



**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**MEETING OF THE SCRUTINY STEERING BOARD**

**TUESDAY, 4TH MARCH 2008 AT 6.00 PM**

**COMMITTEE ROOM, THE COUNCIL HOUSE, BURCOT LANE, BROMSGROVE**

**MEMBERS:** Councillors P. M. McDonald (Chairman), J. T. Duddy (Vice-Chairman), Mrs. M. Bunker, R. J. Deeming, B. Lewis F.CMI, D. L. Pardoe and C. B. Taylor

**AGENDA**

1. To receive apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest and whipping arrangements
3. To confirm the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Steering Board held on 5th February 2008 (Pages 1 - 6)
4. Refuse and Recycling Scrutiny Report (Pages 7 - 54)
5. New Task Groups (Pages 55 - 72)
6. Recommendation Tracker (Pages 73 - 86)
7. Cabinet's Forward Plan (Pages 87 - 92)
8. Work Programme (Pages 93 - 96)

9. To consider any other business, details of which have been notified to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services prior to the commencement of the meeting and which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next meeting.

K. DICKS  
Chief Executive

The Council House  
Burcot Lane  
BROMSGROVE  
Worcestershire  
B60 1AA

22nd February 2008

# Agenda Item 3

## BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### MEETING OF THE SCRUTINY STEERING BOARD

TUESDAY, 5TH FEBRUARY 2008 AT 6.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillors P. M. McDonald (Chairman), J. T. Duddy (Vice-Chairman), Mrs. M. Bunker, R. J. Deeming, B. Lewis F.CMI, D. L. Pardoe and C. B. Taylor

Observers: Councillor Mrs. J. Dyer M.B.E., Councillor S. P. Shannon and Councillor M. J. A. Webb

Officers: Mr. K. Dicks, Mr. T. Beirne, Mr. P. Street, Mrs. C. Felton, Mrs. S. Sellers and Ms. D. McCarthy

#### 78/07 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

#### 79/07 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest or whipping arrangements were made.

#### 80/07 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Steering Board held on 8th January 2008 were submitted.

**RESOLVED** that, subject to the amendment to minute number 72/07 to include "(f) that Councillor Duddy be nominated as this Council's reserve representative on the joint countywide flooding scrutiny group", the minutes of the meeting be approved as a correct record.

#### 81/07 CABINET RESPONSE TO THE AIR QUALITY SCRUTINY REPORT

As the Portfolio Holder for Planning (which included Climate Change), Councillor Mrs. Dyer presented the Cabinet's response to the Air Quality Scrutiny Report. It was explained that the Cabinet had considered the report at its last meeting held on 9th January 2008 where the work of the Task Group, together with the excellent quality of the final scrutiny report, had been acknowledged.

Responses to each recommendation were taken one by one and it was noted that the majority of recommendations put forward had been approved.

With regard to the first recommendation relating to Low Emission Zones, part of the Cabinet's response was that the impact on the surrounding road

network as a result of motorists attempting to avoid the Low Emission Zones could make the situation worse. However, the Chairman questioned how the Cabinet could come to that conclusion with no supporting evidence. A discussion ensued.

It was confirmed that in relation to recommendation 4, Scrutiny Members were correct in stating that Worcestershire County Council (as the Highways Authority) were responsible for the particular set of traffic signals referred to in the recommendation and therefore, the County Council was the appropriate authority.

Councillor Mrs. Dyer was thanked for her attendance.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that the Cabinet be requested to reconsider its response to recommendation 1, as it appeared it had no supporting evidence; and
- (b) that the Cabinet's response to all other recommendations contained within the Air Quality Scrutiny Report be noted.

82/07 **PUBLIC TRANSPORT (BUSES) SCRUTINY REPORT**

Councillor Lewis presented the Scrutiny Report as Chairman of the Public Transport (Buses) Task Group. There was a brief discussion on the report, including its format.

The Task Group Chairman stated that he wished to be involved in ensuring the approved recommendations were implemented. Mr. Street, the Executive Director – Partnerships and Projects, informed the Board that there was already a Joint County and District Town Centre Steering Group and to ensure proper coordination, it was suggested that Councillor Lewis might wish to join that Group.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that the following recommendation be included in the report: "Councillor Lewis be invited to sit on the Joint County and District Town Centre Steering Group to assist the Council in ensuring any approved recommendations contained within the scrutiny report are implemented";
- (b) that, subject to (a) above being included, the Public Transport (Buses) Scrutiny Report containing recommendations be approved.

**RECOMMENDED** that the Public Transport (Buses) Scrutiny Report, as agreed by the Scrutiny Steering Board, be placed on the next available Agenda for Cabinet's consideration and all recommendations contained with the report be approved.

83/07 **UPDATE ON REFUSE AND RECYCLING SCRUTINY TASK GROUP**

Councillor Scurrall, Chairman of the Refuse and Recycling Task Group, provided a brief update which was read out to the Board.

Members were informed that at the Task Group Meeting held on 28th January 2008, the suggestion of investigating value for money was considered. It was agreed that as the current scrutiny investigation had now concluded, the Task Group would not delay its Scrutiny Report and the proposals it contained. However, the Task Group were of the opinion that the Scrutiny Steering Board should consider examining this issue as a separate scrutiny exercise.

It was confirmed that the Refuse and Recycling Scrutiny Report with recommendations would be on the next agenda for consideration by the Scrutiny Steering Board and the Task Group Chairman would be in attendance to present the report.

**RESOLVED** that the update given on the progress of the Refuse and Recycling Task Group be noted.

84/07 **UPDATE ON JOINT FLOODING SCRUTINY**

The Chairman of this Board, as the nominated representative on the Joint Countywide Task Group looking at flooding, stated that unfortunately, he had been unable to attend the meeting held at County Hall the previous evening.

However, he had received an update from Worcestershire County Council's officers and therefore could inform the Board that Councillor King from Wychavon District Council had been appointed Chairman. It was stated that the Task Group was intending to invite all agencies involved to future meetings to discuss the impact of recent flooding, the lessons learnt and ways all agencies could work better together in the future.

**RESOLVED** that the update provided by the Chairman be noted.

85/07 **CALLS FOR ACTION - CLG CONSULTATION**

The Board considered the report on Calls for Action as set out in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

Members were informed of the consultation exercise currently being carried out by the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) and were urged to put forward recommendations to full Council, via the Monitoring Officer, in response to the consultation paper.

There was a discussion on the Calls for Action process and various points were raised, such as the possible timescales for Councillors to respond and the impact certain timescales might have on single Member wards. There was also a concern over how letters to Councillors from the public would be monitored and it was suggested that perhaps they could be sent via officers.

It was reported that due to the limited information available from the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG), a further report on the matter would be submitted later in the year when guidance had been issued. (It was stated that if any Member had any comments relating to Local Petitions they should direct them to the Monitoring Officer after the meeting.)

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

**RECOMMENDED** that full Council include the following concerns of the Scrutiny Steering Board in response to the CLG consultation exercise on Calls for Action:

- (a) what would be the timescales for Councillors to respond to public requests and how could it be ensured single Member Wards would not be disadvantaged by those timescales; and
- (b) what procedure could be put in place to ensure requests from the public were monitored and recorded.

86/07 **CABINET'S FORWARD PLAN**

Consideration was given to the Cabinet's Forward Plan which contained the key decisions scheduled to be made over the next few months.

Members were reminded that the Cabinet's Forward Plan would be developed and improved in the near future to make it more meaningful to the Scrutiny Steering Board. It was explained that Heads of Service would be expected to incorporate information required for the Forward Plan into Business Plans and that through the constitution review a 'key decision' would be defined and agreed by full Council in March 2008. It was anticipated that the newly developed Forward Plan would be available to the public and the Scrutiny Steering Board by June 2008.

The Board was informed that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman had invited Councillor Webb (Portfolio Holder for Customer Care and Customer Service, and Revenue Generation) to attend to explain why the report relating to the Customer Panel 2 Results (item number 7 on the Forward Plan) had been delayed by a month by officers.

Councillor Webb responded that the delay had been due to the time taken to compile suitable questions. It was believed that it was important that questions within the survey covered all necessary areas in a clear and concise way, as it was believed that the quality of feedback was linked with the quality of questions. Councillor Webb informed the Board that he had a meeting scheduled with the Assistant Chief Executive the following week and would be discussing: (i) the progress of the report; and (ii) ensuring further delays would be avoided.

More information was requested on item number 15 which related to a write-off. However, it was believed that this was a confidential item and officers might not be able to provide any further information. It was also stated that it was unlikely to be a key decision.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services be requested to provide either further details in relation to item number 15 on the Forward Plan or an explanation as to why more information could not be disclosed, including details on the relevant legislation.

- (b) that the comments received from Councillor Webb (Portfolio Holder for Customer Care and Customer Service, and Revenue Generation) in relation to item number 7 on the Forward Plan be noted; and
- (c) that the Cabinet's Forward Plan be noted.

87/07 **SCRUTINY PROPOSALS**

Members considered the three scrutiny proposals received and there was a discussion on which should be added to the Board's work programme and the priority order. During that discussion it was pointed out that the spatial strategy, which one of the scrutiny proposals related to, was already on the work programme of the Performance Management Board.

The suggestion made by the Refuse and Recycling Task Group regarding scrutinising Value for Money in relation to Street Scene and Waste Management was also considered.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that a Task Group scrutinising Anti-Social Behaviour be established but that the appointment of Chairman be deferred until the next meeting of the Board;
- (b) that a Task Group scrutinising issues surrounding Alcohol Free Zones (AFZ) be established and Councillor Duddy be appointed as Chairman;
- (c) that letters be sent out to non-Cabinet Members requesting them to complete a membership form if they wish to join one of the Task Groups; and
- (d) that the topic of Value for Money in relation to Street Scene and Waste Management be considered by the Board at its next meeting.

88/07 **WORK PROGRAMME**

The work programme of the Scrutiny Steering Board was considered.

**RESOLVED** that the full work programme be noted.

89/07 **MEMBER TRAINING**

(The Chairman agreed to the consideration of this item as a matter of urgency as a decision was required thereon before the next ordinary meeting of the Scrutiny Steering Board.)

Mrs. Felton, Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, informed the Board that at a recent Modern Councillor Steering Group Meeting, scrutiny training which had been provided in 2007/08 was discussed. Members were requested to put forward their views on the training to Mrs. Felton to assist officers in developing the training programme for 2008/09. It was explained that Members' views on training content was of particular interest.

It was requested that school holidays, industrial shut downs and other Member meetings should be avoided where possible. With regard to content, it was stated that training on Value for Money would be useful.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that officers consider the suggestion of incorporating Value for Money training into the training programme for 2008/09; and
- (b) that any other suggestions/comments be directed to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services.

The meeting closed at 7.15 pm

Chairman

## BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### SCRUTINY STEERING BOARD

4TH MARCH 2008

#### REFUSE AND RECYCLING TASK GROUP

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Councillor Mrs. M. A. Sherrey JP
Responsible Head of Service	Head of Street Scene and Waste Management
Scrutiny Task Group Chairman	Councillor C. R. Scurrall

#### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 To consider the findings and recommendations made by the Refuse and Recycling Task Group which are contained within the attached report.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 Members are requested to:
- (a) consider and approve the attached report and recommendations contained within it; and
  - (b) submit the attached report to the Cabinet for approval.

#### 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 At the Meeting of the Scrutiny Steering Board on 12th June 2007, it was decided a Task Group would be established to scrutinise issues relating to refuse and recycling and that Councillor Taylor would be appointed as Chairman.
- 3.2 The full terms of reference were approved by the Scrutiny Steering Board at its meeting held on 3rd July 2007 when membership of the Task Group was also agreed.
- 3.3 After the first meeting of the Task Group, Councillor Taylor believed he had an interest and therefore resigned immediately. The Scrutiny Steering Board appointed Councillor Scurrall to take over as Chairman at its meeting on 2nd October 2007.
- 3.4 Further details can be found in the "Terms of Reference" and "Background and Methodology" sections on page 6 of the attached report.

#### **4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 For the majority of recommendations there are either no financial implications or minimal financial implications as outlined in the attached report. All of these costs can be met within the existing budget.
- 4.2 In relation to the NVQ training referred to in recommendations 1 to 3, funding assistance from Learning and Skills Council (LSC) is available and would cover the full cost of recommendations 1 and 2. It is expected that they will also cover approximately 50% of the costs of recommendation 3 which in total would amount to over £75,000. Therefore, the total cost to this Council will be approximately £1500 and this can be met within the existing training budget.

#### **5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 There are no legal implications relating to this report.

#### **6. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES**

- 6.1 This report links to Council Objectives Environment and Improvement.

#### **7. RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 7.1 The risk of not implementing the recommendations contained within the attached scrutiny report is that this Council does not continue to improve the refuse and recycling service and in particular, customer service standards.

#### **8. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 If the recommendations were approved and implemented, residents living in Bromsgrove District would benefit from improved customer service (e.g. via NVQ Training being provided to refuse and recycling crews, which would have an emphasis on customer satisfaction, as explained in the attached report).

#### **9. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 There are no implications directly relating to this report for the Council's Equalities and Diversity Policies.

#### **10. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 As there will be a significant amount of funding assistance available from the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) in relation to implementing recommendations 1, 2 and 3, it means that the NVQ Training would be value for money, particularly as it states within the recommendations that specific local protocols would need to be built into the training to ensure it meets the requirements for Bromsgrove District.

## 11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Procurement Issues – None.
Personnel Implications – There are implications in relation to recommendation 2 which requests that it is made a requirement for all new employees to either hold the NVQ in Waste Management or achieve it within an agreed timeframe.
Governance/Performance Management – None
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998 – None
Policy – None
Environmental – the refuse and recycling service is inextricably linked to environmental issues.

## 12. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holder	Yes
Chief Executive	Yes
Executive Director (Partnerships and Projects)	Yes
Executive Director (Services)	Yes
Assistant Chief Executive	Yes
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	Yes
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes
Head of Organisational Development & HR	Yes – The Learning and OD Manager was consulted.
Corporate Procurement Team	No

**13. WARDS AFFECTED**

All Wards.

**14. APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 – Refuse and Recycling Scrutiny Report including its seven appendices.

**15. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None.

**CONTACT OFFICER**

Name: Della McCarthy, Committee Services Officer  
E Mail: [d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk)  
Tel: (01527) 881407



**Bromsgrove**  
District Council

[www.bromsgrove.gov.uk](http://www.bromsgrove.gov.uk)

# SCRUTINY REPORT

## REFUSE AND RECYCLING

—

## SCRUTINY REPORT

---

Completed January 2008

Committee Services Officer: Della McCarthy

Page 11

# CONTENTS PAGE

	<b>Page Number</b>
Members	1
Summary of Role of Task Group	1
Summary of Recommendations	2
Terms of Reference	6
Background and Methodology	
▪ Public Involvement	6
▪ Witnesses	6
▪ Research	7
▪ Areas Covered	7
▪ The 'One Page Strategy'	8
Findings and Recommendations	
▪ Workforce Development (Recommendations 1-3)	10
▪ Increasing Recycling Rates (Recommendations 4-9)	13
▪ Green Waste Collection (Recommendation 10)	16
▪ Fortnightly Collections	17
▪ Communication (Recommendations 11-15)	18
Conclusion	20
Review	21
List of Appendices	22
<b>Appendix 1</b> – Task Group's Terms of Reference	
<b>Appendix 2</b> – A List of those the Task Group consulted	
<b>Appendix 3</b> – The 'One Page Strategy'	
<b>Appendix 4</b> – Extracts from Reports relating to NVQ Training	
<b>Appendix 5</b> – Information on Recycling Rates of Local Authorities	
<b>Appendix 6</b> – Incentive Scheme Trials	
<b>Appendix 7</b> – Extracts of comments made by local residents	

## **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

### **REPORT OF THE REFUSE AND RECYCLING TASK GROUP**

JANUARY 2008

#### **MEMBERS**

Councillors C. R. Scurrall (Chairman), Mrs. M. Bunker, Mrs. A. E. Doyle, S. P. Shannon and C. J. Tidmarsh

(Councillor C. B. Taylor was appointed Chairman initially and attended the first meeting of the Task Group. However, following the first Task Group Meeting, Councillor C. B. Taylor believed he had an interest and therefore resigned immediately. The Scrutiny Steering Board appointed Councillor C. R. Scurrall to continue as Chairman at its meeting in October 2007. Councillor C. R. Scurrall was already a Member of the Task Group and had received the required training to lead the scrutiny investigation.)

