



SCRUTINY COMMISSION

This meeting will be recorded and the sound recording subsequently made available via the Council's website: charnwood.gov.uk/pages/committees

Please also note that under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 that other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting. The use of any images or sound recordings is not under the Council's control.

To: Councillors Brookes, Hamilton, Ranson (Vice-Chair), Seaton (Chair), Parton, Popley and K. Harris (For attention)

All other members of the Council
(For information)

You are requested to attend the meeting of the Scrutiny Commission to be held in council offices on Monday, 14th November 2022 at 6.00 pm for the following business.

Chief Executive

Southfields
Loughborough

4th November 2022

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING 5 - 14

To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 10th October 2022.

3. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER REGISTRABLE AND NON-REGISTRABLE INTERESTS

For information, disclosable pecuniary interests and registrable interests relate to entries that are included, or should be included, on a councillor's register of interests. Non-registrable interests relate to any other matters.

4. DECLARATIONS OF THE PARTY WHIP

5. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURES
11.16

No questions were submitted.

6. BULKY WASTE COLLECTION CHARGES REVIEW 15 - 17

A report of the Head of Contracts (Leisure, Waste and Environment) to allow scrutiny of the impact of the introduction of charges for bulky waste collections.

7. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF ANY SPECIFIC FINANCIAL
MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED BY CABINET

There are no items of this nature on the Cabinet agenda for the Commission to consider.

8. CABINET ITEMS FOR PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY

There are no Cabinet items selected for pre-decision scrutiny.

9. SCRUTINY COMMISSION PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY - CABINET 18 - 19
RESPONSE

A report of the Cabinet setting out its responses to recommendations of the Committee on pre-decision scrutiny items.

10. PROGRESS WITH PANEL WORK 20 - 25

A report of the Head of the Governance and Human Resources to consider updates on the work of scrutiny panels.

11. WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL REPORT 26 - 67

A report of the Head of Governance and Human Resources to consider the report of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel and the recommendations set out therein.

12. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 68 - 72

A report of the Head of Governance and Human Resources enabling the Commission to review and agree the scrutiny work programme.

13. SCRUTINY COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME 73 - 84

A report of the Head of Governance and Human Resources setting out the list of forthcoming Executive Key Decisions and the group's Work Programme for consideration, in order to identify items for future scrutiny.

14. FLY TIPPING IN CHARNWOOD

85 - 88

A report of the Head of Contracts (Leisure, Waste and Environment) to allow scrutiny of the levels of fly tipping with Charnwood Borough.

For information, further meetings of the group are scheduled as follows:

12th December 2022

9th January 2023

6th February 2023

SCRUTINY QUESTIONS

What topics to choose?

- What difference will scrutiny make?
- Is this an area of concern – public/performance/risk register?
- Is this a corporate priority?
- Could scrutiny lead to improvements?
- What are the alternatives to pre-decision scrutiny?

Pre-decision scrutiny

- What is Cabinet being asked to agree?
- Why?
- How does this relate to the overall objective? Which is ...?
- What risks have been identified and how are they being addressed?
- What are the financial implications?

- What other options have been considered?
- Who has been consulted and what were the results?
- Will the decision Cabinet is being asked to take affect other policies, practices etc.?

Basic Questions

- Why are you/we doing this?
- Why are you/we doing it in this way?
- How do you/we know you are making a difference?
- How are priorities and targets set?
- How do you/we compare?
- What examples of good practice exist elsewhere?

SCRUTINY COMMISSION 10TH OCTOBER 2022

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Seaton)
The Vice Chair (Councillor Ranson)
Councillors Brookes, Hamilton, Parton and
K. Harris

Councillor Morgan (Leader of the Council), Rattray
(Cabinet Lead Member for Business Support) and
Bokor (Cabinet Lead Member for Loughborough)

Director Commercial and Economic Development
Director Housing and Wellbeing
Head of Contracts, Leisure, Waste and
Environment
Head of Transformation, Strategy and
Performance
Head of Regulatory and Community Safety
Enviro-Crime and Dog Control Manager
Democratic Services Officer (SW)

APOLOGIES: Councillor Popley

The Chair stated that the meeting would be recorded and the sound recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

29. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 5th July 2022 were approved.

30. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER REGISTRABLE AND
NON-REGISTRABLE INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

31. DECLARATIONS OF THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

32. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURES 11.16

No questions were submitted.

33. GLYPHOSATE-BASED HERBICIDES IN OPEN SPACES, PLAYGROUNDS AND
PARKS

Councillor Brookes arrived at the meeting at 6:05pm.

Councillor Popley joined the meeting virtually at 6:09pm.

A report of the Head of Contracts (Leisure, Waste and Environment) to provide the Scrutiny Commission with an update on Glyphosate use and any potential alternatives identified by the Council following the review (October 2021), was submitted (item 6 on the agenda filed with these minutes).

The Lead Member for Loughborough and the Head of Contracts (Leisure, Waste and Environment) assisted with the consideration of this item. The following summarises the discussion:

- i. The downward trend in glyphosate use was not related to Covid-19 as there was little service disruption during that period. The downward trend was due to Glyphosate being used sparingly by contractors.
- ii. Since the Scrutiny Commission last reviewed the use of Glyphosate, there had been an investigation into potential alternatives. It was considered that there was currently no viable alternative. Alternatives were damaging to the environment, expensive or not in line with carbon reduction aims.
- iii. Developments in the management of open spaces were anticipated and it was possible that newer alternatives may become available. In addition, there may be changes in cost to some of the alternatives already considered. The use of Glyphosate and alternative methods would remain under review and the Council would identify viable alternative methods when they became available.
- iv. It was highlighted that there were a range of varying views on the use of Glyphosate across the industry. However, Glyphosate use was regulated and considered safe to use in the UK. It was therefore considered to be suitable and safe for use, but not the ideal solution.
- v. Contractors and staff using Glyphosate had appropriate PPE and extensive training of the safety of use. The use of Glyphosate was heavily regulated and was considered safe to use by the Health and Safety Executive.

RESOLVED that the Commission noted the report.

Reason

-

To ensure the Commission was kept informed on the use of Glyphosate-based herbicides in open spaces, playgrounds and parks.

34. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF ANY SPECIFIC FINANCIAL MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED BY CABINET

There were no items of this nature on the Cabinet agenda for the Commission to consider.

35. CABINET ITEMS FOR PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY

36. COST OF LIVING - SUPPORT TO COMMUNITIES AND BUSINESSES

A Cabinet report of the Chief Executive to outline the support the Council has put in place regarding the Cost of Living crisis and to request financial resources to provide enhanced support to residents and businesses (item 8a on the agenda filed with these minutes).

The Leader of the Council, the Director of Housing and Wellbeing and the Head of Transformation, Strategy and Performance assisted with the consideration of this item. The following summarises the discussion:

- i. The maximum £180k of funding from the Reinvestment Reserve would be used to directly support communities and businesses. Council resources such as officer time were part of the running costs of the Council and would not be drawn from this sum.
- ii. The Council had identified a number of themes and options which outlined the work that may be undertaken using the £180k in funding.
- iii. The Council had considered providing printed materials for distribution to target groups, in addition to the information which would be made available online. It was suggested by the Scrutiny Commission that the Council includes a wide range of noticeboards, libraries and Parish and Town Councils across the Borough to promote the support available to communities.
- iv. It was suggested that the wording in the report be changed where a 'pot of funding' was referred to. Alternative phrases to incorporate into the report were 'accounts' or 'funding schemes'.
- v. Members were encouraged to suggest initiatives and schemes offering support to communities and businesses through the Community Development Team at the Council.

- vi. The Big Switch programme was not available at this time. However, when the programme became available again the Council would look to reinstate this form of support.
- vii. There was support available to homeowners, such as the Council Tax rebate scheme and the ECO4 scheme outlined in the report.

RESOLVED

1. That the Cabinet be informed that the Commission supports the recommendations as set out in the report of the Chief Executive.
2. That it be suggested to the Cabinet that they consider the expansion of printed materials for distribution to include promotion of the support available on a wide range of noticeboards, libraries and Parish and Town Councils across the Borough.
3. That the officers consider changing the wording used in the report where a 'pot of funding' was referred to.

Reasons

1. The Commission, having carefully considered the report, felt the Cabinet should approve the recommendation set out.
2. To increase the promotion of support available and to ensure members of the community that are considered to be digitally excluded have the opportunity to utilise the support available.
3. To improve the wording used within the report.

Councillor Robin Popley, attending the meeting virtually, confirmed that he would have supported the recommendations in the report of the Chief Executive if he was present in the room and able to do so.

37. FEASIBILITY STUDIES FOR CARBON REDUCTION

A Cabinet report of the Director of Commercial and Economic Development requesting that the budget initially agreed for Solar Feasibility be expanded in its scope to include feasibility work for any measure to reduce or offset carbon (item 8b on the agenda filed with these minutes).

The Leader of the Council and the Director of Commercial and Economic Development assisted with the consideration of this item. The following summarises the discussion:

- i. The £150k funding referred to in the report was intended for direct use on any measure to reduce or offset carbon. This did not include any Council resource costs such as officer time as this was part of the Council's running costs.
- ii. The Council had actively looked to reduce carbon in ways such as fleet upgrades and the potential of a new, lower carbon Council office.
- iii. Councils within Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland were working to coordinate climate change efforts and the Council was taking others' strategies into account in forming a new climate change strategy.
- iv. The Council would take a prudent approach with regards to the spending of the £150k referred to in the report, ensuring due diligence throughout the process.

RESOLVED that the Cabinet be informed that the Commission supports the recommendations as set out in the report of the Director of Commercial and Economic Development.

Reason

The Commission, having carefully considered the report, felt the Cabinet should approve the recommendation set out.

Councillor Robin Popley, attending the meeting virtually, confirmed that he would have supported the recommendations in the report of the Director of Commercial and Economic Development if he was present in the room and able to do so.

38. CHARNWOOD DOG CONTROL PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER 2022

A Cabinet report of the Head of Regulatory and Community Safety to seek approval of the Notice of Intention and upon expiry of the 28-day notice period to approve the Public Spaces Protection Order (Charnwood Borough Council) Control of Dogs 2023 under the provisions of the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 (item 8c on the agenda filed with these minutes).

The Lead Member for Business Support, the Head of Regulatory and Community Safety and the Enviro-Crime and Dog Control Manager assisted with the consideration of this item. The following summarises the discussion:

- i. The enforcement of the PSPO (Public Space Protection Order) would rely on complaints for targeted enforcement in problem locations, as the Orders apply across the whole of the Borough and staff resources would be limited.

- ii. There had been only one report, which met the threshold of anti-social behaviour , at Stonebow Washlands within the yellow zone highlighted on the map included within the report.
- iii. Members expressed that they were grateful for the introduction of the 'dogs on leads' enforcement in the blue zone highlighted on the map included within the report, demonstrating the area of Stonebow Washlands, as this had had a positive impact on the area.
- iv. Members felt that with regards to recommendation 1, option 1 was the most appropriate course of action, as it was considered that applying the restriction to dogs on leads on the playing fields indicated on the map was not required.

RESOLVED that the Cabinet be informed that the Commission supports the recommendations as set out in the report of the Head of Regulatory and Community Safety.

Reason

The Commission, having carefully considered the report, felt the Cabinet should approve the recommendation set out.

Councillor Robin Popley, attending the meeting virtually, confirmed that he would have supported the recommendations in the report of the Head of Regulatory and Community Safety if he was present in the room and able to do so. He also stated that he would support option 1, as part of recommendation 1.

39. SCRUTINY COMMISSION PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY - CABINET RESPONSE

A report of the Cabinet was considered setting out its responses to the recommendations of the Commission on pre-decision scrutiny items (item 9 on the agenda filed with these minutes).

RESOLVED that the Cabinet's responses to the Commission's recommendations be noted.

Reason

The Commission was satisfied that it added value where appropriate and welcomed the Cabinet's consideration of the Commission's views and recommendations as part of its decision making process.

40. PROGRESS WITH PANEL WORK

A report of the Head of Governance and Human Resources to review the progression of scrutiny panels was submitted (item 10 on the agenda files with these minutes).

The Lead Officer and the Democratic Services Officer assisted with the consideration of this item. The following summarises the discussion:

- i. The paused informal scrutiny panel 'Combatting Loneliness' was discussed. There had not been sufficient member engagement and so the panel was not able to commence at this time.
- ii. The paused informal scrutiny panel 'Promoting Tourism in Charnwood' was discussed. Following the implementation of the new leadership structure at the Council, Officers were organising workloads and it was suggested that the panel was revisited in January 2023.
- iii. The 'Crime, Youth Crime and ASB' scrutiny panel was discussed. Following discussions between the proposed Chair of the panel and the Community Safety Partnership team, it was suggested that the panel did not progress. This was due to duplication of work, as there had recently been an ASB review undertaken at the Council. In addition, the Community Safety Partnership was scrutinised on an annual basis by the Finance and Performance Scrutiny Committee. Therefore, it was felt that there was not a need to undertake a panel at this time. However, the Commission felt that there would be a benefit in scrutinising the outcome of the ASB review at the Council. The Scrutiny Commission requested a presentation and a report as soon as possible on the outcome of the ASB review, including information on results and what has been changed.
- iv. The Scrutiny Commission approved a Budget Scrutiny Panel for the year 2022/23, with Councillor Mark Charles nominated as Chair, and Councillor Robin Popley nominated as Vice-Chair.
- v. The Commission discussed the potential for a scrutiny panel on the Cost of Living. However, it was agreed that it would be more appropriate to provide the Commission with an update on the action plan associated with the work undertaken by the Council regarding the Cost of Living.

RESOLVED

1. That the Scrutiny Commission reviewed the progression of scrutiny panels.
2. That a Budget Scrutiny Panel for the Council year 2022/23 was approved and that Councillor Mark Charles be appointed Chair and Councillor Robin Popley be appointed Vice-Chair of the panel.
3. That the Scrutiny Commission receive a presentation and a report as soon as possible on the outcome of the ASB review, including information on results and what has been changed.
4. That the Scrutiny Commission receive an update on the Cost of Living Action Plan when appropriate.

Reasons

- 1-2. To ensure timely and effective scrutiny of the matter/subject.

- 2 To enable panel work to commence.
- 3 To ensure the recent ASB Review at the Council was properly scrutinised.
- 4 To ensure the Scrutiny Commission was kept updated on the Cost of Living Action Plan.

Councillor Robin Popley, attending virtually, confirmed that he would have supported the resolutions had he been present in the room and able to do so.

41. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

A report of the Head of Governance and Human Resources to enable the Commission to review and agree the Scrutiny Work Programme. This includes reviewing the changes made by the Finance and Performance Scrutiny Committee and adding items to their work programme (item 11 on the agenda filed with these minutes).

The Lead Officer assisted with the consideration of this item.

RESOLVED

1. That the Scrutiny Commission reviewed the Finance and Performance Scrutiny Work Programme and make any amendments the Commission feel necessary.
2. That the Scrutiny Commission agreed that the Finance and Performance Scrutiny Work Programme be updated in accordance with the decisions taken during consideration of this item and any further decisions taken during this meeting.

Reasons

1&2 To ensure timely and effective scrutiny of the matter/subject.

2.To ensure that the information contained within the Work Programme is up to date.

Councillor Robin Popley, attending virtually, confirmed that he would have supported the resolutions had he been present in the room and able to do so.

42. SCRUTINY COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME

A report of the Head of Governance and Human Resources was considered, to enable the Commission to consider its work programme and forthcoming Key Decisions and decisions to be taken in private by the Cabinet in order to schedule items for pre-decision scrutiny (item 12 on the agenda filed with these minutes).

The Lead Officer and the Democratic Services Officer assisted with the consideration of this item.

