

Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 1st July, 2019

5.00 - 8.10 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Chris Mason (Chair), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Sandra Holliday, John Payne, Paul Baker, Max Wilkinson, Dilys Barrell, Iain Dobie, Jo Stafford and Dennis Parsons
Also in attendance:	Cabinet Member Clean and Green (Councillor Chris Coleman), Darren Knight (Director of People and Change), Richard Gibson (Corporate Strategy and Engagement Manager), Mark Sheldon (Director of Corporate Projects), Karen Watson (Client Manager - Interim) and Gareth Edmundson (MD, Ubico)

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

The Leader had given his apologies.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting had been circulated with the agenda.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 3 June 2019, be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

4. PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS, CALLS FOR ACTIONS AND PETITIONS

None were received.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No matters had been referred to the committee.

6. CALL IN - IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HOUSEHOLD RECYCLING CENTRE AND CHANGES TO BRING BANK SITES

The Chairman, who had made the request for call-in, had done so for three main reasons: he refuted the assertion that there had been meaningful public consultation in terms of the four bring bank sites which had been identified for removal of the CBC bring banks; 32% of those surveyed had supported the removal of the garden waste skip at the household recycling centre, but what of the other 68%, and; the report suggested that carbon emissions would drop as a result of larger vehicles making fewer journeys (to empty bring bank skips) but

it appeared no account had been taken of the residents that would have to travel further to access bring banks at other locations.

Karen Watson, the interim Client Manager for Environmental Services outlined the rationale for the recommendations in the Cabinet report. There had been a large increase in resident recycling and the household recycling centre continued to be well used. Feedback from users of the site suggested that they would like the site to accept a wider range of materials, but for this to be considered, the site would need to be optimised to create more space, whilst managing health and safety and operating costs would need to be reduced to fund the cost of recycling any additional materials. All existing containers were old and in varying states of disrepair and therefore needed to be replaced. Larger (new) containers would have greater capacity and therefore need to be emptied less frequently. In addition to the household recycling centre, the Council also provided 12 bring bank sites across the town and following the public consultation there was support for the removal of some of the less well used recycling banks where residents can access the kerbside recycling service. Everest Road and the High Street had the lowest usage, Church Piece caused the biggest health and safety issues, as well as reducing the number of car parking spaces in a relatively small car park, and the Hatherley area benefitted from bring bank sites in two local supermarkets, with Asda – Hatherley Lane being the least well used. These sites also caused more fly-tipping issues.

The Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment had prepared answers to some of the questions that were circulated in advance (Appendix 1) but after reading his response to the first question, the Chairman invited other members of the committee to put any questions they had. The Cabinet Member and Client Manager gave the following responses:

- The removal of the garden waste skip at the household recycling centre would create a large area on the site which could accommodate skips for the collection of alternative materials. Over 16,000 people subscribed to the garden waste scheme and further consultation would provide insight into why people continued to use the site when alternatives were available.
- There had been no accidents at Church Piece, which was described as a miracle, and 'near miss' data was not collated. But the driver(s) were so concerned by the risks posed at this site that they were taking extended amounts of time to reverse and often had to abandon their attempts due to vehicles parked in close proximity to the skip. Local residents were also eager to create more parking.
- All skips would be upgraded as this would ultimately generate capacity within the service to allow them to be emptied as often as was required. For safety reasons, chain skips would be retained.
- It had been proven that some businesses were using the Church Piece site.
- Many residents of St. Pauls had kerbside recycling and the council worked closely with landlords of Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO), including Cheltenham Borough Homes.
- Reducing residual waste was the driving force behind the proposals; it was nonsensical to continue to accept residual waste. 3-4 years ago the

Cabinet Member had been involved in a bag-splitting exercise and had been alarmed to find unopened clothing, fabric, money, dvds, books, etc and whilst any decision would be based on feedback from public consultation, ultimately the council should not continue to continue to accept residual waste without question. The council had declared a climate change emergency and therefore needed to help residents with behaviour change, which would go hand-in-hand with communications.