This Task Group wishes to acknowledge the assistance received from Mr. D. McGrath from Link Support Services (UK) Ltd who has helped the Task Group from the start of the investigation, with focusing on specific topic areas using the 'One Page Strategy', all the way through to the end of the scrutiny investigation when this report was finalised. Members would also like to thank all officers involved from Street Scene and Waste Management as well as the Committee Services Officer, Ms. D. McCarthy.

#### **SUMMARY**

The role of the Refuse and Recycling Task Group was to carry out a scrutiny exercise to identify issues affecting the efficiency and performance of the service since the introduction of two weekly collections, highlighting the promotional aspirations of the workforce as a means of strengthening the service and make general recommendations for strengthening the service.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Workforce Development – Recommendations 1 to 3**

With a view to achieving higher sustainable levels of resident satisfaction and improving the efficiency of the service, as well as giving employees an opportunity to obtain relevant qualifications, we recommend the following:

1. NVQ Training for Existing Workforce

NVQ Training in Waste Management from WAMITAB (Waste Management Industry Training Advisory Board) via NEW College is given to all refuse and recycling staff over a 2 year period commencing September 2008 with the following conditions:

- standards for 'performance criteria' and 'knowledge requirements' specific to this Council are built into the awards;
- the preferred primary assessment method is observation (rather than witness testimonies or personal statements); and
- that performance criteria is observed consistently over a certain time period rather than as a one-off

Please refer to pages 10-11 for more detail on recommendation 1.

*(Cost: Nil. Funding assistance via the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) is available and is believed to be worth in the region of £75,000 and £90,000 meaning there would be **no cost** to this Council.)*

2. NVQ Training for New Employees

It is made a requirement of all new employees to either hold the NVQ in Waste Management or achieve it within an agreed timeframe.

*(Cost: Nil. It is anticipated that future funding will be obtained via the Learning and Skills Council.)*

3. NVQ Training for Team Leaders

The following NVQ training is given to the three Refuse and Recycling Team Leaders:

- Team Leading in Refuse and Recycling via NEW College
- BITS (Business Improvement Techniques) via RDI (Resource Development International)

*(Cost: It is expected that a proportion of the funding (approximately 50%) will be available from the Learning and Skills Council. Therefore, it is anticipated that the total cost to this Council will be approximately £1500 and this can be met within the existing training budget.)*

**Increasing Recycling Rates – Recommendations 4 to 9**

One of the agreed outcomes of the Task Group was to investigate possibilities of improving recycling rates which led to the following:

4. Commingled Recycling Service

Request that Street Scene and Waste Management Officers monitor the progress Worcestershire County Council is making in relation to building their own sorting plant by 2009, as this will enable a commingled recycling service to be launched (making it easier to recycle and likely to encourage more recycling) and therefore significantly improve this Council's recycling rates.

*(Cost: Nil. There is a saving identified in 2010/11 of £100k as a result of the Council moving to commingle waste provision.)*

5. Recycling Additional Materials

Street Scene and Waste Management Officers be requested to continue to encourage Worcestershire County Council officers to investigate recycling more materials through the Waste Management Forum.

*(Cost: Nil)*

6. Benchmarking

Request that Street Scene and Waste Management Officers continue to regularly and systematically benchmark against the top 10-15 local authorities in the recycling league table which are achieving higher recycling rates, with a view to adapting any parts of their services to Bromsgrove which may prove successful in helping to increase our recycling figures.

*(Cost: Nil)*

7. Expanding the Recycling Service

Street Scene and Waste Management Officers be requested to continually investigate ways in which the Council can expand the recycling service to reach the remaining 6% of the District.

*(Cost: Nil)*

8. Eco-School Programme

In order to educate as many children as possible to take responsibility for the future of their own environment and encourage more recycling throughout the District, Street Scene and Waste Management officers be requested to continue to encourage all schools to join the Eco-School programme, particularly primary schools.

*(Cost: Nil)*

9. Incentive Schemes

Request that Street Scene and Waste Management officers keep up to date with developments of the Defra pilot incentive scheme and when the results are known, the option of introducing such a scheme be investigated further.

*(Cost: Nil)*

**Green Waste Collection – Recommendation 10**

It was agreed that the Green Waste Collection Service would be a specific topic area for the Task Group to investigate. Due to the recent decision in relation to the Medium Term Financial Plan 2008/09 -2010/11, our recommendation is:

10. Consultation

Request the Head of Street Scene and Waste Management to make certain there is thorough consultation with local residents in relation to the green bin charging arrangements due to be put in place. Effective communication will help ensure smooth implementation of the charging system which should avoid a reduction in customer service standards.

*(Cost: Minimal and can be met within the existing budget.)*

**Fortnightly Collections**

One of the agreed outcomes was that the satisfaction levels of the fortnightly refuse collections would be assessed. This has been completed and the Task Group agree that it is not necessary to make any recommendations regarding fortnightly collections. More details are given on page 17

**Communication – Recommendations 11 to 15**

The Council should adopt a clear communication strategy to help improve the recycling service as there is a strong correlation between communication and customer satisfaction:

11. Communication with local residents  
Increase communication with local residents wherever possible to encourage reducing, reusing and recycling. For example, ensuring local residents are aware that they can request more recycling boxes free of charge.  
*(Cost: Minimal and can be met within existing budget)*
12. Collection Arrangements  
To ensure that local residents are clear about which containers should be placed on the kerbside and when, officers be requested to investigate trialling wheelie bin stickers during 2008/09 or 2009/10, similar to Lichfield District Council.  
*(Cost: Nil. However, the cost of printing bin stickers instead of calendars would need to be considered if this recommendation is approved.)*
13. Member and Parish Council Training  
Similar to Daventry District Council, training/information sessions be arranged to inform Members of the following to ensure they have a sound knowledge of the Street Scene and Waste Management Services to pass on to local residents:
  - the history of the service;
  - where the Council is at present; and
  - plans to progress the service in future.Members of Parish Councils should also be invited to attend these sessions.  
*(Cost: Minimal and the cost of such sessions can be met within the existing budget.)*
14. Member Updates  
Updates relating to the refuse and recycling service be included in Members' Bulletins.  
*(Cost: Nil)*
15. Vehicle Tracking and Communication System  
The Head of Street Scene and Waste Management be requested to further investigate the effectiveness of various vehicle tracking and communication systems with a view to trialling a model in the future.  
*(Cost: Nil. At this stage, it is believed that further investigation is required to assess the potential benefits and financial implications. Any trialling should be at no cost to the Council.)*

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

At the meeting of the Scrutiny Steering Board held on 12th June 2007, it was decided a Task Group would be established to scrutinise issues relating to refuse and recycling.

The Task Group's terms of reference, which were compiled by the first appointed Chairman, Councillor Taylor, were approved by the Board at its meeting held on 3rd July 2007, subject to additional wording. The full terms of reference are attached as **Appendix 1**. The Membership of the Task Group was also agreed at the same meeting.

The Task Group was given 4 months (from the date of its first meeting) to complete its work. To ensure effective scrutiny, the Task Group waited until after the scrutiny training held in August before commencing the scrutiny investigation. The first meeting was on 22nd August 2007.

As Councillor Taylor resigned due to an interest, Councillor Scurrrell was appointed Task Group Chairman by the Scrutiny Steering Board at its meeting in October 2007. The change in Chairmanship after one meeting delayed the work of the Task Group for a few weeks and therefore the deadline for completion of the scrutiny exercise was extended by the Board to 28th January 2008.

## **BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY**

### Public Involvement

A press release was issued informing the public the Refuse and Recycling Task Group had been set up. Members of the public were encouraged to submit their views, comments and suggestions for the Task Group to consider. Information about the Task Group was also uploaded on to the website where again the public were encouraged to voice their opinions and suggestions for improvement.

A total of almost 30 letters and emails were received which is the largest number for any Task Group so far. It is worth noting that almost half of the comments received were complimentary about the refuse and recycling service.

### Witnesses

The Refuse and Recycling Task Group worked closely with Street Scene and Waste Management officers as well as the Learning and Organisational Development Manager. The Task Group also believed it was important to gain input from the relevant Portfolio Holder.

The Task Group researched and contacted other local authorities with high recycling rates and those classed as waste and recycling beacon authorities who are seen as exemplars of sustainable waste management.

Others contacted to provide evidence were: Training providers, such as NEW College and RDI (Resource Development International) regarding NVQ training; Parish Councils; and local supermarkets (as well as Head Offices) regarding recycling, reusing and reducing waste schemes. Unfortunately, no response has been received to date from the supermarkets.

A full list of those contacted is set out in **Appendix 2**.

### Research

A wealth of background information was considered by Members in between meetings which included: information from the IDeA Beacon Scheme website, such as various case studies relating to the theme 'Waste and Recycling'; the Joint Municipal waste Management Strategy for Herefordshire and Worcestershire 2004-2034, Managing waste for a brighter future; the work of the Cabinet's Street Scene Advisory Group which also looked at the waste collection service; this Council's Refuse and Recycling Collection Policy; scrutiny reports from other local authorities; and information produced by Defra on letsrecycle.com.

### Areas Covered

There were a total of seven task group meetings and at the first meeting a schedule of work was devised.

The four main areas covered were:

- Workforce development
- Improving the recycling rates
- Green waste collection service
- Fortnightly refuse collection service

Further details on these main areas covered are included in the next section.

However, there were many issues discussed during the scrutiny investigation and below is a list of some of them (in no particular order):

- Reducing, reusing and recycling
- Waste Minimisation Strategy
- Customer Survey on Street Scene and Waste Management
- Recycling rates compared to other local authorities
- Various strategies used by other local authorities to improve recycling rates particularly at Broadland District Council, North Kesteven District Council and North Norfolk District Council (as suggested by Mr. McGrath, Facilitator)
- Audit Commission Report on Waste Management

- Work being carried out by Worcestershire County Council such as Jilt the Junk, Shop Smart and Love Food Hate Waste campaigns
- Publicity and consultation
- Home composting, sink macerators, organic waste shredding and green grow soil
- Parish Councils views on the Green Waste Collection Service
- Performance Indicators such as total tonnage collected
- Information from various external sources including the IDeA (Improvement and Development Agency), CfPS (Centre for Public Scrutiny), letsrecycle.com and Local Government News.
- Wheelie bins and recycling containers
- Local supermarkets (in relation to excess packaging and plastic bags)
- Plastic bag free town of Modbury in Devon
- Pay as you throw proposal
- Compost street sweeping and street recycling bins
- Eco-School Programme
- Draft reports compiled by Resource Futures consultants selected via Defra Waste Implementation Programme relating to Worcestershire County

### The 'One Page Strategy'

The Task Group had the opportunity to work with Mr. McGrath who most Members will have met through various training events held. Mr. McGrath acted as a facilitator and introduced the 'one page strategy'.

Bromsgrove District Council has a statutory duty to scrutinise issues of key concern to members of the public. In exercising this duty this Council has decided that its approach to Overview and Scrutiny will be 'Ambitious Scrutiny' which involves focusing on clear challenge areas with a view to:

- Spotting and exploring policy opportunities which hold the potential to improve service standards;
- Working within a project framework;
- Underpinning overview and scrutiny activity with relevant Member development and facilitation support to introduce best practice methodologies;
- Consulting widely with a particular emphasis on identifying best practice exemplars; and
- Producing specific and workable recommendations which hold the potential to improve service delivery

Members took part in 'ambitious scrutiny' training to assess the potential to employ this approach to the work of the Refuse and Recycling Task Group. It is understood that obtaining a clear focus and producing a succinct project plan is key to ensuring effective scrutiny within fairly tight timescales. Therefore, Members received training support from Mr. McGrath in a particular approach to

project planning - the 'one page strategy'. The one page strategy is used as an aid to:

- Gain a clear understanding of the focus of the review – aimed at the most productive 'payback' areas
- Articulate this focus clearly on one piece of paper
- Identify potential outcomes (to explore throughout the review) and
- Point out key activities for Task Group Members

It was clear from the outset that we wished to explore a variety of areas under the general umbrella of refuse and recycling. We, as a Task Group, acknowledged that refuse and recycling is a huge portfolio and so it was highly desirable to get a clear focus on specific areas to review.

Following a thorough discussion, a one page strategy was produced and is attached as **Appendix 3**. In brief, the one page strategy identified the four main areas of focus as:

- (a) **Workforce development (for waste management staff)** with a particular focus on measures aimed at improving customer, resident satisfaction and efficiency and performance of the service. Local and national research carried out by the authority indicates that satisfaction with household waste collection dropped by 7% to 76% satisfied. Nationally satisfaction levels with waste collection staff dropped by 5%.
- (b) **Exploring opportunities to further improve 'dry recycling rates'** noting that Bromsgrove was named recently via a Defra poll as one of the top ten most improved Councils in the country for recycling and composting.
- (c) **Assess potential to support green waste collection during the winter months.** It is understood that this particular issue has moved on since the Task Group commenced its investigation and this has been taken on board when making our recommendations in relation to green waste collections.
- (d) **Consultation to assess satisfaction levels regarding fortnightly bin collections**

To ensure the Task Group remained focussed on the specific topics agreed to be scrutinised, the 'One Page Strategy' was a standing item on every agenda.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Workforce Development (Recommendations 1-3)

One of the main areas the Task Group decided to investigate was developing the workforce through relevant training in order to further improve customer service and resident satisfaction. We believe residents of the District deserve a high performing and efficient workforce and therefore the Task Group considered this particular area in great detail.

It is important to both Members of the Task Group and officers that we provide the best service possible to local residents and the refuse and recycling collection service is no exception, particularly as this is the one service used by all residents. The Task Group was impressed by the Recycling Team achieving a level of customer satisfaction that puts them amongst the top 25% nationally and we want to help ensure they remain in the top quartile and improve further!

It is also our concern that refuse and recycling crews may feel undervalued but we believe staff morale could be improved by providing recognition to staff through giving them the opportunity to achieve a nationally recognised qualification.

Following the scrutiny training and through completing our 'one page strategy', we were encouraged to set 'unreasonable' ambitions in this area (as an aid to 'thinking the unthinkable and being creative') and expressed a desire for all refuse and recycling crews to be trained in efficiency improvement techniques and customer satisfaction at **no cost** to the Council.

Members and officers collectively identified two potential training providers who could deliver appropriate training for operatives and the Learning and Organisational Development Manager was asked to research the answers to a number of specific questions which were put to training providers and internal staff and to 'give evidence' to the Task Group. The Learning and Organisational Development Manager was also requested to assess the different training providers which were RDI (Resource Development International) and NEW College. **Appendix 4** is an extract of the reports from the Learning and Organisational Manager which provides more detail on the training providers and the NVQ Training.

Funding assistance via the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) is available to support the training, development and assessment of the refuse and recycling crews and therefore, there would be no financial implications for this Council. In fact, it should be pointed out that the level of funding available to support training and development of operatives is estimated to be worth in the region of £1500-£1800 per member of staff. Around 50 members of staff would participate

in the scheme (over a 2 year period) which means **this would attract support to the authority in the region of £75,000-£90,000**, notwithstanding benefits to the operatives, the Council and members of the public generated via the training. This would not be a 'quick fix' but a long term project.

To ensure the training has a noticeable impact on the service, we believe that specific local protocols aimed at reinforcing the high customer standards in the waste management operations need to be built in to help ensure residents' satisfaction is improved (e.g. Daventry District Council achieves 85% user satisfaction). Source IDEA Beacon case study published August 2006.