The Scrutiny Commission added the following items to their work programme:

- i. ASB Review Update – to include a presentation and a report outlining the outcomes of the review and the changes that have been made as a result (as soon as possible).
- ii. Cost of Living Action Plan Update – a report to include progress against the Cost of Living action plan.

RESOLVED

1. That forthcoming Executive Key Decisions or decisions to be taken in private by the Executive, set out in Appendix 2 to the report, and scheduled scrutiny of those matters, be noted.
2. That the Commission's current work programme be noted.
3. That the following items be added to the Scrutiny Commission's work programme for pre-decision scrutiny:
 - ASB Review Update
 - Cost of Living Action Plan Update

Reasons

- 1&3 To ensure effective and timely scrutiny, either to provide Cabinet with advice prior to it taking a decision or to ensure that the Council and external public service providers and partners were operating effectively for the benefit of the Borough.
2. To ensure effective and timely scrutiny.

Councillor Robin Popley, attending the meeting virtually, confirmed that he would have supported the resolutions had he been present in the room and able to do so.

NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the Council meeting on 7th November 2022 unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.

2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Scrutiny Commission.
3. Councillor Robin Popley attended the meeting virtually. Votes were taken only from members of the committee physically present in the room.
4. The following Lead Members and Officers attended the meeting virtually: Councillors Morgan, Rattray and Bokor, Director of Housing and Wellbeing, Director of Commercial and Economic Development, Head of Regulatory and Community Safety and Enviro-Crime and Dog Control Manager.

<i>REPORT TO:</i>	Scrutiny Commission
<i>SUBJECT:</i>	Review of the introduction of charges for bulky waste collections (36 months)
<i>LEAD OFFICER:</i>	Matthew Bradford, Head of Contracts (Leisure, Waste and Environment)
<i>CABINET LEAD MEMBER:</i>	Cllr. Leigh Harper-Davies, Lead Member for Community Support and Equalities
<i>ORIGIN OF ITEM:</i>	Defunct Neighbourhoods and Community Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee
<i>BRIEF FOR THE COMMITTEE</i>	To scrutinise the impact of the introduction of charges for bulky waste collections

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. Charges for bulky waste collections were introduced in October 2019 (Cabinet approval – July 2019).

1.2. A Cabinet paper in June 2020 reviewed the implementation phase of these charges during the first 5 months. This was followed up by a 12 and 24 month review report presented to the Scrutiny Commission in December 2020 and November 2021 respectively.

2. PURPOSE

2.1. To further review the risks and benefits from the introduction of Bulky Waste collection charges 36 months after their enforcement.

2.2. To discuss the impact COVID 19 had in this service, along with the mitigation measures.

3. Risk management and mitigation measures

In the original report there were three identified areas of risk. This section will provide information on how each of them was mitigated.

3.1. *Potential increase in fly-tipping:*

A comparison of the same 12 months (October-September) between the year before and the third year after the introduction of the charges showed an overall decrease (16%) in the number of incidents (776 compared to 900). This decrease was equally identified in items not collected as part of the bulky waste service, such as garden waste and black bags of household waste.

In categories included in the bulky waste collections, like white goods and electrical items, there has been an increase of 12.2% (92 incidents compared to 82).

	Baseline (pre-charges)	5-month review	12-month review	24-month review	36-month review
Total number of fly-tipped items	900	383	988	1187	776
Fly-tipped items that could have been collected as bulky items	82	29	79	110	92
Percentage (%)	9.1%	7.6%	8.0%	9.3%	11.9%

3.2. Managing increased demand leading up to the introduction of charges:

This risk was adequately managed in cooperation with the Council's collections contractor. Additional resources were deployed where necessary. No issues or complaints were received as a result.

3.3. Customer satisfaction:

Customer satisfaction surveys are carried out by an independent body as part of the Environmental Services Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). One of the questions is focused to satisfaction from bulky waste collections. It was found that the annual average score in the surveys carried out the year before the introduction of the charges was 92.9% compared to the one carried out in September 2022 that was 76.3%. As the methodology of data collection has changed in the last year (online compared to telephone surveys) these figures are not comparable. It is worth clarifying that any dissatisfaction was associated with the introduction of charges and not the service standard.

3.4. Equality and Diversity

The Council continues to assess requests for Hardship Criteria on a case-by-case basis. Since the introduction of the charges 152 applications have been received and in 32 cases the charges have been waived.

4. Benefit realisation

4.1. Less waste sent to landfill

After analysing the collected tonnages for the same period (October – September) for the year before and after the introduction of the charges, it was found that there was an overall increase of approximately 10.5%. This is in line with the 10% increase in volume that has been identified because of COVID 19 and has been associated with people spending more time at home and thus generating more household waste. This is an area that can be revisited once the numbers normalise and there is a like for like comparison of the external factors.

4.2. Contract compliance:

As stated in the original report, the existing Environmental Services contract is based on 12,000 collections per year. The reduction in the number of requests ensures that the Council complies with this figure and diminishes the risk of incurring any extra charges in the form of contract variation.

4.3. Income generation:

The income generated from the introduction of these charges will allow the Council to offset part of the costs for subsidising the wider Environmental Services contract. It was agreed that from April 2022 the price for this service would increase from £20 to £25 per request for service. During the second full year (October 2021 – Sept 2022) this service generated £146,700 against a set budget of £118,000.

5. The COVID 19 factor

5.1. The pandemic has had an impact on this service. The closure of the HWRCs for 3 months (summer 2020) might have generated some additional interest as residents did not have the option to dispose these items by themselves. At the same time the suspension of the service by the Council might have had a negative impact over a short period of time. The level of income generated in the third year prove that residents trust this service and carry on using it.

5.2. A continuous monitoring of the aforementioned, as well as any emerging factors, would allow the Council to adjust the service in order to meet residents' requirements.

Appendices:

None

Background Papers:

None

Officer(s) to contact:

Matthew Bradford
Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces
01509 634 695
Matthew.Bradford@charnwood.gov.uk

SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 14TH NOVEMBER 2022

Report of the Cabinet

SCRUTINY COMMISSION PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY – CABINET RESPONSE

Purpose of Report

To set out the Cabinet's responses to the recommendations of the Commission on pre-decision scrutiny items.

Action Requested

To note the responses to the recommendations submitted by the Commission on items considered for pre-decision scrutiny.

Policy Context

One of the principles of effective scrutiny, identified by the Centre for Public Governance and Scrutiny, is "provide a constructive critical friend challenge to the Executive".

Pre-decision Scrutiny

Since the meeting of the Commission on 10th October 2022, the Cabinet considered the following items on which the Commission undertook pre-decision scrutiny:

- A. COST OF LIVING SUPPORT TO COMMUNITIES AND BUSINESSES
- B. FEASIBILITY STUDIES FOR CARBON REDUCTION
- C. CHARWOOD DOG CONTROL PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER 2022

Details of the Commission's consideration of the items as reported to the meeting of the Cabinet on the 13th October 2022 can be found in the minutes from the Commission's meeting on 10th October 2022.

The Chair of the Commission, Councillor Seaton attended the Cabinet's meeting on the 13th October 2022 to present the Commission's reports to the Cabinet.

Cabinet Response

The Cabinet considered the Commission's reports and acknowledged the work undertaken and the views of the Commission. In particular, the Cabinet responded as follows to the reports:

COST OF LIVING SUPPORT TO COMMUNITIES AND BUSINESSES

The Cabinet adopted the officer recommendation as set out in the report, which the Commission had supported.

FEASIBILITY STUDIES FOR CARBON REDUCTION

The Cabinet adopted the officer recommendation as set out in the report, which the Commission had supported.

CHARNWOOD DOG CONTROL PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER 2022

The Cabinet adopted the officer recommendation as set out in the report, which the Commission had supported.

Report Implications

The following implications have been identified for this report:

Financial Implications

None.

Risk Management

No risks have been identified in connection with this report.

Background Papers: None

Officer to contact: Sally Watson
Democratic Services Officer
01509 634969
sally.watson@charnwood.gov.uk

SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 14TH NOVEMBER 2022

Report of the Head of Governance and Human Resources

SCRUTINY PANELS

Purpose of the Report

To review the progression of scrutiny panels.

Actions Requested

1. To review the progression of scrutiny panels.
2. To approve any panel scoping documents submitted.

Reasons

- 1-2. To ensure timely and effective scrutiny of the matter/subject.
2. To enable panel work to commence.

Scrutiny Panels

Waste Management Scrutiny Panel

The Waste Management Scrutiny Panel met on 1st November 2022 for their final meeting. The outcomes of the meeting can be found in the minutes of the meeting, which have been published on the council's website. The panel's report, including recommendations are attached to the agenda for this meeting of the Scrutiny Commission.

Digital Transformation Scrutiny Panel

The Digital Transformation Scrutiny Panel report was submitted to Cabinet at their meeting on 13th October 2022. The Cabinet considered the recommendations of the panel, which they supported. The resolutions can be found in the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet.

Budget Scrutiny Panel

At their meeting on 10th October 2022 the Scrutiny Commission approved a Budget Scrutiny Panel for 2022/23, with Councillor Mark Charles as Chair and Councillor Robin Popley as Vice-Chair of the panel. The Budget Scrutiny Panel had their first meeting on 31st October 2022. The outcomes of the meeting can be found in the minutes, which will be published on the Council's website. The Budget Scrutiny Panel were due to meet again on 13th December 2022.

Crime, Youth Crime and ASB Scrutiny Panel

At their meeting on 10th October 2022, it was suggested that the Crime, Youth Crime and ASB Scrutiny Panel not be pursued as there had recently been an ASB Review at the Council. In addition, it was highlighted that the work of the Charnwood Community Safety Partnership was scrutinised on an annual basis by the Finance and Performance Scrutiny Committee. Therefore, it was considered that a scrutiny panel on this topic may duplicate work. In order for the Scrutiny Commission to be satisfied that there was not a need for this panel to commence, an update was requested from officers, outlining the outcomes of the recent ASB Review.

Combatting Loneliness Scrutiny Panel and Promoting Tourism in Charnwood Scrutiny Panel

At their meeting on 5th July 2022 the Scrutiny Commission agreed to pause the Combatting Loneliness Scrutiny Panel and the Promoting Tourism in Charnwood Scrutiny Panel until the Council's new senior management structure had been embedded.

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Scrutiny Panels

Background Papers: None

Officer to Contact: Karen Widdowson
 Democratic Services Manager
 01509 634785
 karen.widdowson@charnwood.gov.uk

Scrutiny Panels

The CfGS 4 Principles:

- Provides a ‘critical friend’ challenge to the executive – policy development, policy review and performance management.
- ‘Enables’ the voice and concerns of the public and its community to be heard.
- Independent and Member Driven.
- “Drives improvement” for the Local Authority.

We welcome proposals for scrutiny from Members, whether on the appropriate committee or not; outside bodies; and Charnwood residents.

This will be a living document, so as new ideas and proposals arise, they may take priority over proposals that have been on the list for a longer period.

Only 4 panels (Formal or Express) can be held at any one time, so timings will need to take account of this. Informal meetings will be conducted without Democratic Service officer time and can therefore be run concurrently.

Chair	Type	Topic	Scope	Terms of Reference	Timing
Cllr Ward	Formal	Waste Management and Recycling	To provide the Council with the technical information and necessary evidence base to aid future decision making on the waste management strategy.		Concluded
Cllr Charles	Formal	Budget Scrutiny	To closely review all aspects of the proposed budget for the following year and to monitor		Autumn (Sept – Jan annually)

			the performance of the budget from the previous year.		
Cllr Parton	Informal	Combatting Loneliness	<p>Undertake desk based and interviewing research to understand what the level of loneliness is in the Borough currently and in what age groups. Identify activities already undertaken by the council to combat loneliness. What can be done to promote these facilities with hard to reach groups?</p> <p>Identify specific actions that could be undertaken by CBC to combat loneliness that are not currently being undertaken. What actions/ discussions could we have with our partners to support this project?</p> <p>Investigation to identify how Parish Councils could become involved.</p>	<p>Seek residents' individual views through social media and press.</p> <p>Interview local charities and support groups. Interview Leicestershire County Council Adult Social Care representatives and CAMHs.</p>	PAUSED

Cllr Popley	Informal	Promoting Tourism in Charnwood	<p>Identify our key attractions to the area, both physical buildings and special events. What is CBC doing to promote and support these venues/ events? What else could be done? Do we have a unique selling point that we are not exploiting?</p> <p>How do people travel to the area? Where do they stay? What specific actions could CBC take to encourage more people to visit the area; spend more money on local businesses; and to stay for a longer period?</p> <p>Identify opportunities for tourism to recover post-pandemic.</p>	<p>Approach and/ or interview peer councils to see what they do.</p> <p>Look at specific events around the country to see if they could be adapted for CBC, eg: Congleton Makers Market, or Stockton on Tees Comedy Festival.</p>	PAUSED
Councillor Hamilton	TBC	Crime, ASB and Youth Crime	Identify specific actions that CBC can undertake to support our key partners in preventing and tackling crime.	Interview outside bodies such as the police, probation service, youth groups, and charities to understand their work and what prevents/ hinders	Panel likely to be DELETED . Outcomes of the

			<p>Review of ASB currently planned within Council.</p> <p>Discussion required with officers to establish scope of review.</p>	<p>them from dealing with crime, ASB and youth crime promptly in our Borough.</p>	<p>ASB review to be reviewed December 2022.</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---

Express	Informal	Formal	Proposed

SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 14TH NOVEMBER 2022

Report of the Head of Governance and Human Resources

WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL REPORT

Purpose of the Report

To consider the report of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel and the recommendations set out therein.

Action Requested

That the Scrutiny Commission considers the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel report, attached as an Annex, and, if satisfied, submits it to the next available Cabinet meeting.

Background

Following a decision of the Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 11th October 2021, a Waste Management Scrutiny Panel has undertaken scrutiny in accordance with the agreed Scrutiny Scope Document.

Background Papers: None additional to those listed in the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel report.

Officer to Contact: Laura Strong
Democratic Services Officer
01509 634734
laura.strong@charnwood.gov.uk

REPORT OF THE WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL

Foreword by Councillor Ward, Chair of the Panel

“The Waste Management Scrutiny Panel was established in 2021, its scope to look at ways in which Charnwood Borough Council could improve its recycling rates, and also reduce the volume of waste entering the residual waste stream, particularly in light of the Council’s own climate strategy and anticipated changes to legislation brought about by the Environment Bill. Members have been fortunate to have been supplied with a wealth of information by both officers and external stakeholders around which to formulate recommendations, which we hope Cabinet will seriously consider implementing. The Panel also submitted a response to the draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy 2022-2050, which can be read at appendix 3. Thank you to all who contributed to the Panel’s work”.

1. Background

Following a decision of the Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 11th October 2021, a Waste Management Scrutiny Panel has undertaken scrutiny in accordance with the agreed Scrutiny Scope Document attached as **Appendix 1** (updated to reflect position at end of Panel’s work).

2. Panel Membership

Councillors Ward (Chair), Boldrin, Forrest, Howe, Needham and Parton.

3. Panel Meetings and Matters Considered

9th November 2021

Considered:

- the Scrutiny Scope Document agreed by the Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 11th October 2021, updated to list Panel membership and meeting dates;
- key task in the Scrutiny Scope Document, a breakdown and analysis of the Council’s waste and recycling data, benchmarked against similar local authorities, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces;
- key task in the Scrutiny Scope Document, the proposals in the Environment Bill regarding waste management and the changes this would necessitate, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces and reading for members of the Panel in advance of the meeting (DEFRA – Consultation on Consistency in Household and Business Recycling in England May 2021).

Added to key tasks in Scrutiny Scope Document:

- consideration of the draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy.