- Ubcio provided a good service and had a good working relationship with CBC, which was why the Cabinet Member had been keen to end the relationship with the Joint Waste Team as he felt it hindered the council's ability to promote the Cheltenham service and successes.
- Consultation on the household recycling centre would start in mid-July, having been postponed following the call-in of the initial decision. This would be online, though as was the norm, community groups would be welcome to paper copies and the Cabinet Member wasn't concerned that the summer holidays would result in a lower level of responses given that a previous consultation had been undertaken over the Christmas period and resulted in the highest response to date.
- The Chairman voiced concerns that the skips had not been maintained, resulting in the degradation of the flooring of the skips, to the point where the floor could come away when being lifted. The committee were advised that this issue had only come to light as a result of the council's decision to take back direct management of Ubico from the Joint Waste Team and reiterated the level of urgency associated with the need to order new skips given the deteriorating condition of the existing stock.
- The Cabinet Member felt that current enforcement resource levels were adequate. Posters were put up in locations across the town, warning the public that fly tipping was an offence. For two weeks before the bring banks are removed from the 4 sites, officers will be on site offering advice to existing users regarding the kerbside recycling service. Enforcement officers did, and would continue to work closely with Ubico to deal with fly tipping issues immediately and take action where there is evidence. This would include the use of CCTV where necessary. He suggested that the committee may wish to establish a task group to look at the issue of fly tipping. There had been 179 incidents on fly tipping on public land, with only 7 fixed penalty notices having been issued only 1 having been referred to legal, which demonstrated the difficulties surrounding identifying perpetrators
- Admittedly, there was a lack of data in terms of carbon levels, but this was something the Client Manager and her team were looking to address.
- As a matter of clarification the Cabinet Member advised that there were a total of 121 banks on the 12 existing sites and the proposal was to remove 11 banks for the 4 sites.

Some members queried the call-in request, suggesting that the concerns raised in relation to the Household Recycling Centre were irrelevant given that the decision itself was simply to undertake more consultation. Whilst members welcomed the opportunity to discuss and understand the issue, they felt that the call-in could have been avoided had the committee discussed the issue in advance of the Cabinet meeting.

The Chairman outlined the four options available to the committee and upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the committee support the decision without qualification or comment

The lead members would give further consideration to the suggestion of a fly tipping review.

7. UNAUTHORISED ENCAMPMENT POLICY - GLOUCESTERSHIRE CONSTABULARY

Police Sergeant (PS) Mike Yates attended on behalf of Inspector John Turner who had been named on the agenda.

He would aim to provide the committee with a better understanding of the Police powers when dealing with unauthorised camping, as well as commenting on proposed legislative amendments aimed at improving the effectiveness of enforcement against unauthorised encampments.

Members were referred to Gloucestershire Constabulary's (GC) 'Unauthorised Encampments Policy', as circulated with the agenda. In summary, he explained, unauthorised camping was a civil offence and not necessarily a Police issue, though they would deal with supporting interested parties (occupiers of the land and landowners), in order to prevent breach of the peace and threats to person or property. In most instances, the lead authority would be the District Council in respect of District Council owned land and privately owned land or common land where there was no identified owner.

When negotiations or civil remedies had been deemed unsuitable or failed, police would consider becoming involved in bringing about the prompt and lawful removal of unauthorised encampments, including the use of police powers under Section 61 and 62 of the Criminal Justice & Public Order Act 1994. Section 61 could be applied once one or more of three conditions were met: damage to the land or property on the land; the use of threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour towards the occupier, a member of their family, an employee or an agent for the occupier, or; there are six or more vehicles on the land. However, other considerations would also include whether action was proportionate and necessary, and resources would be a consideration given the level of resources that would be required were the direction to leave not be heeded. It was noted that decisions to evict would be made by an Officer not below the rank of Inspector. If the unauthorised campers had not left by the date and time specified, or, if they were to return to the same site within a three month period, then they would be referred to the Magistrates court where they could be given a fine or sentenced to up to three months in prison. Section 62 was not as prescriptive on the conditions to be met but stipulated that a suitable alternative location must be available in the same local authority area.

In terms of the proposed legislative amendments, at this stage there had been nothing more than a government circular and therefore it wasn't possible for him to comment on how effective proposed changes might be. However, regardless of any amendments, there would be a need for any action to be proportionate

and to give consideration to resources. Ultimately, he suggested, any action would simply move the problem from one place to another.

PS Yates gave the following responses to member questions:

- STORM was the name of the incident log system used by the police.
- Unfortunately he had no recent experience of dealing with unauthorised encampments in the Borough and therefore couldn't give a view on how the council could work more closely or effectively with the police, however, he was of the opinion that the two needed to engage at an early stage.
- A member indicated that the proposed legislative amendments included changes to the threshold from 6 down to 2 vehicles, with no return within 12 months rather than 3 months. PS Yates suggested that encampments often comprised of more than six vehicles and as such he was unsure what this amendment would achieve, though he did feel that extending the no return period to 12 months would prove a useful preventative measure.