The Task Group therefore recommend the following:

<b>Recommendation 1</b>	<p>NVQ Training in Waste Management from WAMITAB (Waste Management Industry Training Advisory Board) via NEW College is given to all refuse and recycling staff over a 2 year period commencing September 2008 with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ standards for 'performance criteria' and 'knowledge requirements' specific to this Council are built into the awards;</li> <li>▪ the preferred primary assessment method is observation (rather than witness testimonies or personal statements); and</li> <li>▪ that performance criteria is observed consistently over a certain time period rather than as a one-off.</li> </ul>
<b>Financial Implications</b>	<p>There are no financial implications relating to this recommendation as funding assistance via the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) is available. As it costs in the region of £1500-£1800 per member of staff, this would attract support to the authority in the region of £75,000 and £90,000.</p>

To make certain the Council continues to have a high performing and efficient workforce, we believe it needs to ensure that all new refuse and recycling operatives are provided with the same training and development opportunities. Therefore, assuming the NVQ in Waste Management from WAMITAB (Waste Management Industry Training Advisory Board) is still being offered, we recommend the following:

<b>Recommendation 2</b>	<p>It be made a requirement of all new employees to either hold the NVQ in Waste Management or achieve it within an agreed timeframe.</p>
-------------------------	---

<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications relating to this recommendation as it is anticipated that future funding will be obtained via the Learning and Skills Council.
-------------------------------	--

The Task Group fully support Team Leaders also being offered the opportunity to improve their skills as this can only be of benefit to our customers. Similar to the NVQ training for refuse and recycling staff, the training should still have standards built into the awards which are specific to this Council to ensure there is a link with improving customer satisfaction. Therefore, as suggested by the Learning and Organisational Development Manager, our final recommendation in relation to workforce development is:

<b>Recommendation 3</b>	The following NVQ training is given to the three Refuse and Recycling Team Leaders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Team Leading in Refuse and Recycling via NEW College</li> <li>▪ BITS (Business Improvement Techniques) via RDI (Resource Development International)</li> </ul>
<b>Financial Implications</b>	It is expected that a proportion of the funding (approximately 50%) will be available from the Learning and Skills Council. Therefore, it is anticipated that the total cost to this Council will be approximately £1500 and this can be met within the existing training budget.

## Increasing Recycling Rates (Recommendations 4-9)

We understand that our ‘unreasonable’ ambition of improving dry recycling waste by 10% is only likely to be achieved once Worcestershire County Council, as the disposal authority, has the facilities.

Worcestershire County Council will be building a MRF (Materials Recycling Facilities) which is anticipated to be up and running by 2009/10 and will therefore enable this Council to launch a commingled recycling service. This should see a dramatic increase in this Council’s recycling figures from 40% to approximately 50-55%. We would also support this as it could lead to savings for the District Council as there would be an ability to collect waste more economically.

Through research and questioning other local authorities with higher recycling rates, it appears that one of the main differences is that they provide a commingled recycling service.

It should be pointed out that although the Task Group, as part of its investigation, looked at increasing recycling rates, it also fully appreciates the hard work of officers which has ensured the Council is achieving very good recycling rates. We were pleased to learn that out of 393 local authorities, **Bromsgrove is ranked 50 for its recycling rates during 2006/07** and if you compare that to neighbouring authorities (Worcestershire County Council - 155, Wyre Forest - 224, Worcester City - 261, Malvern - 282, Wychavon - 333, Redditch - 354) this is an excellent achievement. (See **Appendix 5**)

However, some local authorities are achieving far higher recycling rates at around 50-55% and it is important that we strive to do even better. Particularly as other local authorities are improving which is why Bromsgrove is ranked 50 out of 393 in 2006/07 when it was ranked 21 out of 393 in 2005/06.

<b>Recommendation 4</b>	Request that Street Scene and Waste Management Officers monitor the progress Worcestershire County Council is making in relation to building their own sorting plant by 2009, as this will enable a commingled recycling service to be launched (making it easier to recycle and likely to encourage more recycling) and therefore significantly improve this Council’s recycling rates.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications. In fact, there is a saving identified in 2010/11 of £100k as a result of the Council moving to commingle waste provision.

As Worcestershire County Council is building its own sorting plant, this opens up the potential for this Council to recycle more materials. However, it is understood that what this Council is able to collect is dependent on what the County Council can dispose of and this leads to the next recommendation.

(For your information, Waste Management Forum Meetings are attended by the relevant officers from each local authority across Worcestershire, including Worcestershire County Council.)

<b>Recommendation 5</b>	Street Scene and Waste Management Officers be requested to continue to encourage Worcestershire County Council officers to investigate recycling more materials through the Waste Management Forum.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

Improvement is a Council Objective and to ensure we continue to improve the refuse and recycling service provided to our residents, we feel it is important that benchmarking is carried out on a regular basis.

<b>Recommendation 6</b>	Request that Street Scene and Waste Management Officers continue to regularly and systematically benchmark against the top 10-15 local authorities in the recycling league table which are achieving higher recycling rates, with a view to adapting any parts of their services to Bromsgrove which may prove successful in helping to increase our recycling figures.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

We believe the Council should aim to provide its services to as many local residents as possible if not all. We commend Street Scene and Waste Management officers in ensuring 96% of residents receive a recycling service, however, Members and officers agree that it is our aim to overcome barriers which prevent the Council offering its recycling service to all local residents and the Task Group would like to ensure that the last 6% of the District is not forgotten.

<b>Recommendation 7</b>	Street Scene and Waste Management Officers be requested to continually investigate ways in which the Council can expand the recycling service to reach the remaining 6% of the District.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

The Eco-Schools programme helps children become more effective citizens by encouraging them to take responsibility for the future of their own environment. Pupil involvement is a key part of the Eco-Schools programme and it is hoped that this will improve children's awareness and encourage more recycling as well as encouraging reducing and reusing. The Task Group feel that this programme is an excellent way of educating children so that recycling, reducing and reusing becomes second nature.

<b>Recommendation 8</b>	In order to educate as many children as possible to take responsibility for the future of their own environment and encourage more recycling throughout the District, Street Scene and Waste Management officers be requested to continue to encourage all schools to join the Eco-School programme, particularly primary schools.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

We were interested to learn that five local authorities have been chosen to pilot incentives for household waste minimisation and recycling. The aim is to reward local residents who reduce, reuse and recycle and encourage those who do not to change their behaviour and there is a feeling that there is strong public support for such schemes. The Task Group feels it is important that the pilot schemes are monitored as with further information, we will be in a position to assess in the future whether such schemes would be appropriate for Bromsgrove District. (Further information is attached as **Appendix 6**)

<b>Recommendation 9</b>	Request that Street Scene and Waste Management officers keep up to date with developments of the pilot incentive scheme and when the results are known, the option of introducing such a scheme be investigated further.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

**Green Waste Collection**  
(Recommendation 10)

There has been much discussion in relation to the Green Waste Collection Service and some Members have aired very different view points from reintroducing the green bin collection during the winter months to scrapping the service altogether. However, things have moved on since we started this scrutiny investigation and earlier this month, Full Council agreed to introduce a charge from April 2009, anticipated to be £30 per household per year for a collection service between April and November or approximately £45 per household per year for a 12 month collection service, depending upon the uptake.

As the Council will be charging for the green waste service in future years commencing April 2009, we feel it is vital that there is thorough consultation with local residents in order to ensure customer service standards do not suffer. Through consultation, officers will be able to investigate the demand for the service and work out feasible arrangements to ensure smooth implementation. We need to learn from past mistakes and make certain we communicate effectively with all local residents in order to maintain a high level of customer satisfaction.

<b>Recommendation 10</b>	Request the Head of Street Scene and Waste Management to make certain there is thorough consultation with local residents in relation to the green bin charging arrangements due to be put in place. Effective communication will help ensure smooth implementation of the charging system which should avoid a reduction in customer service standards.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are minimal financial implications in terms of communicating to our residents, however, these are minimal and can be met within the existing budget.

## Fortnightly Collections

We had a very good response to the press release and information posted on to the website which informed the public of the Task Group and asked for views, comments on suggestions. What was perhaps more unusual was the level of very positive responses received which shows how hard all staff in Street Scene and Waste Management have worked to ensure our residents now receive a good standard of service. This is backed up by the fact that Bromsgrove was named recently via a Defra poll as one of the top ten most improved Councils in the country for recycling and composting. (Extracts from comments received from local residents are attached as **Appendix 7**)

One area where there appeared to be conflicting viewpoints was the satisfaction levels of the fortnightly refuse collections as opposed to weekly collections, particularly in light of private companies offering such a service. Therefore, it was decided that this would be an area which required further assessment. To do this, we contacted the Parish Councils to complete a very simple and concise survey on this particular point which we called the “Waste Matters” survey.

Perhaps surprisingly, as we have always had a good response rate from Parish Councils in the past with scrutiny investigations, only 9 out of 20 Parish Councils responded, even though they were given 3 months to respond and reminders were sent. One Parish Council decided rather than give a collective response, individual Members were asked to complete the survey and 3 responses were received. Alvechurch Village Society (AVS) asked to be included in the survey and also responded taking the total number of responses to 12.

Out of the 12 responses received from the Parish Councils and AVS, **9 stated they were either ‘very satisfied’ or ‘satisfied’** with the fortnightly refuse collection service as opposed to a weekly collection service and only **3 stated they were ‘dissatisfied’**.

The Task Group also believe that the fortnightly collection helps to ensure the recycling rates remain high by encouraging local residents to recycle. We received a number of positive comments about the recycling service in particular and in light of the comments received from the public and Parish Councils, as well as taking into account the major financial implications, we believe moving to a weekly collection service would be of no benefit and would be a backward step.

We are satisfied that the fortnightly refuse collections (as opposed to weekly) are not a major issue for our local residents, particularly to those who recycle, and therefore we have no recommendations to make relating to this topic area.

**Communication with local residents**  
(Recommendations 11-15)

We believe that promoting reducing, reusing and recycling is key to sustainability. It is an excellent achievement to have the high recycling rates that we do and we need to ensure this continues. We feel this can be addressed through further communication with residents. For example, it appears that not all residents are aware that they can request more recycling boxes free of charge. If residents are not aware of this, they may be placing recycling into their grey bins unnecessarily.

<b>Recommendation 11</b>	Increase communication with local residents wherever possible to encourage reducing, reusing and recycling. For example, ensuring local residents are aware that they can request more recycling boxes free of charge.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are minimal financial implications which can be met within the existing budget.

Since the refuse and recycling kerbside collection was introduced, we are aware that officers have tried various methods to make it clear to local residents which containers should be placed on the kerbside and when.

We would like to suggest that, similar to Lichfield District Council, a bin sticker showing when and what is to be collected could be very useful to our residents.

<b>Recommendation 12</b>	To ensure that local residents are clear about which containers should be placed on the kerbside and when, officers be requested to investigate trialling wheelie bin stickers during 2008/09 or 2009/10, similar to Lichfield District Council.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications to investigating this option. However, the cost of printing bin stickers instead of calendars would need to be considered if this recommendation is approved.

During our investigation, we considered the work of beacon authorities. The IDeA Beacon Scheme website gives information on various case studies relating to local authorities who are providing residents with an effective waste collection and recycling service. Two of the case studies we looked at related to Daventry District Council. What we learnt from Daventry District Council in particular, which is one of the UK's leading recycling Council's, is officers and Members have a shared awareness of the need to support local residents. What they found particularly helpful was enabling communication with Parish Councils and local residents. This led the Task Group to discussing how this Council could support the local communities it serves in a similar way. It is felt that to ensure Ward Members and

Parish Councils can support the public, there needs to be a thorough understanding of the service.

We believe that there is a strong correlation between communication and customer satisfaction so in order for Members to effectively communicate with local residents on the refuse and recycling service, which is the one service used by ALL residents in the District, we want to recommend that:

<b>Recommendation 13</b>	Similar to Daventry District Council, training/information sessions be arranged to inform Members of the following to ensure they have a sound knowledge of the Street Scene and Waste Management Services to pass on to local residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the history of the service;</li> <li>▪ where the Council is at present; and</li> <li>▪ plans to progress the service in future.</li> </ul> Members of Parish Councils should also be invited to attend these sessions.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	Minimal financial implications which can be met within the existing budget.

To ensure Members are continually updated by Street Scene and Waste Management in relation to the refuse and recycling service, we also recommend the following:

<b>Recommendation 14</b>	Updates relating to the refuse and recycling service be included in Members' Bulletins.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

Vehicle tracking was discussed by the Task Group including possible benefits as it was understood that a particular vehicle tracking device was being trialled by Redditch Borough Council. However, we understand that a 2-way communication device could have more advantages. For example, with a 2-way communication system, officers would be able to contact the crews and vice versa. Crews would be able to inform other officers of issues such as, reasons for missed bins. Therefore, there is a strong possibility this could further improve customer service. Although crews do use mobile phones, a communication system would ensure there is an auditable trail and there are also health and safety issues to consider in relation to mobile phone use when on the rounds as opposed to a communication system.

Although this is potentially a good proposal, we understand that financial implications may be an issue and at this stage, it is difficult to conclude whether or not the benefits justify the cost of installing such a device in refuse vehicles (of

which there are approximately 20). Therefore, we would like to recommend the following:

<b>Recommendation 15</b>	The Head of Street Scene and Waste Management be requested to further investigate the effectiveness of various vehicle tracking and communication systems with a view to trialling a model in the future.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

**CONCLUSION**

Members of the Task Group believe that although Street Scene and Waste Management officers are doing an excellent job, we should not be complacent. As previously mentioned, the refuse and recycling collection service is the one service used by all residents and therefore, it is not surprising that it is often used to judge the performance of the Council. It is, therefore, particularly important that we ensure we provide the best service possible.

It should be pointed out that our recommendations link to two Council Objectives, Improvement and Environment, as well as two Priorities, Customer Service and Clean Streets and Recycling. There is also a strong connection to one of the Council’s Values, Customer First. We found officers from Street Scene also fully supportive of the recommendations included within this report.

Officers and Members of the Task Group agree that although recycling is important, we should also work hard at ensuring we are reducing waste as well as reusing. After all, if we are able to reduce the waste we produce and collect, this will automatically increase our recycling figures. Although it is not within our powers to ensure manufacturers reduce the amount of packaging they use, we can work with local residents to do our part. We firmly believe that educating and communicating with the public are crucial to encouraging everyone to do as much as possible to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill.

We are already providing a good service compared to many other local authorities across the county which shows just how far the service has improved. It is thanks to the hard work of officers and local residents who have made certain the Council is achieving very good recycling rates. Let’s keep improving.

We have found this scrutiny exercise very valuable and hope the Cabinet will see the benefits of the recommendations put forward for consideration. We would also like to take this opportunity to once again thank all those who contributed to our scrutiny investigation, including the officers from Street Scene and Waste Management and Mr. McGrath our facilitator.

## **REVIEW**

The Refuse and Recycling Task Group will reconvene in 12 months time to carry out a review of the outcome of this report including whether or not recommendations were approved and implemented and the impact of these actions.

**Councillor C. R. Scurrell**  
Chairman of the Refuse and Recycling Task Group

### **Contact Officer**

Name: Della McCarthy

Email: [d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk)

Tel: 01527 881407

# APPENDICES

**Appendix 1** – Task Group’s Terms of Reference

**Appendix 2** – A List of those the Task Group consulted

**Appendix 3** – The ‘One Page Strategy’

**Appendix 4** – Extracts from Reports relating to NVQ Training

**Appendix 5** – Information on Recycling Rates of Local Authorities

**Appendix 6** – Incentive Scheme Trials

**Appendix 7** – Extracts of comments made by local residents

**REFUSE AND RECYCLING TASK GROUP**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The attached scrutiny exercise scoping checklist (which acted as the Refuse and Recycling Task Group's terms of reference) was approved by the Scrutiny Steering Board on 3rd July 2007, subject to additional wording being included in the 'specific subject to be scrutinised' section so that it read as follows:

"Identifying issues affecting the efficiency and performance of the service since the introduction of two weekly collections, highlighting the promotional aspirations of the workforce as a means of strengthening the service and make general recommendations for strengthening the service."