2nd February 2022

Considered:

- key task in the Scrutiny Scope Document, investigate other local authorities considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood, taking into account demographics, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces (commenced);
- key task in the Scrutiny Scope Document, investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve our recycling rates, via submitted suggestions from members of the Panel (commenced).

31st March 2022

Considered:

- key task in the Scrutiny Scope Document, investigate other local authorities considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood, taking into account demographics, via a further presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces (completed);
- key task in the Scrutiny Scope Document, investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve our recycling rates, via report back on investigations/enquiries agreed at previous Panel meetings (completed);
- Draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces also sent to members of the Panel in advance of meeting. Resulting Panel response to the Strategy consultation is attached as **Appendix 3**.

11th May 2022

Considered:

- key task in the Scrutiny Scope Document, identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them, via input from J. McGovern (Serco, Council's waste collection contractor) and a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces (commenced).

27th July 2022

Considered:

- key task in the Scrutiny Scope Document, identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them, via input from J. Ardley (Community Warden,

Loughborough University), Council tenants (written submission), a further presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces and reading for members of the Panel in advance of the meeting (HMOs: Barriers to Improving Recycling Oct 2019, WRAP and Guide to Improving Waste Management in Domestic Rented Sector, Resource London LEDNET) (completed).

1st November 2022

Considered:

- the Panel's report, agreed.

The information considered by the Panel at its meetings and as background reading is available on the Council's website, here:

[Browse meetings - Waste Management Scrutiny Panel - Charnwood Borough Council \(modern.gov.co.uk\)](http://modern.gov.co.uk)

Minutes detail the Panel's discussions at each meeting and are available via the above link, also attached as **Appendix 2** to this report.

4. Visit to Casepak Materials Recycling Facility

The above was listed as a key task in the Scrutiny Scope Document. Efforts to arrange this with the facility have to date been unsuccessful.

5. Other Attendees

Others attended meetings of the Panel and assisted with its scrutiny as follows:

The Cabinet Lead Member for Community Support
The Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces
J. McGovern (Serco, Council's Waste Collection Contractor)
J. Ardley (Community Warden, Loughborough University)

6. Recommendations of the Panel

The Panel wishes to make the following recommendations in respect of its scrutiny of Waste Management:

1. REPRESENTATION TO MPs

A written submission be sent to Jane Hunt and Ed Argar, MPs setting out the Panel's concerns regarding the Environment Bill, particularly the cost implications for the Council, and also that the way the Government is asking the Council to present its waste collection data (i.e. not including brown

bins) skews its figures negatively. Considered by the Panel on 9th November 2021, Minute 6.

2. CHARNWOOD SUSTAINABILITY FAIR

Charnwood Borough Council establish a 'Charnwood Sustainability Fair'. This would be an annual event, possibly in the marketplace or the Town Hall, that pulls together local organisations working in the areas of sustainability under one roof, allowing them the opportunity to raise awareness around their activities, services or products. Examples of groups who could participate include Transitions Loughborough (Repair Cafes), Exaireo Paint Reuse scheme, the Zero Waste Refill Shop, LCC Master Composters, etc.

3. BIN LABELLING

Charnwood Borough Council consider labels for bins (domestic and street bins), listing the materials that can be recycled – using visual symbols and braille, so that residents with visual impairments, with limited literacy or with English as a second language are also able to clearly understand. This is something that residents are consistently unclear on and could help reduce the number of contaminate loads.

4. TARGETED EDUCATION CAMPAIGNS

Charnwood Borough Council target education campaigns, starting with those collection round areas that SERCO has identified as being the poorest performers in terms of contaminated loads, etc. (Rounds 1,5,6). Messaging needs to be continuous, not sporadic. Also, consider what happens with the bins of 'repeat' offenders. Is there any kind of greater level of enforcement that can take place? Could we secure communal bin stores or install CCTV, to discourage fly-tipping in these areas?

5. PROMOTE PARTNER AGENCIES/LOCAL GROUPS, BUSINESS AND ORGANISATIONS WORKING TO REDUCE WASTE

There are lots of initiatives in and around the Borough of Charnwood working to reduce or eliminate waste (Repair Cafés, Zero Waste and Refill Shops, Exaireo Paint Reuse, SOFA, Leicestershire Master Composters, Too Good To Go, Freegle, Freecycle, etc.). Charnwood could play a key role in helping to raise awareness of their existence and of their activities.

6. COMMS CAMPAIGN – CHARNWOOD WASTE CHAMPION CHALLENGE, WHAT CAN GO IN YOUR RECYCLING BIN, ETC.

Set up a challenge for residents and schools (and councillors and council staff!) to reduce their waste, have a stall on the market to show people what can and can't go in the recycling bin, videos of councillors going through their own recycling bin to check, talks in schools, etc.

7. LIAISE WITH LCC OVER INTRODUCING TERRACYCLE COLLECTION POINTS AT REFUSE SITES FOR HARDER TO RECYCLE ITEMS, TIP

OPENING TIMES, AND OFFERING THE OPPORTUNITY TO BUY ITEMS THAT ARE STILL IN GOOD WORKING ORDER

The Panel also discussed reintroducing the collection of other items to the recycling collection, such as batteries, some electrical items, textiles, etc., but these items are now collected either in most shops (batteries), at the waste site (electrical items) or via textiles banks.

8. USE DECALS ON THE SIDE OF BIN LORRIES TO PROMOTE REUSABLE NAPPIES, HOME COMPOSTING SCHEMES, GARDEN WASTE SCHEME, ETC.

9. SUPPORT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCRAPSTORE/LIBRARY OF THINGS/OTHER SIMILAR INITIATIVES

A Scrapstore would repurpose for craft projects, etc. scrap materials otherwise destined for the residual waste stream, both from domestic properties but also donated by local businesses. A library of things would allow residents to borrow tools and equipment without having to purchase them.

10. DISCUSS CREATING A PAINT COLLECTION POINT AT ONE OF THE CHARNWOOD WASTE SITES WITH LCC

The Panel was informed that this has been suggested previously to the County Council, but it could be suggested again.

11. INTRODUCE RECYCLING COLLECTIONS FOR INTERESTED LOCAL BUSINESSES

The Panel was informed that some investigatory work around this had already begun, and that Charnwood already collects recycling from businesses in the BID area. Whilst the waste collected may not contribute towards the Council's recycling figures, it would still potentially make a positive impact on the amount of waste diverted from the residual waste stream.

12. WORK CLOSELY WITH LBORO UNIVERSITY PARTNERS ON END OF TERM CLEAR OUTS

The Panel was informed that this has started happening this year and panel members noted that the end of term clear outs seemed better than in previous years, but that greater collaboration was needed between the Council and the University to make sure the dates chosen for the collections were appropriate, etc.

13. INTRODUCE FOOD WASTE COLLECTIONS, POSSIBLY ALONGSIDE A FOOD WASTE REDUCTION CAMPAIGN

Panel members understand that it is potentially a financially onerous undertaking, and that it would be preferable to await the detail of the Environment Bill around whether or not mandatory food waste collections are to be introduced, but it was felt that this is inevitable and also the action

most likely to increase our recycling rates and reduce residual waste. *Final Panel meeting clarified that this recommendation was intended to apply at the point food waste collection becomes mandatory and Government funded.*

7. Background Papers

Information considered by the Panel at its meetings and as background reading is available on the Council's website, here:

[Browse meetings - Waste Management Scrutiny Panel - Charnwood Borough Council \(moderngov.co.uk\)](https://www.moderngov.co.uk)

8. Equality Implications

An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) may be required to assist any decision to implement the Panel's recommendations.

9. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Scrutiny Scope Document
Appendix 2 – Minutes of Panel Meetings
Appendix 3 – Panel response to consultation on Draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy 2022-2050

November 2022



REVIEW TITLE: WASTE MANAGEMENT AND RECYCLING REVIEW
SCOPE OF ITEM / TERMS OF REFERENCE
To provide the Council with the technical information and necessary evidence base to aid future decision making on the waste management strategy.
REASON FOR SCRUTINY
<p>Charnwood Borough Council's recycling rates have been below the 50% target set by the Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament for some time now. The Panel will seek to identify why this is the case and make suggestions on how to improve the recycling rate in the Borough.</p> <p>Recycling waste contamination is approx. 12%. The Panel will seek to identify how the Borough can reduce this level and educate its residents.</p> <p>Waste minimisation is vital for future generations. The Panel will look at educational initiatives and the activities of organisations set up with the aim to reduce waste.</p> <p>The Environment Bill is likely to significantly impact our service delivery. The Panel will seek to explore what this means in practice.</p> <p>To provide public reassurance that scrutiny is looking at the matter in light of Climate Change.</p>
MEMBERSHIP OF THE PANEL
<p>Chair – Councillor Ward</p> <p>Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe, Needham and Parton</p>
WHAT WILL BE INCLUDED
<p>To identify waste prevention strategies, maximise waste as a resource, and recover usable materials, balancing this with exploring ways to improve our recycling rates.</p> <p>To look at how the Environment Bill will impact our waste management and make some proposals for appropriate changes to our service in light of this if necessary.</p>
WHAT WILL BE EXCLUDED
Areas of waste management that Charnwood Borough Council are not responsible for or have influence over. However, this will not preclude the Panel making representations to other bodies.
KEY TASKS * including consideration of efficiency savings

- ~~Breakdown and analysis of our own waste and recycling data. Benchmark against other similar authorities. Completed 09 Nov 2021.~~
- ~~Identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them. Commenced 11 May 2022, completed 27 July 2022.~~
- ~~Investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve our recycling rates. Commenced 02 Feb 2022, completed 31 Mar 2022.~~
- ~~Overview of proposals of Environment Bill regarding waste management. Look at what changes this will necessitate. Completed 09 Nov 2021.~~
- ~~Research waste prevention activities and organisations both within the Borough and elsewhere that are committed to waste reduction. Confirmed as completed 31 Mar 2022.~~
- ~~Investigate other local authorities that are considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood Borough Council, taking into account demographics. Commenced 02 Feb 2022, completed 31 Mar 2022.~~
- ~~Visit recycling and processing plants (e.g. Casepak). Visit to Casepak to be arranged by Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces, recommended to panel members if able to attend.~~
- ~~(Added 09 Nov 2021) Draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy 2022. Completed 31 Mar 2022.~~

STAKEHOLDERS, OUTSIDE AGENCIES, OTHER ORGANISATIONS *

Matt Bradford, Head of Service; Cllr. Leigh-Harper Davies, Lead Member for Community Support and Equalities; Cllr Rollings, Lead Member for Transformation; SERCO; LCC, Loughborough University; Climate Action Leicester & Leicestershire; Transitions Loughborough; Residents Groups, Leicestershire & Rutland Reuse Network, LetsRecycle.com, Tenant Groups and Resident Associations.

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

To be considered at the Panel's penultimate meeting.

LINKS/OVERLAPS TO OTHER REVIEWS

n/a

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

Officer time including Head of Service and Democratic Services Team.

REPORT REQUIREMENTS (Officer information)

Report and recommendations to Scrutiny Commission.

REVIEW COMMENCEMENT DATE

COMPLETION DATE FOR DRAFT REPORT

April September 2022

* Key tasks and stakeholders may be subject to change as the review progresses.

PROGRESS OF PANEL WORK (Minutes of Panel meetings provide detail)

MEETING DATE	PROGRESS TO DATE
09 November 2021, 6pm	Key Tasks Completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakdown and analysis of our own waste and recycling data. Benchmark against other similar authorities. • Overview of proposals of Environment Bill regarding waste

	<p>management. Look at what changes this will necessitate.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Panel asked that Jane Hunt, MP be invited to attend a Panel meeting to discuss concerns regarding the Environment Bill, particularly the cost implications for the Council. Panel subsequently decided on 02 Feb 2022 that this could instead be achieved by way of written submission setting out Panel's concerns.</p>
14 December 2021, 6pm	Cancelled (Covid-19)
02 February 2022, 6pm	<p>Key Tasks <u>Part</u> Completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate other local authorities that are considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood Borough Council, taking into account demographics. Investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve our recycling rates.
15 March 2022, 6pm	Cancelled (Covid-19)
31 March 2022, 6pm	<p>Key Tasks Completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate other local authorities that are considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood Borough Council, taking into account demographics. Investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve our recycling rates. Draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy 2022-2050. Research waste prevention activities and organisations both within the Borough and elsewhere that are committed to waste reduction. (Confirmed as completed at previous meetings).
26 April 2022, 6pm	<p>Key Tasks <u>Part</u> Completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them.
11 May 2022, 6pm	
14 June 2022, 6pm	<p>Key Tasks Completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them. <p>Penultimate meeting should consider Equality Implications.</p>
20 June 2022, 6pm	
27 July 2022, 6pm	
01 November 2022, 6pm	Final meeting, to agree Panel's report (physical meeting).

REPORT SUBMITTED TO SCRUTINY COMMISSION

July October/November 2022

**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL
9TH NOVEMBER 2021**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)

Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe, Needham and Parton

Councillor Harper-Davies (Cabinet Lead Member for Community Support and Equalities)

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces
Democratic Services Officer (EB)
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: None

The Chair stated that the meeting would be livestreamed and recorded and the recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

1. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY AND PERSONAL INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

2. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

3. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

Councillor Needham arrived at the meeting at 6.09pm.

4. SCRUTINY SCOPE DOCUMENT

Considered and discussed, the scrutiny scope document for the Panel, agreed by Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 11th October 2021 and updated to list Panel membership and meeting dates.

Matters suggested to look at/list on the scrutiny scope document were confirmed as matters for the County Council decision as waste disposal authority (provision of recycling and household waste sites, use of incinerator). These were excluded from scrutiny by the Panel, but this did not preclude making representations to other bodies. Confirmed that parties worked together, illustrated by forthcoming draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy. Whether the Council's fleet would be

suitable given the changes proposed by Environment Bill was appropriate for consideration under item 7 in the agenda.

AGREED

1. Scrutiny scope document be noted;
2. Panel to consider forthcoming draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy at a later meeting. This included modelling of performance/carbon impact of different recycling arrangements/options and would be useful to Panel's scrutiny.

5. COUNCIL'S WASTE AND RECYCLING DATA AND COMPARISONS

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, a breakdown and analysis of the Council's waste and recycling data, benchmarked against similar local authorities, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Noted, downward trend in percentage recycled, particularly in 2016, reason not known, could be affected by change in regulations/categories.
- (ii) Increase in Charnwood garden waste charge over time had not adversely affected subscriber numbers.
- (iii) Current 50% recycling target set by EU Waste Directive in 2009. New Environment Bill proposed 65% (by 2035).
- (iv) Composition of waste important. Reference to significant effect of garden waste on percentage recycled.
- (v) Noted, peak performance in percentage recycled in 2011/12 for all authorities listed, reason not known. Reference to dry summers affecting garden waste tonnage. Some fluctuations could be due to factors not within Council's control.
- (vi) Noted, percentage recycled excluding garden waste, NWLDC significantly lower, only authority listed that did not have co-mingled collection (separation/sorting by residents required). Concern that the latter system being proposed in Environment Bill.
- (vii) Noted, gradual decline waste sent for composting since 2016/17. Difficult to know whether that had been impacted by any increase in home composting. NWLDC performed best, only authority listed with free of charge garden waste service.
- (viii) Noted, Charnwood collected most tonnage residual waste due to being biggest district and uptick of 10% due to Covid, but residual waste per household comparatively low in Charnwood, positive.
- (ix) Noted, comparatively, Charnwood recycling rates reasonably good, concern that 65% proposed by Environment Bill would be difficult to achieve.

AGREED

The presentation and discussion be noted.