The Chairman thanked PS Yates for his attendance.

8. UBICO ANNUAL REPORT AND PERFORMANCE

Gareth Edmundson, the MD for Ubico, welcomed the opportunity to present the Ubico Annual Performance Report (2018-19) to the committee. He explained that he had now been in post for two years and 2018-19 had been another strong year for the organisation, especially in terms of consolidating their position. He welcomed the realignment of the relationship between Ubico and CBC, as he now saw Karen Watson, the Client Manager and her team regularly at the depot, which demonstrated the strength of the council as a commissioner.

Comprehensive performance information had been circulated with the agenda but key points included:

- 8 months of work had resulted in significant improvements to health and safety and Ubico having achieved the International Standard for Health and Safety (ISO45001).
- A new Fleet Manager was appointed and improved management of fleet and assets would deliver future dividends.
- Opportunities for sharing and exchanging vehicles to smooth out any cost volatilities were currently being explored.
- Ubico would soon be implementing new fleet management software which would underpin operations and were actively investigating how technology could improve the service, including in-cab software.
- To ensure that the finance team was appropriately resourced for a company of Ubico's size and turnover, they had recruited a full-time Financial Controller and technician. This had allowed for improved financial data, monthly reporting, and would enable improved budget setting and forecasting for the future.
- The ability to demonstrate value for money was important to Ubico. Ubico compared favourably to outsourced providers within the market; Ubico remained at 5.8% (corporate overheads), where outsourcing

typically resulted in 9% and a profit margin of 3-4%. Ubico delivered at cost which was why financial planning was so important.

- Ubico would continue to pursue commercial opportunities and in the coming years intended to present a number of investment opportunities to shareholders in areas including: hire vehicles; commercial waste, and; fleet maintenance.
- Operationally, Ubico consistently met stretch targets for food waste collections and as such were currently piloting some adjustments.
- The seasonal nature of garden waste meant that weight spiked at certain times of the year and an additional vehicle was used to reduce pressure on existing rounds.
- Adoption of a new 'People Strategy' and 'Code of Conduct' aimed to align all Ubico staff, where many had been bought together from partner organisations. Induction information was also currently being redesigned.

The Managing Director of Ubico gave the following responses to member questions:

- The figures being reported for missed collections did not include those where collections had to be abandoned for health and safety reasons.
- As mentioned, historically Ubico did not have sufficient finance team resource and as a consequence some financial risks were not built into the budget. For example, the partnership sum did not reflect the age and condition of the fleet, and therefore the increasing maintenance costs. The partnership sum needed to reflect the actual position otherwise Ubico would, in a sense, start the year in deficit.
- Authorities had adopted very different approaches to reducing residual waste, with some stringently refusing to collect residual waste bins if they contained any kind of recyclable materials, and CBC preferred to encourage residents instead. Stroud had just won a recycling award and their approach involved giving residents a very small residual waste bin, leaving them no choice but to recycle as much as possible.
- Co2 reduction was a consideration for Ubico. Telematics allowed review of how drivers were using vehicles and therefore identify improvements that would result in better fuel efficiency.
- Electric vehicles could work well in Cheltenham but because of the initial cost involved, electric vehicles would never make it through the procurement process. This needed to be reviewed.
- Admittedly, some rounds were tight and crews just wanting to get on and do the job were rushing more than they needed to. As a result there had been a slight increase in accidents, but Ubico were actively reinforcing that whilst they acknowledge crews just wanted to do a good job, they should not risk safety (and rush).
- The review of the household recycling centre currently being undertaken by CBC would have no impact on the work of Ubico at that site.
- Javelin Park was a live issue but Ubico were engaging with partners and Gloucestershire County Council. CBC had taken the decision not to deliver directly to the park and had instead chosen to take their waste to a transfer station. There was a risk if this bulk transfer wasn't able to get access to the site, but Ubico would be looking at what mitigations

Grundons had in place if this issue were to arise. This was a significant issue which he assured members, was being constantly monitored.

- In terms of what happened to batteries from electric vehicles, he would need to get a response and share this outside of the meeting, as he did not know the answer.