The terms of reference was also agreed by the Task Group at its first meeting on 22nd August 2007.

# SCRUTINY EXERCISE SCOPING CHECKLIST

This form is to assist members to scope the scrutiny exercise in a focused way and to identify the key issues it wishes to investigate.

When the Board decides to set up a Task Group to scrutinise a particular subject, the appointed Chairman of the Task Group should complete this checklist. Completed forms will be considered by the Board and by the Task Group as a whole at the Task Group's first meeting.

- General Subject Area to be Scrutinised: *Quality of refuse & recycling Service.....*
- Specific Subject to be Scrutinised: *Identifying issues affecting.....  
the efficiency and performance of the Service such as the  
introduction of two weekly collections, highlighting the  
promotional expectations of the workforce as a means  
of strengthening the Service.....*

- Should the relevant Portfolio Holder(s) be invited to give evidence? **YES/NO**
- Should any Officers be invited to give evidence? **YES/NO**  
If yes, state name and/or post title: *H.R. and Legal  
and Street Scene*

- Should any external witnesses be invited to give evidence? **YES/NO**  
If so, who and from which organisations? *Amois*

- Should the Task Group receive evidence from other sources other than witnesses? **YES/NO**  
If so, what information should the Task Group wish to see and from which sources should it be gathered? *Finance / Budget HR?*

- Should a period of public consultation form part of the Scrutiny exercise? **YES/NO**  
If so, on what should the public be consulted? *To be decided*

Have other authorities carried out similar scrutiny exercises? **YES/NO**

If so, which authorities?.....*Unknown*.....

What were their conclusions and what can we learn from them?.....*Unknown*.....

Will the Scrutiny exercise cross the District boundary? *Possibly* **YES/NO**

If so, should any other authorities be invited to participate?.....*Yes*.....

.....

- Would it be appropriate to co-opt anyone on to the Task Group whilst the Scrutiny exercise is being carried out? **YES/NO**

If so, who and from which organisations?.....

.....

What do you anticipate the timetable will be for the scrutiny exercise?

.....*Unknown*.....

.....

.....

- Approximate number of Task Group Meetings?.....*Unknown*.....

Signed:.....*[Signature]*.....

Chairman of behalf of the: *Refuse & Recycling Service 7*.....Task Group

Date:.....*20 June 2007*.....

Please return completed forms to:  
Della McCarthy  
Committee Services Officer  
Legal and Democratic Services  
Bromsgrove District Council

**A List of those the Task Group Consulted**

**External Witnesses:**

Public:

- Members of the Public via press releases and the Council's website. A total of 26 emails and letters were received.

Other Local Authorities:

- Broadland District Council
- North Kesteven District Council
- North Northfolk District Council
- Worcestershire County Council

Parish Councils:

- All Parish Councils were contacted twice during the scrutiny investigation asking for views via the "Waste Matters" survey.

Supermarkets and Stores:

- Alldays Stores
- Asda Stores (Both the Manager at the local store and the Chief Executive based at their Head Office in Leeds)
- Iceland
- Morrisons Supermarket
- One Stop Community Stores
- Somerfield Stores
- Spar Supermarkets
- Tesco Express

Waste Contractors:

- Severn Waste (Worcestershire County Council's Waste Contractors).

Other:

- Alvechurch Village Society (AVS) – requested to be consulted when Parish Councils were contacted.

It should be noted that Mr. D. McGrath, Link Support Services (UK) Ltd, was also present at most of the meetings to act as a Task Group facilitator.

**Internal Witnesses:**

Street Scene and Waste Management:

- Mr. M. Bell, Head of Street Scene and Waste Management
- Mr. K. Hirons, Street Scene and Waste Manager
- Ms. A. Wardell, Waste Policy and Promotions Manager

Human Resources and Organisational Development:

- Ms. H. Parkinson, Learning and Organisational Development Manager

Cabinet Member:

- Councillor Mrs. M. A. Sherrey JP, Portfolio Holder for Street Scene and Recycling.

Mr. Hirons and Ms. Wardell attended all Task Group Meetings between them. For the majority, both were present.

All relevant officers were made aware of the recommendations and were given an opportunity to comment.

As with all scrutiny reports, all financial implications were checked by the Head of Financial Services and all legal implications were checked by the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services and/or a Senior Solicitor.

## THE 'ONE PAGE STRATEGY' – FOR THIS OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY TOPIC

Last Updated: 26 November 2007

### OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY: KEY QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

**What is the broad Topic area?** Refuse & Recycling/ Waste Management

**What is the specific topic areas?** 1/ **Workforce development** to improve customer service & resident satisfaction 2/ Assess potential to **support green waste** collection during winter months 3/ Assess satisfaction levels of **fortnightly collections** 4/ Strategy to improve overall **'dry' recycling rates**

**What is the unreasonable ambitions?**

- 1/ Workforce development training for collection staff fully funded by LSC
- 2/ Report to assess options for some level of green waste collection during winter
- 3/ Ward based consultation in some areas to assess whether fortnightly collection is problematic and how we can deal with complaints more effectively
- 4/ Improve dry recycling waste from 22% to 32% in 12 months

**How well do we perform at the moment?**

Reports requested on current performance levels for (a) resident satisfaction with collection service and (b) current recycling rates

**Who shall we consult about the current service and how we can improve it?**

**Residents of Bromsgrove** some local ward newsletters or Council newspaper  
**Businesses:** Learning Skills Council training provider and local supermarkets  
**Expert Witnesses/ other Councils:** BDC Officers in Waste Management, Parish Councils, Training Dept. and Portfolio Holder

**What other help do we need?**

**Research help:** which Councils are best recycling performers, who can we contact/visit?

**Training:** Preparing a questioning and listening plan, preparing for a benchmarking visit if required, preparing a 'change' plan to produce realistic and achievable recommendations

**How long should it take?**

**4 months** (28th January 2008) – within which timescale we will complete:

- ✓ Workforce development plan recommendations
- ✓ Green waste/ winter collection recommendations
- ✓ Overall recycling plan recommendations

**What will be the outcomes?**

- (a) *all collection staff trained in efficiency improvement techniques & customer satisfaction - fully funded externally*
- (b) *Assessed satisfaction of fortnightly collection*
- (c) *Options assessed to support winter collection*
- (d) *Key recommendations to improve overall recycling rates*

Below are extracts from various reports that the Task Group received during its scrutiny investigation from the Learning and Organisational Development Manager in relation to NVQ training for refuse and recycling crews:

**Briefing Note – 21/11/07**

**From Helen Parkinson – Learning & Organisational Development Manager**

Training / NVQ provider	Pros	Cons
NEW College – NVQ in waste management operations from Waste Management Industry (WAMITAB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Qualification is industry-specific</li> <li>○ Assessment and training is carried out on site, out on the rounds</li> <li>○ No agency backfill costs associated with taking staff off the rounds</li> <li>○ Includes a basic skills assessment, training and support</li> <li>○ Relationship already established with NEW College and discussions about qualifications underway since May</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Qualification not specifically aimed at improving the business</li> <li>○ Lingering concerns about how NVQs can be used to drive up standards of service</li> </ul>
RDI – NVQ in Business Improvement Techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Qualification specifically aimed at improving the business</li> <li>○ Includes support for basic skills issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 14 weeks (half day sessions) of training for groups of 10, on site, but off the rounds – <b>agency backfill costs of £14,000</b> (@ £100 per person per day)</li> <li>○ Qualification is not industry specific</li> </ul>

**Briefing Note – 12/12/07**

**From Helen Parkinson – Learning & Organisational Development Manager**

Information received from Mr. B. Johnson, Workforce Relationship Manager at NEW College:

“...research has shown that above and beyond developing the skills of employees the benefits are improved morale and reduced staff turnover.

Improved morale amongst staff generally leads to more productive interactions with clients and improvements in customer service.

We would be happy to give you reference to employers, that have employees who have completed NVQ's with us, so that you can ask them directly for their views, or if you go on to the website of [www.traintogain.gov.uk](http://www.traintogain.gov.uk) they have numerous reported success stories already collated from actual employers.

NEW college is Beacon Status and there are only 98 other organisations within the country that have this and other colleges often come to us for guidance. We have also achieved 5, 1's in OFSTED."

Qualifications take upwards of 6 months to complete normally but some employees may complete their training within a shorter timescale whilst others may take longer. A lot depends on how many assessors NEW College can provide.

### **Briefing Note – 17/12/07**

#### **From Helen Parkinson – Learning & Organisational Development Manager**

The current issue with resident satisfaction is caused by the current customer standards for refuse and recycling not always being carried out consistently, e.g. the placement of recycling boxes or grey bins after emptying. This assumes that if the service is carried out 'perfectly' to the agreed standard, residents will be satisfied. This assumes in turn that the customer standard is based on what residents have said would satisfy them.

The training and qualification will be used to reinforce the standard, ensure it is carried out consistently, thus having potential to drive up customer satisfaction. The training/qualification will be carried out within the WAMITAB NVQ framework, with 'local conventions' to make the standard specific rather than general.

The information below is taken from [www.letsrecycle.com](http://www.letsrecycle.com)

Please note that **Bromsgrove District Council** and **neighbouring authorities** within Worcestershire County are highlighted in **YELLOW**.

You will see that **Bromsgrove District Council** is ranked 50 out of 393

## English local authorities - performances on waste (2006/07)

The following table contains municipal waste data issued by Defra to letsrecycle.com in November 2007 for the period covering the financial year 2006/07.

The data shows household waste recycling and composting rates for English councils from April 1, 2006 to March 31, 2007, showing recycling rate (dry recyclables), composting rate (green waste and food waste) as well as the total amount of combined recycling and composting for the year.

Councils are listed in overall performance order:

Rank	Local Authority	Recycling %	Composting %	Total
1	North Kesteven District Council	28.08	27.41	55.49
2	South Shropshire District Council	21.84	31.36	53.2
3	Rushcliffe Borough Council	27.07	25.11	52.18
4	Huntingdonshire District Council	24.49	27.23	51.72
5	Ryedale District Council	20.13	30.88	51.01
6	South Cambridgeshire District Council	18.24	32.74	50.98
7	Teignbridge District Council	19.84	30.6	50.44
8	St Edmundsbury Borough Council	23.2	26.83	50.03
9	South Hams District Council	27.7	21.06	48.76
10	Harborough District Council	19.64	28.96	48.6
11	Cambridgeshire County Council	22.08	26.42	48.5
12	Waveney District Council	26.33	22.08	48.41
13	Melton Borough Council	22.79	25.11	47.9
14	Lichfield District Council	23.31	24.28	47.59
15	Fenland District Council	19.54	27.83	47.37
16	Somerset County Council	26.5	20.78	47.28
17	Daventry District Council	17.1	29.93	47.03
18	Forest Heath District Council	22.06	23.96	46.02
19	Devon County Council	26.2	19.6	45.8
20	South Somerset District Council	27.02	18.69	45.71
21	Broadland District Council	32.27	13.42	45.69
22	Three Rivers District Council	20.4	25.2	45.6
23	Kettering Borough Council	22.3	22.78	45.08

## Appendix 5

24	Chiltern District Council	32.44	12.59	45.03
25	Vale Royal Borough Council	19.02	26.01	45.03
26	Canterbury City Council	28.08	16.91	44.99
27	Cherwell District Council	22.96	21.67	44.63
28	South Staffordshire Council	20.65	23.6	44.25
29	South Ribble Borough Council	22.5	21.7	44.2
30	Chorley Borough Council	23.53	20.55	44.08
31	Mid Devon District Council	17.77	26.31	44.08
32	Hambleton District Council	14.69	29.23	43.92
33	Peterborough City Council	19.22	24.53	43.75
34	Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council	24.96	18.21	43.17
35	Dacorum Borough Council	20.61	22.42	43.03
36	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	17.93	25.09	43.02
37	Suffolk County Council	23.92	18.98	42.9
38	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	21.97	20.79	42.76
39	Uttlesford District Council	30.06	12.69	42.75
40	Leicestershire County Council	20.57	21.96	42.53
41	Dorset County Council	23.78	18.56	42.34
42	Mendip District Council	22.55	19.35	41.9
43	Oswestry Borough Council	18.45	23.39	41.84
44	North Norfolk District Council	26.08	15.53	41.61
45	Cotswold District Council	18.11	22.93	41.04
46	Taunton Deane Borough Council	23.95	17.08	41.03
47	North Shropshire District Council	13.03	27.9	40.93
48	Erewash Borough Council	25.49	15.41	40.9
49	South Northamptonshire District Council	15.93	24.95	40.88
50	<b>Bromsgrove District Council</b>	<b>21.22</b>	<b>19.61</b>	<b>40.83</b>
51	Oadby and Wigston Borough Council	22.85	17.52	40.37
52	Lincolnshire County Council	23.27	17.04	40.31
53	Macclesfield Borough Council	20.37	19.87	40.24
54	Stratford-on-Avon District Council	14.32	25.91	40.23
55	Wyre Borough Council	19.23	20.96	40.19
56	Shepway District Council	26.79	13.37	40.16
57	Buckinghamshire County Council	23.51	16.59	40.1
58	West Wiltshire District Council	18.79	21.31	40.1
59	Fylde Borough Council	17.81	22.2	40.01
60	Bexley LB	22.21	17.79	40
61	York City Council	23.3	16.63	39.93
62	Bath and North East Somerset Council	25.59	14.24	39.83
63	Cambridge City Council	17.09	22.54	39.63
64	West Devon Borough Council	20.65	18.98	39.63
65	South Gloucestershire Council	20.76	18.78	39.54
66	Wycombe District Council	21.01	18.39	39.4
67	Northamptonshire County Council	21.4	17.9	39.3
68	Eden District Council	21.05	18.17	39.22
69	Mole Valley District Council	31.61	7.56	39.17
70	Lancashire County Council	24.83	13.91	38.74
71	Broxtowe Borough Council	26.54	12.12	38.66
72	Breckland Council	27.55	10.92	38.47

## Appendix 5

73	Norfolk County Council	26.1	12.36	38.46
74	Blaby District Council	27.52	10.9	38.42
75	North Lincolnshire Council	17.27	21.15	38.42
76	Woking Borough Council	27.18	11.21	38.39
77	Fareham Borough Council	27.18	11.19	38.37
78	Oxfordshire County Council	22.83	15.52	38.35
79	Tamworth Borough Council	23	15.34	38.34
80	Suffolk Coastal District Council	16.55	21.76	38.31
81	Wiltshire County Council	24.24	14.04	38.28
82	West Lancashire District Council	18.11	19.89	38
83	Shropshire County Council	17.81	20.11	37.92
84	Nottinghamshire County Council	25.29	12.54	37.83
85	Horsham District Council	14.91	22.84	37.75
86	Bridgnorth District Council	19.66	18.01	37.67
87	Eastleigh Borough Council	31.26	6.2	37.46
88	Northampton Borough Council	20.41	16.81	37.22
89	Cannock Chase Council	18.64	18.41	37.05
90	Staffordshire County Council	19.55	17.44	36.99
91	Epping Forest Borough Council	25.17	11.79	36.96
92	Castle Morpeth Borough Council	28.41	8.51	36.92
93	Ipswich Borough Council	18.92	17.86	36.78
94	Hampshire County Council	25.19	11.55	36.74
95	East Lindsey District Council	19.23	17.44	36.67
96	Kennet District Council	22.98	13.67	36.65
97	Gedling Borough Council	32.08	4.49	36.57
98	Derbyshire Dales District Council	18.25	18.24	36.49
99	Babergh District Council	28.63	7.83	36.46
100	Bournemouth Borough Council	29.11	7.16	36.27
101	Lincoln City Council	17.64	18.63	36.27
102	Cheshire County Council	17.93	18.29	36.22
103	Congleton Borough Council	13.39	22.68	36.07
104	Charnwood Borough Council	27.95	7.94	35.89
105	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council	20.86	15.03	35.89
106	Weymouth and Portland Borough Council	24.64	11.25	35.89
107	Hertfordshire County Council	19.69	16.09	35.78
108	Forest of Dean District Council	14	21.76	35.76
109	Braintree District Council	23.4	12.1	35.5
110	Bracknell Forest Borough Council	23.93	11.56	35.49
111	North West Leicestershire District Council	14.31	20.96	35.27
112	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	14.28	20.91	35.19
113	North Devon District Council	18.43	16.68	35.11
114	East Cambridgeshire District Council	16.8	18.3	35.1
115	North Yorkshire County Council	18.9	16.17	35.07
116	Milton Keynes Council	24.38	10.57	34.95
117	Telford and Wrekin Council	19.82	15.09	34.91
118	Waverley Borough Council	31.15	3.74	34.89
119	Bedfordshire County Council	21.27	13.59	34.86
120	East Hampshire District Council	29.31	5.52	34.83
121	Carlisle City Council	17.23	17.28	34.51

