



AGENDA

For a meeting of the
HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL
to be held on
TUESDAY, 8 NOVEMBER 2005
at
2.30 PM
in the
COMMITTEE ROOM 1, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST. PETER'S HILL, GRANTHAM, LINCS
Duncan Kerr, Chief Executive

Panel Members:	Councillor Elizabeth Channell, Councillor Nick Craft (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Donald Fisher, Councillor Bryan Helyar, Councillor Fereshteh Hurst, Councillor Stan Pease, Councillor Mrs Margery Radley, Councillor George Waterhouse (Chairman) and Councillor Avril Williams
Scrutiny Officer:	Paul Morrison 01476 406512 p.morrison@southkesteven.gov.uk
Scrutiny Support Officer:	Jo Toomey 01476 406152 j.toomey@southkesteven.gov.uk

Members of the Panel are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business listed below.

- 1. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**
To receive comments or views from members of the public at the Panel's discretion.
- 2. MEMBERSHIP**
The Panel to be notified of any substitute members.
- 3. APOLOGIES**
- 4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
Members are asked to declare interests in items for consideration at the meeting.
- 5. ACTION NOTES**
The notes of the meeting held on 6th September 2005 are attached for information.
(Enclosure)
- 6. FEEDBACK FROM THE EXECUTIVE**

- 7. WASTE AND RESOURCES ACTION PROGRAMME**
The Panel to receive a presentation from the Waste and Resources Action Programme.
- 8. LEISURE TRUST**
The Head of Leisure and Cultural Services to update the Panel on the principle of a Leisure Trust.
- 9. HOSPITAL PROVISION IN SOUTH KESTEVEN**
The Director of Finance and Performance for the United Lincolnshire Hospitals NHS Trust and the General Manager, Woman and Child Service Unit for the Peterborough and Stamford Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust to attend the meeting.
- 10. REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS**

 - Mental Health Services Working Group
 - PIPs Working Group

(Enclosure)
- 11. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

(Enclosure)
- 12. WORK PROGRAMME**

(Enclosure)
- 13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS, which Chairman, by reasons of special circumstances, decides is urgent.**



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 5th September 2005, this item would then be considered at the Council meeting on 8th 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 (8th 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 5th 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 8th 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 8th 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.

Agenda Item 10

PIPs WORKING GROUP, 21.10.05, 2.30p.m. CR2

Present:	Councillor Craft (Healthy Environment DSP), Councillor Stokes (Economic DSP) Anthony Hardy, Matt Hubbard, Jo Toomey	
	The PIP company had approached the Council about the identification of viable sites for Public Information Pillars. A model PIP had been placed for people to view and had generated a lot of interest. PIPs had been considered by both the Economic and Healthy Environment DSPs, who had each appointed one member to represent them. Grantham would be the pilot project. A similar survey had also been done for Bourne, Stamford and the Deepings. 15-20 PIPs would make the scheme viable but sufficient take-up across the District and elsewhere in the vicinity would make less necessary for the scheme to be viable.	
1 St. Peter's Hill Green – north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not want to clutter up the green • Have been issues in the past about putting things in front of the Guildhall • If the main entry to the building is relocated, footfall could depreciate • Is on a major thoroughfare, near to central taxi rank and near a key civic entry. • BT boxes, traffic light boxes and bins in this area suffer from flyposting, a PIP in this location could reduce this 	X
2 St. Peter's Hill Green – South	As above.	X
3 St. Peter's Hill – west of green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could have traffic implications because of its proximity to the pedestrian crossing • Too close to green 	X
4 St. Peter's Hill, opp. Bus stop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In suggested location it would be on the run up to the statue. • Suggest moving it to the middle of the smaller path to the north of the central area and positioning in middle near benches or near to the trees at the top • If desired in an area where footpath is not very wide, the standing could be broadened to facilitate. 	✓
5 Bus Station, ladies toilets	Refer directly to Morrisons. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have no planning objection 	?
6 Bus station near stand one	Refer directly to Morrisons. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be ideal because it is close to where all national coaches come in • It is on the main thoroughfare through from the bus station to a principal shopping area 	?

