

4 February 2019

Committee	Overview and Scrutiny
Date	Tuesday, 12 February 2019
Time of Meeting	4:30 pm
Venue	Tewkesbury Borough Council Offices, Severn Room

ALL MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ARE REQUESTED TO ATTEND

Agenda

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

When the continuous alarm sounds you must evacuate the building by the nearest available fire exit. Members and visitors should proceed to the visitors' car park at the front of the building and await further instructions (during office hours staff should proceed to their usual assembly point; outside of office hours proceed to the visitors' car park). Please do not re-enter the building unless instructed to do so.

In the event of a fire any person with a disability should be assisted in leaving the building.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

To receive apologies for absence and advise of any substitutions.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Pursuant to the adoption by the Council on 26 June 2012 of the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct, effective from 1 July 2012, as set out in Minute No. CL.34, Members are invited to declare any interest they may have in the business set out on the Agenda to which the approved Code applies.



	Item	Page(s)
4.	MINUTES To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2019.	1 - 10
5.	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN To determine whether there are any questions for the relevant Lead Members and what support the Overview and Scrutiny Committee can give to work contained within the Plan.	11 - 13
6.	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19 To consider the forthcoming work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	14 - 19
7.	GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL UPDATE To receive an update from the Council's representative on matters considered at the last meeting.	
8.	GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTHWATCH To receive an update from Gloucestershire Healthwatch on the new arrangements and how they impact on the borough.	
9.	GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE To receive an update from the Council's representative on matters considered at the last meeting.	
10.	ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COUNCIL'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH, COMMUNITY AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE To conduct the annual review of the effectiveness of the Council's involvement in the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee in order to authorise payment of the Council's contribution to the running costs for the forthcoming year.	20 - 23
11.	TEWKESBURY BOROUGH NEWS REVIEW To consider the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations arising from the Tewkesbury Borough News Review and how the arrangements have worked over the initial 12 month period.	24 - 36
12.	GRASS CUTTING IMPROVEMENT PLAN To adopt the report of the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group and to recommend to the Executive Committee that it be approved.	37 - 56
13.	TRADE WASTE To consider the current position in respect of trade waste and to determine monitoring arrangements of the action plan for further developing the service.	57 - 66

DATE OF NEXT MEETING
TUESDAY, 12 MARCH 2019

COUNCILLORS CONSTITUTING COMMITTEE

Councillors: R E Allen (Vice-Chair), P W Awford (Chair), G J Bocking, K J Cromwell, J E Day, D T Foyle, P A Godwin, R M Hatton, H C McLain, T A Spencer, P E Stokes, P D Surman, M G Sztymiak, H A E Turbyfield and M J Williams

Substitution Arrangements

The Council has a substitution procedure and any substitutions will be announced at the beginning of the meeting.

Recording of Meetings

In accordance with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, please be aware that the proceedings of this meeting may be recorded and this may include recording of persons seated in the public gallery or speaking at the meeting. Please notify the Democratic Services Officer if you have any objections to this practice and the Chair will take reasonable steps to ensure that any request not to be recorded is complied with.

Any recording must take place in such a way as to ensure that the view of Councillors, Officers, the public and press is not obstructed. The use of flash photography and/or additional lighting will not be allowed unless this has been discussed and agreed in advance of the meeting.

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 8 January 2019 commencing at 4:30 pm

Present:

Chair	Councillor P W Awford
Vice Chair	Councillor R E Allen

and Councillors:

G J Bocking, K J Cromwell, J E Day, D T Foyle, P A Godwin, R M Hatton, H C McLain, T A Spencer, P D Surman, M G Sztymiak, H A E Turbyfield and M J Williams

OS.63 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 63.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was taken as read.
- 63.2 The Chair welcomed the Managing Director of Ubico to the meeting and indicated that he was present for Agenda Item 8 - Ubico Report.

OS.64 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

- 64.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P E Stokes. There were no substitutions for the meeting.

OS.65 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 65.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct which was adopted by the Council on 26 June 2012 and took effect from 1 July 2012.
- 65.2 There were no declarations made on this occasion.

OS.66 MINUTES

- 66.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2018, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

OS.67 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

- 67.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 14-18. Members were asked to determine whether there were any questions for the relevant Lead Members and what support the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could give to the work contained within the plan.
- 67.2 It was

RESOLVED That the Executive Committee Forward Plan be **NOTED**.

OS.68 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19

- 68.1 Attention was drawn to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2018/19, circulated at Pages No. 19-25, which Members were asked to consider.
- 68.2 With regard to the pending items listed in the Work Programme, a Member indicated that the West Oxfordshire Visit/Presentation on Grounds Maintenance could be removed as a presentation had been received by the Grass Cutting Improvement Working Group at its first meeting. The Chair understood that the Working Group had made considerable progress in a short space of time and he looked forward to receiving its report and recommendations at the next meeting. The Member went on to question what progress had been made in respect of the Single Use Plastic Policy and the Deputy Chief Executive advised that he had asked Officers for an update and would be happy to share that with Members when it was received.

68.3 It was

RESOLVED That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2018/19 be **NOTED** and the West Oxfordshire Visit/Presentation on Grounds Maintenance be removed from the list of pending items.

OS.69 PLANNING KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

- 69.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Development Services, circulated at Pages No. 26-35, which asked Members to consider the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in relation to the planning service.
- 69.2 The Head of Development Services explained that the Development Services review had been approved at Council in April 2018 and progress against the supporting action plan had been reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in October 2018 where Members had requested that a report on the KPIs for the planning service be brought to the Committee. The Business Transformation Manager advised that the proposed indicators focused on a number of themes, the first of which related to the validation of planning applications; this was important as it was often the first contact the customer had with the planning team. The complexity of the process depended upon whether an application was 'major' i.e. 10 or more dwellings or 1,000sqm or more, 'minor' i.e. one to nine dwellings or less than 1,000sqm, or 'other' which were predominantly householder applications but also included advertisement consent, listed building consent or change of use. Whilst the team was not where it wanted to be in terms of current performance and speed, there had been improvement and a whole suite of actions would ensure that continued. Page No. 30 related to the speed of decisions on applications which Members would be familiar with as they were presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a quarterly basis as part of the performance management report. It should be borne in mind that a national planning performance regime had been introduced in October 2013 in which the government had set minimum standards for the speed and quality of planning decisions on planning applications over a two year rolling period and a local planning authority could be "designated" as underperforming if it did not meet those standards. If a Council was designated, applicants could apply directly to the Planning Inspectorate for the category of development – major, non-major or both – for which the Council was underperforming. The threshold for speed of decisions was 60% for major development and 70% for non-major development; as Tewkesbury Borough Council was performing significantly above these thresholds it was recommended that the current local performance indicators - which were divided into major, minor and other - were retained.

- 69.3 The Business Transformation Manager explained that the purpose of planning was to achieve the right outcome at the right time and a KPI had been suggested in relation to the number of dwellings and affordable homes permitted which would demonstrate how the authority was contributing to the housing needs of the borough. In addition, an annual review of Planning Committee decisions was proposed to be undertaken to establish the number of decisions contrary to the Officer recommendation and what issues that might raise, for example, if there was a need for more training, better presentations etc. It was also proposed to consider the outcome of appeals in line with the requirements of the Protocol for Councillors and Officers Involved in the Planning Process. Page No. 32 of the report related to appeals and the quality of decision-making which was also part of the government's criteria for designation as a poorly performing planning authority. Quality was measured as a proportion of all applications which were refused planning permission but then allowed on appeal. As with speed of decision, the measures were applied separately to major and non-major applications over a two year rolling period. The target for decisions on major and non-major applications was for no more than 10% to be allowed on appeal and that was rolled forward each year. Performance was currently quite good but would need to be monitored going forward. In terms of applications for costs against the Council if an appeal was upheld, it was felt that the target should be zero as costs were only awarded for unreasonable behaviour.
- 69.4 In respect of planning enforcement, cases were classed as Category A, B, C or D and KPIs were proposed for each – Category A cases were those where, without prompt action, there was material risk of further harm; Category B cases were those where development was causing, or likely to cause, irreparable harm or damage; Category C cases were those where there was a risk of material harm to the environment or undue harm to residential amenity; and Category D cases were breaches causing limited disturbance to local residents or the environment. These had been based on what was set out within the Planning Enforcement Plan. The Business Transformation Manager explained that customer satisfaction within the planning service was often difficult to measure but it was felt that it would be helpful to carry out an annual review of corporate complaints about the service. In addition, a customer satisfaction survey had been prepared, which would initially be tested on customers of the pre-application service, so there would also be a KPI in relation to that. Members were advised that the pre-application service – which was discretionary - was being reviewed and additional KPIs would come forward as a result of that. It was also intended to carry out some work during the next financial year to establish the cost of delivering the planning service. Once that data had been captured and analysed, it would provide information which was likely to form the basis of further KPIs.
- 69.5 A Member raised concern that, due to the layout of the report, it was difficult to see at a glance how the Council was currently performing against each of the proposed KPIs. The Committee had previously agreed that a standard template should be used for performance reports with a smiley face system which he would have liked to see applied here. With regard to Page No. 28, Paragraphs 2.1.2-2.1.4 of the report, he questioned whether the targets were sensible and realistic – it was common to see improvement quickly from a few easy fixes but this was difficult to sustain in the long term. The Business Transformation Manager advised that the KPIs had been discussed at length by the team who had been surprised by some of the statistics and keen to improve. There had been a significant recruitment drive and the planning service was now fully staffed so, whilst challenging, the targets were thought to be achievable. She explained that the purpose of this report was to ensure that the proposed KPIs were at the right level and performance would be reported using the standard format going forward. A Member congratulated Officers on the excellent set of targets set out at Page No. 28 – the trajectory in terms of

validation of minor applications, from 16.5 days in 2017/18 to 11 days in 2018/19 and a target of seven days for 2019/20, was exactly what the Council should be striving to achieve.