The Client Manager gave responses to some member questions:

- She confirmed that a trial of different bins, including gull-proof bins was being undertaken. Salisbury Avenue would be the first site to trial different 'on the go' recycling bins.
- Various alternative options were being explored in terms of weed treatment to avoid the use of glyphosate, but it was important for members to understand that there would not be a single solution to this problem.
- It was accepted that the council needed to make better use of social media with regard to waste and improving and expanding on the information on the website.
- Street sweeper provision was currently under review, with one vehicle having recently been taken off line.

The Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment was pleased to hear that members agreed with his view that the move to sustainable planting had been a success. There were admittedly issues in some areas where the weather had impeded growth. He was scheduled to meet with the Parks and Gardens team and would raise the query regarding London Road and feedback a response to the committee.

In response to the question of why CBC had decided to use a transfer station rather than deliver waste directly to Javelin Park, the Cabinet Member explained that to do so would have meant that crews would have to cut-short collections once the vehicle had reached capacity and travel along the Golden Valley and M5 to deliver to Javelin Park. This posed an unacceptable risk given the weight of a (at capacity) vehicle and the distance required, and as such CBC chose to use a transfer station. He felt that this was absolutely the right decision. He did note that this formed part of a three year agreement, at the end of which an alternative waste transfer station would be required and he suggested that this could form part of the longer term Swindon Road depot review.

A number of members commended the service that Ubico delivered and thanked the attendees for the information they had produced and for their attendance.

9. UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GLOUCESTERSHIRE JOINT HEALTH & WELLBEING STRATEGY

Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager passed on the apologies of Councillor Harman, as Cabinet Member for Public Health and Communities at Gloucestershire County Council, who had wanted to attend the meeting. He made clear that it was not he, nor Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC), that were responsible for writing this strategy, but rather the Gloucestershire Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB Board), who had a statutory duty to develop a strategy. The current strategy for 2012-2032 'Fit for the Future' focussed on

five priorities, with action cards for each. In 2018, Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) commissioned an LGA Peer Challenge and this concluded that the strategy needed to be refreshed. This was still very much a working progress, though extensive community engagement had been undertaken; resulting in seven proposed priorities (set out at 3.4) and eight principles for ways of working (set out at 3.10). He noted that Pat Pratley, Chief Executive of CBC, as the district council officer representative on the board had been named as the strategic lead for the 'Housing' priority. The revised draft would be considered by the HWB Board on the 23 July and then would follow a consultation phase before the strategy was tabled for final approval in November 2019.

In response to a member question, the Strategy and Engagement Manager reiterated that the strategy was a HWB Board document and not a GCC document; which aimed to bring together partners to work together to improve health and wellbeing outcomes and reduce inequalities through commissioning.

Members voiced their concerns that the strategy felt unfocussed and risked leading to little or no action to improve health and wellbeing outcomes for local residents. The Chairman committed to writing to the HWB Board and asking that the revised draft strategy needed to include specific actions with smart outcomes. The Strategy and Engagement Manager asked that Pat Pratley, Chief Executive be included in any correspondence.

10. REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE AT END OF QUARTER 4 (APRIL 2018 TO MARCH 2019)

Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager introduced the corporate performance report, reminding members that this data was presented annually, providing the committee with an opportunity to make any comments or observations prior to the report being taken to Cabinet, where any comments would be reported verbally.

In the 2018-19 interim action plan, 90 milestones were identified, of which 63 (70%) had been completed successfully, 19 (21%) were not delivered within the financial year but were on track to be delivered within the revised timescale, and 8 (9%) were not completed by the end of the financial year. Many of the 8 milestones that had not been completed related to major projects which were very complex, but those that had been delivered or were on target, represented a vast amount of activity. He noted that these reports would look very different in the future as a result of a new performance management system.

The Strategy and Engagement Manager gave the following responses to member questions:

- External consultants (Focus) had developed 5 options ranging from £4m-30m but that with Heritage Lottery Fund and Arts Council reducing the amount of capital funding available until 2021 and 2022 there had been concerns about our ability to raise sufficient funds to deliver the project. However, the project was continuing and a shopping list was currently being devised with a view to delivering as much redevelopment as possible within what remained of the £1.7m capital still available. It was suggested that a further update could be scheduled on the work plan.

- The Cabinet Member Housing explained that in relation to contactless donation points to support homelessness charities, it was determined that although it might produce benefits at the outset, given the cost of installation, this would quickly drop-off and the decision was made to not progress the project. The Executive Director of People and Change reported that a Project Manager had reviewed this issue and proposed an initiative whereby homelessness charities registered as recipients of the Cheltenham Lottery fund. The Cabinet Member would be providing an update to Cabinet on this issue.