## Appendix 5

122	Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	25.87	8.58	34.45
123	Watford Borough Council	18.43	16.01	34.44
124	Exeter City Council	29.17	5.15	34.32
125	Mid Suffolk District Council	34.21	0	34.21
126	Essex County Council	21.28	12.91	34.19
127	West Sussex County Council	22.34	11.83	34.17
128	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	18.38	15.72	34.1
129	Guildford Borough Council	25.65	8.41	34.06
130	Easington District Council	13.14	20.85	33.99
131	Wokingham Council	22.82	11.17	33.99
132	Alnwick District Council	28.86	5.08	33.94
133	Chichester District Council	32.6	1.22	33.82
134	Chelmsford Borough Council	16.17	17.41	33.58
135	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	22.11	11.47	33.58
136	Poole Borough Council	23.32	10.26	33.58
137	Northumberland County Council	24.08	9.47	33.55
138	Hyndburn Borough Council	24.91	8.6	33.51
139	South Oxfordshire District Council	27.17	6.11	33.28
140	South Bucks District Council	26.18	7.04	33.22
141	North Hertfordshire District Council	15.26	17.95	33.21
142	West Lindsey District Council	19.6	13.41	33.01
143	Gloucestershire County Council	19.24	13.77	33.01
144	Mid Bedfordshire District Council	24.44	8.52	32.96
145	Allerdale Borough Council	16.83	16.09	32.92
146	Maldon District Council	19.77	13.1	32.87
147	South Norfolk Council	28.58	4.27	32.85
148	Derby City Council	18.63	14.09	32.72
149	Warwickshire County Council	15.93	16.79	32.72
150	Stockport MBC	15.61	16.9	32.51
151	Kent County Council	21.79	10.64	32.43
152	Medway Borough Council	20.12	12.27	32.39
153	Arun District Council	25.72	6.66	32.38
154	St Albans City and District Council	19.14	13.16	32.3
155	Worcestershire County Council	22.5	9.78	32.28
156	Cumbria County Council	18.42	13.79	32.21
157	Swindon Borough Council	22.52	9.61	32.13
158	Carrick District Council	23.95	8.1	32.05
159	Blackpool Borough Council	20.03	11.94	31.97
160	South Bedfordshire District Council	16.78	15.17	31.95
161	Bristol City Council	21.44	10.5	31.94
162	Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Council	24.62	7.31	31.93
163	South Kesteven District Council	18.06	13.83	31.89
164	Bromley LB	25.96	5.89	31.85
165	Pendle Borough Council	21.23	10.61	31.84
166	Richmond upon Thames LB	22.78	8.93	31.71
167	Chesterfield Borough Council	15.28	16.41	31.69
168	North Dorset District Council	24.59	7.06	31.65
169	Richmondshire District Council	16.89	14.75	31.64
170	Derbyshire County Council	19.01	12.61	31.62

## Appendix 5

171	Burnley Borough Council	22.02	9.59	31.61
172	East Dorset District Council	21.52	10.06	31.58
173	Torridge District Council	18.03	13.46	31.49
174	Brentwood Borough Council	19.82	11.39	31.21
175	North Somerset Council	18.19	12.98	31.17
176	Colchester Borough Council	18.45	12.51	30.96
177	Surrey County Council	21.46	9.49	30.95
178	South Lakeland District Council	16.83	14.11	30.94
179	Chester City Council	15.77	15.09	30.86
180	Hart District Council	25.91	4.94	30.85
181	Corby Borough Council	18.61	12.05	30.66
182	Cornwall County Council	21.58	9.07	30.65
183	Hillingdon LB	18.56	12.08	30.64
184	Copeland Borough Council	15.18	15.35	30.53
185	Purbeck District Council	30.32	0.13	30.45
186	Wellingborough Borough Council	17.83	12.49	30.32
187	Havant Borough Council	29.92	0.39	30.31
188	Wealden District Council	13.5	16.77	30.27
189	Sutton LB	20.81	9.45	30.26
190	Sevenoaks District Council	24.59	5.54	30.13
191	Hertsmere Borough Council	12.46	17.4	29.86
192	Surrey Heath Borough Council	20.15	9.65	29.8
193	Isle of Wight Council	14.89	14.87	29.76
194	North East Derbyshire District Council	13.49	16.21	29.7
195	Stafford Borough Council	11.4	18.26	29.66
196	Enfield LB	19.36	10.28	29.64
197	East Riding of Yorkshire Council	20.8	8.79	29.59
198	Selby District Council	14.45	15.14	29.59
199	Barnet LB	17.92	11.55	29.47
200	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council	23.97	5.46	29.43
201	Warwick District Council	15.27	14.08	29.35
202	Bolton MBC	18.5	10.76	29.26
203	Durham County Council	16.62	12.63	29.25
204	Southend-on-Sea Borough Council	19.83	9.31	29.14
205	Vale of White Horse District Council	22.82	6.28	29.1
206	Derwentside District Council	19.47	9.54	29.01
207	East Sussex County Council	18.38	10.54	28.92
208	Luton Borough Council	19.53	9.26	28.79
209	New Forest District Council	26.27	2.44	28.71
210	Preston Borough Council	16.24	12.33	28.57
211	Craven District Council	17.72	10.63	28.35
212	Rotherham MBC	17.21	11.13	28.34
213	Durham City Council	16.99	11.32	28.31
214	Cheltenham Borough Council	16.56	11.71	28.27
215	Ashfield District Council	27.62	0.59	28.21
216	East Staffordshire Borough Council	12.5	15.7	28.2
217	City of London	28.1	0.09	28.19
218	Rossendale Borough Council	21.29	6.85	28.14
219	Camden LB	22.38	5.67	28.05

## Appendix 5

220	Welwyn Hatfield Council	12.94	15.1	28.04
221	Wansbeck District Council	22.03	5.96	27.99
222	Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council	13.86	14.1	27.96
223	Warrington Borough Council	15.62	12.32	27.94
224	Wyre Forest District Council	27.89	0	27.89
225	North Cornwall District Council	21.1	6.66	27.76
226	Harrow LB	14.7	13	27.7
227	Reading Borough Council	22.86	4.78	27.64
228	Hartlepool Borough Council	17.22	10.4	27.62
229	Broxbourne Borough Council	13.71	13.89	27.6
230	South Derbyshire District Council	14.25	13.33	27.58
231	Teesdale District Council	17.42	10.11	27.53
232	West London Waste Authority	17.37	10.16	27.53
233	East Northamptonshire Council	23.26	4.26	27.52
234	Waltham Forest LB	17.23	10.28	27.51
235	West Dorset District Council	27.04	0.3	27.34
236	Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council	20.62	6.69	27.31
237	Brighton and Hove Council	23.86	3.41	27.27
238	Bedford Borough Council	14.26	12.97	27.23
239	Leicester City Council	16.3	10.88	27.18
240	Test Valley Borough Council	21.61	5.4	27.01
241	Caradon District Council	20.69	6.21	26.9
242	Stevenage Borough Council	15.85	11.02	26.87
243	Plymouth City Council	19.92	6.94	26.86
244	Mansfield District Council	21.34	5.48	26.82
245	West Oxfordshire District Council	22.98	3.83	26.81
246	East Hertfordshire District Council	14.48	12.08	26.56
247	Tynedale District Council	21.85	4.71	26.56
248	Wear Valley District Council	18.23	8.26	26.49
249	Crawley Borough Council	26.14	0.29	26.43
250	Tewkesbury Borough Council	17.97	8.42	26.39
251	Walsall MBC	14.17	12.2	26.37
252	North East Lincolnshire Council	11.97	14.37	26.34
253	Sedgefield Borough Council	16.61	9.67	26.28
254	Kerrier District Council	18.43	7.79	26.22
255	Boston Borough Council	26.15	0	26.15
256	Torbay Council	18.48	7.58	26.06
257	Basildon District Council	18.77	7.29	26.06
258	Elmbridge Borough Council	24.01	1.98	25.99
259	Herefordshire Council	18.59	7.33	25.92
260	Castle Point Borough Council	16.74	9.13	25.87
261	Worcester City Council	25.79	0.06	25.85
262	Newcastle-upon-Tyne City Council MBC	15.27	10.54	25.81
263	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	25.76	0	25.76
264	Lancaster City Council	15.88	9.88	25.76
265	Greater Manchester WDA (MBC)	17	8.72	25.72
266	Newark and Sherwood District Council	25.71	0	25.71
267	Amber Valley Borough Council	25.64	0	25.64
268	Adur District Council	25.22	0.4	25.62

## Appendix 5

269	Penwith District Council	18.82	6.75	25.57
270	Southampton City Council	17.77	7.74	25.51
271	Trafford MBC	14.7	10.75	25.45
272	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council	10.87	14.36	25.23
273	Mid Sussex District Council	20.54	4.65	25.19
274	Halton Borough Council	14.55	10.5	25.05
275	Merton LB	21.33	3.72	25.05
276	Sheffield City Council	18.31	6.63	24.94
277	Restormel Borough Council	22.18	2.75	24.93
278	North Warwickshire Borough Council	9.76	15.16	24.92
279	Ealing LB	17.97	6.95	24.92
280	Haringey LB	19.35	5.37	24.72
281	Bradford City MDC (MBC)	12.52	12.18	24.7
282	Malvern Hills District Council	24.7	0	24.7
283	Oxford City Council	16.93	7.77	24.7
284	Chester-Le-Street District Council	17.08	7.58	24.66
285	Gravesham Borough Council	24.58	0	24.58
286	West Somerset District Council	22.14	2.29	24.43
287	Doncaster MBC	15.68	8.72	24.4
288	Tameside MBC	18.44	5.84	24.28
289	Wakefield City MDC	13.38	10.9	24.28
290	Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	23.58	0.7	24.28
291	Winchester City Council	22.33	1.93	24.26
292	Coventry City Council	13.14	11.07	24.21
293	Rugby Borough Council	12.51	11.67	24.18
294	Rutland County Council	13.15	11.02	24.17
295	Barnsley MBC	14.01	10.09	24.1
296	Gosport Borough Council	22.78	1.32	24.1
297	Tandridge District Council	24.1	0	24.1
298	South Tyneside MBC	12.56	11.4	23.96
299	Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames	18.37	5.53	23.9
300	Nottingham City Council	15.22	8.57	23.79
301	Wolverhampton MBC	9	14.79	23.79
302	Sefton MBC	15.3	8.43	23.73
303	Sunderland City Council	14.95	8.77	23.72
304	Thurrock Council	18.2	5.5	23.7
305	Western Riverside Waste Authority	21.96	1.72	23.68
306	Hammersmith and Fulham LB	22.74	0.89	23.63
307	Greenwich LB	21.28	2.33	23.61
308	Blyth Valley Borough Council	22.7	0.86	23.56
309	Islington LB	18.85	4.65	23.5
310	Solihull MBC	15.35	8.12	23.47
311	Salisbury District Council	18.53	4.85	23.38
312	Stroud District Council	23.24	0	23.24
313	Harrogate Borough Council	17.74	5.46	23.2
314	Lambeth LB	20.54	2.56	23.1
315	North London Waste Authority	15.95	7.14	23.09
316	Portsmouth City Council	19.36	3.67	23.03
317	Dudley MBC	12.85	10.12	22.97

## Appendix 5

318	Eastbourne Borough Council	18.14	4.78	22.92
319	Bury MBC	12.98	9.93	22.91
320	Tendring District Council	22.88	0	22.88
321	Wandsworth LB	22.6	0.27	22.87
322	Christchurch Borough Council	21.21	1.58	22.79
323	Darlington Borough Council	16.02	6.69	22.71
324	South Holland District Council	22.57	0.07	22.64
325	Rushmoor Borough Council	19.7	2.77	22.47
326	Slough Borough Council	14.68	7.79	22.47
327	Merseyside WDA (MBC)	13.73	8.66	22.39
328	Leeds City Council MBC	15.83	6.47	22.3
329	North Tyneside Council	12.9	9.25	22.15
330	Lewes District Council	21.48	0.66	22.14
331	West Berkshire District Council	15.89	6.23	22.12
332	Gateshead MBC	12.95	9.13	22.08
333	Wychavon District Council	21.95	0.05	22
334	Sedgemoor District Council	15.32	6.57	21.89
335	Wigan MBC	12.92	8.95	21.87
336	Worthing Borough Council	18.8	2.83	21.63
337	Kirklees MBC	16.27	5.31	21.58
338	St Helens MBC	8.69	12.89	21.58
339	Brent LB	11.25	10.27	21.52
340	Ribble Valley Borough Council	12.5	8.91	21.41
341	Gloucester City Council	15.18	6.13	21.31
342	Calderdale MBC	15.15	6.15	21.3
343	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	15.17	6.09	21.26
344	Barking and Dagenham LB	15.15	5.93	21.08
345	North Wiltshire District Council	16.41	4.65	21.06
346	Kingston-upon-Hull City Council	14.21	6.81	21.02
347	Bassetlaw District Council	20.98	0	20.98
348	Epsom and Ewell Borough Council	19.69	1.24	20.93
349	Berwick-upon-Tweed Borough Council	20.12	0.41	20.53
350	Havering LB	13.48	6.95	20.43
351	Sandwell MBC	14.09	6.3	20.39
352	Westminster City Council	19.57	0.81	20.38
353	Salford City Council MBC	13.56	6.81	20.37
354	Redditch Borough Council	20.31	0	20.31
355	Bolsover District Council	9.55	10.58	20.13
356	Croydon LB	14.63	5.48	20.11
357	Stoke-on-Trent City Council	14.81	5.18	19.99
358	High Peak Borough Council	15.14	4.82	19.96
359	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	19.31	0.6	19.91
360	Aylesbury Vale District Council	19.04	0.81	19.85
361	Hounslow LB	15.7	3.92	19.62
362	Hackney LB	14	5.57	19.57
363	Ashford Borough Council	14.33	5.15	19.48
364	Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council	13.5	5.98	19.48
365	Spelthorne Borough Council	17.05	2.41	19.46
366	Harlow District Council	17.61	1.69	19.3

## Appendix 5

<b>367</b>	Maidstone Borough Council	12.82	6.39	19.21
<b>368</b>	Manchester City Council MBC	15.05	3.94	18.99
<b>369</b>	Dover District Council	11.73	7.05	18.78
<b>370</b>	Scarborough Borough Council	9.05	9.66	18.71
<b>371</b>	Rochdale MBC	11.48	7.21	18.69
<b>372</b>	Dartford Borough Council	18.63	0	18.63
<b>373</b>	Redbridge LB	13.63	4.97	18.6
<b>374</b>	Runnymede Borough Council	16.76	1.8	18.56
<b>375</b>	Southwark LB	14.28	4.18	18.46
<b>376</b>	Birmingham City Council	11.66	6.73	18.39
<b>377</b>	East London Waste Authority	13.46	4.91	18.37
<b>378</b>	Norwich City Council	18.37	0	18.37
<b>379</b>	East Devon District Council	18.36	0	18.36
<b>380</b>	Hastings Borough Council	17.62	0.63	18.25
<b>381</b>	Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council	9.7	7.9	17.6
<b>382</b>	Thanet District Council	14.11	3.16	17.27
<b>383</b>	Rochford District Council	15.21	1.79	17
<b>384</b>	Rother District Council	16.43	0	16.43
<b>385</b>	Knowsley MBC	8.62	7.37	15.99
<b>386</b>	Swale Borough Council	15.06	0.7	15.76
<b>387</b>	Lewisham LB	15.49	0.26	15.75
<b>388</b>	Oldham MBC	10.14	5.41	15.55
<b>389</b>	Middlesbrough Borough Council	13.54	1.88	15.42
<b>390</b>	Wirral MBC	9.1	5.05	14.15
<b>391</b>	Newham LB	11.76	1.82	13.58
<b>392</b>	Liverpool City Council	8.37	4.35	12.72
<b>393</b>	Tower Hamlets LB	11.64	0.11	11.75

## Waste Strategy for England 2007: Incentives for Recycling by Households

Following consultation over the summer of 2007 we announced that the Climate Change Bill will provide a power for local authorities to pilot incentives for household waste minimisation and recycling. This will allow pilot authorities to recognise more effectively the efforts of those householders who reduce, reuse and recycle their waste, and provide an incentive to those who do not change their behaviour.

