



# MEETING OF THE HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL

TUESDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2005 2.30 PM

---

## PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Elizabeth Channell  
Councillor Nick Craft (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillor Fereshteh Hurst

Councillor Mrs Margery Radley  
Councillor Ian Stokes  
Councillor George Waterhouse (Chairman)  
Councillor Avril Williams

## OFFICERS

Head of Waste and Contract Services  
Head of Leisure and Cultural Services  
Sustainable Waste Management Policy  
Officer  
Scrutiny Officer  
Scrutiny Support Officer

## OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Auger

---

The Chairman stated that the site visit that morning to Stainby Landfill Site and Mid UK Recycling Limited in Caythorpe had been both interesting and useful. He thanked the relevant officers for organising the visit.

Following recent items in local newspapers, the Chairman requested that any member who makes representations claiming to act on behalf of the Panel, informs him as a courtesy.

## 26. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None received.

## 27. MEMBERSHIP

The Panel were notified that Councillor Stokes would be substituting for Councillor Pease for this meeting only.

## 28. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fisher and Helyar.

## 29. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

### **30. ACTION NOTES**

Noted.

### **31. FEEDBACK FROM THE EXECUTIVE**

The response attached to the agenda from the Healthy Environment Portfolio Holder was noted. The Scrutiny Officer informed the Panel that Cabinet had agreed officer recommendations on the pest control service on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2005, this item would then be considered at the Council meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2005. It had been approved by the Cabinet that the Council should pay the company a sum to take over the management of the service.

The Vice-Chairman stated that he had represented both the DSP and the Waste Collection Working Group at the Cabinet meeting where the wheeled bin scheme was discussed (8<sup>th</sup> August 2005). The Cabinet had agreed to begin consultation for the scheme and suggested a one-month limited trial. It was also suggested that the Working Group attend site visits to Newark and North Kesteven District Councils. The Panel discussed Cabinet's decision in terms of their recommendation; this included discussion on the timescale for the project, whether a trial period would be necessary and the purpose of the consultation exercise.

### **32. REVIEW OF BRING SITES**

The Panel scrutinised a report prepared by the Sustainable Waste Management Policy Officer. This included background information on the history of recycling banks and responded to concerns that the bins were always full. The bins in use had been chosen because of their accessibility but they are small. A campaign had begun to encourage people to squash cans and bottles to prevent space being wasted with air. Investigations were also being made into the possibility of introducing signs to direct people to the nearest alternative site when bins are full.

The Panel discussed the emptying frequency of the bins; each site had a dedicated day when bins were emptied, while the frequency with which they were emptied was dependant upon the use of the site. The Sustainable Waste Management Policy Officer stated she would review the shape of the lid for cardboard bins. The Panel were pleased with the proposals that had been presented.

### **33. PROMOTION OF BIN SCHEME**

The Panel noted the report from the Head of Waste and Contract Services, stating that a consultation exercise involving all members of the public would be carried out. Consultation would occur throughout September 2005 with results ready for presentation in December 2005/January 2006. Consultation mechanisms would include Local Area Assemblies, Parish Councils and SK Today. It would identify areas where people perceive a wheeled bin scheme would not work. The consultation document would advise members of the

public what could be achieved through different means of waste collection.

The Panel discussed the feasibility of the trial and potential outcomes. The trial would demonstrate the potential weight split between general household refuse and mixed recyclables. Budgetary provision was also discussed; the scheme had been included in the Contracts Service Plan. The Panel considered alternative solutions for areas where wheeled bins would not be practical; these included the possibility of communal bins for flats and the continuation of the black bag and boxes scheme for terraced properties.

The Panel discussed whether consultation was necessary as there were many working models. They were also concerned about the expense of a trial period, for which vehicle adaptations may need to be made and approximately 10,000 bins would need to be purchased at a cost of approximately £17.50 each.

### **CONCLUSIONS:**

#### ***For the Cabinet to note that:***

- 1. There is great concern over the time element and cost implications of a trial period;***
- 2. There is disappointment in the slowness of the Cabinet taking a decision, from the initiation of consultation and a trial period combined with the implications of the tender process;***
- 3. The tender process be allowed to run concurrently with the consultation exercise.***

### **34. LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE LOCAL PLAN**

The Head of Waste and Contract Services summarised the amendments to the Lincolnshire Waste Local Plan and their implications for South Kesteven. Two proposed sites in Colsterworth for an energy from waste plant had been withdrawn and no alternative sites had been proposed. Uffington Road, Stamford, had been added as a site for the development of a Household Waste Recycling Centre. Two sites in Market Deeping had been deleted while a site in Stowgate had been added. The document also stated that a transfer station would be required within the area; a location for this had not been specified.

