representatives on the activities and manner in which funding is spent by the outside bodies within the responsibility of the Regulatory Services Committee, be noted.

25. **BUDGET MONITORING REPORT**

The Committee considered a report, reference T58, previously circulated, which provided Members with budget monitoring information for services under the Regulatory Services Committee.

The Management Accountant drew Members' attention to paragraph 3.4 of the report which showed a projected underspend of £60,000 on the net revenue expenditure of £3,476,687 for the Committee.

With slippage from 2017/18 having been added to the revised capital budget, it was anticipated that expenditure would be in line with the budget.

It was resolved:

- 1) To note that this Committee has a projected revenue underspend of £60,000 compared to its approved budget of £3,536,687;
- 2) To note that this Committee has a projected capital programme outturn of £2,530,799, which is in line with its capital budget for the year.

26. **FORWARD AGENDA PLAN**

The Committee noted the forward agenda plan and that a further report on the Neighbourhood Recycling Centre Provision Consultation would come to the September 2018 meeting.

It was resolved;

That the Forward Agenda Plan, and the comments made thereon, be noted.

The meeting concluded at 5:32pm.