7 The Pantiles	Refer Directly to Morrisons	?
8 Welby Street Outside Sheila's cakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have been lots of A-Boards in this vicinity and if LCC instate a blanket ban, this would offer an alternative to all in vicinity • Would be more practical either outside Morrisons entry, near to Pet shop, opposite Planet Hair 2 OR • Down the alley leading to Greenwoods Row at the corner between the entry from Welby Street and the Guildhall Street Car Park 	✓
9 Welby Street and Wide Westgate – corner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide bit of pavement • Could have implications for the market • In the vicinity of listed buildings and would represent street clutter 	✓
10 Outside the Blue Bull	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would pick up footfall of pedestrians on their way to new developments 	✓
11 Junction near Morrison's roundabout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area is in the process of road improvement, which would have a significant impact 	✗
12 Outside Bottoms up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is already a lot of clutter • It is a key pedestrian access • There would be one on the opposite side of the road 	✗
16 Market Place/ Conduit Lane corner	No	✗
17 Conduit Lane (Conduit side)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of historic area • Would replace dead tree • Would have high foot fall 	✓
18 Conduit Lane north	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not get as high an amount of foot fall as opposite side of the road • Pavement is not that wide 	✗
19 Market square	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible • Could affect minimum access allowances for car doors • May need to be set back a bit further and where the footpath is wider 	✓
20 Vine Street, B-Buster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footpath would be wide enough to take one • Have just finished updating the area, do not want to ruin all the work that has been done 	✗

21 Vine Street – Watergate House	No	X
23 Watergate outside clothes shop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be ideal 	✓
24 Watergate near car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too near other identified site on Watergate 	X
25 Watergate outside Kwik Fit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location • Has high footfall on Saturday mornings • No aesthetic value <p><i>Identified as a back-up site</i></p>	✓
26 Swinegate	No	X
27 High Street, Bairstow Eves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pavement too narrow • Would be disruptive to pedestrian access and would encourage people to walk on the road 	X
28 High St, outside M&S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poles in front of Marks and Spencer would be removed so PIPs would not mean increased street clutter • Wide pavement • Would need to be clear of bus stop • Would need to allow access for street sweeper 	✓
29 High St, outside Green- woods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footpath is narrower than further along that section of pavement • Would inhibit pedestrian flow because there is used to cross towards the George Shopping Centre 	X
30 High St. outside Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would need to be set well back but allow enough room for the sweeper 	✓
31 Guildhall Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could affect lorry access for Argos and Woolworths • Would logistically be a good location because of access from Guildhall Street coming from High Street or Westgate, users of Guildhall Street car park, people coming through Kings Walk, the George Shopping Centre, etc. 	✓
33 High St. outside Travelcare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No problems as long as is sensibly placed 	✓

36 St. Peter's Hill corner a	No	X
37 St. Peter's Hill Corner b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would need to be moved from near to the statue towards the top of St. Catherine's Road 	✓
39 London Rd, South of Camb St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did used to be trees there so PIPs would present no increase in street clutter • Would be preferable if moved further down (towards Neptune Fish Bar) 	✓
40 London Rd outside Br red cross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be ideal to situate behind the sign • Used as an either/or alternative with number 41 	?
41 London Rd nr entry to JJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used as an either/or alternative with number 40 • Would be used as an alternative to advertising bins 	?
43 London Rd outside £stretcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pavement too narrow 	X
44 London Rd outside Hollands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide pavement 	✓
45 Morrison's roundabout (Station Rd side)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide area of paving • Would need to be located exactly after consideration of proposed highway improvements to the area 	✓
46 Mount St East	No – residential	X
47 Mount St. West	No – residential	X
48 North Parade nr Kingdom Hall	No – residential	X
49 North Parade	No – residential	X
50 Not identified	UNION STREET TOWARDS ASDA Ask PIP Ltd to consider	✓
	A list of recommended sites would be sent to the relevant DSP (Healthy Environment) for ratification. A list of recommended	

	sites would be sent to all members of the Economic DSP. Any specific representations should be with Councillor Craft by Monday 7 th November for consideration at the next meeting of the Healthy Environment DSP on Tuesday 8 th December.	
--	---	--