6. ENVIRONMENT BILL - WASTE MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS AND CHANGES REQUIRED

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, the proposals in Environment Bill regarding waste management and changes this would necessitate, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

In advance of the meeting, members of the Panel had been asked to read: DEFRA – Consultation on Consistency in Household and Business Recycling in England May 2021 (included at item 7 on the agenda).

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Noted, likely to have considerable impact, including in respect of costs.
- (ii) Noted, problem of over-consumption increasing, importance of establishing a more circular economy, better that was done, less new raw materials needed.
- (iii) Reference to Council being in the middle, between manufacturers/Government and waste disposal authority (County Council). Limited impact Charnwood as waste collection authority could have. Unable to decide type of packaging being produced or disposal facilities. Noted, this Council could have influence, work to play its part, ensure residents had opportunity to manage waste in a responsible way.
- (iv) Noted, effect of waste and how it was managed on carbon emissions.
- (v) Noted, Environment Bill included proposals to encourage packaging that was easier to recycle, Extended Producer Responsibility, to be explained later in presentation.
- (vi) Difficult to find out how much recycled material was being used in packaging.
- (vii) Waste hierarchy outlined, better to prevent waste or reuse items than to recycle, including in respect of carbon footprint. Recovery of, for example, energy from waste better than disposal. Noted, around 70% Leicestershire's residual waste incinerated for energy/heat recovery. No revenue to Charnwood from that, cost to County Council.
- (viii) Noted, Environment Bill expectation/legal obligation was improved recycling rates despite the ideal being prevention or reuse of items first, difficult for waste collection authority. Better to consider how much waste a household produced than how much was being recycled? View that correct to consider prevention and reuse of items, even if that adversely affected recycling rates.
- (ix) Currently, Charnwood recycling at around 43%, step change would be needed to achieve 65% proposed in Environment Bill. Significant change had been affected in the past, had started with one bin that all waste went in.
- (x) Proposed Deposit Return Scheme and likely issues for Council outlined. Hopefully assist people in understanding value of packaging. Understood that promised burden funding from Government would not cover loss of revenue from receiving less materials via household waste collection. Noted, this was more a risk for the County Council. View that proposal was good idea, despite likely impact on Charnwood's recycling rates, better that recycled than not.
- (xi) Proposed Extended Producer Responsibility outlined, "polluter pays". Levy for hard to recycle items. Noted, most of recycling collected was packaging, could be significant source of income to Council, offset increased costs anticipated

from other elements of Bill. Not much detail yet on how payments would be decided/made, possibly based on what collected and its composition. Confirmed that Council already recorded this information via sample checks. Unclear how what manufacturers were producing would be recorded.

- (xii) How much recyclable material was within the residual waste was known, although not monitored as frequently/not required by DEFRA. Done every few years, wagon of residual waste examined, was cost involved. Results of last exercise (about 2 years ago) could be shared with Panel. Better prevention of that could assist recycling rates. Noted that residual waste, 30-40% by weight was food, did get small amount of recyclable materials, garden waste, nappies. Concern that charging for garden waste meant it ended up in residual waste, this was not the case based on analysis of its composition.
- (xiii) Noted, Environmental Bill did not support co-mingled collection of recyclables, rather sorting/separation by residents. Reason, prevention of fragments of glass causing problem for paper mills. Exemption would be possible (TEEP). View that proposal was more complicated for residents and would result in lower recycling rates, however considered that materials would be cleaner/better quality. Considerable debate on issue. Better to address paper mill issue than change way 100s local authorities collected recycling in a significantly more resource efficient way (co-mingled). Re: burden funding, understood that would be for food waste/garden waste, not this proposal, so Council likely to have to meet cost of new receptacles, vehicles, training. Concern that cost would be considerable, must be case for economic exemption. Noted, significant waste likely in form of existing bins that may no longer be fit for purpose. Concern that harder system was, less likely that residents would do. Twin stream option easier than multi stream.
- (xiv) Re: when Bill would be effective, some elements would require secondary legislation, contact with DEFRA had suggested 2023/24 originally, anticipated may get pushed back to 2025, but that was an assumption/not certain. Considerable work needed to introduce.
- (xv) Re: core set of recyclables that would need to be collected, Council already collected all of those. Positive, but did mean the task to increase recycling was more difficult. Some scope if materials were added to collection, those would be counted in recycling performance, for example textiles, batteries, small electricals, specialist items such as toothbrushes. Noted, worth considering potential to do this.
- (xvi) Proposed weekly separate collection of food waste outlined. Already stated, 30-40% of residual waste. Considerable cost for the Council, both revenue and capital estimated in presentation. Burden funding would apply, but unclear if in full and ongoing. Concern that proposal might legitimise food waste when progress had been made in people considering the matter more. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces' previous experience with food waste collection suggested the opposite, that seeing food waste separately increased awareness and resulted in action to reduce it. Important that any food waste collection was accompanied by information campaign, principal aim should be to prevent. Concern that food waste might be transported some distance for processing.
- (xvii) Re: whether residual waste collection could be reduced if 30-40% food waste was collected separately and those resources transferred, may not be an option, achieving all of that 30-40% in the food waste collection rather than residual

would be difficult and number of households not static. Food waste collection would required separate/new fleet.

- (xviii) Reference to NWLDC food waste collection trial, taken to plant in Warwickshire. Were capacity issues in respect of anaerobic digestion facilities. Re: transport distances, local transfer stations may be needed. Government wanted food waste collection due to methane it generated in landfill, but waste in Leicestershire mostly incinerated.
- (xix) Confirmed, Charnwood had responded to consultation on Bill proposals, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces happy to share those responses with the Panel. Many questions had required yes/no answers, but concern expressed regarding costs and inability of Council to fund if Government didn't fully cover costs long-term.
- (xx) Proposed free of charge garden waste collection outlined. Substantial loss of income given Council currently charged. Government had indicated contribution to costs, but not for loss of income, adverse effect on those already providing. Re: concern that county councils already in difficult funding position for higher priority services such as adult social care, clarified that for food and garden waste proposals, costs would be to collection authority, disposal authorities likely cost saving as disposal of residual waste most expensive and should be less of this. Financial benefit to recycling more, but this would not be shared by collection authorities. Question as to whether the Government understood the financial position of local authorities? Likely costs to Council of implementing proposals was a significant concern. The Cabinet Lead Member for Community Support and Equalities advised that Jane Hunt MP for Loughborough was a member of a Government Waste Management Panel, it might be useful to raise the concern on this with her. It was understood that representations to MP had been made, also reiterated that Council had made its views known. Reference to forthright response of LGA on the matter.
- (xxi) Discussion regarding use of sanctions, encouragement, information to improve recycling rates, whether evidence of effectiveness elsewhere. Noted, Fixed Penalty Notices no longer available to Council, increasing awareness, effective communication, incentives such as competitions were options, could be cost effective, particularly social media. Council did refuse to collect bin if aware contaminated. Noted, important to explore this, not sure residents always aware of all the items that could be recycled via co-mingled collection, for example various soft plastics. Important to communicate a positive message. Related to key task for Panel, "identifying barriers and ways to overcome them".

AGREED

1. The presentation and discussion be noted.
2. The Council's responses to the consultation on the Environment Bill be sent to members of the Panel.
3. Further to (xii) above, results of the most recent examination of a wagon of residual waste be sent to members of the Panel.

4. Further to (xx) above, Jane Hunt MP for Loughborough be invited to attend a meeting of the Panel to discuss the concerns regarding the Environment Bill outlined above, particularly the cost implications for the Council.

7. FURTHER PANEL MEETINGS AND KEY TASK PLANNING

Considered and discussed, the key tasks in the scrutiny scope document to be considered at the next meeting of the Panel and any work members of the Panel would undertake in advance of that meeting.

AGREED

1. Key tasks to be considered at next Panel meeting on 14th December 2021:

“Investigate other local authorities that are considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood Borough Council, taking into account demographics” – via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

“Investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve our recycling rates” – via investigation by members of the Panel prior to the meeting, the Chair would provide guidance on what was required in this respect.

2. A visit by members of the Panel to the Casepak Materials Recycling Facility be arranged as soon as possible.
3. Draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy be scheduled for consideration at Panel’s meeting on 2nd February 2022 – via presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.
4. Further scheduled meetings of the Panel, as set out on the agenda, be noted.

NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.

**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL
2ND FEBRUARY 2022**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)

Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe and Needham

Councillor Harper-Davies (Cabinet Lead Member
for Community Support and Equalities)

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces
Democratic Services Officer (SW)
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: None

The Chair stated that the meeting would be livestreamed and recorded, and the recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

8. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY AND PERSONAL INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

9. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

10. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 9th November 2021 were confirmed as a correct record.

11. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

12. LOCAL AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED TO BE LEADERS IN WASTE MANAGEMENT

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, other local authorities considered to be leaders in waste management and ways to apply to Charnwood, taking into account demographics, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Presentation set out top 5 performing authorities 2020-21 (England), percentage recycled, collection methods, whether weekly food waste collection, whether

garden waste collection and any charge. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces proposed to provide further information to next meeting on performance of audit family of authorities like Charnwood.

- (ii) Noted, none of top 5 were hitting 65% recycling target proposed by Environment Bill, although some close. Authorities ranked 2 and 4 had shared service element, and authorities ranked 1 and 3 located next to each other.
- (iii) Noted, all top 5 had weekly food waste collection, all had charged for garden waste collection, all had comingled collection (top performer separated paper/card). Environment Bill was proposing separate not comingled collection of recyclables. Expected that top performers might provide free garden waste collection, not the case, all charging at approximately median price. Would be interesting to know if lowest performing authorities were more likely to require separation/sorting of recycling by residents, noted that authorities with lower recycling tended to be urban, city.
- (iv) Noted, authority ranked 3 collected recycling weekly, residual waste fortnightly, gave an importance to the recycling element. Size of that district (area/population) not known, would need to investigate.
- (v) View that Charnwood garden waste collection service excellent, good value. Also, collection of food waste might reduce contamination of recycling.
- (vi) What was preventing Charnwood from achieving performance at this level? Multiple factors. No food waste collection (approximately 40% of residual waste was food). Top 5 all appeared to be more affluent, leafy, larger properties, bigger gardens, therefore more garden waste. Charnwood not super urban, but also not very green/affluent.
- (vii) Reason Environment Bill proposed separate collection of recyclables, prevention of fragments of glass causing problems for paper mills. Charnwood's current fleet single compartment so difficult to separate, cost of changing diminished as fleet got older.
- (viii) More specific information would be useful, characteristics of areas concerned, percentage of recycling total that was food waste. Latter might illustrate how much Charnwood could improve recycling performance by collecting food waste. In response, thought that data available was material sent for composting/anaerobic digestion combined (garden and food waste). Development of draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy had involved high level modelling of options, all included food waste collection as Government likely to mandate in 2024 or 2025, provided prediction of recycling rates likely to be achieved. Strategy programmed for consideration by Panel at next meeting.
- (ix) Potential cost of implementing food waste collection, or a trial of? In response, had been cost analysis done with other Leicestershire authorities approximately 5 years ago, now old information. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces estimated the cost of food waste collection with residual waste collection continuing fortnightly at in excess of £1m per annum. Top 5 performing authorities were doing so, how? In response, residual waste most expensive for County Council (waste disposal authority) to dispose of, food waste approximately a quarter of that cost. Some waste collection authorities may have arrangements with their waste disposal authority to share the benefit of increasing food waste disposal and reducing residual waste, affected a subsidy of the cost of collection. There was no such arrangement in Leicestershire, so all costs would fall to the waste collection authority. Reference intention of Government to make food waste collection mandatory, had indicated it would

fund any new commitment, certainty that this would be at 100% of cost and ongoing would be welcomed. Concern if funding subsequently withdrawn, particularly given position of local authority finances. Suggestion that Jane Hunt, MP be asked to put that request to Government, confirmed that those representations had been made.

- (x) Home composting should be encouraged, noted that this would not assist Council's recycling rates, but was more environmentally friendly than collecting food waste. County Council scheme for reduced cost composters referenced, this could be promoted. Home composting would reduce weight of residual waste. Disappointing that Government targets did not reward reducing waste in such ways, prevention better for environment/correct focus.
- (xi) Reference to a key task not yet considered/scheduled "identify barriers and looking at ways to overcome them". Challenges posed by flats/communal bins. Stated that recycling rates not available by ward but were available by collection round listing streets covered. Noted, useful to receive that breakdown when panel considered that key task, also to incorporate engagement of residents as part of that.
- (xii) Noted, indication of composition of residual waste had been provided at last meeting.

AGREED

1. The presentation and discussion be noted.
2. Further consideration of this key task be scheduled for the next Panel meeting on 15th March 2022, via a further presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces to provide information on performance of audit family of authorities like Charnwood, noting also (i) above query as to whether lowest performing authorities were more likely to require separation/sorting of recycling by residents and (ii) useful to know characteristics of areas.
3. Note paragraph (xi) above for when Panel considers key task "identify barriers and looking at ways to overcome them".

13. NEW RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY AND METHODS THAT COULD HELP IMPROVE RECYCLING RATES

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, new research, technology and methods that could help improve recycling rates, via proposals/suggestions from members of the Panel (item 7 on the agenda details these).

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Suggestion - take part in/promote campaign to prevent contamination of recycling by nappies. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces noted, could get more involved/look into that (also County Council work to promote reusable nappies, waste minimisation campaigns). Possibility of promoting campaign on side of fleet and via social media. Nappies could be large proportion of residual waste for some families, also significant contaminant in recycling bins.

- (ii) Suggestion – visual display of waste items and what bin they go in. View that good visual, easy to understand, no language barrier. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces suggested good for street bins in key locations, could look at cost. Currently looking at trial of compaction street bins, less frequent emptying, indicated when needed to be, positive carbon impact. Noted, panel may wish to recommend trial of suggested visual display bin, prevention of contamination of recycling in street bins. Noted, anticipated less recycling in street bins once deposit return schemes introduced, also less littering. Visual display could be more useful to educate/inform than a paper leaflet, help use of correct bin both out and at home. Also, increase awareness of what could be recycled in Borough.
- (iii) Suggestion – publicity. Importance recognised. Key messages, effective methods. Did not wish to add to waste in doing so. Understanding psychology of what persuaded different people to participate. Possible use of fleet lorries and social media channels already highlighted. Information events, videos, competitions, work with schools particularly important. Suggested that a recommendation of the panel could be that resources were committed to produce effective strategy around increasing recycling and reducing residual waste. Contract with Serco provided £10k per annum for communications and some staff time could be allocated from Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces team. Noted, had been in business continuity mode over past couple of years, hoped to focus more on communications moving forward. Recognised, challenging environment over past couple of years, how hard Council and Serco staff had worked in that time. Suggested, Borough wide schools recycling challenge. Example given of zero residual waste challenge. Developing communications was supported.
- (iv) Suggestion – scrap store and library of things. Reduced residual waste and consumption, could also be more affordable. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces advised both would require partnership with suitable organisation in social/voluntary sector to progress. Possible partners discussed, initial enquires could be made, Councillor Ward could do so with Transitions and Men/Women in Sheds, Councillor Forrest could do so with John Storer House. Noted, investigating only at this stage, to assist the panel with any recommendations it might wish to include in its report. Reference to repair shops (previously run by Transitions, Fearon Hall, similar group in Leicester City referenced by Councillor Needham, Leicester Hackspace, she could pass details to the Chair).
- (v) Suggestion – items not collected in household recycling. Small electricals, paint, printer cartridges, batteries, terracycle items. Was there scope for household recycling sites to accept such items? Only 2 currently accepted paint, Hamilton and Whetstone, distance to travel. Donated nearly new paint could be purchased at Exaireo paint shop in Loughborough, but nowhere to donate if had surplus paint. In response, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces, paint longstanding issue for residents, raised with County Council over many years, hazardous waste, special storage arrangements, therefore at limited sites, issue would be raised again. Some paint offered for reuse. Small electricals were already accepted at household recycling sites. As part of draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy work, considering whether batteries, small electricals and textiles could be added to household collections. Regarding terracycle items, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces would investigate whether facilities might be provided at County Council's household recycling sites and

was therefore viable recommendation for Panel to make? Noted, harder to recycle packaging should reduce with Government's proposed Extended Producer Responsibility, outlined at last meeting.