- 69.6 A Member drew attention to Page No. 31 of the report and the annual review of Planning Committee overturns which he felt was aimed at Members and he questioned whether Case Officers would be considered to establish if there were any patterns in this regard. The Business Transformation Manager provided assurance that the review was intended to be a qualitative assessment to take stock of where the Committee was and there was a role for both Members and Officers in democratic accountability. She explained that decisions were quite often finely balanced which was the purpose of having a Planning Committee. Another Member expressed the view that there was also a need to look at situations where the Committee permitted an application against an Officer recommendation to refuse in order to look for trends and identify training needs. The Business Transformation Manager undertook to bring a template to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee before it was populated; it was intended to look at a whole financial year so this would be after April 2019.
- 69.7 A Member noted that a customer satisfaction questionnaire was being carried out in relation to the pre-application service and he felt it would be more appropriate to do this at the end of the planning process as customers may feel differently if they had followed pre-application advice but their application had subsequently been refused. It would also be important to know if the customer had submitted an application before or if this was their first experience of using the service. In response, the Business Transformation Manager clarified that the questionnaire was being tested on the pre-application service before being rolled out to all customers; a questionnaire had been drafted for customers who had already had a decision on their planning application which asked whether they had received pre-application advice.
- 69.8 With regard to the number of homes delivered, a Member noted that 2,157 dwellings had been granted outline planning permission in 2017/18 and he questioned how many of those had been on appeal. The Head of Development Services confirmed that this figure included those allowed on appeal and she undertook to find out how many were appeals following the meeting. Referring to the recent appeal decision where an Inspector had found that the Council was unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, a Member questioned how this impacted on other applications which had been refused on that basis. The Head of Development Services advised that the Council did not agree with the Inspector's methodology and calculations and was currently taking advice on how to proceed. In terms of how this would impact on applications that had been refused, she stressed that each application was considered on its own planning merits; the Council's position was that it was not engaging the paragraph in the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to the five year supply and the development plan being out of date. In a situation where the Council was forced to concede the issue there were a number of things that could be done in relation to boosting the supply of land through the planning process and making a case that some of the sites the Inspector felt were undeliverable could be delivered, and she clarified that the Planning Policy Team had been working on this already. In response to a query as to whether the Tewkesbury Borough Plan would now be brought forward as a matter of urgency, the Head of Development Services confirmed that it was always intended to bring the plan forward as soon as possible; however, 450 representations had been received during the consultation which Officers were working through. Some of the representations, particularly those from statutory consultees, were quite weighty and could potentially require additional work to be undertaken but she provided assurance this would be done as swiftly as possible via the Borough Plan Working Group. Notwithstanding this, she advised that it was likely to be some months before it became clear what the Plan would look like

bearing in mind the complexity of some of the issues. The Planning Policy Team was small but, if it became apparent there was a resource issue that would have a detrimental impact on the delivery of the plan, that would be flagged up to Members. She stressed that decisions on the borough plan needed to be made in the soundest way possible, taking on board all of the information and ensuring that statutory consultees were content. In response to a query regarding the significant amount of responses that had been received in relation to Cheltenham Borough Council's local plan consultation, Members were advised that this was no indication of the quality of the plan or public engagement, rather it was the content of the representation that was important - some would be one-line emails whereas others would raise technical matters relating to the National Planning Policy Framework which needed in-depth consideration.

69.9 Having considered the information provided, it was

RESOLVED That the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in relation to the planning service be **NOTED**.

OS.70 UBICO REPORT

70.1 The report of the Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 36-83, provided an update on the performance of the Ubico contract for the waste, recycling, street cleansing and grounds maintenance services for the first six months of 2018/19. Members were asked to consider the report.

70.2 The Head of Community Services advised that the level of information provided to monitor the Ubico contract had increased significantly compared to previous years to allow greater oversight of services and he felt this was demonstrated by the openness and transparency of the Ubico performance report, attached at Appendix 1 to the report. He advised that the amount of residual household waste per household was very similar to the previous year and there had been a small increase in the percentage of household waste reused, recycled and composted from 54.07% to 55.57% which was positive. In terms of missed bin collections, the Key Performance Indicator had been revised significantly from 1% in previous years - meaning that Ubico would have been well within the target of 42,000 missed collections for the year – to 0.1% as part of the improvement plan and had since been further revised to a 0.05% stretch target. The graph at Page No. 50 of the report gave a visual representation of the pattern of missed bin collections between April and September 2018 and showed a drop between July and August with a slight increase in September. It was now possible to track missed bin collections per waste stream and the graph at Page No. 48 of the report showed that recycling and refuse was broadly within target but food caddies, which were often hidden behind large bins, were missed more frequently. The Managing Director of Ubico advised that a common question he was asked was how Ubico compared with other contractors. He had investigated the reporting profiles for the South Oxfordshire and the Vale of White Horse District Councils - which had contracts with Biffa and were first and second in the country in terms of recycling with a rate of approximately 61% - and they had a missed bin rate of 0.11% in 2017 which was outside their stretch target of 0.04%. It was noted that the service was very similar to Tewkesbury Borough Council's with two weekly refuse and recycling collections, and the most interesting finding was the suggestion that the stretch target had not been attained because of additional food waste, which had been introduced mid-2017, and the fact that rounds were bigger therefore there was a higher level of human error. The Forest of Dean District Council, which had a kerbside sort service operated by Biffa, had a missed bin rate of 0.06% in the last quarter; the latest available data, for October and November 2017, showed that Tewkesbury Borough Council was comparable with a missed bin rate of 0.07% which was getting closer to its own stretch target. Biffa was recognised nationally as a good provider in

terms of its systems and internal processes, for instance, it used in-cab technology so was able to log addresses where bins had not been presented for collection etc. therefore he was content that Tewkesbury Borough Council's weekly missed bin collections were currently at 45-65 per week and that the target would deliver continuous improvement.

- 70.3 With regard to garden waste, the Head of Community Services indicated that garden waste subscriptions had continued to increase with over 2,200 since April. Requests for new bins remained high with an average of 117 refuse bins and 125 recycling bins requested per month and it was noted that the stock control system introduced by Ubico as part of the improvement plan had meant that stock had been maintained at an appropriate level. Bulky waste collections remained consistent with an average of 233 requests per month; there was currently a charge of £82 for this service, with a 50% discount for those in receipt of benefit, but this was being reviewed. Members were informed that the street cleansing review would be completed shortly; this had been delayed by the issues in relation to the Energy from Waste site at Javelin Park which had required a lot of resources from both the Council and Ubico. The graph on the left side of Page No. 62 of the report showed the number of street cleanliness complaints, for example, requests for litterbin and dog bin emptying, which had a target of two working days for completion; this was not currently being achieved and was an area that needed more work. It was noted that the graph on the right related to 'special circumstances', for example, requests for litter picking on an A road, which had a target of 14 working days for completion due to the more complex nature. Similarly, fly-tipping was not consistently achieving its two-day target which could be an issue with recording - for instance, multiple reports of the same fly-tip might be recorded separately - in addition, whilst all fly-tips were recorded, some were on private land and therefore not the responsibility of Ubico to collect. As such, this indicator needed to be reviewed in order to better reflect what was being collected and what Ubico was being monitored on.
- 70.4 The Head of Community Services indicated that he had been surprised to see an increase in the number of formal complaints about waste and recycling, with 68 in the first half of 2018/19 compared with 82 for the full year 2017/18, particularly considering the significant changes to the service in the last year. It was thought this could be attributed to complainants responding because of past service failures i.e. if a customer's bin had been missed five times in 2017/18, a single missed bin in the current year could prompt them to make a formal complaint. In terms of financial performance, the report set out that Ubico had forecast an overspend of £140,000; the latest data meant that had increased to £153,000. Whilst this was significant, it needed to be considered in the context of the £3.7M contract; nevertheless, assurance was provided that the Council was impressing on Ubico the need to bring the services within budget. The national driver shortage had been particularly challenging, and had resulted in an over-reliance on agency staff, as such, consideration was being given to increasing the current 5% market supplement in order to attract and retain drivers as well as using the apprenticeship levy to help Ubico to 'grow its own' drivers. The Head of Community Services recognised that Members had been frustrated with the lack of detail contained within previous reports so he hoped this report had helped to address that; he pointed out that this report was more in line with the level of information needed by Officers in order to monitor the Ubico contract in a meaningful way and he confirmed that all partners received broadly the same information so it could be more easily compared with other contracts as and when necessary.
- 70.5 A Member raised concern that some of the graphs contained within Appendix 1 to the report were difficult to understand, not least because of the use of similar colours. He felt that Members needed an indication of whether performance was good, bad or indifferent rather than just giving a percentage or a figure. Ubico had promised to provide economies of scale and he sought clarification on the likely

impact of Cheltenham Borough Council's decision to leave the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee. The Head of Community Services explained that the graphs used within the report did include targets so Members could see if they were being achieved, for example, Page No. 44 set out the number of missed recycling collections with the target clearly shown as a red line - anything below the line was within target and anything above the line was outside the target. He recognised that the Committee was used to seeing smiley faces to show performance but this report was of such importance he wanted to ensure that it was very clear what each indicator was; notwithstanding this, he would be happy to add a traffic light /speedometer system for future reports. He went on to confirm that Cheltenham Borough Council would remain in the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee until later in the year; it was unclear at this stage what would happen after that time but this was being considered by the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee and the Joint Waste Team. In the interim, Tewkesbury Borough Council was contributing towards the management of the Joint Waste Team which was costing approximately £1,000 until September 2019. He confirmed that Cheltenham Borough Council would still be part of the Ubico contract. The Managing Director of Ubico thanked the Member for the feedback on the report format and indicated that this was a learning process for the organisation as there had been no meaningful reporting until recently. Every effort was being made to improve transparency and openness given that Ubico was a teckal company, and therefore a shared endeavour. His overall view was that performance was good but there was work to do. In terms of governance, the partners were all equal shareholders, including Cheltenham Borough Council. Ubico now operated a number of contracts and liked to focus on the similarities between them rather than the differences - for example, two weekly refuse collections and two weekly garden waste collections - in order to begin to model what an integrated service might look like; it would be the Council's right as a stakeholder as to whether it took that option when the business plan was presented for approval.