Healthy Environment DSP - Performance Monitoring 2005/06

Those indicators with a number in the PI column are from the Government's Best Value Performance Indicators suite used by many Councils. The remaining indicators are local to SKDC and may be relatively simple measures/indicators only. The reader is asked therefore to exercise an element of caution when interpreting any data attached to them.

Key: C=cumulative; A=average; N=number; %=percentage; C.A=cumulative average; Q=quarterly; blank=monthly

PI	SKDC Priority Area and PI Description	IND Type	Reporting	2004/05 SKDC Outturn	2003/04 Upper Quartile	2005/06 SKDC Target	April	May	June	July	August	Sept	Are We Improving Yr on Yr?	2006/07 SKDC Targets	2007/08 SKDC Targets
	RECYCLING Priority A														
82a/b	Recycling - % of household waste recycled and composted	A		14.5%	22%	18%		24%*	23%	25.20%	29%	28%	Y	21%	24%
	STREET SCENE Priority A														
199	Cleanliness of relevant land and highways	%	Q	19%	12%	17%			11%			12%	Y	15%	12%
Local	Street Cleaning pass rate for town centres	%				95%	N/A	93.75%	93.75%	95%	95%	95%	N/A	96%	97%
Local	No. of fixed penalty fines issued	C				60	5	15	43	84	138	180	N/A	70	70
Local	Average time taken to remove flytips	A				2 days	Same day	Same day	Same day	Same day	1 day	2 days	N/A	2 days	2 days
Local	Satisfaction with street scene by TCMPs	%	Q			80%			57%			57%	N/A	82%	84%

Sep								
Aug								
July								
Jun								
May								
Apr								

**DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANELS (DSPs)
WORK PROGRAMME 2005/6**

This Work Programme is partly derived from the Cabinet's Forward Plan, but also contains items that have been brought forward by the DSPs themselves. Such items are in italics.

Where the item has appeared on the Forward Plan, the anticipated date of the key decision is listed in the second column. The third column shows the last available date that the full DSP can consider this item before the key decision is due to be taken (unless a special meeting is called). This does NOT necessarily mean that the item will appear on the DSP agenda, this will only happen if this is requested by the Chairman or members of the DSP. There will also be instances where there is no DSP meeting before a decision is due to be taken; in these cases the next meeting date after the decision date is shown.

As Cabinet meets monthly and the DSPs meet bi-monthly it is not possible within the current timetable of meetings for the DSPs to consider every single Cabinet or Cabinet Member decision. Scrutiny members are therefore encouraged to read this Work Programme and bring forward items for consideration where they think that an item should be considered by the DSP.

HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT DSP

<u>ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION</u>	<u>DATE OF KEY DECISION (IF APPROPRIATE)</u>	<u>DSP MEETING /ACTION</u>
SKDC enforcement policy – a generic plan for regulatory services	February 2006	17.01.06
<i>Grantham Hospital – possible closures</i>	<i>N/a</i>	<i>Identified as an issue by the DSP on</i>
<i>Hospital Provision in Stamford</i>		<i>08.09.05</i>

**DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANELS (DSPs)
WORK PROGRAMME 2005/6**

Mental Health Services	N/a	Identified as an issue by Comms/Eng DSP on 13.01.05. Site visit has taken place.
Visit to ambulance control centre in Lincoln	N/a	Identified as an issue by Comms/Eng DSP on 13.01.05
Waste collection arrangements	Not before December 2005	08.11.05
Design competition for promotion of wheelchair bin scheme	N/a	17.01.06
Management of cultural services – results of consultation on the feasibility of managing arts and leisure through a non profit making trust	December 2005	08.11.05
High Hedges	Identified at Council on 8.9.05	08.11.05