The Lead members would schedule a further update for a future meeting.

11. THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE PROVISION

Mark Sheldon, the Director of Corporate Projects, introduced the report which identified a number of options for the future provision of public conveniences in the town; ultimately the aim of which was to provide access to a greater number of well-maintained and more accessible facilities. Members would be aware that of the new 'Changing Places' accessible toilet at Pittville Park, whilst paid for by Gloucestershire County Council, it now fell to Cheltenham Borough Council to cover maintenance costs and this was an additional consideration of the review, with an effort being made to off-set these costs by achieving savings elsewhere. The review had focussed on four options, with option 3 (community partnership scheme initiative) covering some of the town's toilet provision being the preferred option to explore further. Partnership schemes work on the basis whereby participating businesses agree to let members of the public use their facilities during normal opening hours without the need to make a purchase from the business, a strategy that had been adopted in a number of other areas across the country including Gloucester. He stressed that the reference to closures at 4.3 of the report was premature, but rather this was one option and would only result in a formal recommendation if a successful community partnership scheme could be put in place following a consultation process. Other options for managing toilets could include transferring responsibility to a third party.

The Director of Corporate Projects gave the following responses to member questions:

- Commercial opportunities would arise from the ability to use redundant amenities for something else.
- Charging for the use of public conveniences, a strategy which had been adopted in many other tourist destinations would be considered, but the partnership scheme was the preferred option.
- The option for a Changing Places facility within Regent Arcade was being explored in view of the possibility that the arcade would be open later in the evening as a consequence of the planned cinema complex.
- A partnership scheme with local businesses could result in improved access to well-maintained facilities for longer periods of time (pubs and restaurants well into the evening).
- Initial discussions had been held with The Cheltenham Trust regarding transfer of all operational liabilities of the Imperial Gardens facilities. Members commented that this facility, as it stood, fell far below what

should be considered as acceptable standards and officers did not disagree.

- £500 per annum, per business, would be offered to incentivise participation in the Cheltenham scheme, though it was possible that some would participate for free. Initial contact with businesses had not yet commenced.

The proposal for retention of the Sandford Park facilities was welcomed, as was the recognition that the facilities were no longer fit for purpose and in need of refurbishment.

The Director of Corporate Projects and Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment thanked the committee for their feedback. Members were comfortable with option 3, welcomed the opportunity to share their thoughts at this stage and looked forward to considering further recommendations on this issue in the future.

12. CABINET BRIEFING

The Leader had given his apologies and as such, a written briefing had been circulated with the agenda. Members were asked to contact him directly with any comments or queries.

13. UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY TASK GROUPS

There were none.

14. REVIEW OF SCRUTINY WORKPLAN

The scrutiny work plan had been circulated with the agenda and would be updated to reflect the matters arising from this meeting, namely:

- Consideration of the Cabinet report on the Household Recycling Centre would be scheduled for a future meeting.
- Consideration of the draft Gloucestershire Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy would be scheduled for a future meeting.
- Consideration of the Cabinet report on the future of public conveniences would be scheduled for a future meeting.

The Chairman also noted that as per the request of the committee, three additional 2020 meeting dates had been identified (30 March, 26 May and 27 July) and these would be marked as 'if required'.

A member suggested that the meeting currently scheduled for the 20 April 2020 would likely prove inconvenient for any members that were campaigning in advance of the borough elections. The Lead members would consider this at the next briefing.

15. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXEMPT INFORMATION

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that in accordance with Section 100A(4) Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining agenda items as it is likely that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, if members of the public are

present there will be disclosed to them exempt information as defined in paragraph 3, Part (1) Schedule (12A) Local Government Act 1972, namely:

Paragraph 3; Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

16. EXEMPT MINUTES

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 3 June had been circulated with the agenda.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the exempt minutes of the meeting held on the 3 June be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

17. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was scheduled for Monday 19 August.

Chris Mason
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Call in review of improvements to the household waste recycling centre and changes to bring bank sites decision taken on 11 June 2019

Questions for witnesses to be asked at the O&S meeting on 1 July 2019

The Chairman

The Chairman of O&S will explain the reasons why he felt the call-in was appropriate.

Members of O&S will be able to ask any questions.