A maximum of five local authorities will be able to pilot the schemes. Councils will be able to come forward with their own schemes, for approval by the Secretary of State, that fit local circumstances. This approach will allow us to monitor the impacts of incentives in England and report back to Parliament before a decision is made whether to roll them out more widely.

Powers in the Bill would enable authorities to pay rebates to householders for good performance on recycling and waste minimisation. They would also allow an authority, if it wanted to, to collect incentive based payments from householders for their waste collection. To avoid placing additional burdens on local residents, we are requiring that any pilot requesting payments from householders must return to residents all the revenue it collects. This means that residents as a whole will not be paying more. We are also enabling authorities to pay back rebates, and collect any payments, through Council Tax, should they wish to do so. (Once the powers come into force Government will publish guidance on the operations of the schemes.)

We have built in further checks and balances to help ensure the right level of public protection. Pilots could only be introduced where there was a good kerbside recycling service in place. Authorities will have to take account of the needs of, or impacts on, potentially disadvantaged groups – for example families with young children or the elderly. Pilot authorities will also have to have a flytipping prevention strategy in place. Evidence from other countries suggests that fly tipping would not necessarily increase, but we consider that having a strategy in place is good common sense. (Guidance would give more detail of these safeguards.)

Government also intends to retain a reserved power to create a cap in the future on the level of incentive, should this be necessary. We consider that this power provides a further protection for households.

**Below is a selection of extracts of some of the comments made by local residents in response to the Refuse and Recycling Task Group requesting their views:**

---

“We find these services (Refuse and Recycling) very good. Having, in the beginning, doubts about the use of these large wheelie bins we have been won over completely.”

- “1. Recycling is **THE** major success of BDC and from our UK travels and UK holidays is one of the best in England.
2. We have had **NO** problems with our grey bin – even when we were a family of 5.”

“I would like to say that we are very happy with the fortnightly system and have adjusted to it without any problems.”

“We need to review your barmy and disgusting decision to leave festering food rubbish around for up to two weeks.”

“I should like to express my support for and approval of the current waste collection arrangements.”

“As far as I am concerned there are two main areas of concern, namely the insistence that the collection is every fortnight for household rubbish which, to my mind, is unhealthy. The second issue is that, although the Council are prepared to congratulate themselves on the amount that is recycled, there are omissions to the types of material that can be dealt with.”

“Thank you very much for a reliable and regular Rubbish Collection.”

“Please bring back weekly collections. Food waste, no matter how well wrapped, is encouraging rodents.”

“I think it requires a return to the weekly collections...”

“My experience is that the current provision of the boxes for paper and plastic waste for recycling and a large green wheelie bin for garden waste – does not reflect our particular needs and we have to dispose of potentially recyclable material in the black wheelie bin.”

“I’m all for the recycling service – but when are we going to get it??!!”

“I write to applaud the current bin collection service with alternative collections on a weekly basis.”

## BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### SCRUTINY STEERING BOARD

4TH MARCH 2008

#### NEW TASK GROUPS

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Councillors Mrs. J. M. L. A. Griffiths and P. J. Whittaker
Responsible Head of Service	Head of Culture and Community Services Head of Planning and Environmental Services

#### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 To appoint a Chairman and consider the membership of the Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group.
- 1.2 To consider the membership and terms of reference of the Alcohol Free Zones Task Group.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 Members are requested to:
  - (a) decide upon the membership of each Task Group (see attached Task Group Membership Forms – Appendices 1 and 2);
  - (b) appoint a Chairman for the Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group;
  - (c) consider and agree the terms of reference of the Alcohol Free Zones Task Group (see attached Scrutiny Exercise Scoping Checklist – Appendix 4); and
  - (d) decide upon the length of time the Alcohol Free Zones Task Group will have to carry out its investigation (Task Groups are normally expected to conclude their investigations within four months from the date of the first meeting).

#### 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 At the previous meeting of the Scrutiny Steering Board on 5th February 2008, two new Task Groups were established to scrutinise the following issues:
  - Anti-Social Behaviour
  - Alcohol Free Zones

- 3.2 Councillor J. T. Duddy was appointed Chairman of the Alcohol Free Zones Task Group, however, no one was appointed Chairman of the Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group and this was deferred.
- 3.3 As agreed, Task Group Membership Forms were sent out to all Members (with the exception of Members of the Cabinet) asking anyone who had an interest in becoming a Member of one of the Task Groups to complete the appropriate form and return it to this Board's Committee Services officer. (Please see Appendices 1 and 2).
- 3.4 You will note that at the time of compiling this report, a total of 3 Membership Forms had been received for the Alcohol Free Zones Task Group (not including Councillor Duddy as Chairman) and a total of 3 Membership Forms had been received for the Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group (including the Chairman to be appointed). Although the minimum number of Members on a Task Group is 3, it is recommended that each Task Group is made up of 5 or 6 Members (and is cross party if possible) to try and ensure good scrutiny.
- 3.5 As the Board did not appoint a Chairman for the Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group at its last Meeting, it is important it does so at this meeting. Members are reminded that it states in the Constitution (Appendix to Part 8, Task Group Procedure Notes) that:
- “The Chairman of the Task Group will be appointed by the Scrutiny Steering Board and will normally be a Member of the Scrutiny Steering Board. However, the Scrutiny Steering Board may, if it considers it appropriate, appoint as Chairman of a Task Group a Councillor who is not a Member of the Scrutiny Steering Board who has undergone the appropriate chairmanship training.”
- 3.6 Members who were interested in chairing meetings of the Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group (and had attended the appropriate scrutiny training) were asked to indicate this on their Membership Form. Two Members (Councillors K. Taylor and C. J. Tidmarsh) have showed an interest in being appointed Chairman of the Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group. Whoever is appointed Chairman will then be tasked with completing the Scrutiny Exercise Scoping Checklist to help the Board agree the Task Group's terms of reference.
- 3.7 Councillor Duddy, as the Chairman of the Alcohol Free Zones Task Group, was sent a Task Group Chairman Form (attached as Appendix 3 for information) and a Scrutiny Exercise Scoping Checklist to complete. The scoping checklist forms the basis of the Task Group's terms of reference and therefore the Board needs to consider this carefully. It is attached as Appendix 4.

3.8 Members are reminded that when setting a timescale for a Task Group, it is usually expected that a Task Group will conclude its investigation within four months from the date of the first Task Group meeting. However, the Board can decide that certain topics require more time to ensure complex issues are properly scrutinised.

**4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 There are no financial implications directly relating to this report.

**5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no legal implications directly relating to this report.

**6. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES**

6.1 This report does not directly link to Council Objectives.

**7. RISK MANAGEMENT**

7.1 There is no risk, either negative or positive, directly associated with this report.

**8. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 There are no customer implications directly relating to this report.

**9. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 There are no implications directly relating to this report for the Council's Equalities and Diversity Policies.

**10. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 There are no Value for Money implications directly relating to this report.

**11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

Procurement Issues – None.
Personnel Implications – None
Governance/Performance Management – None
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998 – None
Policy – None
Environmental – None

## 12. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holders	They are aware of the Task Groups which have been established
Chief Executive	Yes
Executive Director (Partnerships and Projects)	Yes
Executive Director (Services)	Yes
Assistant Chief Executive	No
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	No
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes
Head of Organisational Development & HR	No
Corporate Procurement Team	No

## 13. WARDS AFFECTED

All Wards.

## 14. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Membership Forms for the Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group

Appendix 2 – Membership Forms for the Alcohol Free Zones Task Group

Appendix 3 – Task Group Chairman Form for the Alcohol Free Zones Task Group completed by Councillor J. T. Duddy.

Appendix 4 – Alcohol Free Zones Task Group Scrutiny Exercise Scoping Checklist completed by Councillor J. T. Duddy.

## 15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

## CONTACT OFFICER

Name: Della McCarthy, Committee Services Officer  
E Mail: [d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk)  
Tel: (01527) 881407

# Appendix 1

# **TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP FORM**

**Please complete the following:**

Name of Task Group:	<b>Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group</b>
Chairman of Task Group:	TBA
Issues to be scrutinised:	To examine strategies and policies which reduce anti-social behaviour. (The full terms of reference will be decided by the Scrutiny Steering Board.)
Note: The minimum number of Members on a Task Group is 3 and the maximum is 7	

➤ Name: *...Cllr. Caroline Spencer.....*

➤ Why are you interested in becoming a member of this particular Task Group?

*...Because there has been anti-social problems within my Ward and I appreciate that this is happening across Bromsgrove and District and there is a need to discuss to see how we can try and overcome and address some of the problems. ....*

➤ What skills and knowledge would you bring to the Task Group?

*...Work closely with my local CSO and attend the PACT Meetings for my Ward. Also represent BDC on the PCCG (new name to be given) where reports on anti-social behaviour can be openly discussed with the Police.....*

➤ Would membership of this Task Group raise any conflicts of interest which would prevent you from participating in meetings of this Task Group?

Yes                       No                       Unsure  *Need advice*

If "Yes" or "Unsure", please state why? *If elected as Chairman of the Council in May '08?*

➤ What days of the week are you generally available to attend a meeting at 6pm?

(Please tick all that apply)

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
		More available		

➤ Please state if you are available at any other times:

*6.00pm. Meetings are best suited to me OR DAYTIME ON WEDNESDAYS (Do not work on Wednesdays).....*

(Note: All meetings will commence at 6pm unless ALL Members of a Task Group agree they are ALL available to attend at a different time)

➤ Have you booked any holidays during the next 3-6 months?    Yes                       No

If "Yes", please state the dates you will be away...

*Monday 24<sup>th</sup> March – Monday 31 March (Easter week).....*

➤ Are you interested in being appointed Chairman                      Yes                       No \*\*

(Note: You must have attended the Scrutiny Training in August 2007 to be appointed Chairman of the Task Group)\*\* *Did not attend Scrutiny Training in Aug. '07*

Once complete, **please return to: Pádraig McCarthy** (Committee Services Officer),  
Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, **no later than 18th February 2008**

## TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP FORM

Please complete the following:

Name of Task Group:	<b>Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group</b>
Chairman of Task Group:	TBA
Issues to be scrutinised:	To examine strategies and policies which reduce anti-social behaviour. (The full terms of reference will be decided by the Scrutiny Steering Board.)
Note: The minimum number of Members on a Task Group is 3 and the maximum is 7	

➤ Name: *Rit Taylor*.....

➤ Why are you interested in becoming a member of this particular Task Group?  
*Feel that young people are being disadvantaged*  
*+ need some help*.....

➤ What skills and knowledge would you bring to the Task Group?  
*Have children*.....

➤ Would membership of this Task Group raise any conflicts of interest which would prevent you from participating in meetings of this Task Group?  
 Yes                       No                       Unsure   
 If "Yes" or "Unsure", please state why?.....

➤ What days of the week are you generally available to attend a meeting at 6pm?  
 (Please tick all that apply)

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
-	-	-	-	

➤ Please state if you are available at any other times: .....  
 (Note: All meetings will commence at 6pm unless ALL Members of a Task Group agree they are ALL available to attend at a different time)

➤ Have you booked any holidays during the next 3-6 months?    Yes                       No   
 If "Yes", please state the dates you will be away.....

➤ Are you interested in being appointed Chairman                      Yes                       No   
 (Note: You must have attended the Scrutiny Training in August 2007 to be appointed Chairman of the Task Group)

# TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP FORM

Please complete the following:

Name of Task Group:	<b>Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group</b>
Chairman of Task Group:	TBA
Issues to be scrutinised:	To examine strategies and policies which reduce anti-social behaviour. (The full terms of reference will be decided by the Scrutiny Steering Board.)
Note: The minimum number of Members on a Task Group is 3 and the maximum is 7	

➤ Name:..... JOHN T. O'MAHONY .....

➤ Why are you interested in becoming a member of this particular Task Group?  
 ..... CHAIR BRONSLOVE H. W. & W. MULLA N. W. .....  
 ..... POLICE CONSULTATIVE C&F .....

➤ What skills and knowledge would you bring to the Task Group?  
 ..... CASE POLICE INVOLVEMENT .....  
 ..... LEGAL BACKGROUND .....

➤ Would membership of this Task Group raise any conflicts of interest which would prevent you from participating in meetings of this Task Group?

Yes  No  Unsure

If "Yes" or "Unsure", please state why?.....  
 .....

➤ What days of the week are you generally available to attend a meeting at 6pm?  
 (Please tick all that apply)

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

➤ Please state if you are available at any other times: ..... YES .....  
 (Note: All meetings will commence at 6pm unless ALL Members of a Task Group agree they are ALL available to attend at a different time)

➤ Have you booked any holidays during the next 3-6 months? Yes  No   
 If "Yes", please state the dates you will be away.....

➤ Are you interested in being appointed Chairman Yes  No   
 (Note: You must have attended the Scrutiny Training in August 2007 to be appointed Chairman of the Task Group)

# Appendix 2

## TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP FORM

Please complete the following:

Name of Task Group:	<b>Alcohol Free Zones Task Group</b>
Chairman of Task Group:	Councillor J. T. Duddy
Issues to be scrutinised:	To examine the application, reasons, use and effectiveness of AFZ. To look at impact on crime and effects of displacement of drinking in public. (The full terms of reference will be decided by the Scrutiny Steering Board.)
Note: The minimum number of Members on a Task Group is 3 and the maximum is 7	

➤ Name:..... ANTHONY BLAKE .....

➤ Why are you interested in becoming a member of this particular Task Group?

..... TOWN CENTRE IMAGE .....

➤ What skills and knowledge would you bring to the Task Group?

..... I DRINK ALCOHOL RESPONSIBLY .....

➤ Would membership of this Task Group raise any conflicts of interest which would prevent you from participating in meetings of this Task Group?

Yes

No

Unsure

If "Yes" or "Unsure", please state why?.....

➤ What days of the week are you generally available to attend a meeting at 6pm?

(Please tick all that apply)

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

➤ Please state if you are available at any other times: .....

(Note: All meetings will commence at 6pm unless ALL Members of a Task Group agree they are ALL available to attend at a different time)

➤ Have you booked any holidays during the next 3-6 months? Yes  No

If "Yes", please state the dates you will be away.....

## TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP FORM

Please complete the following:

Name of Task Group:	<b>Alcohol Free Zones Task Group</b>
Chairman of Task Group:	Councillor J. T. Duddy
Issues to be scrutinised:	To examine the application, reasons, use and effectiveness of AFZ. To look at impact on crime and effects of displacement of drinking in public. (The full terms of reference will be decided by the Scrutiny Steering Board.)
Note: The minimum number of Members on a Task Group is 3 and the maximum is 7	

➤ Name: Helen Jones

➤ Why are you interested in becoming a member of this particular Task Group?  
ASB including under age drinking affecting Catshill roads, causing me concern

➤ What skills and knowledge would you bring to the Task Group?  
Knowledge of the importance of having an alcohol free zone.

➤ Would membership of this Task Group raise any conflicts of interest which would prevent you from participating in meetings of this Task Group?

Yes  No  Unsure

If "Yes" or "Unsure", please state why? licensee at Bromsgrove Rovers

➤ What days of the week are you generally available to attend a meeting at 6pm?

(Please tick all that apply)

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
/		/		/

➤ Please state if you are available at any other times: .....

(Note: All meetings will commence at 6pm unless ALL Members of a Task Group agree they are ALL available to attend at a different time)

➤ Have you booked any holidays during the next 3-6 months? Yes  No

If "Yes", please state the dates you will be away.....

## TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP FORM

Please complete the following:

Name of Task Group:	<b>Alcohol Free Zones Task Group</b>
Chairman of Task Group:	Councillor J. T. Duddy
Issues to be scrutinised:	To examine the application, reasons, use and effectiveness of AFZ. To look at impact on crime and effects of displacement of drinking in public. (The full terms of reference will be decided by the Scrutiny Steering Board.)
Note: The minimum number of Members on a Task Group is 3 and the maximum is 7	

> Name: DAVID McGRATH

> Why are you interested in becoming a member of this particular Task Group?

WE HAVE AN ALCOHOL FREE ZONE HERE IN RIBERY FOR SOME YEARS - BUT ITS LARGELY IGNORED BY YOUNG PEOPLE. I FEEL WE NEED TO HAVE MORE THAN JUST SIGNS UP ETC.

> What skills and knowledge would you bring to the Task Group?

MY EXPERIENCE OF CONFRONTING YOUNG PEOPLE IN THEIR PURSUIT OF ALCOHOL & SUBSEQUENT BEHAVIOUR I.E. ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

> Would membership of this Task Group raise any conflicts of interest which would prevent you from participating in meetings of this Task Group?

Yes  No  Unsure

If "Yes" or "Unsure", please state why? .....

> What days of the week are you generally available to attend a meeting at 6pm?

(Please tick all that apply) EXCEPT WHEN THERE ARE COUNCIL MEETINGS / TRAINING ETC

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
✓	✓	✓	✓	

> Please state if you are available at any other times: AM, afternoon

(Note: All meetings will commence at 6pm unless ALL Members of a Task Group agree they are ALL available to attend at a different time)

> Have you booked any holidays during the next 3-6 months? Yes  No

If "Yes", please state the dates you will be away: I COULD BE AWAY FROM

MAY 5<sup>th</sup> R/ TRAINING IN ITALY

Once complete, please return to: David McGrath (Committee Services Officer)

Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, no later than 18th February 2008

# Appendix 3

## TASK GROUP CHAIRMAN FORM

Please complete the following:

Name of Task Group:	<b>Alcohol Free Zones Task Group</b>
---------------------	--------------------------------------

➤ Name:.....Councillor James Duddy.....

➤ Would membership of this Task Group raise any conflicts of interest which would prevent you from participating in meetings of this Task Group?

Yes

No

Unsure

If "Yes" or "Unsure", please state why?.....

.....

➤ What days of the week are you generally available to attend a meeting at 6pm?

(Please tick all that apply)

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

➤ Please state if you are available at any other times: .....

(Note: All meetings will commence at 6pm unless ALL Members of a Task Group agree they are ALL available to attend at a different time)

➤ Have you booked any holidays during the next 3-6 months? Yes  No

If "Yes", please state the dates you will be away.....

Once complete, **please return to:** Della McCarthy (Committee Services Officer),  
Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services, **by 18 February 2008**

# Appendix 4

## SCRUTINY EXERCISE SCOPING CHECKLIST

This form is to assist Members to scope the scrutiny exercise in a focused way and to identify the key issues it wishes to investigate.

When the Board decides to set up a Task Group to scrutinise a particular subject, the appointed Chairman of the Task Group should complete this checklist. Completed forms will be considered by the Board and by the Task Group as a whole at the Task Group's first meeting.

- General Subject Area to be Scrutinised: ALCOHOL FREE ZONES (AFZ).....
- Specific Subject to be Scrutinised: TO EXAMINE THE APPLICATION, REASONS, USE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF AFZ. TO LOOK INTO THE IMPACT ON CRIME / ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR / ENFORCEMENT LEVELS AND THE EFFECTS OF DISPLACEMENT AND DRINKING IN PUBLIC.....  
.....  
.....
- Should the relevant Portfolio Holder(s) be invited to give evidence? **YES/NO**
- Should any Officers be invited to give evidence? **YES/NO**  
If yes, state name and/or post title: HEAD OF CULTURE AND COMMUNITY, SAFETY MANAGER, NEIGHBOURHOOD WARDENS.....  
.....
- Should any external witnesses be invited to give evidence? **YES/NO**  
If so, who and from which organisations? CHIEF INSPECTOR OF POLICE AND YOUTH SERVICE.....  
.....
- Should the Task Group receive evidence from other sources other than witnesses? **YES/NO**  
If so, what information should the Task Group wish to see and from which sources should it be gathered? IT MAY WISH TO OBTAIN STATISTICS ON ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR IN DROMSPOUR. ANY DATA ON OPERATIONS OF AFZ IN TERMS OF PROSECUTIONS OR APPLICATION OF POWERS.....  
.....
- Should a period of public consultation form part of the Scrutiny exercise? **YES/NO** ?  
If so, on what should the public be consulted? PERHAPS DISCUSS WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF THE TASK GROUP.....

- Have other authorities carried out similar scrutiny exercises? **YES/NO** ?

If so, which authorities? I HAVE SEARCHED THE INTERNET AND CAN NOT FIND ANY

What were their conclusions and what can we learn from them?.....  
.....  
.....

- Will the Scrutiny exercise cross the District boundary? **YES/NO**

If so, should any other authorities be invited to participate?.....  
.....  
.....

- Would it be appropriate to co-opt anyone on to the Task Group whilst the Scrutiny exercise is being carried out? **YES/NO**

If so, who and from which organisations? PERHAPS DEPENDING ON WHAT OTHERS MEMBERS OF THE TASK GROUP THINK.

- What do you anticipate the timetable will be for the scrutiny exercise?

4 MONTHS  
.....  
.....  
.....

- Approximate number of Task Group Meetings? 4-6

Signed: J. RES

Chairman of behalf of the: ALCOHOL FREE ZONES Task Group

Date: 11/02/08

Please return completed forms to:  
Della McCarthy  
Committee Services Officer  
Legal and Democratic Services  
Bromsgrove District Council

This page is intentionally left blank

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**SCRUTINY STEERING BOARD**

**4TH MARCH 2008**

**RECOMMENDATION TRACKER**

This report lists all scrutiny recommendations approved by Cabinet with information on: who will be progressing the approved recommendations; when the recommendations are expected to be implemented by; and any officer comments which might be useful to the Scrutiny Steering Board. The recommendations are grouped by Task Group.

All general recommendations made by the Scrutiny Steering Board are also listed when applicable.

General Recommendations made by the Scrutiny Steering Board on: 5th February 2008

<b>*Rec. No.</b>	<b>Detail of Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer Responsible</b>	<b>Implementation to take place by</b>	<b>Tick if completed</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
N/A	The Public Transport (Buses) Scrutiny Report, as agreed by the Scrutiny Steering Board, be placed on the next available Agenda for Cabinet's consideration and all recommendations contained within the report be approved.	Committee Services Officer	March	✓	The Scrutiny Report is on the Agenda for the Cabinet's Meeting scheduled to be held on 5th March 2008.
N/A	Full Council include the concerns of the Scrutiny Steering Board in response to the CLG consultation exercise on Calls for Action.	Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services	February	✓	The Board's full response has been included in a report to the Full Council Meeting due to be held on 27th February 2008.

\*Note: "Rec. No." is the Recommendation Number as given within a Scrutiny Report compiled by a Task Group

Approved Recommendations from Air Quality Scrutiny Investigation:

9th January 2008 (Date agreed by Cabinet)

*Rec. No.	Detail of Recommendation	Officer Responsible	Implementation to take place by	Tick if completed	Officer Comments
1	<p>This Council considers applying to Worcestershire County Council for certain roads to be made low emission zone roads therefore limiting access to certain types of vehicles which reduce air quality. Specifically, the following roads/areas should be low emission due to high NO2 levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Approximately a 2 mile radius around Bromsgrove town centre</li> <li>▪ A38 Bypass in Rubery</li> <li>▪ All roads in Rubery with a weight restriction</li> <li>▪ A456 in Hagley</li> <li>▪ A491 in Hagley</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>At the Scrutiny Steering Board Meeting on 5th February 2008, it was agreed that Cabinet would be requested to reconsider its response to this recommendation. A report has been submitted to Cabinet and will be considered on 5th March 2008.</p>
2	<p>The Council remain committed to improving Bromsgrove Railway Station including the Park and Ride facility as this will encourage the public to use public transport and therefore reduce the numbers of cars on the roads which are having a negative impact on air quality.</p>	Assistant Chief Executive	By 21st March 2008		<p>Executive Director – Partnerships and Projects will send letter to Railway Station Working Group to ensure they are aware of the approved scrutiny recommendations highlighting the issue of adequate car parking and traffic management in the</p>

					Aston Fields area with regard to access and egress from the car park.
4	<p>(a) Request that Worcestershire County Council's Highways alter the traffic signals on the A38 North into Bromsgrove so to reduce exit blocking and improve traffic flow near the AQMA; and</p> <p>(b) Request that both Worcestershire County Council's Highways and this Council's Environmental Health Team monitor the area before and after the alterations in order to obtain evidence to prove whether or not the alteration have been successful.</p> <p>(The Cabinet also wished the appropriate authority to consider making the operation of the traffic signals part time (e.g. during the night, the traffic was much lighter and this would reduce the amount of stationary traffic and therefore improve air quality.)</p>	<p>Worcestershire County Council's Highways</p> <p>Head of Planning and Environmental Health Services</p> <p>Worcestershire County Council's Highways</p> <p>Highways Agency</p>	By 21st March 2008		<p>Executive Director – Partnerships and Projects will write to Worcestershire County Council (WCC) requesting the traffic lights be altered as requested and to ask that WCC indicate when they will undertake this work so that Environmental Health (EH) can monitor before the alteration and after.</p>



	Birmingham Road (by Davenal House) and investigate, in partnership with Worcestershire County Council Highway's, whether or not it might help decrease traffic congestion and therefore lower the air pollution at this location which has high NO2 levels.				been unable to attend so far. However, a reminder has been sent and the issue of road management will feature as a major item at future Town Centre Steering Group meetings. The issue of air quality will form part of the discussions with the Highways Unit.
8	<p>(a) Request that Worcestershire County Council review the timing of the traffic signals located at the top end of the High Street by The Strand with a view to reducing the build up of standing traffic;</p> <p>(b) If County Council agree to amend the timing of the traffic signals in (a), request that they monitor the traffic congestion before and after making the alteration to measure whether the action has had a positive impact; and</p> <p>(c) Request Environmental Health monitor air quality around Davenal House, Birmingham Road before and after the (a) is implemented to measure whether it has helped improve air quality (which is known to be poor at this location).</p>	<p>Head of Planning and Environmental Health Services</p> <p>Worcestershire County Council's Highways</p>	Commence exploring air quality issues with Highways Unit by 30th April 2008		This will be linked to recommendation 7.

9	<p>(a) The Head of Planning and Environmental Health Services be requested to consider the best ways to discourage development within an AQMA; and</p> <p>(b) An air quality guidance note for developers be drafted by the Planning and Environmental Health Officers to try and control and mitigate the impact property development has on air quality.</p>	Head of Planning and Environmental Health Services	On going		The Planning and Environment Department apply government guidance with developers, but EH in coordination with Development Control are examining ways of strengthening application of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 23.
10	<p>(a) There is ongoing communication with local residents who own and/or reside in a property located in the AQMA to ensure they are fully aware of the situation. (The Task Group will be ensuring the households affected receive a copy of this report for their information); and</p> <p>(b) A sign be erected (by the County Council) in the AQMA to inform the public that it is an AQMA and that the District Council is working with other agencies to reduce air pollution in the vicinity. The sign should also pose the question "Is your journey</p>	Head of Planning and Environmental Health Services	By 31st December 2008		<p>EH will enhance the information on the website by the end of 2008 and use this as the basis for providing further information to households in the AQMA.</p> <p>Executive Director – Partnerships and Projects will write to WCC requesting sign.</p>

	necessary?" to encourage the public to think about their travel habits and the impact it has on air pollution.				
11	Environmental Health be requested to update information on the Council's website as soon as possible and ensure it is regularly updated.	Head of Planning and Environmental Health Services	By 31st December 2008		See response to recommendation 10 above.
12	<p>(a) The Environmental Health Team be requested to work in partnership with Worcestershire PCT (and local GP surgeries) and ensure they are kept up to date in regards to which areas are known poor air quality areas to help investigate further the correlations between poor air quality areas and respiratory illnesses such as asthma; and</p> <p>(b) Request that Worcestershire PCT work closely with GPs to ensure the criteria used for diagnosing and recording data relating to asthma is standardised wherever possible to enable the analysis of data to be more meaningful.</p>	Head of Planning and Environmental Health Services  Worcestershire PCT	<p>Considered by LSP Theme Groups by 30th June 2008</p> <p>Letter written by 30th April 2008</p>		<p>There is an Air Quality Steering Group that includes the PCT. However, this only meets once a year so the issue will be raised at both the LSP Better Environment Group and the Health and Well Being Group.</p> <p>Executive Director – Partnerships and Projects will write to public health officer at PCT regarding outcomes of Air Quality Scrutiny Group.</p>

13	<p>(a) The Environmental Health Team be requested to actively discourage bonfires (with the exception of social events on and around 5th November) through promotion, similar to Birmingham City Council; and</p> <p>(b) Ensure that members of the public are aware how to report bonfires if they are a nuisance.</p>	Head of Planning and Environmental Health Services	By 30th September 2008		An article will be published in Together Bromsgrove regarding bonfires and reference will be made to the BDC website and WCC website regarding discouragement to bonfires.
14	The Head of Street Scene and Waste Management be requested to further investigate and assess options available (such as using bio fuel in refuse and recycling vehicles) which could assist the Council in contributing to improving air quality.	Head of Street Scene and Waste Management	Ongoing	Updates to be provided	The current cost of bio fuel is more expensive than the traditional fuel that we purchase. There are also environmental concerns about the current availability of such fuels and whether they have a beneficial affect on the environment. The department is therefore continuing to research the options and monitor the ongoing debate with the use of such fuels. At present it is not considered appropriate to enter into a long tem commitment to use bio fuels within Council vehicles, however a regular update will be provided.