- (vi) Suggestion – package free shops, assist provision of. Zero waste shop already existed in Loughborough (Baxter Gate). Should promote. Query as to whether work being undertaken with markets to encourage less plastic, not known at this meeting. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces had met pre-pandemic with Surfers Against Sewage regarding Plastic Free Towns, might be useful to speak to again. Understood there was a village in Charnwood that had taken up challenge, not known at this meeting, possibly Rothley.
- (vii) Suggestion – Olio app. Should promote. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces stated this had been considered before, some conflict with Council's food hygiene enforcement role. Reference to other apps and sites that could reduce waste that might be appropriate for Council to promote/share information on. Too Good To Go, Freecycle, Freegle, Preloved.
- (viii) Suggestion – food waste recycling using fly larva. Suggested that anaerobic digestion would be more beneficial, produced compost and energy.
- (ix) Suggestion – publicity and suggestions from public. Considered under (iii) above.
- (x) Suggestion – education/publicity regarding recycling, particularly in student areas. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces outlined partnership working on this with aim of minimising problems, enforcement was undertaken where appropriate. Could be information overload for new students, first time householders, no easy solutions, ongoing effort. Local councillors would be involved in plans, particularly for end of year.

Councillors Harper-Davies and Howe left the meeting prior to the conclusion of this item.

AGREED

1. The suggestions and discussion be noted.
2. Further consideration of this key task be scheduled for the next Panel meeting on 15th March 2022, to enable the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces and councillors to report back on the investigations/enquiries agreed above, with a view to establishing suggestions that are viable as panel recommendations.

14. FURTHER PANEL MEETINGS AND KEY TASK PLANNING

Considered and discussed, the key tasks in the scrutiny scope document to be considered at the next meeting of the Panel and any work members of the Panel would undertake in advance of that meeting.

A verbal update was given on the invitation to Jane Hunt, MP to attend a meeting of the Panel. Panel had requested having been advised that she was a member of a Government Waste Management Panel, wished to discuss concerns regarding Environment Bill, particularly cost implications to Council. Jane Hunt, MP had responded, she was not a member of such a panel, but was happy to attend if that would assist. Panel asked to consider if still wished Jane Hunt, MP to attend meeting.

AGREED

1. Key tasks to be considered at next Panel meeting on 15th March 2022 (in addition to those agreed earlier in meeting):

“Draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy” - via presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces. Presentation to be emailed to panel members as soon as possible so that they could consider in advance of meeting. Panel advised to look at 11 pledges in the Strategy and the collection options appraisal. Noted, Panel may wish to submit written response to consultation on Strategy.

2. A further meeting of the Panel be scheduled to follow the last meeting currently scheduled in April. A panel meeting in December 2021 had been cancelled and the further meeting was needed to ensure the work set out in scrutiny scope document was completed, including engagement with residents/Serco.
3. Democratic Services Officer (LS) to meet with Chair and Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces following meeting to provisionally schedule remaining key tasks and engagement work by the Panel into remaining meetings, for agreement at next meeting.
4. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces to arrange date for visit to Casepak Materials Recycling Facility as soon as possible, recommended to panel members if able to attend.
5. Engaging with Members of Parliament was best way of ensuring concerns heard by Government. This could be achieved by way of written submission setting out Panel’s concerns and would enable remaining meetings to focus on other work still to be done. Therefore, no need for Jane Hunt, MP to attend panel meeting.
6. Further scheduled meetings of the Panel, as set out on the agenda, be noted.

NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.

**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL
31ST MARCH 2022**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)

Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe and Needham

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces
Democratic Services Officer (EB)
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: None

The Chair stated that the meeting would be recorded and the sound recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

15. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY AND PERSONAL INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

16. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

17. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 2nd February 2022 were confirmed as a correct record.

18. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

19. LOCAL AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED TO BE LEADERS IN WASTE MANAGEMENT

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, other local authorities considered to be leaders in waste management and ways to apply to Charnwood, taking into account demographics.

Consideration of this key task had been commenced at Panel meeting on 2nd February 2022 (top 5 performing authorities 2020-21 (England) considered). To be completed at this meeting via further presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces to provide information on performance of audit family of authorities like Charnwood, noting also (i) query as to whether lowest performing authorities were more likely to require separation/sorting of recycling by residents and (ii) useful to know characteristics of areas.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Noted, presentation set out top 5 and bottom 5 performing authorities for recycling 2021 (East Midlands) because Government database no longer enabled audit family comparison. Had looked at collection authorities only, ie. borough/district. Top performer recycled 63.5%, bottom 25.4%. Charnwood at 43.5%. Top performer (South Northamptonshire) close to hitting proposed Government target 65% by 2035. Had food waste collection, co-mingled recycling and free garden waste collection. Planned to charge for latter from April 2022, would be interesting to see how affected performance next year. Performance of other authorities listed was briefly outlined against what collected and how, whether charged for (garden waste, food waste, co-mingled).
- (ii) Noted, top performer 63.5%, second top 57.6%, difference could be due to garden waste collection being charged for by latter. Also, glass not being collected seemed to be significant factor when looking at bottom performers.
- (iii) Question, advantage to collecting garden and food waste together? Advantage was one mixed collection, one vehicle, although likely fortnightly as per garden waste, separate food waste collection usually weekly. Mixed garden and food waste required different treatment to just garden waste, briefly outlined. Estimated cost of treating just garden waste approximately £22 a tonne, mixed garden and food waste (most of which would be garden waste) approximately £35 a tonne. Both provided compost, anaerobic digestion treatment could also provide energy via biogas. Noted, mixed collection did mean fewer collections, lower carbon emissions. However, Government was proposing separate food waste collection. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces would not advocate, but mixed garden and food waste collection was a choice available to Charnwood.
- (iv) Briefly outlined, previous arrangement whereby this Council had made own arrangements for processing of recycling and was paid by waste disposal authority for doing so (recycling credits). County Council stopped permitting around 5 years ago, had resulted in loss of income to Charnwood of approximately £880k per annum. Garden waste collection charges introduced to try to balance that loss.
- (v) In response to question, Government likely to mandate food waste collection, asking for that to be weekly. Council had choice as to how to collect, examples and challenges of options briefly outlined. Advice was separate collection, separate vehicle, weekly. Re: separation of paper/glass, Environment Bill proposed separate collection for prevention of fragments of glass causing problems for paper mills, but exemption available. Previously noted data suggested that comingled collections achieved higher recycling performance, easier for residents, higher participation.

AGREED the further presentation and discussion be noted.

20. NEW RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY AND METHODS THAT COULD HELP IMPROVE RECYCLING RATES

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, new research, technology and methods that could help improve recycling rates.

Consideration of this key task had been commenced at Panel meeting on 2nd February 2022 (suggestions from members of the Panel discussed). To be completed at this meeting via the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces and members of the Panel reporting back on agreed investigations/enquiries (see Waste Management Scrutiny Panel Minute 13 – 2nd February 2022).

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Councillor Ward had spoken with Men in Sheds and Transitions re: whether they would be willing to engage with Council on repair/reuse activities, both had been keen to have conversation with Council on that. Contact details had been passed to Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.
- (ii) Councillor Forrest had spoken with John Storer House re: possible scheme to enable borrowing of items used occasionally (library of things), unfortunately centre did not have space, particularly now it operated community shop. Possibility of hiring room upstairs for purpose, would need to fund that, find volunteer staff to run.
- (iii) Suggested that Sofa (Nottingham Road) might be a possibility for the above, already did furniture upcycling, had space upstairs, might be worth contacting them.
- (iv) Councillor Needham's contact at Leicester Fixers no longer active, it had had a network of groups across County but activities affected by pandemic. Harborough branch still operating, partly due to person leading and it was well supported by local council, might be useful to look into further, Councillor Needham would do so.
- (v) Noted, any of the initiatives discussed likely to need financial support to be successful.
- (vi) Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces reported that plans re: end of year student waste still being finalised, would share those by email in due course. Proactive, partnership approach. Re: promotion reusable nappies on sides refuse vehicles, could do so, budget available, initial outlay in changing image expensive. Could use same method to promote various waste minimisation and recycling messages, perhaps on 2 or 3 vehicles to start. View that a useful message would be information on what could go in recycling bins, residents not always aware, recognised that continual messaging in that respect. Noted, sides refuse vehicles already used to promote various other Council activities and messages.
- (vii) Discussion re: use of bin stickers to inform of materials that could go in green bins for recycling that residents might not be aware of, how that might be best worded, communicated, perhaps highlight a particular item such as soft plastic, rather than a long list of all items. Operatives did not have time on rounds to apply stickers, had used agency staff in past to do so, message aimed at reducing contamination. Could consider repeating with different message. Reference to previous market place event to educate on this, successful, useful to repeat, incorporate competitive element/challenge.
- (viii) Noted, when Panel made recommendations it would have lots of ideas to put forward.
- (ix) Noted, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces still working via County Council to secure visit to Casepak, hoped that would be possible end April.

AGREED the reporting back and discussion be noted.

21. DRAFT LEICESTERSHIRE RESOURCES AND WASTE STRATEGY

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, the draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy 2022-2050, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

In accordance with the Panel's request, the presentation had been emailed to panel members following the last meeting on 2nd February 2022, so that they could consider in advance of this meeting. Panel had been advised to look at 11 pledges in the Strategy and the collection options appraisal.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Noted, over 3,000 responses to the consultation from members of the public to date. Panel may wish to submit a response following its discussion.
- (ii) Pledge 1 - purchasing and internal waste management. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (iii) Pledge 2 – support and encourage waste prevention activity. Confirmed authorities already worked together, strategy would galvanise, have action plan, implement strategy. View that campaigns needed to be continuous to be most effective. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (iv) Pledge 3 – continue delivering reuse services and expand where practicable and signpost. Reference to County Council looking to put reuse provision at some recycling and household waste sites and whether any currently existed. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (v) Pledge 4 - implement and promote separate food waste collections subject to confirmation Government policy, legislation, funding and procure anaerobic digestion capacity. In response to question, how likely to operate outlined, not yet known where anaerobic digestion facility would be. Noted, likely to be much increased demand for such facilities, gap in market. Government had recognised new burden on local authorities and that it would fund. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (vi) Pledge 5 – explore use alternative fuels for collection/transportation waste, reduce carbon/improve air quality. This Council's collection vehicles currently all diesel, when purchased viable alternatives had not been available (were looked at, considerable difference in cost outlined), pledge would mean looking to better options as replaced. View that unfortunate that the fleet needed renewing when it did. Question re: whether purchasing together with other councils would reduce cost? In response, procurement framework used to assist competitive price. Noted, fleet replaced only couple of years ago, depreciate over 8 years, view to running for up to 10, 2030 Carbon Neutral Plan would require different option, fleet significant proportion of Council emissions. Trial was planned in next year or two and working with Energy Saving Trust to undertake green fleet audit. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces not aware of any waste collection authority operating fully electric fleet, some trialling 1 or 2. Hoped that better, viable options available from manufacturers as soon as possible, also that Council would be able to benefit from others' experiences. Reference to some councils using hydrogenated vegetable oil in lieu of diesel, zero carbon, but adverse environmental impact, deforestation. More expensive. Energy Saving Trust did

not support use. Likely hydrogen would be preferred fuel in future. Panel agreed with pledge.

- (vii) Pledge 6 – continue garden waste collection system as Government guidelines subject to legislation and total Government funding, procure composting capacity. Currently unclear whether Government funding would just be to extend provision to all or would also offset loss of income if Council had to provide for free, Council's income from garden waste service £1.4m in current year (overall Council budget around £20). Noted, significant cost to Government if all local authorities required compensating for loss. Question, what happened to compost created? Used for agricultural purposes and land restoration, not thought to still be available for public to purchase as in the past. No income for this Council, net cost to County Council to process. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (viii) Pledge 7 – full range of recyclables collected as specified by Government and subject to funding. Noted, Charnwood already collected full range. Question, trade waste collections, all other Leicestershire local authorities collected mixed recyclables from businesses, plans to start doing so here? Would it count towards recycling performance? In response, currently surveying residual waste business clients to establish appetite for, if wanted and viable/could cover costs, would introduce. Already collecting recycling from Loughborough town centre businesses that were part of BID, BID was funding. Hoped to complete survey within next few months, did not count towards recycling performance, but correct to provide if able to do so. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (ix) Pledge 8 – explore viability of adding extra materials to recycling collections. If collection authority decided to collect, County Council would need to make disposal arrangements. View that examples given in pledge, batteries, small electricals, clothing all items which were relatively easy to recycle elsewhere, such as in supermarkets, other retailers, charities, clothing banks, although this recycling would not count towards Council's performance. More welcome/useful would be including items that were more difficult for residents to recycle, such as items processed by Terracycle, coffee pods, crisp packets. Noted, some such items may no longer be produced under Extended Producer Responsibility proposals in Environment Bill. Panel agreed with pledge, but would like to see items that were more difficult to recycle included in it.
- (x) Pledge 9 – collection systems to contribute to national 65% recycling target, may include restricting residual waste capacity. Noted, restricting residual waste capacity meant smaller black bin or less frequent collection. Reference to changes in packaging that should result from Extended Producer Responsibility proposals, should mean more could be recycled, less capacity needed in residual waste bin. Noted, no restriction on volume of recycling or food waste that would be collected. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (xi) Pledge 10 – continue to allocate a communications budget. View that joint communications strategy needed across authorities, sharing of message. View that strategy in general ambitious, huge undertaking, not wish to duplicate existing recycling provision, not wish to over promise, under deliver. In response, strategy was for period up to 2050, many targets part of national strategy that Government had promised funding for. Was significant change. With sufficient resourcing, could be delivered. Charnwood not doing alone. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (xii) Pledge 11 – County Council reduce waste sent to landfill to less than 5% by 2025 in advance of 10% national target by 2030. Collection authorities'

performance in reducing residual waste could assist. Alternative to landfill likely to be energy from waste (incineration). Question, percentage currently sent to landfill? Approximately 40-50% across County. Not much of Charnwood's residual waste went to landfill, most incinerated. Therefore, pledge represented considerable reduction in less than 3 years, considered likely that County already had plans in place to achieve. Noted, incineration capacity used may not be within County. Currently, sites in Coventry and Stoke on Trent used. Panel agreed with pledge.