Cabinet Member Clean and Green Environment – Councillor Chris Coleman

1. The public have not been specifically consulted on the 4 sites identified within the report, does the Cabinet Member consider this 'meaningful public consultation' or will he consider further consultation with current users of these sites?

Response:

I actively encourage public consultation and I do think there has been sufficient consultation on this matter. The public gave a clear steer in the public consultation undertaken in December 2019/January 2019 when we had the largest response back to a waste and recycling consultation with over 4,200 people responding and 60.7% of respondents said that they would support a reduction in the number of bring banks, as detailed in the report.

The recycling banks provided by Cheltenham Borough Council (i.e. card, paper, glass, tins and plastics) are recommended to be removed from just 4 sites however all these recyclable items, including cardboard, are already collected at kerbside for majority of the households in Cheltenham therefore residents can put these items in their kerbside recycling box. This isn't really a reduction in service, simply making it easier for residents to recycle at home, using the kerbside recycling service already provided. The third party bring banks provided on these sites will remain and these are the bring banks that collect items, with the exception of textiles, that are not collected at kerbside such as foil, carrier bags and books.

Church Piece presents a significant health and safety risk and therefore no amount of consultation with the public will change the risks that they, as users of the site, are exposed to. I absolutely accept that this is a busy site but the safety of the public is paramount. This site has third party bring banks already and these will stay because servicing of these banks takes place less frequently and by smaller vehicles. I hope that removing the bring banks will discourage 'fly tipping' on this site which has been a problem.

The bring banks are for domestic recycling however recently enforcement officers have discovered evidence of waste from businesses in the bring banks at Church Piece and this is being followed up but this has been an issue for some time at this site. Businesses are required to have their own trade waste and recycling disposal arrangements in place and are not permitted to use domestic waste and recycling services funded by local tax payers.

Asda, Hatherley is a well-used site however there is an alternative site, Morrisons, close by. The bring banks at Morrisons are in a quieter part of the car park and present less health and safety issues for the public. This site is also the busier of the two sites. This site has three third party bring banks – two types of textiles and carrier bags. I would like the space created by the removal of the glass, plastic, paper and card skips filled with a larger number of third party recycling banks to increase the amount of materials which can be collected which aren't available to residents as part of the kerbside recycling collection such as soft plastics, foil and this is being considered.

Everest Road only has two recycling banks and is therefore a less well used site situated in the middle of a residential area offering all residents a kerbside recycling service. I would like to see the space created by the removal of the two Cheltenham Borough Council skips filled with third party bring banks collecting items not available at kerbside.

The Lower High Street car park (opposite Matalan) only has one bring bank and is therefore less well used. Again, I would like to see the space created by the removal of the two Cheltenham Borough Council skips filled with third party bring banks collecting items not available at kerbside.

I am happy to ask officers to consult further and seek feedback from users of the 4 sites identified and have asked officers to include this in the wider consultation planned for the future of the HRC and other environmental services over the summer however for the health and safety issues mentioned above, the Cheltenham Borough Council bring banks at Church Piece need to be removed as soon as possible.

All members were invited to attend a tour of the Swindon Road depot on 17 June 2019 which included the household recycling centre and provided an opportunity to hear about the planned changes and ask questions. I am pleased to say that 16 members attended the tour. As a follow up to the tour, all members were invited to help shape the further consultation planned and forward questions and ideas by 1 July 2019.

I have also asked officers to be available before the council meeting on 22 July 2019 to provide an opportunity for members to ask further questions and understand more about the changes to the household recycling centre along with waste, recycling and street cleansing in general.

It is important that the order to replace the bring banks at the household recycling centre and the bring bank sites is placed urgently to mitigate the health and safety risks identified in the report. I would seek members agreement that officers can do this tomorrow in view of the 6 week lead time for delivery.

2. Which are the less well used recycling bank sites and you provide data on this?

Response:

The less well used sites tend to be the ones with fewest bring banks such as Everest Road and the Lower High Street Car Park. Historically the busiest sites have had more bring banks located on those sites to cope with demand.

The technology available at Ubico at present does not easily provide specific weight data for each bring bank site however the use of the site has been measured by Ubico who service the sites. The frequency for Ubico emptying the bring banks is based on how quickly the bring banks fill up and therefore how often they need emptying.

There is a direct correlation between usage and frequency of emptying therefore this feedback from Ubico has been used to determine the 'less well used' bring banks along with those sites which experience more 'fly tipping' which is cleared up by the Ubico street cleansing team reducing the time this team has available to keep our streets clean.