15	It is requested that the newly established Energy Efficiency Project Group progress the Council's Staff Travel Plan as a matter of urgency and work together with the LSP Better Environment Theme Group.	Executive Director – Partnership and Projects	A draft Travel Plan will go to CMT by 14th March 2008. The Energy Efficiency Group will work on the draft so a plan can be presented to Cabinet by 31st October 2008.	The demand for a meaningful Travel Plan has also been supported by CMT and a report is to be presented in March. This report will go to the Energy Efficiency Group in April and a Travel Plan will be submitted to Cabinet by 31st October 2008.
16	<p>(a) To help the Council lead by example to other agencies, training be offered to all Members and staff (including those based at the Depot) on air quality (and other green issues) to improve their awareness of the impact their behaviour at home and at work can have on air quality;</p> <p>(b) As part of that training, it is suggested that the film “An Inconvenient Truth” relating to the work of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize winner Al Gore be shown at the Council House; and</p> <p>(c) The Head of Street Scene and Waste Management ensure specific training is provided to refuse and recycling crews relating to where refuse vehicles should be parked (to avoid causing traffic</p>	<p>Head of Planning and Environmental Health Services</p> <p>Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services</p> <p>Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development</p> <p>Head of Street Scene and Waste Management</p>	<p>Member Training to be discussed at the next Modern Councillor Programme Steering Group Meeting.</p> <p>Report to CMT mid March on Staff Training Priorities for 2008/9</p>	<p>The Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services will ensure that this item is on the Agenda for the next Modern Councillor Programme Steering Group Meeting. The Steering Group will then decide when this particular training should be added on to the Member Training Work Programme.</p> <p>The Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development will ensure that this item is considered by CMT along with all other proposed corporate training priorities, and prioritised accordingly.</p> <p>Refuse and recycling</p>

	congestion) with engines turned off during breaks.		Weekly briefing for crews to include instruction outlined in recommendation 16 (c) will be developed and will commence from July 2008		crews are instructed as part of their induction training to avoid causing unnecessary obstruction when operating service vehicles. This instruction will be reiterated on a regular basis as a reminder and Street Scene and Waste Management will develop a weekly briefing for crews which will include this instruction along with other service specific issues.
17	The Licensing Section be requested to remind taxi drivers not to leave their engines running whilst waiting for the next fare at a taxi rank. As an incentive to change their behaviour, it should be pointed out that (a) it will save fuel; and (b) it is an offence to leave a vehicle running when not in the vehicle and any person doing so is at risk of receiving a fixed penalty notice. This information could be included in a newsletter for example.	Head of Planning and Environmental Health Services	End of February 2008	✓	A Newsletter incorporating this information has been sent to all taxi drivers and taxi operators in February 2008.

18	<p>(a) To ensure car parking spaces are reserved for those who join the car sharing scheme (which could act as an incentive);</p> <p>(b) Through various forms of publicity, the Communication Team ensure that staff are frequently reminded and encouraged to join the Car Sharing Scheme and encouraged to use other alternatives to travel to work such as walking, cycling or public transport; and</p> <p>(c) The numbers of staff from Bromsgrove District Council joining the car sharing scheme be monitored.</p>	<p>Executive Director – Partnership and Projects</p> <p>Assistant Chief Executive</p>	<p>A draft Travel Plan to be considered at CMT by 14th March and by Energy Efficiency Project Group at April meeting.</p>		<p>Car sharing will form part of the travel plan to be considered by CMT by 14th March and by the Energy Efficiency Project Group in April 2008. (See recommendation no. 15 above)</p>
19	<p>Further investigations be carried out by the Human Resources Section into the possibility of having: (a) a pool of Council owned environmentally friendly cars for essential and casual car users; or (b) a loan/lease scheme to assist and encourage staff to convert their own car to alternative fuel.</p>	<p>Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development</p>	<p>2010</p>		<p>The review of car allowances is being addressed through Single Status, and it is proposed that a new set of criteria is developed for determining which posts attract the allowance going forward. It has been agreed in principle that this review will take place over the next 12 months, and that any individual members of staff who are found to no longer undertake sufficient</p>

					business miles to receive the allowance should be protected for 2 years, in accordance with the same principle for JE protection. This is to minimise the potential effect upon individual members of staff who may be financial losers through both JE and the review of car allowances. The possibility of having environmentally friendly pool cars and loan/leasing scheme will be included in this process.
20	<p>The Council consider revising the current car allowance pay scales and not pay more to those who are potentially the worst polluters.</p> <p>(The Cabinet resolved that investigations be undertaken into the revision of the current car allowance pay scales to include the possibility of paying a flat rate for all users regardless of engine size.)</p>	Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development	2010		See officer comments under recommendation number 19 above.

21	Support be given to a Home Working Policy as reducing the number of times staff need to travel to and from the office will help reduce the number of cars on the road and this will help towards improving air quality. Therefore, a report from the Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development should be submitted to the Corporate Management Team without delay.	Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development	15th January 2008	✓	Corporate Management Team (CMT) is generally supportive of the principle and it was discussed once again on 15th January 2008. However CMT is mindful of the wider context, such as office accommodation / asset management and technological capabilities / resources. Consequently, CMT do not feel able to implement the policy at the present time. At present, there is a pilot within Revenues and Benefits to ensure that the technology to allow for home working is correct. Although a corporate Home Working Policy has not yet been adopted, Heads of Services can allow home working when appropriate.
----	---	--	-------------------	---	---

Abbreviations:

AQMA = Air Quality Management Area  
 BDC = Bromsgrove District Council  
 CMT = Corporate Management Team  
 EH = Environmental Health  
 JE = Job Evaluation

LSP = Local Strategic Partnership  
 PCT = Primary Care Trust  
 PPS = Planning Policy Statement  
 WCC = Worcestershire County Council

This page is intentionally left blank

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**FORWARD PLAN – 1ST MARCH 2008**

This Forward Plan lists the key decisions which the Cabinet expects to have to make during the period 1st March 2008 to 30th June 2008.

Item No.	Portfolio Holder/ Lead Member Responsibility	Subject	Details of Proposed Decision	Expected Date of Decision	Original Expected Date of Decision	Principal Groups or Organisations to be consulted and date and method of consultation	Documents to be considered in relation to the Decision	Comments
1	Councillor Mrs. J. Dyer	Air Quality Scrutiny Report	At the request of the Scrutiny Steering Board, to reconsider the Cabinet's previous response to the Air Quality Scrutiny Report recommendation with regard to Low Emission Zones	5th March 2008			Report of the Head of Planning and Environment Services	
2	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Benefit Fraud Prosecution Policy	To approve an updated Housing/Council Tax Benefit fraud prosecution policy	5th March 2008			Report of the Head of Financial Services	
	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Capital Strategy	To consider and recommend Council to approve the Capital Strategy for 2008-2011	5th March 2008			Report of the Head of Financial Services	
	Councillor R. Hollingworth	Council Plan 2008/11 – Part 2	To consider and make recommendations on the Council Plan 2008/11 Part 2	5th March 2008	6th February 2006		Report of the Assistant Chief Executive	Delayed by officers
5	Councillor R. D. Smith	Dedication of Cycleway	To approve the dedication of a cycleway at Catshill as part of a Sustrans route	5th March 2008			Report of the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services	
6	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Fees and Charges	To consider and agree the proposed levels of Council fees and charges for 2008/09	5th March 2008			Report of the Head of Financial Services	
7	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Financial & Performance Monitoring – Integrated Report	To consider the financial position and performance indicators for the 3rd quarter of 2007/08 and any corrective actions required	5th March 2008			Report of the Head of Financial Services	
8	Councillor R. Hollingworth	Improvement Plan Exception Report	To consider any exceptions to the Council Improvement Plan as at December 2007	5th March 2008			Report of the Assistant Chief Executive	

Page 87

Agenda Item 7

Item No.	Portfolio Holder/ Lead Member Responsibility	Subject	Details of Proposed Decision	Expected Date of Decision	Original Expected Date of Decision	Principal Groups or Organisations to be consulted and date and method of consultation	Documents to be considered in relation to the Decision	Comments
9	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Local Housing Allowance and Discretionary Housing Payment Policies	To note changes to the Housing Benefit Scheme and agree new Local Housing Allowance and Discretionary Housing Payment Policies	5th March 2008			Report of the Head of Financial Services	
10	Councillor Mrs. M. A. Sherrey	Public Transport – Buses Task Group	To consider recommendations from the Public Transport – Buses Scrutiny Task Group	5th March 2008	6th February 2008		Report of the Scrutiny Task Group/Scrutiny Steering Board	Delayed due to the extension of the period allowed for the scrutiny exercise
11	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Treasury Management Strategy	To consider and make recommendations to the Council on an updated Treasury Management Strategy	5th March 2008			Report of the Head of Financial Services	
12	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Value for Money Strategy	To consider and agree a Value for Money Strategy	5th March 2008			Report of the Head of Financial Services	
13	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Write-Off – Sundry Debt	To agree a proposed write-off of a sundry debt (confidential item)	5th March 2008			Report of the Head of Financial Services	

Item No.	Portfolio Holder/ Lead Member Responsibility	Subject	Details of Proposed Decision	Expected Date of Decision	Original Expected Date of Decision	Principal Groups or Organisations to be consulted and date and method of consultation	Documents to be considered in relation to the Decision	Comments
14	Councillor Mrs. J. M. L. A. Griffiths	Artrix Service Level Agreement	To consider a proposed SLA with the Artrix	2nd April 2008			Report of the Acting Head of Culture and Community Services	
15	Councillor R. Hollingworth	CPA re-categorisation request	To consider and recommend the Council to approve a submission to request the re-categorisation of the Council's CPA ranking	2nd April 2008			Report of the Assistant Chief Executive	
16	Councillor R. Hollingworth	Improvement Plan Exception Report	To consider any exceptions to the Council Improvement Plan as at January 2008	2nd April 2008			Report of the Assistant Chief Executive	
17	Councillor P. J. Whittaker	Mobile Home Licensing	To consider an update on the implications of the introduction of Government model standards in Mobile Home licensing agreements	2nd April 2008	5th September 2007		Report of the Head of Planning and Environment Services	Delayed due to staff shortage within the Strategic Housing team
18	Councillor R. D. Smith	Pension Scheme Amendment	To consider proposed changes to the Pension Scheme arising from Regulations	2nd April 2008			Report of the Head of HR and Organisational Development	
19	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Procurement Strategy and Code	To consider and approve a new Procurement Strategy and Code for the Council	2nd April 2008			Report of the Head of Financial Services	
20	Councillor Mrs. M. A. Sherrey	Refuse and Recycling Task Group	To consider recommendations from the Refuse and Recycling Scrutiny Task Group	2nd April 2008			Report of the Scrutiny Task Group/Scrutiny Steering Board	
21	Councillor R. D. Smith	Single Status (Job Evaluation)	To approve, subject to the outcome of a ballot, the implementation of new pay and grading for staff and changes to pay protection and terms and conditions	2nd April 2008			Report of the Head of HR and Organisational Development	

Item No.	Portfolio Holder/ Lead Member Responsibility	Subject	Details of Proposed Decision	Expected Date of Decision	Original Expected Date of Decision	Principal Groups or Organisations to be consulted and date and method of consultation	Documents to be considered in relation to the Decision	Comments
22	Councillor R. Hollingworth	Improvement Plan Exception Report	To consider any exceptions to the Council Improvement Plan as at February 2008	30th April 2008			Report of the Assistant Chief Executive	

**NOTE: There will be no Cabinet meeting in May 2008**

Item No.	Portfolio Holder/ Lead Member Responsibility	Subject	Details of Proposed Decision	Expected Date of Decision	Original Expected Date of Decision	Principal Groups or Organisations to be consulted and date and method of consultation	Documents to be considered in relation to the Decision	Comments
23	Councillor M. J. A. Webb	Customer Panel 2 Results	To consider the findings of the Customer Panel 2 Survey	4th June 2008	6th February 2008		Report of the Assistant Chief Executive	Delayed due to the timescale for the receipt of survey results from external company
24	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Financial & Performance Monitoring – Integrated Report	To consider the financial position and performance indicators for the 4th quarter of 2007/08 and any corrective actions required	4th June 2008			Report of the Head of Financial Services	
25	Councillor R. Hollingworth	Improvement Plan Exception Report	To consider any exceptions to the Council Improvement Plan as at March 2008	4th June 2008			Report of the Assistant Chief Executive	
26	Councillor G. N. Denaro	Statement of Accounts 2007/08	To consider and recommend the full Council to approve the Statement of Accounts for 2007/08	25th June 2008 (special meeting)			Report of the Head of Financial Services	

All decisions will be taken collectively by the Cabinet. Any person who wishes to make representations to the executive or decision taker about a matter in respect of which a decision is to be made can write to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services at The Council House, Burcot Lane, Bromsgrove B60 1AA, or by email to [k.firth@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:k.firth@bromsgrove.gov.uk) before the date shown in the 5th column.

Councillor R. Hollingworth  
Leader of the Council

The Council House  
Burcot Lane,  
BROMSGROVE B60 1AA

14th February 2008

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCRUTINY STEERING BOARD

### WORK PROGRAMME

The Work Programme consists of three sections: Items for Future Scrutiny and Updates; Current Scrutiny Task Groups; and Scrutiny Task Group Reviews.

**RECOMMENDATION:** To consider and agree the work programme

### ITEMS FOR FUTURE SCRUTINY AND UPDATES

Subject	Date of Consideration	Other Information
Recommendation Tracker	Jan/Mar/May/ July/Sept/Nov	Report monitoring recommendations to be included on the Board's Agenda on a bi-monthly basis for a trial period of 12 months starting January 2008.
Climate Change	4th March 2008	To avoid duplicating the work of the Energy Efficiency Project Group (which has been set up to evaluate the recommendations contained within the Energy Savings Trust Assessment) the Board agreed at its November 2007 meeting to consider this item as a possible topic for scrutiny in March 2008. The Board now needs to decide whether or not it should remain on its work programme.
Value for Money – Street Scene and Waste Management	4th March 2008	The Board decided to consider this topic as a possible area for scrutiny at its next meeting in March 2008. The Board now needs to decide whether or not it should remain on its work programme.
Spatial Programme (ICT)  (Scrutiny proposal from Councillor McDonald)	4th March 2008	At the last meeting of the Board, Members decided not to establish a Task Group to scrutinise this topic at this time. The Board now needs to decide whether or not it should remain on its work programme.
Older People  (Councillor Mrs. Bunker)	TBC	Possible area for scrutiny following outcome of a focus group to find out specific issues which may need to be scrutinised in future. A scrutiny proposal would need to be completed if the Board was minded to scrutinise this area.
Worcestershire Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen Network (Update)	TBC	Members to receive an update from Chairman after the next Worcestershire Network meeting when meeting date has been confirmed.

## CURRENT SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS

Current Task Groups	Date Report Due	Other Information
Public Transport - Buses	5th February 2008  (Due to be considered by Cabinet on 5th March 2008. Cabinet Response to be presented to the Board on <b>1st April 2008</b> )	Task Group established and Councillor B. Lewis F.CMI appointed as Task Group Chairman. Membership and Terms of Reference agreed July 2007. First Task Group Meeting held on 22nd August 2007 following the Scrutiny Training on 20th August 2007. Task Group has been granted one month's extension and work is to be completed no later than 21st January 2008.
Refuse and Recycling	4th March 2008  (Due to be considered by Cabinet on 2nd April 2008. Cabinet Response to be presented to the Board on <b>29th April 2008</b> .)	Task Group established and Councillor C. R. Scurrill appointed as the new Task Group Chairman in October. Membership and Terms of Reference originally agreed July 2007. First Task Group Meeting held on 22nd August 2007 at 6pm following the Scrutiny Training on 20th August 2007. Due to change in Chairman, Task Group work is now due to be completed no later than 28th January 2008.
Reducing Anti-Social Behaviour	TBA	Task Group established. Appointment of Chairman, Membership and Terms of Reference to be agreed.
Alcohol Free Zones	TBA	Task Group established and Councillor J. T. Duddy appointed as Task Group Chairman. Membership and Terms of Reference to be agreed on 5th March 2008. First meeting due to be held April 2008.

## SCRUTINY TASK GROUP REVIEWS

<b>Task Group</b>	<b>Date of Review (when Task Group is due to reconvene)</b>
Culture and Community Services	9th July 2007 - Task Group work complete -
Use of Consultants	24th July 2007 - Task Group work complete -
Bromsgrove District Housing Trust (BDHT)	11th December 2007 - Task Group work complete -
Car Parking	6th March 2008
Flytipping	12th March 2008
Watercourses	19th March 2008
Air Quality	January 2009

Note: A seminar relating to the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 will be held in the future covering key courses of action. This will be arranged once more is known on what the impact will be on overview and scrutiny committees.

This page is intentionally left blank