- 70.6 With regard to the national driver shortage, a Member questioned whether drivers left employment with Ubico and returned as agency drivers as that was a way they could earn more money. The Managing Director of Ubico advised that drivers realised there were preferential deals available, and some would take whichever contract was more favourable; whilst it was not uncommon, he did not have exact figures for drivers who left and were subsequently re-employed. Recruitment was a genuine national problem; however, he was able to have open and honest conversations with the Head of Community Services around how this could be approached which meant that Tewkesbury Borough Council was in a good position to address this issue. A Member indicated that she was struggling to understand the graph at Page No. 76 of the report in respect of reasons for absence and clarification was provided that that particular indicator was a global one for the whole company rather than one which related solely to Tewkesbury Borough Council. A Member queried why there were two 'other' categories within the percentage spilt chart at Page No. 76 and the Managing Director of Ubico explained that it had been difficult to extract this data from the nurse-led absence system so this was a work in progress; however, he confirmed that one of the 'other' categories covered a whole host of individual reasons for absence which could not be mapped but added up to a significant amount.
- 70.7 A Member drew attention to Page No. 69 of the report which showed near miss reporting and he questioned what the reason was for the increase in the 'struck by moving vehicle' category in July, August and September. In response, the Managing Director of Ubico indicated that he would need to look back at the previous submissions but it could be that there was no particular reason – near miss reporting had historically been low as drivers tended to consider it as part of the job and they had to be sent constant reminders about reporting so it could be that they were more likely to report incidents if they had recently been prompted. The

Member indicated that it would have been helpful to have that commentary in the report and the Managing Director of Ubico thanked him for that feedback. In response to a query as to when the analysis of the vehicle fleet could be expected, the Head of Community Services confirmed that the fleet had just been valued which would give an indication of its condition and he undertook to ensure this was included in the annual report in future. The Managing Director of Ubico advised that the spend on maintenance and repair was also an indication of performance; that was likely to increase as the vehicles got older. A Member questioned whether vehicles were checked regularly, and the Head of Community Services confirmed that checks were undertaken on a daily basis in line with the scoring system set out at Page No. 82 of the report. The Managing Director of Ubico explained that the fleet compliance score was an assessment following a set of standards to satisfy the Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency (DVSA) - should it carry out a spot-check - that vehicles were being maintained correctly and that drivers were compliant with the operator's licence; Ubico set itself a 90% benchmark in that regard. In response to a query as to whether drivers used the same vehicles, Members were informed that rounds were kept consistent, where possible, and drivers preferred to use the same vehicle.

70.8 A Member congratulated Ubico on a successful Christmas period in terms of bin collections as he understood that had gone very well from the feedback he had received. The Managing Director of Ubico advised that Ubico was always looking to make improvements but the fact that there had been no severe weather conditions had helped. Notwithstanding this, a lot of material had been collected during that period and there had been a couple of pinch points which would be subject to an internal review. A Member noted that there had been some concern regarding street cleansing and he sought clarification as to when the review would be concluded. In response, the Head of Community Services confirmed that it was in the Joint Waste Team business plan for 2018/19 but the review had been slightly delayed so it may not be delivered by March; he undertook to come back to Members with a fixed date following the meeting.

70.9 The Chair thanked the Head of Community Services and Managing Director of Ubico for their report and it was

RESOLVED That the Ubico performance report for the first six months of 2018/19 be **NOTED**.

OS.71 ENVIRO-CRIMES UPDATE

71.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 84-90, which set out the progress made in tackling enviro-crime across the borough.

71.2 The Head of Community Services advised that the report before Members was an interim report setting out the actions in respect of enviro-crimes between April and September 2018. The previous enviro-crimes action plan had been delivered and the team was now in the process of drawing up a new action plan for 2019/20 which would be brought to the Committee as part of the annual report in June 2019. The Environmental Health Manager drew attention to Page No. 86, Paragraph 2.1 of the report, which set out the metrics currently recorded and the figures for the first two quarters of 2018/19. With regard to littering, he advised that the number of complaints had been relatively consistent and was generally low; however, it was intended to engage other Officers and Members to act as 'eyes and ears' in order to broaden the Council's presence across the borough and to maximise the chances of catching people littering. In terms of dog fouling, a Public Space Protection Order had been put in place earlier in the year which increased the fine that could be imposed and required dog walkers to produce, on request, a means for picking up after their dog. In terms of the latter, he stressed

that it was not intended to take enforcement action straight away as it could be that people might have used the bags they had taken with them etc. but was intended to facilitate engagement, particularly with responsible dog owners. An advertisement had been included in the Tewkesbury Borough News which had received positive feedback and Members were advised that it was intended to target specific hotspots so any suggestions would be welcomed.

- 71.3 In terms of enforcement action, Members were informed that a case involving a number of waste offences had been taken to court in November 2018 but the individual had not attended, therefore this had not been resolved and a warrant had been issued for their arrest. A man had appeared in court in September 2018 in connection with a fly-tipping incident but, unfortunately, the Council had been unable to take this to trial as a key witness had no longer been available. It was difficult to track down individuals when it was not necessarily a high Police priority; however, the Council did have a very good working relationship with the Police and had carried out a joint operation on rural crime in November 2018 which was something the Environmental Health Manager would be looking to repeat. He went on to advise that a large number of the fixed penalties served in the first six months of the year related to incidents that occurred in and around the recycling centres at Morrison's in Tewkesbury and Tesco in Bishop's Cleeve. Discussions had taken place with the Store Manager of Morrison's as to whether CCTV could be installed but, due to budget and corporate restraints, he had taken the decision to restrict the recycling centre to textile banks only. The impact on the recycling centre at Spring Gardens was being monitored and the Head of Community Services advised that there had been a significant report of fly-tipping during the previous week, which he had gone out to investigate himself, and he confirmed that evidence of at least four companies had been found so enforcement action would be taken. The Environmental Health Manager explained that the problem at Tesco in Bishop's Cleeve seemed to be quite significant and signs had subsequently been erected to indicate that the area was being monitored which had reduced the number of issues. He noted that there had been a drop in the number of fixed penalty notices but pointed out that this was partly because there was a choice of pursuing a prosecution for fly-tipping rather than issuing a fixed penalty, and, depending on its nature and seriousness, that was often the preferred option.
- 71.4 Members were advised that community engagement activity had been carried out in respect of dog fouling and fly-tipping and, whilst there were limitations in terms of what could be done, if Officers were made aware of hotspots then there were measures that could be employed to target those areas. A range of complaints had been received by different partner agencies regarding issues in and around Coriander Drive, Churchdown and a multi-agency meeting had been held to develop a strategy for engaging with the local community and working with them to tackle anti-social issues. This was considered to be a much more robust approach and one which would help residents take pride in their area. The Head of Community Services indicated that, following the Community Services review, a new structure for Environmental Health was being introduced. The report stated that this had been done in November 2018 but he clarified that it was a work in progress; existing staff had moved into their new roles and new members of staff would be starting work over the coming weeks and further recruitment to the remaining vacant posts was ongoing.
- 71.5 A Member raised concern that dog fouling was as much of a problem as it had ever been, according to residents, so it did not appear that any action that had been taken was working. Whilst he recognised that this was an interim report, he felt that more detail was required rather than just stating what had been done, for example, he wanted to know more about the potential of fining people for dog fouling. The Head of Community Services indicated that he would take this on board for the next report; he had received an email which needed to be actioned in

relation to fines and he committed to looking into that following the meeting. Another Member was pleased to see the section on community engagement - it was a big job, but if Officers could get that level of support from the public, he felt it could be very effective. The Head of Community Services explained that, under the new structure, Environmental Health would be divided into three teams based on geographical area which it was hoped would help in terms of taking ownership and communications etc. A Member questioned how much publicity was given to enforcement as it was important to send a message that the Council was taking action. Members were advised that action was reported on the Council's website and across social media; whilst press releases were issued, they were not necessarily picked up. Email updates had also been provided to Members over the last two months and that information had been passed to Town and Parish Councils to help engender ownership. The Head of Community Services provided assurance that Officers were doing all they could but were reliant on the press running the stories. A Member indicated that she had seen photographs of vehicles on social media which had been used to name and shame fly-tippers and she felt this could be a very useful platform in relation to enviro-crimes.

- 71.6 In response to a general query regarding consistency of reports, the Head of Corporate Services indicated that the standard template for monitoring reports, which had previously been adopted by the Committee, had been circulated to Officers. The Head of Corporate Services had advised that an action plan would be provided with the annual report in June and going forward. On that basis, it was

RESOLVED That the progress made in tackling enviro-crimes across the borough be **NOTED**.

The meeting closed at 6:18 pm

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN 2018/19

REGULAR ITEM:

- **Forward Plan – To note the forthcoming items.**

Committee Date: 6 March 2019			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Council Plan 2016/20 Refresh (Annual).	To consider the Council Plan and make a recommendation to Council.	Head of Corporate Services.	Yes – brought forward from 3 April 2019.
Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group.	To consider the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	Head of Community Services.	No.
Development of a Strategic Planning Framework for Gloucestershire County to 2050 and Beyond	To consider whether to work in partnership with the five other Local Planning authorities, Gloucestershire County Council and the GFirst LEP to develop a broad Strategic Planning Framework for Gloucestershire, to 2050 and beyond, via the preparation of a ‘Statement of Common Ground’	Chief Executive.	No.
Discretionary Rate Relief Policy.	To agree the Discretionary Rate Relief Policy.	Head of Corporate Services.	Yes, from 6 February to allow for further information.

11

Committee Date: 6 March 2019			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Confidential Item: Irrecoverable Debts Write-Off Report (Quarterly).	To consider the write-off of irrecoverable debts.	Head of Corporate Services.	Yes, from 6 February as no write-offs to consider at that meeting. Added to March Agenda to consider any write-offs required prior to the end of the financial year.
(To be considered in private because of the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)).			

Committee Date: 3 April 2019			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Performance Management Report – Quarter Three 2018/19.	To receive and respond to the findings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee’s review of the quarter three performance management information.	Head of Corporate Services.	No.
High Level Service Plan Summaries (Annual).	To consider the key activities of each service grouping during 2017/18.	Head of Corporate Services.	No.
ICT Strategy.	To approve the ICT Strategy.	Head of Corporate Services.	Yes – from 16 January 2019 to align with the action within the Corporate Services action plan.
Workforce Development Strategy.	To approve the Council’s Workforce Development Strategy.	Head of Corporate Services.	Yes – from 6 March 2019 to allow further work on the strategy.