Church Piece regularly needs 'fly tipping' cleared and whilst this site requires regular emptying of the bring banks, access issues frequently prevent this.

Asda, Hatherley needs less emptying and is therefore less well used than Morrisons that requires more frequent emptying and is therefore the site in that part of town that is recommended to remain.

Everest Road and the High Street Car park sites are emptied much less frequently because they do not fill up as quickly and are therefore less well used.

3. What proactive measures will be undertaken to mitigate the risk (as highlighted in the Cabinet report) of increased fly-tipping, in addition to the retrospective actions detailed in the risk assessment, if any?

Response:

Posters were put up in locations around the town, including the bring bank sites, warning the public that fly tipping was an offence and this attracted media interest. The Council received positive feedback from local businesses effected supporting this approach.

For two weeks before the bring banks are removed from the 4 sites, officers will be on site providing help and guidance to existing users of the site to enable them to access the kerbside recycling service.

Enforcement officers are, and will continue to work closely with Ubico to immediately deal with any fly tipping issues across the town and take action where evidence exists. This will include the use of mobile CCTV where necessary and we would encourage the public to report fly tipping, particularly when they see it happening and are able to provide information about the perpetrators.

I would like to suggest that Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider establishing a working group to review the council's approach to fly tipping, within existing resources, and help shape an awareness campaign with the public.

4. Given the expected reduction in the net cost of servicing the bring bank locations (£17,000), will additional resource be made available to tackle increased fly tipping should this arise?

Response:

Members will be aware of the Council's financial position following years of central government reductions in funding to local authorities and therefore it is necessary for Council's to work more efficiently within existing resources.

A review of the council's approach to fly tipping, as suggested above, may help identify any resourcing issues and innovative ways of overcoming these.

5. The report states that carbon emissions will be reduced by the use of larger bulk containers. How much carbon is likely to be saved and has any thought been given to the increase in carbon emissions from vehicles that use the next nearest facility, once the proposed closures have taken place?

Response:

The work required to support the Council's objective to achieve a carbon neutral town by 2030 will be identified as part of the report to members planned for October this year. At present there is insufficient data available but clearly if less journeys are being made carbon emissions will reduce but we are unable, at this stage, to identify by how much.

Residents are encouraged to use the kerbside recycling service to dispose of their recycling therefore if the existing users of the bring bank sites use the kerbside service journeys to the bring bank sites should reduce thereby reducing carbon emissions. That said, I would hope that those people who visit the bring bank sites in future do so on their way somewhere so it is part of the journey anyway and not generating extra carbon emissions.

Client Manager – Environmental Services (interim) – Karen Watson

1. The report states "Officers are satisfied that meaningful public consultation regarding the recycling bring bank site service has been carried out and that changes are not significant in scale". Would the Client Manager agree with this statement; when no public consultation was undertaken on the 4 sites identified and when these 4 sites represent one third (4/12) of existing sites.

Response:

It is always difficult to determine what 'meaningful' public consultation actually means however the public consultation carried out over December 2018/January 2019 does clearly indicate public opinion supporting the reduction in the less well used bring bank sites. With limited resources available to fund consultation, a judgement is always required as to whether 'meaningful' consultation has been carried out.

Regarding Church Piece, as an officer I am required to consider the health and safety of staff and members of the public using the site and I would support further consultation and seeking feedback from existing users of the site to understand why they choose to use the bring banks rather than their kerbside recycling service. This is a piece of work that has been planned for the 2 weeks prior to removal of the bring banks on the 4 sites.

It is true to say that removing 4 out of the 12 bring banks sites reduces the number of sites by one third however this is misleading in that 2 of the sites have only 1 or 2 bring banks and are emptied less frequently than all the others. These 2 bring banks sites (High Street and Everest Road) are not really comparable with the other bring bank sites in town in terms of size or usage. The total number of bring bank sites is in fact 13, including the household recycling centre at Swindon Road.

Church Piece and Asda Hatherley are the 2 sites which are comparable with the other bring bank sites in town and it is regrettable that the health and safety issues surrounding Church Piece cannot be overcome due to the physical structure of the site and that it is used as a busy small car park.

As the cabinet member has outlined, we are looking, if possible, to get additional third party bring banks at Asda, Hatherley to increase the range of materials collected on these sites which cannot be collected at kerbside.

This page is intentionally left blank