The Scrutiny Officer reminded the Panel that the Waste Local Plan had been scrutinised by a DSP Working Group in August 2004 when concerns regarding the proposed sites at Colsterworth and Honeypot Lane had been conveyed to the County Council; these sites had now been deleted from the Plan, so the Working Group's representations had had some effect.

The Panel noted the document.

### **35. MANAGEMENT OF CULTURAL SERVICES**

The Panel received a presentation on the management of cultural services within the District from the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services. The Panel were informed that the item had been considered by the Cabinet on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2005 and had been put out for a two-month period of consultation.

The presentation defined what a Leisure Trust would be; it would be a separate entity to whom responsibility for certain activities would be transferred. Advantages offered by the formation of a Trust would include relief on non-domestic rates, external funding opportunities not available to Local Authorities, tax advantages, management stability, community involvement, employment security, the ability to focus on social objectives and cultural change. The formation of a Trust would mean the loss of control by the Local Authority, who would be entitled to only 20% representation on the board, it would mean the fragmentation of services and the dispersion of in-house central support services, meaning the transfer of staff and the loss of expertise.

A Leisure Trust was identified as an option for the District Council following a Best Value Review of Leisure Services. Before it would be possible to form a Trust, liaison with other authorities, including Lincolnshire County Council would be necessary. The timescale for the project would be from 12 to 18 months. The Trust would be a company limited by guarantee with charitable objectives. The Council would need to decide whether they would prefer a single or multiple Trust option. The contract would be for ten years or more with a concurrent lease, to prevent any breach of contract. With a Leisure Trust, the assets would remain with the council, as would site maintenance responsibilities.

The Panel raised a number of questions of the proposals and discussed the transfer of staff, the standards of service; the District Council could stipulate the service desired. A summary of the consultant's report on the formation of a Leisure Trust had been presented to Cabinet. Members were advised to read this.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

- 1. That the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services should provide an update for the Panel at their next meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2005.***
- 2. Should a member want a copy of the full consultant's report, they should contact the Head of Leisure and Cultural Services.***

### **36. PUBLIC INFORMATION PILLARS**

Further to the report at the June meeting, an update on Public Information Pillars was circulated at the meeting. The Panel noted the update submitted by the Partnership Project Manager. It had been recommended a Working Group be created to identify preferred sites for the PIPs. Once a refined list had been

created, it would be submitted to the DSP for consideration.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

- 1. That Councillor Craft be appointed to the Public Information Pillar working group as the representative of the Healthy Environment DSP;***
- 2. That all members of the DSP be provided with a full list of suggested sites, including a map, for their information.***

**37. DRAFT SCRUTINY HANDBOOK**

The Scrutiny Officer explained that the Draft Scrutiny Handbook had been to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group in July and forwarded to all DSPs for consultation. The Panel noted this but had no recommendations to add.

**38. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

Noted. The Head of Waste and Contract Services stated that the indicator for the 'cleanliness of relevant land and highways' should be green. The target was for 18% dissatisfaction so the figure achieved (11%), was inside the target. The indicator on the 'satisfaction with street scene by TCMPs' was being addressed. The questionnaire that had been sent to them previously would be adapted to provide a broader selection of options. The Head of Waste and Contract Services would also attend a meeting with the TCMP and talk to them about what each indicator means.

**39. WORK PROGRAMME**

Noted. The Chairman advised the Panel that if they wanted an item added to the work programme, that they should contact himself, the Scrutiny Officer or the Scrutiny Support Officer.

It was requested that members of the Mental Health Services Working Group attend the next meeting and present a report to allow the Panel to discuss what they would be able to do. It was requested that Grantham Hospital be added.

It was also requested that the competition in relation to the wheeled bin scheme to increase children's involvement be added.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

- 1. To invite members of the Mental Health Services Working Group to the next meeting of the Panel on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2005;***
- 2. To add to the work programme: Grantham hospital and a children's design competition for the promotion of the wheeled bin scheme.***

**40. ANY OTHER BUSINESS, WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, BY REASONS OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, DECIDES IS URGENT.**

None.

**41. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 17:02.