PENDING ITEMS

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item
Confidential Item: Spring Gardens/Oldbury Road Regeneration.	To consider the information provided and agree a way forward.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19

REGULAR ITEMS:

- **Executive Committee Forward Plan**
- **Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2018/19**

<p><u>Additions to 12 February 2019</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <p><u>Deletions from 12 February 2019</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Committee Date: 12 March 2019			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Review of Water Supply Outage Monitoring Report.	To consider the progress made against the actions arising from the review (<i>NB – Partners to be invited to attend</i>)	Head of Community Services.	Yes – moved from February 2019 due to the number of Agenda items at that meeting.
Performance Report – Quarter 3 2018/19.	To review and scrutinise the performance management information and, where appropriate, to require response or action from the Executive Committee.	Head of Corporate Services.	No.
Flood Risk Management Group Report.	To receive an annual report on the progress against the Flood Risk Management Action Plan.	Head of Development Services.	No.
Healings Mill.	To consider the progress made in respect of Healings Mill.	Head of Development Services.	No – agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 17 July 2018.

14

Agenda Item 6

NB – Changes from previous work programme highlighted in bold

Committee Date: 12 March 2019			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee Update.	To receive an update from the Council's representative on matters considered at the last meeting (20 February and 5 March 2019).	N/A	No.
Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee Update.	To receive an update from the Council's representative on matters considered at the last meeting (14 February 2019)	N/A	No.

Committee Date: 9 April 2019			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee – Six Month Update Report.	To consider the progress made in relation to the 2018/19 Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee Action Plan with a specific focus on Tewkesbury Borough.	Head of Community Services	No – agreed at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 16 October 2018.
Development Services Improvement Plan.	To consider the progress made against the actions within the Plan.	Head of Development Services	No – agreed at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 16 October 2018.
Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20.	To approve the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme for the forthcoming year.	Head of Corporate Services.	No.
Annual Overview and Scrutiny Report 2018/19.	To approve the annual report as required by the Council's Constitution to ensure that the activities of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are promoted both internally and publicly to reinforce transparency and accountability in the democratic process.	Head of Corporate Services.	No.
Housing Strategy Monitoring Report.	To consider – six month update.	Housing Services Manager.	No.
Customer Care Strategy.	To consider – annual update.	Corporate Services Manager.	No.

Committee Date: 9 April 2019

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Community Safety Partnership Update.	To consider the update on the Community Safety Partnership.	Head of Community Services.	No – Exec Cttee approved the reconvening of the Tewkesbury CSP in August 2018. O&S previously received an annual update.
Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel Update.	To receive an update from the Council’s representative on matters considered at the last meeting (15 March 2019).	N/A	No.
Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee Update.	To receive an update from the Council’s representative on matters considered at the last meeting (20 March 2019)	N/A	No.

PENDING ITEMS

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item
Review of Workforce Development Strategy.	Review by O&S Workshop – agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 13 June 2017 – January/February 2019.
Review of Corporate Enforcement Policy.	Review by O&S Workshop – agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 13 June 2017 – March 2019.
Review of Complaints Policy.	Identified for review in the Corporate Policies and Strategies Report and agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 4 September 2018.
Single Use Plastic Policy.	Identified in the Corporate Policies and Strategies Report and agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 4 September 2018 – Workshop to be arranged for March 2019.
Planning Key Performance Indicators – Annual Review of Committee Overturns	To approve the template for the annual review of Committee overturns – agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 8 January 2019.

18

ITEMS FOR INCLUSION IN 2019/20 WORK PROGRAMME	
Single Use Plastic Policy	June 2019 – To consider the actions arising from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee workshop in March 2019.
Disabled Facilities Grants Review Monitoring Report.	June 2019 – To consider the annual update – agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 1 May 2018.
Enviro-Crimes Annual Report.	June 2019 – agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 12 June 2018. Interim report in January 2020.
Review of Planning Enforcement Plan.	July 2019 – Review effectiveness of the Plan once it has been in operation for 12 months – agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 9 January 2018.
Community Services Review Improvement Plan.	July 2019 – Agreed by Council on 24 July 2018.
Warm and Well Update	November 2019 (at the same time as the Housing Strategy Monitoring Report)
Safeguarding Policy and Procedure	Identified for review in the Corporate Policies and Strategies Report and agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 4 September 2018 – put on hold pending new national guidance.

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	12 February 2019
Subject:	Annual Review of the Effectiveness of the Council's Involvement in the Gloucestershire Health, Community and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
Report of:	Head of Corporate Services
Corporate Lead:	Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Lead Member for Organisational Development
Number of Appendices:	None

Executive Summary:

As a member of the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee (GHCOS) the Council has made a contribution to the running costs since 2002. Executive Committee, at its meeting held on 5 October 2011, agreed that :

- A contribution of £2,500 remain in the Council's base budget to be paid subject to the Borough Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee undertaking an annual review.
- As well as receiving regular reports from the Council's representative, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers on an annual basis, the effectiveness of the Council's continued involvement in GHCOS and whether value for money is being achieved for the contribution paid.

Subject to this review, and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee being content, payment of the contribution would be authorised.

Recommendation:

- 1. To CONSIDER the effectiveness of the Council's involvement in the Gloucester Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.**
- 2. That, subject to the Committee being satisfied that value for money is being achieved, officers be authorised to make the payment of £2,500 from the Council's base budget.**

Reasons for Recommendation:

The Council continues to support its commitment to health improvement, to act as an advocate for the borough's communities, and continue working in partnership with other public bodies within the county.

<p>Resource Implications:</p> <p>The £2,500 contribution is included within the Council's budget.</p>
<p>Legal Implications:</p> <p>None directly arising from this report.</p>
<p>Risk Management Implications:</p> <p>Not being part of the Committee would reduce the Council's ability to influence health related issues within the borough.</p> <p>In view of the fact that all other Gloucestershire Districts contribute, there would be a potential reputational issue if the Council did not.</p>
<p>Performance Management Follow-up:</p> <p>Regular feedback is given to Overview and Scrutiny Committee by the Council's representative.</p>
<p>Environmental Implications:</p> <p>None.</p>

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

1.1 In 2003, when the county set-up the then Health, Community and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee, it was agreed to involve the district councils and, since that date, all districts have made a contribution to the running costs. The contribution covers the administrative expense of running the Committee. There is wide coverage of health and care related issues and an officer with specialist knowledge is essential for the Committee to operate effectively.

1.2 The Executive Committee, at its meeting on 1 October 2008, approved payment for three years commencing April 2008. A further report was taken to Executive Committee on 5 October 2011, to agree a way forward, as the three year approval period had elapsed. At this meeting, Executive Committee agreed:

- A contribution of £2,500 remain in the Council's base budget to be paid subject to the Borough Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee undertaking an annual review.
- As well as receiving regular reports from the Council's representative, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers on an annual basis, the effectiveness of the Council's continued involvement in GHCOS and whether value for money is being achieved for the contribution paid.

2.0 GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

2.1 This is a County Council function but, throughout, it has included representatives from each district council. It was decided that the principle behind health overview and scrutiny was to produce a model that involved cross-council co-operation and the effective joining up of the health agenda in the promotion of community development. This model is recognised nationally as best practice.

2.2 The purpose of the Committee (as described on the County's website) is :-

"1. Carry out the overview and scrutiny functions of the County Council delivering the roles set out in Article 8 of the Constitution focussing on health issues from the public's perspective including the use of task groups to carry out its overview and scrutiny functions. To act as a lever to improve the health and those services that impact on the health of local people, working in partnership with other agencies. To address issues of health inequalities between different groups in the community. To determine those matters referred to in Article 11.02.2 of the Constitution (joint committees concerning health service changes).

2. Under the Local Authority (Public Health, Health and Wellbeing Boards and Health Scrutiny) Regulations 2013, to exercise the Council's role:

- in reviewing and scrutinising matters relating to the planning, provision and*
- in commenting on or making a recommendation in relation to proposals for a substantial development or variation to services save that 'referral powers' to the Secretary of State remain with full Council.*

3. Carry out the overview and scrutiny functions of the County Council delivering the roles set out in Article 8 of the Constitution in the context of all matters relating to adult social care."

2.3 Tewkesbury Borough Council nominates a Member representative to the Committee who reports regularly to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the activities of the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Gloucestershire County Council has verbally confirmed that other Gloucestershire districts all intend to continue with their contribution.

3.0 WORK OF THE GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

3.1 During 2018/19 the Committee received a wealth of presentations, monitoring reports, performance reports and financial reports from organisations within the health sector. These included:

- Non-emergency transport – presentation from Arriva Transport Solutions Ltd.
- Director of Public Health Annual Report
- Stroke Rehabilitation
- Regular performance reports, for example – Adult Social Care, Public Health, Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning, Gloucestershire Sustainability and Transformation
- Impact of the Health and Wellbeing Board 2013-18
- Gloucestershire Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report
- Petition – Save North Cotswold X-ray services
- Adult Mental Health
- Gloucestershire Urgent and Emergency Care Sustainability Plan 2018/19 (winter plan)

All agendas and reports can be accessed on the County Council website:

<http://glostext.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=669&Year=0>

4.0 CONCLUSION

4.1 The GHCOS has considered a wide range of scrutiny work during 2018/19 which has contributed to improving health and care services across the whole of the county. Elements of this work impacts in Tewkesbury Borough and this Council's engagement with the Committee has allowed local views to be represented to, and considered by, the Committee in its deliberations.

4.2 Continued membership of GHCOS will allow the Council to maintain its influence on important health issues. Through membership, this Council is able to act as an advocate for the communities in the borough.

5.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

5.1 None.

6.0 CONSULTATION

6.1 None.

7.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

7.1 Council Plan (2016-2020)

8.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

8.1 The Localism Act promotes joint working and the need for local councils to act as advocates for its communities.

9.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

9.1 £2,500 annual contribution.

10.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS (Social/Community Safety/Cultural/ Economic/ Environment)

10.1 None.

11.0 IMPACT UPON (Value For Money/Equalities/E-Government/Human Rights/Health And Safety)

11.1 Involvement in GHCOS helps to identify and improve any health, care and wellbeing issues.

12.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS

12.1 None.

Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Head of Corporate Services
01684 272002 graeme.simpson@tewkesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: None

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	12 February 2019
Subject:	Tewkesbury Borough News Review
Report of:	Head of Corporate Services
Corporate Lead:	Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Lead Member for Economic Development/Promotion
Number of Appendices:	One

Executive Summary:

In October 2017, the Executive Committee agreed a number of recommendations for Tewkesbury Borough News, including for it to be published twice a year in a magazine format – a move from three times a year in newspaper format.