- (xiii) Collection options in strategy and evaluation/scoring of those against criteria briefly outlined to Panel, high level modelling for decision making purposes. Most beneficial option was 5A, followed by 5B, what those collection options would comprise set out in presentation. Noted, options 4-8 were all effectively option 3 with variables added. Question, why did option 3 score only 1 on cost, but most subsequent options scored higher for this? In response, option 3 assumed free garden waste collection with no subsidy of lost income, whereas, for example, option 4 assumed retention of the charge for the service. Noted, difference between 5A and 5B, first was residual waste smaller bin, second was residual waste 3-weekly collection. Operational flexibility higher for 5A, due to fortnightly. Importance of restricting residual waste to encourage food waste participation.
- (xiv) Question, any significant preference for particular collection option(s) in consultation responses to date? In response, no, wide variety of opinions. Would be interesting to see when all responses collated.
- (xv) For each option, annual gross collection cost, kerbside recycling rate (%), indicative collection cost increase relative to baseline and collection cost per 1% increase kerbside recycling performance outlined. Very helpful. Noted, none of options reached 65% recycling target, but offered considerable improvement from current. Noted, difference in cost between options 3 and 5A, but recycling difference greater, 3-4%, showed how restricting residual waste capacity forced behaviour change/participation in collection system. Question, were collective authorities leaning towards particular option? In response, for each authority to choose, status quo would not be an option, no requirement to collectively agree one option. No consensus expressed by Panel in terms of preferred option, but two members of Panel of view that either option 3 and 5A were preferable, did not think that 3-weekly collection of residual waste would be acceptable to residents. May be concern regarding smaller black bin, ameliorated by being able to put most waste in other bins provided. Another member of the Panel expressed a preference for option 5A in the first instance, but would like to consider further.
- (xvi) Concern regarding cost involved. Recognised that councils would need Government financial support to implement. Concern that whatever option chosen, would not be effective in all circumstances, for example, particular requirements for student households, communal bins at flats. Acknowledged that that was the case, a challenge, needed to consider those circumstances. Need also for continuous education on how system worked. Noted, Panel planned to consider barriers to recycling at next meeting, students/University should be engaged with as part of that. Reference to there being very few items that would need to go in residual waste if various proposals discussed were implemented and participated in.

(xvii) Efforts of those residents who had responded to consultation recognised. The Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces was thanked for the useful and clear presentation on the matter.

AGREED

1. The presentation and discussion be noted and the presentation slides to be sent to members of the Panel following the meeting.
2. A Panel response to the consultation be drafted by the Chair based on the Panel's discussion and conclusions as summarised above, to be circulated to members of the Panel for their comment/approval before it is submitted, noting that the consultation closes 25th April 2022. In commenting on the draft response, members of the Panel could express a preference for a particular collection option, if they so wished.

22. FURTHER PANEL MEETINGS AND KEY TASK PLANNING

Considered and discussed, the key tasks in the scrutiny scope document to be considered at the next meeting of the Panel and any work members of the Panel would undertake in advance of that meeting.

Noted, the next meeting of the Panel had been moved from 26th April 2022 to 11th May 2022.

AGREED

1. Following key task had been covered at previous meetings and can be marked as completed:

“Research waste prevention activities and organisations both within the Borough and elsewhere that are committed to waste reduction”.

2. Following key task to be considered at next Panel meeting on 11th May 2022:

“Identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them” – via report back on engagement with stakeholders on this issue, which will be undertaken informally prior to the meeting. Chair of Panel, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces and Democratic Services Officer (LS) to meet as soon as possible to arrange that engagement, members of Panel to inform Democratic Services Officer of any stakeholder they wish to add to list in scrutiny scope document.

3. Opportunity to visit Casepak Materials Recycling Facility still to be confirmed, update provided earlier in meeting, hoped possible end April 2022.
4. Further scheduled meeting of Panel on 14th June 2022 be noted (currently proposed as final meeting to agree Panel's report, physical meeting).

NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.

**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL
11TH MAY 2022**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)
Councillor Boldrin

J. McGovern (Serco)

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces
Democratic Services Officer (SW)
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: Councillor Howe, Needham and Parton

The Chair stated that the meeting would be livestreamed and recorded and the recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

23. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY AND PERSONAL INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

24. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

25. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 31st March 2022 were confirmed as a correct record.

26. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

27. IDENTIFY BARRIERS AND LOOK AT WAYS TO OVERCOME THEM

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them (recycling), via input from J. McGovern of Serco (Council's waste collection contractor) and presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces setting out information on Rejected Loads/breakdown of materials in recycling bin including contaminants.

Noted that J. Ardley, Community Warden, Loughborough University had also been due to attend the meeting to assist Panel's consideration of this key task, but had sent an apology.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Input from J. McGovern – 3 rounds were of concern in terms of contamination of recycling loads, all in Loughborough and collected on a Thursday (confirmed later in discussion as rounds 1, 5 and 6). Individual bins with obvious contamination were left and marked with rejection hanger (identifying the non-recyclables to the householder). Only a cursory inspection (by lifting the lid to view) was possible by operatives (for health and safety reasons) so some contaminated bins did get emptied. A load need only be contaminated by a certain percentage for it to be rejected at the recycling processing facility. Suggested that focus should be on those rounds, barriers preventing correct recycling in those locations (improve rates and reduce contaminants). Area characteristics included communal bins (flats), houses in multiple occupation (HMO), student areas. Was about education/awareness, hoped that residents would wish to recycle for environment, open to all ideas. Reference to video of recycling facility used (Casepak), useful to have link to it on Council website so residents could see what happened to their recycling/assist in knowledge of what could go in green bin? No black plastic. Reference to need to work with University in respect of student areas.
- (ii) Question, what percentage of loads were rejected? In response, quite rare for whole load to be rejected, none last 12 months. More often necessary to reject part load as facility would separate contaminated part when tipped, if possible. Rounds 1, 5 and 6 where whole loads had been rejected in past. Shown on screen by Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces, maps of areas those rounds covered. Round 1 adjacent Loughborough Railway Station, streets listed; Round 6 town centre areas off Ashby Road, Loughborough, streets listed; Round 5 areas off Queens Road, Loughborough, streets listed.
- (iii) Appeared that two of above areas were largely residential with significant number of flats, one largely HMOs. Therefore, two distinct barriers, flats and communal bin stores and HMOs where 4 or 5 individuals sharing bins. Round 5 also largely terraced housing, limited space, bins on pavements.
- (iv) Question, had J. McGovern spoken with operatives on rounds re: ideas in respect of problem? In response, yes, bins rejected for food waste, particularly takeaway food left on packaging, also disposable nappies. Confusion as sometimes recycling logo on packaging. Operatives were vigilant, didn't wish to reject a bin for trivial reason. Reference to in cab technology being in use, individual address and reason for rejection recorded for any bin rejected, live information available should resident ring in. When residents did make contact, perhaps good time to encourage them to use recycling bin correctly in future?
- (v) Brief discussion regarding whether contaminated recycling bin was discussed with resident at time of non-collection. No, residents not always present, policy of boundary collection, also time constraints and need to avoid confrontation. If bin rejected, contact telephone number left.
- (vi) Question, had J. McGovern any further suggestions in respect of matter? In response, residents be encouraged to put recyclables into green bin loose rather than bagged. In particular, black plastic sacks were a contaminant. Suggestion that residents have container in bathroom for recyclable products generated in that room, to prevent them ending up in residual waste. Finally, a suggestion that a wider range of items be accepted as part of the recycling collection. Stated, Charnwood already collected relatively large range of materials for recycling, considered that residents not always aware of all items that could go in

green bin. Reference to possible need to provide up to date information on that in suitable format for residents.

- (vii) Reference to work being undertaken with University, including J. Ardley, re: student waste, particularly as academic year end approached. Last 2 years had focused on business continuity. Planned work for 2022 briefly outlined by Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces, included clothing bring sites, furniture reuse, encouraging landlords to use Council's bulky waste service. Contamination of recycling bins an all year issue.
- (viii) Noted, identified 3 problematic rounds, focus on what could be done in those areas re: educating residents on what should go in green bin. Interesting to monitor effect of any such work. In response, controlled trial possible, needed to be based on complete round as weight data on that basis.
- (ix) Rejected Load information Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces had was in line with position outlined by J. McGovern and referenced above. Shown on screen by Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces, material breakdown recycling loads first 3 months 2022 (composition analysis). Outlined how calculated. Around 12% residual contaminants by weight, food waste by far biggest contaminant, followed by liquid filled bottles. Nappies also significant. Reference to campaign 2017 "no food, no nappies, no textiles", biggest contaminants at time, some short term impact, need for permanent messaging.
- (x) Question, how deal with part filled bottles, for example cooking oil bottle with some product left in it? In response, sent to landfill/incineration. Volume meant not possible to empty/clean at facility, also health and safety considerations, could not be certain what liquid was. Reference to visit for Panel members to Casepak Materials Recycling Facility, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces was organising, would see volume of materials and how processed, largely automated, some manual elements.
- (xi) Suggestion that food waste contamination be targeted, biggest contaminant. Stated that likely different key contaminants on above identified rounds, based on demographic of areas, for example unlikely to be significant contamination from nappies on round 5 (large student population), might be in rounds 1 and 6. Noted, monthly assessment of load based on random vehicle, not known what round submitted information came from, but reasonable to suggest that certain contaminants would be more prevalent in some areas than others.

The Chair stated that this key task would need to be further considered and completed at next meeting, to enable consideration of Collection Round data and to report back on Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces' discussion with tenant members of the Council's Housing Management Advisory Board (tenant input). Also (stated earlier in meeting), contribution from J. Ardley of Loughborough University either via written submission or attending meeting, if possible (student input).

J. McGovern was thanked for assisting the Panel with its scrutiny. He thanked the Panel for the opportunity to contribute and would feed any additional suggestions from the Serco team back to the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

AGREED

1. The submitted information, discussion and suggestions made be noted.

2. The need to focus any recycling education campaign on the areas covered by collection rounds 1, 5 and 6 and their key contaminants be noted in particular.
3. The maps shown at this meeting indicating the streets covered by collection rounds 1, 5 and 6 be circulated to Panel members following the meeting.
4. Further consideration and completion of this key task be scheduled for the next Panel meeting on 20th June 2022, via consideration of Collection Round data, reporting back on Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces' discussion with tenant members of the Council's Housing Management Advisory Board (tenant input) and, if possible, a contribution from J. Ardley of Loughborough University either via written submission or attending meeting (student input).

28. COMPLETION OF SCRUTINY SCOPE DOCUMENT AND FINAL PANEL MEETING

The Chair stated that the next meeting of the Panel on 20th June 2022 would no longer be its final meeting, it would be for the purpose of completing the above key task, as outlined. A final Panel meeting had been scheduled for 27th July 2022, to agree the Panel's report.

AGREED

That the further scheduled Panel meetings and their purpose be noted.

NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.

**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL
27TH JULY 2022**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)
Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe and Needham

J. Ardley (Loughborough University)
Councillor Harper-Davies (Lead Member for
Community Support)

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces
Democratic Services Officer (SW)
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: Councillor Parton

The Chair stated that the meeting would be recorded and the sound recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

1. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS, AND OTHER REGISTRABLE AND NON-REGISTRABLE INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

2. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th May 2022 were confirmed as a correct record.

4. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

5. IDENTIFY BARRIERS AND LOOK AT WAYS TO OVERCOME THEM

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them (recycling).

Consideration of this key task had been commenced at Panel meeting on 11th May 2022 (see Waste Management Scrutiny Panel Minute 27 – 11th May 2022). To be completed at this meeting via input from J. Ardley (Community Warden, Loughborough University), input from Council tenants (agenda pages 7-8) and

presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces setting out Collection Round data.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Input from J. Ardley – University focus was education of students re: waste management/recycling, worked very closely with N. Gibson (Charnwood Borough Council) in that respect, ongoing and repeated process as students changed. Students from all over country/world, those living off campus needed to be aware of particular requirements in Charnwood. Report expected by end August 2022 on end of year clear out outcomes, happy for Panel to be sent copy once available, Panel would welcome this. Reference to similar initiative March 2022, more than £2k raised via that, also received impact assessments from charities involved. Had tried to increase reuse and recycling, reduce waste to landfill, would continue to do so. Statutory authority was Borough Council, but University worked to support via education/dealing with any problems. Sustainability increasingly on agenda.
- (ii) Question, what had 2022 end of year clear out event comprised, how differed from previous years? In response, N. Gibson/S. Ritchie (Borough Council) could best outline. Lots of publicity/education. Lessons learnt from event in March 2022, had been quite challenging as items collected for several different charities, detailed. Simpler approach for 2022 end of year, arranged with landlords for them to receive Air Ambulance (AA) charity collection bags for use by students who moved out early, then a main collection event 27/28 June where week before AA delivered bags to every student property for donations, work also undertaken to encourage participation, outlined. Landlords had assisted, particular landlord had put boxes outside each of his properties with list of what could be donated, then taken to food banks or passed to University for AA.
- (iii) Discussion re: problem with end of year clear out in 2022, not occurred previous years, possibly in part due to longer period of time between most students leaving and then additional waste collection by Council on 4 July? Many bags ripped open, witnessed or evidenced in some cases that street homeless were checking through (asked where witnessed if those persons needed help) resulted in large amounts of rubbish in streets, mixing of items previously correctly sorted and bagged. Some members of Panel already aware of these events having spoken with residents/had seen. Difficult to see, made it appear that many students had not acted correctly, but vast majority had. Suggestions welcomed as to how could be prevented. Couple of cases where students had not dealt with end of year waste correctly, firm action taken by J. Ardley and how all students then remedied outlined.
- (iv) Discussion re: difficulty in choosing best date for additional waste collection by Council, did liaise on that for maximum benefit. Must be on weekend or Monday due to resources being committed on other days, resources only allowed it to be done once. Usually as soon as possible after end of term, aware that some did leave earlier. If too early, additional rubbish likely to be put out after/remain over summer. J. Ardley stated that how students used properties had changed since pandemic, may be more effective for Council to do additional waste collection a little earlier in 2023, see if improved matters? Reference to consultation with landlords, aware when most students leaving. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces happy to discuss. Reference to rejected suggestion that one tip permit

- be provided to each landlord at end of year to allow left waste to be taken, this was County Council matter, limited influence, but could look at.
- (v) Stated, previous Panel discussion had suggested that University and Borough Council should work more closely together in respect of end of year clear out, above input suggested that that was happening. Councillors and residents had noticed better in 2022 than previous years and students had largely acted correctly, assisted by clear message from University that not doing so would not be tolerated.
 - (iv) Question, could there be a collection point for AA bags to prevent them needing to be left on street and then ripped open? In response, more collection banks installed this year (AA and British Heart Foundation). Always happy to consider further locations/accept assistance with securing. Ideal additional location would be car park, Storer Road. Reference to continuous collection of items on campus, charities would be invited to collect regularly once sorted. Permanent operation to assist regular donation of students' unwanted items was being worked towards, assistance from Students' Union. All help from councillors, community and partners to achieve welcomed. Noted, J. Ardley and team worked to personally collect items if needed, but J. Ardley role principally anti-social behaviour. Important to manage waste effectively and sustainably. Suggestion re: additional temporary collection boxes, each would need monitoring. Noted, timing of activities crucial to outcomes. Question, role of University's Sustainability Team? In response, J. Ardley meeting with, team mainly campus focused, hopefully would widen, although off campus lead on waste collection/prosecutions needed to be Borough Council as statutory authority.
 - (vi) Stated, previous input to Panel from Serco (Council's waste collection contractor) and submitted data suggested that contamination of recycling bins was greater in some areas, including those with large student populations. In response, J. Ardley aware of data, streets concerned, did visit properties to educate, ongoing process to do so, no single person in control of recycling bin in such households. Question, what did University do to inform students what was expected of them, particularly beginning of year? In response, social media publicity (J. Ardley could provide examples) and door knocking. Leaflets not considered useful, student properties received many and added to waste. Pictorial information stickers on bins might be helpful, particularly as English was not a first language for some students.
 - (vii) J. Ardley was thanked for assisting the Panel with its scrutiny and she left the meeting.
 - (viii) Reference to bulky waste items, usually landlord responsible for. Noticed considerable reduction in such items left out this year, noted that Borough Council officers had made landlords aware that such items wouldn't be collected as part of additional waste collection and that they needed to arrange for suitable disposal of/that enforcement action would be taken where necessary.
 - (ix) Considered, Council tenant input set out on agenda pages 7-8. Response 1 – many soft plastic items could now be included in green recycling bins, useful to go back to tenant and let them know that. Also, consider how that change could be publicised. Response 2 – Shepshed incinerator would be commercial operation, not known what waste would be taken there, Charnwood residual waste currently incinerated via County Council arrangements with facilities in Coventry and Stoke on Trent. Not known if County Council would use Shepshed

facility. Response 3 – laminated pictures on green bins of items that could be recycled, could be done, quite lengthy list, might mean images quite small. Reverse done previously, items not to put in green bins, key contaminants. “Yes please” items a more positive message.