As part of the changes, Tewkesbury Borough Council entered into a contract with Wychavon District Council to design the magazine for a 12 month period, with a review and formal competitive process to be carried out after this time.

This report reviews the implementation of the recommendations and sets out the next steps in terms of the formal competitive process for securing a designer moving forward.

Recommendation:

To CONSIDER the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations arising from the Tewkesbury Borough News Review and how the arrangements have worked over the initial 12 month period.

Reasons for Recommendation:

To give assurance that the review recommendations are in the process of being implemented.

Resource Implications:

As part of the Executive Committee recommendations, the overall cost of Tewkesbury Borough News was reduced by £4,066 per year. It is hoped that this may be reduced further.

Legal Implications:

The tender process referred to in the report will be undertaken in accordance with the Council's Contract Rules as set out in the Constitution.

Risk Management Implications:

To ensure we have a cost effective way of communicating with our residents.

Performance Management Follow-up:

The 12 month trial will be reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee in 2018

Environmental Implications:

None.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

- 1.1** Tewkesbury Borough News is the Council's main proactive communications method, which reaches all households in the borough.
- 1.2** Following a Member workshop held at the end of 2016 to gain feedback on corporate communications, it was agreed that an Overview and Scrutiny Working Group be set up to review Tewkesbury Borough News.
- 1.3** The Overview and Scrutiny Working Group carried out their review over three sessions, as described in the final report attached at Appendix 1.
- 1.4** The Executive Committee endorsed the findings of the review and agreed the final recommendations as follows:
- That two magazine editions of Tewkesbury Borough News be published per year with a one-flick PDF online version placed in a prominent place on the council's website.
 - That Head of Corporate Services be authorised to
 - Enter into a contract with Wychavon District Council for a 12-month trial period and to waive the Contract Rules accordingly.
 - Engage with parish councils who do not currently submit news articles
 - Seek to work to maximise advertising income.
- 1.5** Now that 12 months have passed, and two editions of the magazine have been issued, in line with the final recommendations the Council will go out to tender for the design and print element of the magazine.

2.0 12 MONTH PROGRESS REVIEW

2.1 This report provides an overview of the past 12 months split into the following categories:

- Overview of past 12 months
- Costs
- Advertising
- News from Parish Councils
- Feedback from readers
- Tender process

To give Members a 'quick glance' view of progress, there is a status key next to each section:

☺ This element of the project has been successful.

☹ This element of the project has been successful in parts but requires work.

☹ This element of the project was unsuccessful and a plan will be put in place to ensure it is achieved for 2019 onwards.

2.2 OVERVIEW OF PAST 12 MONTHS

2.2.1 The Council's Communications team has worked hard to achieve a new magazine format working with new designers. This has included introducing a new writing style (suitable for magazine format), new features, and setting up new working practices internally and with Wychavon District Council. The two editions of the magazine were successfully issued in April 2018 and November 2018.

2.2.2 Overall, the feedback from both the Council's Communications team and Wychavon District Council's design team has been positive. Working with a local authority design team meant that we were able to easily liaise with each other and there was a clear understanding from the outset as to the purpose of the magazine. It has also proved to be a learning curve for us in terms of understanding exactly what helps us to produce a successful publication, including:

- Ensuring content is at final draft when it is sent over to the designer.
- Ensuring images used in the magazine are of an excellent quality and are eye-catching.
- Where the design does not quite meet the brief, a bit of flexibility is required to suggest amends.
- A clear timetable of deadlines needs to be agreed at the start of each edition.

2.3 COSTS ☺

2.3.1 One of the main objectives of the review was to save money. Previously, Tewkesbury Borough News in newspaper format cost just under £25,000 per year. By moving to magazine format and being delivered twice a year, savings of £4,066 per year were achieved.

2.3.2 It is anticipated that delivery costs will continue to rise as the number of homes in the borough increases and Royal Mail continue to have annual price increases. However, it is aimed to make more income from advertising (as explained in Paragraph) and remain hopeful that tender bids for the design and print of the magazine are competitive.

2.4 ADVERTISING USED TO OFFSET COST ☹️

2.4.1 Tewkesbury Borough News includes paid-for advertising, which is used to offset some of the cost of the magazine.

2.4.2 For the first edition, Wychavon District Council sourced the advertising bringing in £900 of income; however, advertisers were not particularly forthcoming and felt they did not have the capacity to carry this out for the second edition of the magazine.

2.4.3 Gathering advertising is a time-consuming exercise and, unfortunately, there is no in-house capacity for this. Therefore, it has been included as an essential category in the tender bid document and, to encourage competition, it is suggested that any income raised from advertising above £1,200 per edition will be shared between the Council and the designer.

2.5 NEWS FROM PARISH COUNCILS ☹️

2.5.1 One element of the final recommendations which has not yet been fully explored is to engage further with Parish Councils to ensure areas from across the borough are represented within the magazine.

2.5.2 Currently, Members and Parish Councils receive an email asking them to submit ideas for the magazine but it tends to be the same areas responding each time.

2.5.3 To overcome this issue, different areas of the borough are proactively being covered in the magazine on a rolling basis. For example, main features have included Staverton Airport; a feature on a local electrician company; and, in the next edition, a community-focused garden nursery based in the borough.

2.5.4 In addition, the Communications Officer will attend the next Town and Parish Council Seminar and make contact with Parish Clerks for their ideas.

2.6 FEEDBACK FROM READERS 😊

2.6.1 A light touch survey was carried out with the Council's Citizens' Panel (approx. 250 members) after the first edition of the new magazine format was delivered to gauge readers' feedback.

26 responses were received, all of which were overwhelmingly positive.

24 respondents said they felt it was a great change when asked about the new format of the magazine.

25 respondents felt there was a good balance of community, Council and business news.

2.6.2 In terms of areas for improvement, the main feedback was to ensure there is representation across the borough and not to focus too closely on Tewkesbury and Winchcombe. This will be resolved through increased engagement with Parish Councils as part of the content-setting process.

2.7 NEXT STEPS: TENDER PROCESS 😊

2.7.1 As part of the final recommendations, it was agreed that a formal competitive exercise be carried out after 12 months. This process has commenced and the tender bid document went live on 11 February with a deadline of 1 March for submissions.

2.7.2 The tender process gives an opportunity to outline exact requirements for the design and print of the magazine. Regular enquiries are received about the design and print of Tewkesbury Borough News, so it is hoped there will be a good level of interest.

2.7.3 There is normally a spring edition and a winter edition of the magazine; however, due to Purdah, this year the first edition will be issued in June. In line with that timeframe, it is aimed to award the contract on 25 March with the contract to start from 12 April.

3.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

3.1 None.

4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1 A consultation was carried out with the Citizens' Panel after the first edition of the magazine format.

Operational managers were consulted in terms of the impact of the new magazine format.

5.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

5.1 None

6.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

6.1 None

7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

7.1 None

8.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS (Social/Community Safety/Cultural/ Economic/ Environment)

8.1 None

9.0 IMPACT UPON (Value For Money/Equalities/E-Government/Human Rights/Health And Safety)

9.1 None

10.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS

10.1 None

Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Communications and Policy Manager
01684 272002 clare.evans@teWKesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Tewkesbury Borough News Review Report

Tewkesbury Borough News review

2017



contents

Introduction	1
Session 1	1
Session 2	2
Session 3	4



Introduction / Background

Tewkesbury Borough News is the council's main proactive communications method, which reaches all households in the borough.

Following a member workshop held on 10 October 2016 to gain feedback on corporate communications, it was agreed that an Overview and Scrutiny to review Tewkesbury Borough News would be worthwhile.

The overview and scrutiny review working group was made up of the following members:

Cllr Blackwell; Cllr Dean (chair); Cllr Foyle; Cllr Hillier-Richardson; Cllr McClain; Cllr Stokes.

And the following officers:

Head of corporate services; policy and communications manager; finance manager; economic development and community manager; Joint Waste Team officer.

The review took place over three sessions, as described within this report.

The review session 1

The first review session took place on 5 June.

It was agreed that the scope of the project would include:

- The format of the publication.
- The frequency of the publication.
- Reducing the cost – or stopping it altogether.

The policy and communications manager presented the working group with information about Tewkesbury Borough News, including its background, current formatting and costs. Members were informed that:

- Tewkesbury Borough News is currently issued three times a year in newspaper format to each household in the borough.
- A 2017 snapshot survey (using Citizens' Panel) revealed 86% of respondents read it in part or in full.
- It promotes all council services
- It provides a significant level of cost-avoidance e.g. Joint Core Strategy and waste and recycling promotion.
- It costs us £23,977 per year.

During the session, a member showed the group a copy of the Cotswold Lion (the magazine of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and suggested a similar format would be an attractive option for Tewkesbury Borough News.

The communications and policy manager had received a quote from a local authority designer (referred to as Designer 1) and circulated examples of their work. The quote was £2891 per edition, with £1200 received back in advertising. The member indicated that the designer for Cotswold Lion (referred to as Designer 2) would also offset costs through advertising.

A member made clear it was important that we had a good understanding of what residents wanted from Tewkesbury Borough News – do they want a glossy magazine or are they happy with just a basic publication?

Another member suggested that we could do this through the Citizens' Panel and also ask them to give their opinions on what they find valuable information and what edition was most important.

As part of the meeting, the working group heard from three services areas. The economic and development manager explained that his team uses Tewkesbury Borough News as an important vehicle for communicating news in tourism, community sports, health and funding. He also added that people often contacted his team as a direct result of articles in the borough news, such as business grants and community funding.

The Joint Waste Team had submitted a briefing noted detailing why the newspaper is an effective communications method for them, and helped offset significant costs as a result of not having to do alternative marketing.

The finance manager, who reiterated that savings have to be made through this review, made the financial implications of this review clear to the group.

Following the first session, it was agreed:

- To carry out a survey with the Citizens' Panel.
- To bring back information on cost avoidance.
- To bring back detailed costings for Designer 1 and Designer 2, as examples of what indicative costs would be.

The review session 2

This meeting, held on 3 July, opened with the communications and policy manager revealing the outcomes of the survey to the Citizens' Panel.

The responses (60 residents) indicated that:

- The most valuable news was considered to be community news, waste and recycling, and community funding. Followed closely by JCS updates and tourism news.
- Respondents would also like updates on services not run by the council, including transport and crime, as well as ones we are responsible for such as major planning applications.
- The most important edition was considered to be spring (43%) then winter (30%) followed by summer (21.7%).
- There was a split in terms of preference for a magazine (46.7%) or newspaper (53.3%).

The group debated how many editions of Tewkesbury Borough News should be produced in future. Several members felt two editions would be sufficient – spring and winter.

Members agreed that, in terms of format, it would be crucial that the publication remains available online and promoted more prominently than it currently is.

The communications and policy manager took the group through the quotes obtained at this stage, which was for three editions per year.

	Magazine - design, print and delivery	Newspaper - design, print and delivery
Current designers	n/a	£8500 (£25,000)
Designer 1	£9175.10 (£27,525.30)	£5511.24 (£16,533.72)
Designer 2	£9830 (£29,490)	£6910 (£20,730)

Following a discussion, it was agreed that the next session would look at refined quotes for two editions and whether they would both offer a reduction for advertising income, as Designer 2 had not offered that upfront.

A member asked whether advertising could be sourced in-house and the communications and policy manager advised that, while it could be, it is extremely time consuming. The head of corporate services indicated that the majority of businesses advertising in the publication are not based within the borough, and the economic and community development manager suggested his team could help with this through their business contacts.

The working group agreed that cost avoidance is a major benefit of Tewkesbury Borough News. By delivering it to all households in the borough, the council does not have to pay for additional marketing and leaflets.

The working group was given a range of examples of cost avoidance, including for waste and recycling, whereby the council has saved money by using Tewkesbury Borough News to advertise collection round changes (est. saving of £5000) and a food waste collection campaign (£20,000 direct mailing savings). A member of the Joint Waste Team said: "The council has the driest recycling rate in the county – this is not only due to the wide range of materials collected but also due to the

residents' awareness of our scheme, which is promoted in Tewkesbury Borough News"

JCS consultations and updates is another area of cost avoidance, and the group was informed that for the past five years it is anticipated the council saved £3000 per year in media advertising. A member of Joint Core Strategy team "Tewkesbury Borough News has been an invaluable vehicle for us to communicate complicated and sensitive messages, without having to rely on the media which charges a significant amount for coverage."

The group debated the quotes, and how they compared to current costs – and it was suggested that it would be preferable to move to two editions but to adopt a magazine format. It was felt that residents would hold on to a magazine for longer, and would give a more professional impression of the council. A member suggested that it would make Tewkesbury Borough News fit for purpose.

Members were reminded that one of the main objectives of the review is to save money – the head of finance and asset management had included a procurement saving of around £7000. It was noted that the newspaper option for both designers would generate significant savings.

The policy and communications manager then took the group through a list of pros and cons

of magazine and newspaper formats, and the key points were:

Magazine format:

Pros:

- Can look professional
- Makes excellent use of photography
- Would introduce a new style for TBN.

Cons:

- Much pricier
- Can be mistaken for junk mail magazines
- Would not stand out as much as newspaper format.

Newspaper format:

Pros:

- More cost effective
- Projects more of a 'news' feel
- Is our current recognised brand

Cons:

- Cannot be as creative with design
- Does not look as glossy as magazine
- Paper has a disposable feel to it

Members felt that, in addition to the pros and cons identified, a magazine might be more attractive to advertisers and people would likely keep it for longer.

A discussion took place around the circulation of Tewkesbury Borough News. It was agreed that it should continue to be delivered to all households rather than being placed in prominent locations to retain the cost avoidance benefits.

At the end of the meeting, it was agreed:

- To move from three to two editions per year.
- To continue to deliver to every household in the borough.
- For quotes to be obtained from both designers for two editions rather than three.
- Service managers to be consulted in terms of the impact of moving from three to two editions.

The review session 3

The session opened with the proposed costings for two editions per year of each format from the two designers:

Newspaper format two editions per year:

	Designer 1	Designer 2
Design, print, advertising and delivery	£5461 (£10,922)	£5885 (£11,770)
Annual saving	£13,978	£13,130

* (cost in brackets is annual cost for two editions)

Magazine format two editions per year:

	Designer 1	Designer 2
Design, print, advertising and delivery	£11,167 (£20,834)	£10,205 (£18,910)
Annual saving	£4066	£5990

* (cost in brackets is annual cost for two editions)

The working group noted there were significant savings to be made from newspaper format, with savings substantially reduced for the magazine option.

The working group was presented with mock-up front covers from the two designers in both formats, and positive feedback was received for all options. A member expressed the view that a magazine had a psychological value which a newspaper did not – a newspaper is more likely to be thrown away.

To help the group decide on which designer to go with, the policy and communications manager highlighted that while Designer 2 offers good value-for-money, and excellent design, there were concerns that there was no resilience as it is a one-man business and the designer had limited experience with gathering advertising. Designer 1, on the other hand, could call upon a full team of designers, had lots of experience understanding design for local government issues, and there was the potential for them to support the council in other areas of communications and design in the future if it was required.

Following a debate, it was agreed that the benefits of working with another local authority with the added resilience of a team, meant that Designer 1 would be the preferred designers, subject to contract.

In terms of when the two editions should be produced, it was agreed that late October and March would be the best times of year as it would capture Christmas waste/recycling collections as well as budget information for the March edition.

A discussion took place around the tendering process, and it was confirmed that the new designer would be appointed on a 12-month trial basis following which the contract would be put out to tender.

Final recommendations

Having considered all the information provided during the review, in particular the costings and the mock-up front covers, it was agreed:

- To move from three to two editions per year to be published in March and late October.
- To move to a magazine publication.
- That local-authority Designer 1 be recommended as the preferred designer.
- That the new designer to be appointed on a 12 month trial basis following which the contract would be put out to tender.
- To engage with parish councils who do not currently submit news articles.
- To work to maximise advertising income.
- To introduce a one-flick PDF online.
- To ensure the magazine is placed in a prominent place on our website.
- That the Citizen's Panel be asked for its views on the publication following circulation of the first edition.
- That a report be taken to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to review the implementation of the recommendations and how the arrangements had worked over the 12 month period.

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	12 February 2019
Subject:	Grass Cutting Improvement Plan
Report of:	Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group
Corporate Lead:	Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment
Number of Appendices:	1

Executive Summary:

At its meeting on 27 November 2018, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee resolved to establish a Member Working Group to consider the improvements that had been made through the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan and to identify further actions that needed to be taken to ensure that suitable arrangements were in place for the 2019 growing season.

The report of the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group is attached for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Recommendation:

To ADOPT the report of the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group and to RECOMMEND TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE that it be APPROVED.

Reasons for Recommendation:

To ensure Member involvement in the implementation of the plan.

Resource Implications:

There are no direct resource implications arising from the report at this time, although future aspects of consideration could have resource implications. Should resource needs arise - either revenue or capital - these will be subject to a further report and consideration in the wider context of the Council's financial operating environment.

It should also be noted that the Borough Council continues to subsidise the cutting of County Highways-owned land in 2019/20 at an estimated cost of £44,000. The sustainability of maintaining this position in the longer term will need to be considered in light of pressures on the grounds maintenance service and the significant deficit within the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Legal Implications:

None in respect of this report.

Risk Management Implications:

Grass cutting is a high profile service and any service failings impact on the reputation of the Council.

Performance Management Follow-up:

Any risk management implications arising from the individual recommendations will be considered as part of the implementation process, if appropriate.

Environmental Implications:

Considered as part of the work of the Working Group.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

- 1.1** Following an unacceptable level of complaints being received about grass cutting from members of the public in the early part of 2018, the Executive Committee expressed concern about the level and quality of grass cutting across the borough. In response, a Grass Cutting Improvement Plan was adopted by the Executive Committee with responsibility for monitoring given to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 1.2** The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had detailed discussions about the grass cutting service, and the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan, at its meetings on 17 July and 4 September 2018. From those discussions, it was apparent there was some detailed work to be done, in particular on the future standard of the service, number of cuts, level of cut in different areas, resources etc. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee asked for a further report on the plan monitoring and implementation to be submitted to its meeting in February 2019; however, prior to this, it was felt important to involve Members and get their feedback and views on various aspects of the service, including the future level of service, Key Performance Indicators etc.
- 1.3** Accordingly, a small Working Group was established to work with the Head of Community Services on all aspects of the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan.

2.0 GRASS CUTTING IMPROVEMENT PLAN WORKING GROUP REVIEW

- 2.1** The Working Group met on three occasions and considered the improvements that had already been implemented as a result of the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan including:
- grass cutting maps were now up to date and broadly accurate;
 - grass cutting rounds were in the process of being put into a logical order to ensure the best use of the crews time, therefore minimising travelling time;
 - all equipment was now included on a maintenance programme; and
 - increased and effective supervision is in place.
- 2.2** The Working Group also heard from partners at Ubico representing the Tewkesbury Borough contract and the West Oxfordshire contract; this allowed Members to compare the level of resource afforded to these two contracts and to contrast the outcomes that were achieved.
- 2.3** As a result of the work undertaken by the Working Group, a number of recommendations have been developed and are set out in the report attached at Appendix 1.

- 2.4 The Working Group has also developed a suite of Key Performance Indicators, including grass cutting standards, which are outlined in the attached report.
- 3.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**
- 3.1 Not applicable.
- 4.0 CONSULTATION**
- 4.1 Representatives from Ubico and Gloucestershire County Council attended the first meeting of the Working Group.
- 5.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES**
- 5.1 Not applicable.
- 6.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES**
- 6.1 Not applicable.
- 7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)**
- 7.1 Not applicable.
- 8.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS (Social/Community Safety/Cultural/ Economic/ Environment)**
- 8.1 Considered as part of the work of the Working Group.
- 9.0 IMPACT UPON (Value For Money/Equalities/E-Government/Human Rights/Health And Safety)**
- 9.1 Considered as part of the work of the Working Group.
- 10.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS**
- 10.1 Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 27 November 2018.

Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Head of Community Services
01684 272259 Peter.Tonge@tewkesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: Appendix A – Report of the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group

Grass cutting scrutiny review



contents

Introduction	1
Background	1
Methodology	1
Meetings	1
Recommendations	4
Key Performance Indicators	5
Conclusion	5
Acknowledgements	5
Appendix one - Terms of reference	6
Appendix two - Grass cutting improvement plan	7
Appendix three - Grass cutting standards	11
Appendix four - Grounds maintenance member group terms of reference	15



Introduction

Following an unacceptable level of complaints received about grass cutting from members of the public in the early part of 2018, a number of elected Members expressed concern about the level and quality of grass cutting. Whilst it was acknowledged that the unusual weather had contributed to the severity of this event, councillors did not think that sufficient remedial action was being taken. Accordingly an improvement plan was subsequently approved by the Executive Committee the implementation of which to be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Background

Tewkesbury Borough Council is responsible for grass cutting on its own land and has a contract arrangement with Gloucestershire County Highways and some parish councils to cut various areas of grass across the borough. Tewkesbury Borough Council has a contract with Ubico to deliver this. The majority of the grass that the council contracts Ubico to cut on behalf of Gloucestershire County Highways is within housing developments located in areas across the borough such as the Wheatpieces estate, Newtown; Bishops Cleeve; Winchcombe; Longford; Ashleworth; and Gotherington. Tewkesbury Borough Council only cut roundabouts and trunk road verges where they neighbour a development. On highway verges - such as along the A38 south of Tewkesbury, the Tewkesbury Road into Cheltenham and around Junction 9 of the M5 – Gloucestershire County Highways currently has a contract with Amey to undertake the work.

Purpose

At its meeting on 29 November 2018, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee resolved to establish a Member working group to consider the improvements that had already been made through delivery of the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan (attached at Appendix 2) in order to provide Members with confidence that suitable action had been taken to deal with the problem that had occurred in the 2018 growing season. In addition, the working group would consider further actions that needed to be taken to ensure that suitable arrangements were in place for the 2019 growing season.

Methodology

The working group would meet up to three times in order to:

- consider the efficiencies already made by Ubico;
- receive information from Ubico about current levels of activity within the borough as well as in West Oxfordshire District Council and Gloucestershire County Council;
- consider a variety of recommendations for the 2019 growing season; and
- propose a number of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which Ubico would report on regularly going forward.

Terms of Reference for the working group are attached in full at Appendix 1.

Meetings of the working group

Meeting 1 - 6 December 2019

The working group considered the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan and noted that the majority of the

13 actions had been completed. One of the significant actions related to the production and accuracy of grass cutting maps that showed the areas of Tewkesbury Borough Council land and Gloucestershire County Council land that needed to be cut. Members noted that areas where ownership of land was unknown had predominantly been resolved with one notable exception in Mitton. Tewkesbury Borough Council had committed to continue maintaining the land in Mitton until the issue with the owners was resolved.

Particular improvements that were noted were as follows:

- grass cutting maps were now up to date and broadly accurate;
- grass cutting rounds were in the process of being put into a logical order to ensure the best use of the crews' time, therefore minimising travelling time;
- all equipment was now included in a maintenance programme; and
- increased and effective supervision was in place.

Members were informed that approximately 355 acres of Tewkesbury Borough Council land was cut and maintained by Ubico – the equivalent of 270 football pitches. In addition to this, the council cut and maintained approximately 110,000 square metres of verges for Gloucestershire County Highways; generally this was in housing estates as opposed to main roads.

The working group was presented with hard copies of the maps for consideration. As well as grass cutting in these areas there were a significant amount of other works which needed to be carried out which were predominantly in relation to other grounds maintenance, such as cutting back hedges and trees which was undertaken outside of the grass

cutting season due to the bird nesting, and tree work which could only be carried out in the winter months.

Members also considered the service specification which stated that Ubico should maintain the grass in the borough but set out no standards or quality that should be adhered to. Members felt that this should be addressed in the longer term by a variation to the contract and in the short term by the introduction of some Key Performance Indicators.

The Head of Community Services briefed the working group on the current budget for grounds maintenance which for the 2018/19 budget year was approximately £368,000. Gloucestershire County Council paid Tewkesbury Borough Council approximately £5,000 to cut highway verges in the borough despite this costing Tewkesbury Borough Council in the region of £54,000. The Head of Community Services mentioned that the income for the County Council land would be increased to £10,000 in 2019/20 which would still result in a Tewkesbury Borough Council subsidy of £44,000. It was also noted that the problems encountered in the 2018 grass cutting season had resulted in an overspend of £72,000 due to the need for additional resources.

Representations

The working group heard from the following invited representatives:

- Gloucestershire County Highways
- Ubico Operational Manager – Cheltenham Borough Council
- Ubico Operational Manager – Tewkesbury Borough Council
- Ubico Operational Manager – West Oxfordshire District Council

The Ubico Operational Manager from West

Oxfordshire gave a presentation outlining the way that the service was delivered and managed within that area. Members noted that the budget for that service was approximately £600,000 but they had considerably more staff (including seasonal staff during the cutting season) and resources.

The working group was particularly impressed with how the grounds maintenance fleet was managed via a lease contract which meant that there was always spare resource to cover breakdowns and additional service needs. Members learned that there was a formal service specification that Ubico and West Oxfordshire District Council had signed up to which was managed and monitored by that council. The specification set out that the grass would be cut between 14 and 18 times a year as necessary. The Ubico Operational Manager from West Oxfordshire also discussed the mapping system used which linked maps to cutting rounds and allowed for improved contract management of the service. Members explored key differences between West Oxfordshire District Council's service and Tewkesbury Borough Council's service which was, in the main, the greater number of staff at West Oxfordshire District Council, which allowed for greater flexibility, the contract for the equipment and fleet, which allowed for greater resilience when something went wrong; and the mapping system that linked maps to grass cutting rounds.

The working group heard from the Gloucestershire County Highways Representative who explained that the County Council required highway land to be cut to a safety standard which generally amounted to two cuts per year in most areas and the standard fee payable to contractors for that work was 4p per square metre. On main roads (A & B roads) the grass would generally only be cut back to approximately one metre from the roadside to ensure visibility for drivers. The working group also heard about assessments of alternatives to grass cutting being

undertaken by the County Council on rural verges to ensure a greater mix of biodiversity in these areas.

Members discussed the use of equipment and queried whether the correct equipment was on hand at Ubico and whether it was fit for purpose and properly maintained. The Ubico Operational Manager for Tewkesbury Borough Council assured Members that all equipment was maintained by Ubico at the depot in Cheltenham and there was a programme to check and replace equipment prior to the start of the grass cutting season.

The working group found the information from partners useful and felt there would be value in exploring some of the ideas in more depth as longer term actions, for instance, the lease for vehicles and equipment and expansion of the current mapping system.

Meeting 2 - 11 December 2018

The working group considered the information that had been gathered from the previous session and agreed that the efficiencies that had been made so far on the grass cutting methodology were positive.

The working group discussed in detail whether to continue the grass cutting of verges in line with the County Council requirements and agreed that for the 2019/20 growing season they would prefer that these areas were cut at the same frequency as previous years but that a small, inconspicuous area should only be cut twice, as per the County Council requirements and that this area should be monitored so that Members could see the impact. **(Rec 3)**

The working group considered the fact that Ubico had asked for additional funding for the 2019/20 growing season but considered there was little value in increasing the budget without assessing the current system improvements. Rather they felt that the improvement to date should have an impact and,

if properly managed and monitored, this would achieve the desired outcomes in the short term. Members also agreed that Key Performance Indicators should be agreed and monitored regularly. **(Rec 4)**

The working group also agreed that the digitisation of the grass cutting maps alongside the cutting rounds should be undertaken rather than the current paper-based maps. **(Rec 2)**

As well as actions that could be delivered for the 2019/20 cutting season, there were a number of longer term actions including investigating the arrangements for equipment hire and sharing of equipment across Ubico contracts; reviewing the approach to cutting County Highways verges; introducing digitised mapping; and working better with partners. **(Rec. 5)**

The working group agreed that a full audit of grass cutting equipment should be undertaken to ensure that it was fit for purpose and that all resources (including staffing) for the grounds maintenance contract were being fully utilised. **(Rec 1)**

Meeting 3 - 17 January 2019

The working group considered the draft report, recommendations and Key Performance Indicators and agreed that this would form a good basis for monitoring the performance of Ubico's grass cutting in 2019.

The working group discussed whether the budget available for grounds maintenance should be increased; however, being mindful of the council's financial position, the majority of Members felt that it would be prudent to monitor the impact of the improvements that had already been made before taking that decision. There was also a brief debate

about the need to increase the base budget for grounds maintenance to reflect additional land added to the contract by way of adopted housing estates etc. It was agreed this should be reviewed periodically and the grounds maintenance budget increased as appropriate. **(Rec 6)**

Recommendations:

1. That Ubico be required to:
 - undertake an audit of all equipment to ensure it is fit for purpose prior to commencement of the grass cutting season; and
 - make better use of resources/staffing to ensure the workforce is being used to full capacity together with giving consideration to introducing apprenticeships in order to provide succession planning and resilience.
2. That electronic mapping be made a corporate priority to enable IT to complete this work by February 2019.
3. That a small piece of land currently maintained by Tewkesbury Borough Council on behalf of Gloucestershire County Council be identified for cutting twice yearly, as opposed to the current 8-10 times per year, and monitored to understand the likely impact of reducing the number of cuts in other parts of the borough in the future.
4. That in view of the improvements that have been made in terms of round efficiency, mapping and supervision/management, to continue to provide the grounds maintenance service for 2019/20 on the same basis as the current year and to closely monitor delivery throughout.
5. That a member group be established with effect from the new council with Terms of Reference attached at appendix four.

6. That the level of additional land that the council has adopted should be reviewed periodically and, where appropriate, consideration be given to increasing the grounds maintenance budget.

Proposed Key Performance Indicators:

- 100% of grass cutting rounds will be completed in line with round schedules;
- any deviation from grass cutting rounds must be reported to Tewkesbury Borough Council in advance, or reported by the Operational Manager on same day with reason i.e. 100% deviations reported within 24 hours);
- all areas must be litter picked prior to grass being cut;
- grass cutting must be quality checked and 10 areas inspected at least once per month to check it is being cut to the appropriate standard i.e. % measure of A or B grade (Appendix 3);
- where an area cannot be cut, or cannot be cut to a suitable standard, the council must be notified by the following day along with a suggestion for remedial action;
- all equipment must be suitably maintained in line with the maintenance schedule and, where needed, any new equipment should be available with 48 hours of breakdown - any significant purchases (over £5,000) must be approved by the council.