- (x) Noted, collection round data presented 2 week sample, commencing 1st March 2022. Rounds attributed to vehicle, but may be covered by other vehicle to allow repair/servicing or to complete work, effect on data, but still useful indicator of top and bottom performing rounds, dry recycling compared to residual waste. Did not include garden waste, some areas had gardens some did not, would affect figures considerably. Top 5 (outlined) all recycled more than 40% of recycling/residual combined, bottom 5 where data complete (outlined) recycled between 10-20%. Initial campaign/education might target those areas, see if any improvement as a result. Stated, interesting to see areas where recycling not as high, some highlighted previously to Panel by Serco input, included high student population area. Importance of ongoing education, particularly in areas where residents changed more frequently.

AGREED

1. The submitted information, discussion and suggestions made be noted.
2. The report on 2022 end of year clear out outcomes referenced in paragraph (i) above be sent to members of the Panel as soon as available, for their information.
3. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces to discuss with J. Ardley issues relating to end of year clear out, including scheduling of the 2023 end of year additional waste collection by Council.
4. Examples of University social media publicity to students re: waste management be sent to members of the Panel, for their information.
5. Council tenant (response 1) be informed of the soft plastic items that can now be included in the green recycling bin and all Council tenants who responded be thanked for their input and made aware of the discussion at this meeting.
6. Collection Round data presented at meeting be sent to all members of the Panel following the meeting, for their consideration and to assist with deciding on any recommendations the Panel might wish to make.

6. COMPLETION OF SCRUTINY SCOPE DOCUMENT AND FINAL PANEL MEETING

The Panel confirmed that all tasks set out in the scrutiny scope document had now been completed, although a visit by members of the Panel to the Casepak Materials Recycling Facility had not yet been undertaken. That would be useful and the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces would continue to try to arrange, but was dependent on facility accommodating.

The Chair stated that a final meeting of the Panel would now need to be scheduled (to agree the Panel’s recommendations and report). This would be a physical meeting,

date/time and venue to be confirmed. Noted that prior to the meeting, the Democratic Services Officer (LS) would draft the Panel's report and then circulate to the members of the Panel for them to include suggested recommendations.

AGREED

That the above position be noted and actioned.

NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.

**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL
1ST NOVEMBER 2022**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)
Councillor Needham

Councillor Harper-Davies (Lead Member for
Community Support)

Head of Contracts, Leisure, Waste and
Environment
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: Councillor Boldrin, Forrest, Howe and Parton

The Chair stated that the meeting would be recorded and the sound recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

7. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS, AND OTHER REGISTRABLE AND NON-REGISTRABLE INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

8. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

9. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 27th July 2022 were confirmed as a correct record.

10. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

11. PANEL REPORT

Considered and discussed, the Panel's report, for submission to the Scrutiny Commission (item 6 on the agenda filed with these minutes). All members of the Panel had had the opportunity to include suggested recommendations and to comment on the report prior to its submission to this meeting.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Date of Panel's final meeting required amending from 27th September 2022 (this date had been cancelled) to 1st November 2022, agenda pages 10 and 16. Date

stated on Panel report required amending from September 2022 to November 2022, agenda page 13.

- (ii) Panel recommendation 13 (introduce food waste collection, possibly alongside a food waste reduction campaign), agenda pages 12-13. Stated that Government had indicated that it would mandate food waste collection (not yet known when from) and that there would be new burden funding (fully funded). Clarified that Panel recommendation was intended to apply at the point food waste collection became mandatory and Government funded.
- (iii) Section 4 of Panel report (visit to Casepak Materials Recycling Facility), agenda page 10. Members of Panel would still be interested to visit if this could be arranged.
- (iv) Noted that some recommendations were matters Council could lead on, others more likely to be community led. Head of Contracts, Leisure, Waste and Environment considered that the Panel's recommendations were reasonable and could be progressed should they be put forward by Scrutiny Commission and supported by Cabinet.

AGREED

That the Panel's report be submitted to the Scrutiny Commission, to include the amendments set out in (i) above and the clarification regarding Panel recommendation 13 set out in (ii) above.

NOTES:

1. Councillor Harper-Davies attended this meeting virtually. She was not taking decisions.
2. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
3. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.

Panel Response to Draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy 2022-2050

Charnwood Borough Council's Waste Management Scrutiny Panel has considered the 11 pledges and the collection options appraisal set out in the draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy 2022-2050 and wishes to make the following comments:

1. The Panel supports Pledges 1-11.
2. In respect of Pledge 8, the Panel would like to see items that are more difficult to recycle included, for example Terracycle items, coffee pods, crisp packets.
3. No consensus was expressed by the Panel regarding a preferred collection option, although 2 members preferred option 3 or option 5A.
4. The Panel was concerned regarding cost and considered councils would need Government financial support to implement.

Councillor Emma Ward, Waste Management Scrutiny Panel Chair (on behalf of the Panel).

SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 14TH NOVEMBER 2022

Report of the Head of Governance and Human Resources

SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

Purpose of the Report

To enable the Commission to review and agree the Scrutiny Work Programme. This includes reviewing the changes made by the Finance and Performance Scrutiny Committee and adding items to their work programme.

Actions Requested

1. To review the Finance and Performance Scrutiny Work Programme and make any amendments the Commission feel necessary.
2. To agree that the Finance and Performance Scrutiny Work Programme be updated in accordance with the decisions taken during consideration of this item and any further decisions taken during this meeting.

Reasons

- 1&2 To ensure timely and effective scrutiny of the matter/subject.
2. To ensure that the information contained within the Work Programme is up to date.

Policy Context

The Council's Corporate Plan 2020-2024 commits the Council to continue to improve customer service and deliver outstanding services.

Background

A change in the scrutiny structure was approved at full Council on 26th April 2021. This permitted the establishment of a Finance and Performance Scrutiny Committee.

Finance and Performance Scrutiny Committee Work Programme

The Finance and Performance Scrutiny Committee met on 28th June 2022 and the 6th September 2022. The outcomes of these meetings can be found in the minutes available on the Council's website. The Finance and Performance Scrutiny Committee will next meet on 29th November 2022.

Appendices: Appendix - Finance and Performance Scrutiny Committee Work Programme

Background Papers: None

Officer to Contact: Karen Widdowson
Democratic Services Manager
01509 634785
karen.widdowson@charnwood.gov.uk

Finance & Performance Scrutiny Committee Work Programme

Meeting Date	Issue	Scope of Item / Terms of Reference	Reason for Scrutiny	Invitees / Offices	Progress / Notes / Action Requested
6th Sept 2022	Work Programme	To consider items for future meetings.	To allow the Committee to identify items for which scrutiny is required.	N. Conway/ Lead Officer	Standing item
6th Sept 2022	Car parking charges	To provide the Committee with update on raising of car parking fees for Loughborough and general overview	Suggested by Budget Scrutiny Panel, to assess impact and consequences	S. Jackson	Requested FPSC 01 March 2022, added to agenda 28 June, update requested in Sep.
6th Sept 2022 (annual item)	Performance Information (Quarter 1 Report)	Monitoring of Performance Indicator information and Corporate Plan Objectives and Initiatives.	To ensure targets and objectives are being met. To identify areas where performance might be improved.	Relevant Lead Members & Heads of Service / V. Brackenbury	Quarter 4 Report considered at the same time annually.
6th Sept 2022 (annual item)	Annual Performance report	Annual collation of performance information for publication on the Councils website	To communicate performance of the Council against annual targets	V. Brackenbury	Added to work programme by email agreement of the Chair
6th Sept 2022 (annual item)	Revenue Monitoring (General Fund and HRA)	Monitoring of Council's revenue position.	To compare actual income and expenditure against budget, find out why variances have occurred and, where necessary, ensure corrective actions are in place.	Lead Member/ L. Tansey	Three reports to be considered through the year. Reports to be considered at the same time annually.
6th Sept 2022 (annual item)	Capital Monitoring	Monitoring of position with the Council's Capital Plan.	To ensure progress to the Council's Capital Plan and its financing are satisfactory.	Lead Member/L. Tansey	Monitoring report at each quarterly meeting.
6th Sept 2022 (annual item)	Climate Change Strategy Action Plan	Monitoring of the Climate Change Strategy Action Plan.	Monitoring of progress on Action Plan.	Lead Member/ M. French	Requested by Scrutiny Workshop to be an annual review. Agreed with C/VC to review in Sep (19 Jul '21)

29th Nov 2022 (annual item)	Community Safety Partnership	To review the work of the Community Safety Partnership on an annual basis, to enable any issues to be identified for further scrutiny by the appropriate scrutiny body and to enable incidences of violent crime to be monitored.	To ensure effective scrutiny of the work of the Community Safety Partnership	CSP Chair / relevant Head of Service / T McCabe	Legal requirement to be reviewed annually. Agreed with C/VC 19 Jul 2021 to occur mid-year in November.
29th Nov 2022 (annual item)	Performance Information (Quarter 2 Report)	Monitoring of Performance Indicator information and Corporate Plan Objectives and Initiatives.	To ensure targets and objectives are being met. To identify areas where performance might be improved.	Relevant Lead Members & Heads of Service / V. Brackenbury	Quarter 2 Report considered at the same time annually.
29th Nov 2022 (Period 7 - annual item)	Revenue Monitoring (General Fund and HRA)	Monitoring of Council's revenue position.	To compare actual income and expenditure against budget, find out why variances have occurred and, where necessary, ensure corrective actions are in place.	Lead Member/ L. Tansey	Three reports to be considered through the year. Reports to be considered at the same time annually.
29th Nov 2022 (annual item)	Capital Monitoring	Monitoring of position with the Council's Capital Plan.	To ensure progress to the Council's Capital Plan and its financing are satisfactory.	Lead Member/L. Tansey	Monitoring report at each quarterly meeting.
Mar 2023 (annual item)	Performance Information (Quarter 3 Report)	Monitoring of Performance Indicator information and Corporate Plan Objectives and Initiatives.	To ensure targets and objectives are being met. To identify areas where performance might be improved.	Relevant Lead Members & Heads of Service / V. Brackenbury	Quarter 3 Report considered at the same time annually.
7th Mar 2023 (Period 9 - annual item)	Revenue Monitoring (General Fund and HRA)	Monitoring of Council's revenue position.	To compare actual income and expenditure against budget, find out why variances have occurred and, where necessary, ensure corrective actions are in place.	Lead Member/ L. Tansey	Three reports to be considered through the year. Reports to be considered at the same time annually.
7th Mar 2023 (annual item)	Capital Monitoring	Monitoring of position with the Council's Capital Plan.	To ensure progress to the Council's Capital Plan and its financing are satisfactory.	Lead Member/ L. Tansey	Monitoring Report at each quarterly meeting.

27th June 2023 (annual item)	Capital Monitoring including Outturn	Monitoring of position with the Council's Capital Plan.	To ensure progress to the Council's Capital Plan and its financing are satisfactory.	Lead Member/ L. Tansey	Outturn report considered at same time annually.
27th June 2023 (annual item)	Revenue Monitoring (General Fund and HRA) Outturn	Monitoring of Council's revenue position.	To compare actual income and expenditure against budget, find out why variances have occurred and, where necessary, ensure corrective actions are in place.	Lead Member/ L. Tansey	Outturn report considered at same time annually.
27th June 2023	Performance Information (Quarter 4 Report / Outturn)	Monitoring of Performance Indicator information and Corporate Plan Objectives and Initiatives.	To ensure targets and objectives are being met. To identify areas where performance might be improved.	Relevant Lead Members & Heads of Service / V. Brackenbury	Quarter 4 Report considered at the same time annually.

SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 14TH NOVEMBER 2022

Report of the Head of Governance and Human Resources

SCRUTINY COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME

Purpose of Report

To enable the Commission to review its own work programme, including considering the list of forthcoming Executive Key Decisions in order to schedule items for pre-decision scrutiny.

Work Programme

The Commission's current work programme is attached at Appendix 1. Currently the work programme consists of items concerned with the Commission's roles in overseeing the scrutiny function and undertaking pre-decision scrutiny.

At the meeting of the Scrutiny Commission on 10th October 2022 the following items were added to the Scrutiny Commission work programme;

- i. ASB Review Update – 12th December 2022
- ii. Cost of Living Action Plan Update – 9th January 2023

Key Decisions

To enable the Commission to be aware of the Key Decisions to be taken by the Cabinet over the coming months and to determine which, if any, of these items should be programmed for pre-decision scrutiny, details of forthcoming Exempt and Key Decisions to be taken by the Cabinet are attached as Appendix 2.

Items dated prior to this meeting have been removed from the Appendix to avoid confusion.

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Scrutiny Commission Work Programme

Appendix 2 – Notice of Key Decisions

Background Papers: None

Officer to Contact: Karen Widdowson
Democratic Services Manager
(01509) 634785
Karen.widdowson@charnwood.gov.uk

Scrutiny Commission Work Programme

APPENDIX 1

Responsible Body	Meeting Date	Issue	Scope of Item / Terms of Reference	Reason for Scrutiny	Invitees / Officers	Progress / Notes / Action Requested
Scrutiny Commission	14 November 2022 (standard item)	Questions under Scrutiny Committee Procedure 11.16	In response to the CfGS guidance to scrutiny during the Covid-19 pandemic, this existing function will be promoted to encourage public participation.			Agreed Scrutiny Commission 1 June 2020, min ref 5 2020/21
Scrutiny Commission	14 November 2022 (if applicable, standing item)	Pre-decision scrutiny of any specific financial matters to be considered by Cabinet		To ensure pre-decision scrutiny of any out-turn reports, virements and in-year service pressures, particularly when they are related to additional costs arising from decisions by other agencies to reduce services.	K.Widdowson (report) Lead Officer (meeting)	Agreed by SMB 23 January 2019 (see minute 31.2) (supports recommendation of Budget Scrutiny Panel Jan 2019). To be identified from the Key Decisions Notice or from the Cabinet agenda.
Scrutiny Commission	14 November 2022 (standing item)	Cabinet items for pre- decision scrutiny		To allow identification of items from the latest Key Decisions Notice for pre- decision scrutiny by the Commission.	K.Widdowson (report) Lead Officer (meeting)	Items may also be determined by the Chair and Vice-chair in consultation with the Democratic Services Manager. Further items may also be added

Scrutiny Commission Work Programme

Scrutiny Commission	14 November 2022 (standing item)	Pre-decision scrutiny – Cabinet Response		To consider the response of Cabinet to recommendations by the Commission on pre- decision scrutiny items.	K.Widdowson (report) Lead Officer (meeting)	Scrutiny Commission
Scrutiny Commission	14 November 2022 (standing item)	Progress with Panel Work		To review progress with Scrutiny Panels.	K Widdowson	Re-established following Scrutiny Work Programme Workshop on 24 May 2021
Scrutiny Commission	14 November 2022 (standing item)	Scrutiny Work Programme		To review and agree the Scrutiny Work Programme	Lead Officer	Re-established following Scrutiny Work Programme Workshop on 24 May 2021
Scrutiny Commission	14 November 2022 (annual item)	Bulky Waste Collection Charges Review	To review the introduction (in October 2019) of charges for all bulky waste collections.	Annual review to include information on the number of civil litigation cases resulting from fly tipping in the Borough since the bulky waste changes had been implemented and cost of the scheme in relation to the income generated by the scheme.	Lead Officer	Agreed Scrutiny Commission, 15 November 2021, minute reference 54, 2021/22.

Scrutiny Commission Work Programme

Scrutiny Commission	12 December 2022	ASB Review	To include outcomes, results and changes made.	To ensure ASB at the Council was properly scrutinised	Lead Officer	Agreed Scrutiny Commission, 10 October 2022, minute reference 40 2022/23
Scrutiny Commission	12 December 2022	Key Performance Indicator KI 11 - % rent loss from Void Properties – More information	To provide more information to the Scrutiny Commission on the void properties to enable the Commission to decide on further action.		Lead Officer	Agreed Scrutiny Commission 4 April 2022, min ref 125 2021/22
Scrutiny Commission	January 2023	Cost of Living Action Plan Update	To provide the Scrutiny Commission with an update on the work undertaken in relation to the Cost of Living action plan.		Lead Officer	Agreed Scrutiny Commission, 10 October 2022, minute reference 40 2022/23

Scrutiny Commission Work Programme

Scrutiny Commission	January 2023 (annual item)	Budget Scrutiny Panel Report	A report of the Budget Scrutiny Panel following its scrutiny of the Council's draft budget for 2023/24.		Budget Scrutiny Panel Chair	
Scrutiny Commission	6 March 2023	Pre-decision scrutiny – Local Development Scheme	To approve a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) so that the programme for the preparation of planning documents for Charnwood is agreed.		Lead Officer	Agreed Scrutiny Commission, 5 July 2022, minute reference 28 2022/23
Scrutiny Commission	6 March 2023	Pre-decision scrutiny – Corporate Delivery Plan	To approve the Corporate Delivery Plan 2023-24.		Lead Officer	Agreed Scrutiny Commission, 5 July 2022, minute reference 28 2022/23

Scrutiny Commission Work Programme

Scrutiny Commission	June 2023(annual item)	Draft Annual Scrutiny Report (annual item)	To consider the Draft Annual Scrutiny Report with a view to it being recommended to Council for approval.		Karen Widdowson	In accordance with Section 6.3(e) of the Council's Constitution, Scrutiny Commission must report annually to Council on the workings of scrutiny bodies and the operation of the scrutiny function generally.
Scrutiny Commission	2023 – to be confirmed	Web Contract Procurement	To allow the Scrutiny Commission to scrutinize the Web Contract Procurement when appropriate.	Referred from Digital Transformation Scrutiny Panel.	Lead Officer	Agreed Scrutiny Commission, 7 March 2022, min ref 111 2021/22



**FORTHCOMING KEY
DECISIONS AND DECISIONS
TO BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE
BY CHARNWOOD BOROUGH
COUNCIL'S EXECUTIVE**

**Published
19th October 2022**

What is a Key Decision?

A key decision is one which:

- commits the Council to expenditure, savings or increases or reductions in income of £150,000 or more in any financial year;
- makes proposals in relation to the budget or the policy framework under Budget and Policy Framework Procedure 14.2(a); or
- will result in the closure of any facility from which Borough Council services are provided or a reduction by more than 10% in the level of a discrete service provided.

In other cases, the impact of the decision will be considered in terms of the strategic nature of the decision, the effect on the amenity of the community or quality of service provided by the Council to a significant number of people living or working in the locality affected, the size of the area affected and the likely public interest in the decision.

What is a Private Meeting?

Meetings of the Council's Cabinet are open to the public to attend. All or part of a meeting may be held in private, where the item of business to be considered may result in confidential or exempt information being disclosed. Definitions of confidential and exempt information are set out in the Access to Information Procedures in the Council's Constitution.

Representations

Members of the public are able to make representations about forthcoming key decisions to be taken by the Council's Executive, these should be made in writing (including via e-mail) to the responsible officer (details are listed for each proposed key decision). Members of the public are also able to make representations concerning proposals to hold a meeting in private, these should be made in writing (including via e-mail) to Democratic Services (contact details below). In both cases, representations should be submitted by midday on the working day preceding the date on which the decision is due to be taken.

Other information

This document supersedes all previous Forward Plans.

If you have any general queries, please contact:

Karen Widdowson
Democratic Services Manager
Charnwood Borough Council,
Southfield Road, Loughborough, Leicestershire, LE11 2TX
Tel: 01509 634785
Email: democracy@charnwood.gov.uk

FORTHCOMING EXECUTIVE KEY DECISIONS

Decision Item	What is the nature of decision to be taken?	Who will take the decision?	When is the earliest a decision will be taken?	Documents to be considered?	Will the report be considered in public?	Who can give me more information?
Authority to Enter into an Electricity Supply Contract	To approve entry into an Electricity Supply Contract with the Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation for the period Sept 2024 to Sep 2028. To delegate authority to the Director Commercial and Economic Development to finalise the agreement and formally enter the Council into Contract.	Cabinet	17th November 2022	Report	Yes	Justin Henry Director Commercial and Economic Development Tel: justin.henry@charnwood.gov.uk
Charnwood Grants	To consider applications received in Round 2 of the Charnwood Community Grants and Community Facilities Grants Schemes for 2022/23.	Cabinet	17th November 2022	Report	Yes	Peter Oliver Director Housing and Wellbeing Tel: 01509 634952 peter.oliver@charnwood.gov.uk
Draft General Fund and HRA 2023-24 Budgets	To seek approval to the Draft Revenue Budget for 2023-24 as a basis for consultation.	Cabinet	15th December 2022	Report	Yes	Lesley Tansey Head of Finance Tel: 01509 634828 lesley.tansey@charnwood.gov.uk
Capital Plan Amendment Report	To consider and approve amendments to the Capital Plan.	Cabinet Council	15th December 2022 23rd January 2023	Report	Yes	Lesley Tansey Head of Finance Tel: 01509 634828 lesley.tansey@charnwood.gov.uk
Capital Plan Amendment Report	To consider and approve amendments to the Capital Plan.	Cabinet Council	9th February 2023 27th February 2023	Report	Yes	Lesley Tansey Head of Finance Tel: 01509 634828 lesley.tansey@charnwood.gov.uk

Decision Item	What is the nature of decision to be taken?	Who will take the decision?	When is the earliest a decision will be taken?	Documents to be considered?	Will the report be considered in public?	Who can give me more information?
Capital Strategy, Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Minimum Revenue Provision Policy and Annual Investment Strategy 2023-24	To seek approval to a Capital Strategy, Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Annual Investment Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision Policy for 2023-24 and the annual report on the Prudential Code, for recommendation to Council.	Cabinet Council	9th February 2023 27th February 2023	Report	Yes	Lesley Tansey Head of Finance Tel: 01509 634828 lesley.tansey@charnwood.gov.uk
2023-24 General Fund and HRA Revenue Budgets and Council Tax and Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2023-26	To seek approval to the Revenue Budget for 2023-24 and to propose the Council Tax for approval by Council, also the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2023-26.	Cabinet Council	9th February 2023 27th February 2023	Report	Yes	Lesley Tansey Head of Finance Tel: 01509 634828 lesley.tansey@charnwood.gov.uk
Housing Capital Programme	To approve the annual investment programme for improvements to the Council's housing stock.	Cabinet	9th March 2023	Report	Yes	Peter Oliver Director Housing and Wellbeing Tel: 01509 634952 peter.oliver@charnwood.gov.uk
Local Development Scheme	To approve a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) so that the programme for the preparation of planning documents for Charnwood is agreed.	Cabinet	9th March 2023	Report	Yes	Richard Bennett Head of Planning and Growth Tel: 01509 634763 richard.bennett@charnwood.gov.uk
Corporate Delivery Plan 2023/24	To approve the Corporate Delivery Plan 2023-24.	Cabinet	9th March 2023	Report	Yes	Helen Gretton Head of Transformation, Strategy and Performance Tel: 01509 634556 helen.gretton@charnwood.gov.uk

Decision Item	What is the nature of decision to be taken?	Who will take the decision?	When is the earliest a decision will be taken?	Documents to be considered?	Will the report be considered in public?	Who can give me more information?
Charnwood Grants	To consider applications received in Round 1 of the Charnwood Community Grants and Community Facilities Grants Schemes for 2023/24.	Cabinet	6th July 2023	Report	Yes	Peter Oliver Director Housing and Wellbeing Tel: 01509 634952 peter.oliver@charnwood.gov.uk
Capital Plan Outturn 2022/23	To report the Council's capital expenditure results for 2022/23 subject to audit.	Cabinet	6th July 2023	Report	Yes	Lesley Tansey Head of Finance Tel: 01509 634828 lesley.tansey@charnwood.gov.uk
General Fund and HRA Revenue Outturn Report (2022/23) and Carry Forward of Budgets	To report the Council's revenue expenditure results for 2022/23 subject to audit.	Cabinet	6th July 2023	Report	Yes	Lesley Tansey Head of Finance Tel: 01509 634828 lesley.tansey@charnwood.gov.uk
Capital Plan Amendment Report	To consider and approve amendments to the Capital Plan.	Cabinet Council	14th September 2023 6th November 2023	Report	Yes	Lesley Tansey Head of Finance Tel: 01509 634828 lesley.tansey@charnwood.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE MEETINGS TO BE HELD IN PRIVATE

The following items are due to be considered by the Council’s Cabinet and the public could potentially be excluded since exempt or confidential information could be considered.

Decision Item	What is the nature of decision to be taken?	Who will take the decision?	When is the earliest a decision will be taken?	Documents to be considered?	Will the report be considered in public?	Who can give me more information?

When items are considered in exempt or confidential session, the reasons for exemption would fall into one or more of the following categories:

1. Information relating to any individual.
2. Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.
3. Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).
4. Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority.
5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
6. Information which reveals that the authority proposes—
 - (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or
 - (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.
7. Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

CABINET MEMBERS

Members of the Council's Cabinet are as follows:

Name (Group)	Lead Member Responsibilities
Councillor Morgan (Conservative)	Leader of the Council Strategic Relationships, Democratic Services, Legal Services, HR, Electoral Services, Land Charges, Investments and Development, Regeneration, Communications and Inward Investment.
Councillor Barkley (Conservative)	Deputy Leader of the Council Finance and Property Services Council Tax, Business Rates, Revenues and Benefits, Property Services and Building Control, and Audit & Risk.
Councillor Bailey (Conservative)	Planning Development Control, Conservation & Landscape and S106 Agreements.
Councillor Bokor (Conservative)	Loughborough Loughborough Markets & Fairs, Museums, Town Centre Management, Town Hall, Loughborough Public Conveniences, Arts & Culture, Open Spaces, Grounds Maintenance and Engineering.
Councillor Harper-Davies (Conservative)	Community Support Community Safety & Neighbourhood Management, Community Grants, Children & Young People, CCTV, Sports & Recreation, Leisure Centres, Waste and Waste Education.
Councillor Mercer (Conservative)	Private Housing Refugee Resettlement, Housing Option, Allocations & Lettings, Housing Needs, Empty Homes and HMO Licensing.
Councillor Poland (Conservative)	Public Housing Repairs & Investment, Tenancy Management, Supported Housing, Rents & Income Management, Leaseholders and Lifeline, and Equalities.
Councillor Rattray (Conservative)	Business Support Regulatory Services, Parking, Env Health, Street Management, Licensing, Tourism and High Street Recovery.
Councillor Rollings (Conservative)	Transformation Carbon Neutral by 2030, ICS, Customer Relationships, Organisational Development & Improvements and Emergency Planning.

<i>REPORT TO:</i>	Scrutiny Commission
<i>SUBJECT:</i>	Fly Tipping in Charnwood
<i>LEAD OFFICER:</i>	Matthew Bradford, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces
<i>CABINET LEAD MEMBER:</i>	Cllr. Leigh Harper-Davies, Lead Member for Community Support and Equalities
<i>ORIGIN OF ITEM:</i>	
<i>BRIEF FOR THE COMMITTEE</i>	To scrutinise the levels of Fly Tipping with Charnwood Borough

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. The Council has legal responsibilities regarding the investigation and removal of fly-tipped waste. This report sets out the Council's obligations, examines current fly-tipping trends, and looks at our enforcement activity.

2. PURPOSE

2.1. To scrutinise the levels of Fly Tipping within Charnwood Borough.

3. FLY-TIPPING IN CHARNWOOD

3.1. Charnwood Borough Councils Responsibilities:

Fly-tipping is illegal dumping of liquid or solid waste on land or in water. The waste is usually dumped to avoid disposal costs.

The Council must remove and dispose of all fly-tipped waste if it's on relevant land. Relevant land is defined as land where all the following points apply:

- it's open to the air on at least one side
- it's under the Councils direct control
- it's publicly accessible (with or without payment)

In addition, the Council must also keep any highway they're responsible for both clean and clear of litter and refuse (as far as is practicable). This includes fly-tipping

In exception to this, the Environment Agency is responsible if the illegally dumped waste is:

- more than 20 tonnes (about 20 cubic metres)
- more than 5 cubic metres of fibrous asbestos or 75 litres of potentially hazardous waste in drums or containers

- possibly linked to criminal business activity or organised crime.

The Council must remove and dispose of fly-tipped waste in water on council land and may investigate or enforce if the waste:

- is causing amenity issues in an ordinary watercourse or main river
- is causing significant flood risk on an ordinary watercourse
- risks polluting a non-controlled water

The Environment Agency may remove waste, investigate or enforce when there is:

- significant flood risk on a main river or critical ordinary watercourse
- risk of pollution to controlled water

3.2. Investigation, penalties and prosecution:

The Council can investigate the incident when it is on relevant land or water and may choose to pursue enforcement action. If a landowner reports fly-tipped waste on their land you can choose whether to investigate.

The Environment Agency may investigate if the incident is large-scale, serious, organised illegal dumping or immediately threatens human health or the environment.

The Council can issue a fixed penalty notice if it's in line with our enforcement policy.

The Council can also prosecute using:

- Environmental Protection Act 1990 section 33
- Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010, regulations 12 and 38
- Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010, schedule 21 – water discharge activities
- Convicted parties can be fined an unlimited amount or imprisoned for up to 5 years.

The council has issued Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) for fly tipping and Duty of Care (where the person who transfers the waste does not comply with the Waste Duty of Care Code of Practice) and detailed in section 34 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The numbers of FPNs over the last years are shown below:

Year	Fly tipping FPN	Duty of Care FPN
2019-2020	7	3
2020-2021	5	9
2021-2022	7	3

3.3. Clearance timescales:

Council officers and its contractors aim to clear fly-tipping within 1 day of the investigation being concluded. The current performance against this standard is 88.5%

Delays in clearing fly-tipping can occur in some circumstances. These include:

- The need to test the waste to establish its nature prior to making disposal arrangements.
- The need to engage specialist contractors to remove the waste due to its hazardous nature e.g., chemicals.
- The availability and capacity at disposal facilities.

3.4. Number of Fly-Tipping Incidents Recorded

The number of fly-tipping incidents over the last 3 complete years is shown below.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Incidents</i>
<i>2019-2020</i>	<i>924</i>
<i>2020-2021</i>	<i>1198</i>
<i>2021-2022</i>	<i>891</i>

Category of waste Fly-Tipped - October 2021 to September 2022

WASTE TYPE	INCIDENTS
Animal Carcass	0
Green Waste	93
Vehicle Parts	10
White Goods	83
Other Electrical	9
Tyres	32
Asbestos	16
Clinical	0
Construction / Demolition	76
Black Bags - Commercial	0
Black Bags - Household	69
Chemical drums oil or fuel	16
Other household	372
Other Commercial	0
Other	0

Appendices:

None

Background Papers:

None

Officer(s) to contact:

Matthew Bradford

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces

01509 634 695

Matthew.Bradford@charnwood.gov.uk