Conclusion

The working group consider that the information they have received, both from Tewkesbury Borough Council Officers and from partner organisations, has been open and honest, and it has been a good learning exercise and a useful review to undertake.

The report will be presented to the Executive Committee for consideration and, if adopted, the recommendations and Key Performance Indicators implemented and monitored by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, via the member group proposed at Appendix 4.

Acknowledgements.

The Chair of the working group expressed the view that the review of grass cutting in the borough had been useful and productive exercise, resulting in recommendations and performance indicators which should minimise the likelihood of an event on the same scale as the 2018/19 grass cutting season. The working group would like to thank those that participated in the review in particular the following:

- Gloucestershire County Highways Representative
- Ubico Operational Manager – Cheltenham Borough Council
- Ubico Operational Manager – Tewkesbury Borough Council
- Ubico Operational Manager – West Oxfordshire District Council

Members of working group - Councillors: K J Cromwell (Chair), D T Foyle, J R Mason (Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment), H C McLain, M G Sztymiak and M J Williams (Vice-Chair).

Grass cutting improvement plan working group terms of reference

1. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

To work with the Head of Community Services to implement the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan approved by the Executive Committee at its meeting on 6 June 2018.

2. CONSTITUTION AND POWERS

- i. The working group shall comprise four members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment.
- ii. The quorum of the working group shall be three members.
- iii. The working group shall, at its first meeting, appoint a Chair; and Vice-Chair, if necessary.
- iv. Substitution arrangements will not apply.

3. FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

The working group will meet as required in order to produce a detailed report on progress in implementing the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan for the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 12 February 2019.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE

- i. To monitor the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan.
- ii. To hear from partners and other councils as necessary to make recommendations on the number of cuts required, the level of cut across different areas of the borough and the spend required to achieve this.
- iii. To ensure arrangements are in place for a suitable grass cutting service for the borough when the 2019 season commences via the delivery of the Improvement Plan.
- iv. In conjunction with the Head of Community Services, to develop specific Key Performance Indicators to monitor the grass cutting service.

5. DELEGATED POWERS

To prepare a monitoring report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in February 2019 with any service recommendations being made to the Executive Committee, and council if additional financial resources are required.

GROUNDS MAINTENANCE (Grass cutting) ACTION PLAN January 2019

Project managers – Head of Community Services (TBC), Head of Operations - Ubico (Ubico)					
	Action	Target Date	Responsible Officer	Status	Comments
1.	Introduction of a case management system for reporting of work and the management of staff and communication to the public.	December 2017	Head of Community Services - Tewkesbury Borough Council/ Landscape Operations Supervisor - Ubico	✓	Complete. This case management system now allows us to log calls regarding grounds maintenance and track progress on works outstanding and work completed. This gives us a much better oversight of works completed and significant more information to better communicate with the public.
2.	<p>Introduction of clear and accountable KPI's including confirmation of completion of work timescales as outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 'Urgent' to be actioned within 24 hours as there is either risk to people or property or a reputational risk to Ubico or TBC ✓ 'High risk' to be actioned within 2 weeks of being reported ✓ 'Medium risk' to be actioned within 3 months of being reported ✓ 'Low risk' to be actioned within 6 months of being reported 	March 2018	Head of Community Services - Tewkesbury Borough Council/ Landscape Operations Supervisor - Ubico	✓	These KPIs relate mainly to programmed and urgent winter works, have been agreed with Ubico and set standards for how Ubico will respond to requests from TBC.

3.	A further round of new maps to be issued to ensure that all crews have all relevant and up to date information.	04 June 2018	Head of Community Services – Tewkesbury Borough Council	✓	This is to address inconsistencies in the mapping sets, discovered by carrying out checks. There is an acceptance that this is an ongoing piece of work as ownership of land changes and land is adopted, however we are confident that the current maps best reflect the most up to date situation.
4 (a).	Actively seek out third parties of land historically maintained by TBC and negotiate a speedy solution to the maintenance of that land.	July 2018	Head of Community Services – Tewkesbury Borough Council / Grounds Maintenance & Project Officer	✓	A number of 3 rd parties of land have already been identified and arrangements made to maintain the land.
4 (b).	Require 3 rd parties to maintain their land or enter into a contract with them to maintain on their behalf.	February 2019	Head of Community Services – Tewkesbury Borough Council / Grounds Maintenance & Project Officer	☺	Land that we know is not in the ownership of TBC or GCC or third parties has now been identified and negotiations are in place as to who maintains them in future.
5.	Weekly client meetings to update TBC of Ubico's progress and TBC to discuss issues with the grass cutting implemented March 2018	June 2018 & ongoing.	Grounds Maintenance Project Officer - Tewkesbury Borough Council/ Landscape Operations Supervisor – Ubico.	✓	Weekly client / contract monitoring meetings allow issues of nature and quality of work to be discussed. Meetings now happen weekly and will continue until the review is complete.
6 (a).	Regular monitoring checks by TBC officer	June 2018 & ongoing	Head of Community Services – Tewkesbury Borough Council / Grounds Maintenance &	✓	To ensure that the crews are carrying out the cutting according to the maps. Once crews have completed the back log these check will be extended to quality checks.

			Project Officer		
6 (b).	Ongoing monitoring checks carried out by Officers on an ad-hoc basis.	Ongoing until grass cutting season ends.	Head of Community Services – Tewkesbury Borough Council / Grounds Maintenance & Project Officer	✓	Ubico notify TBC every day of the areas that are being maintained that day. Officers carry out ad-hoc spot checks to ensure that the crews are where they are supposed to be and that work is being carried out as agreed.
7.	Weekly member updates with schedule for the following week of areas being cut.	June 2018	Head of Community Services - Tewkesbury Borough Council	✓	All Councillors were informed regularly as to progress on grass cutting until Ubico had had improved the situation. Further updates are by way of the O&S Committee.
8 (a)	Develop quality KPIs to monitor quality of cuts.	July 2018	Head of Community Services – Tewkesbury Borough Council	✓	Short term KPIs were developed to manage the urgent needs at that time and consisted of daily updates and regular improvement plan meeting. These have been delivered.
8 (b)	Develop longer term KPI's in line with the service specification.	March 2019	Head of Community Services – Tewkesbury Borough Council / Head of Operations (Ubico)	✓	KPIs developed by the grass cutting working group.
9 (a)	Tracking devices fitted to all vehicles.	June 2018	Landscape Operations Supervisor - Ubico	✓	Tracking data allows officers to query historic information in the case of complaints and health & safety issues.
9 (b)	Tracking devices fitted to all mowing equipment.	March 2019	Landscape Operations Supervisor - Ubico	TBC	Consideration is now being given as to whether tracking equipment can be fitted to all mobile mowing equipment.
10 (a)	Introduction of an electronic mapping system for all crews to access.	June 2018	Head of Community Services – Tewkesbury Borough Council.	✓	This technology is in place for tree inspections.

10 (b)	Introduction of an electronic mapping system for all crews to access.	December 2018	Head of Community Services – Tewkesbury Borough Council.	☺	Basic electronic mapping will be in place by February 2019. Exploring options for more sophisticated mapping in line with an in-cab technology project.
11.	Ubico to introduce grass cutting round sheets for crews to sign work off on a weekly basis for contract monitoring.	August 2018	Head of Community Services – Tewkesbury Borough Council.	✓	Sign off sheets are now in place and when the crew completes a piece of work they sign off that it is completed. This allows better accountability as supervisors can check on the work and ensure that it is completed to a reasonable standard.
12 (a)	Ubico to review the rounds to ensure they are efficient for the movement of staff and equipment	August 2018	Landscape Operations Supervisor - Ubico / Head of Operations - Ubico	✓	Better route mapping will allow Ubico to maximise the use of resources. Rounds have been reviewed.
12 (b)	Ubico to implement new rounds to ensure they are efficient for the movement of staff and equipment	February 2019	Landscape Operations Supervisor - Ubico / Head of Operations - Ubico	☺	New rounds have been created and will be trialled during the first cut and any amendments needed will be implemented
13.	Ubico to establish any resource or equipment requirements along with a business case to ensure the future efficient operation of the service for TBC to consider.	January 2019	Head of Community Services - Tewkesbury Borough Council Head of Operations - Ubico / Landscape Operations Supervisor - Ubico.	☺	This has been completed as part of the improvement project plan work. This is being also undertaken as part of the longer term improvements and will be updated into a full project plan for this work.

Grass Cutting Standards

A Grade (Good)

No litter

Grass cutting kept on top of

Minimal clippings due to being cut regularly

No weeds

Flat ground

Well maintained generally e.g no holes in ground, seeded



B Grade (Acceptable)

Minimal grass cuttings

Minimal weeds

Regularly cut

No more than 2 pieces of litter



Grade C (Unacceptable)

Grass longer

More grass cuttings remain due to grass being too long when cut

A few weeds

Possibly uneven ground

No more than 2 pieces of litter



Grade D (Poor)

Grass is of an unacceptable length

Weeds present

A lot of grass clippings left after cut

Overgrown around obstacles e.g street signs, trees.

Takes longer to cut

Litter present in quantities



Grounds Maintenance Member Group terms of reference

1. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

To work with the Head of Community Services to oversee the delivery of the council's grounds maintenance service and to consider and develop a number of longer-term projects in relation to the service.

2. CONSTITUTION AND POWERS

- i. The group shall comprise four members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment.
- ii. The quorum of the working group shall be three members.
- iii. The group shall, at its first meeting, appoint a Chair; and Vice-Chair, if necessary.
- iv. Substitution arrangements will not apply.
- v. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will review the Terms of Reference on an annual basis and make a recommendation to the Executive Committee as to whether there is a continuing role for the group.

3. FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

The group will meet as and when required.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE

- i. To oversee the delivery of the council's grounds maintenance service.
- ii. To consider and develop a number of potential longer-term projects including:
 - exploring the potential for introducing a hire contract for equipment;
 - sharing equipment across Ubico partners;
 - revising the council's approach in respect of maintaining Gloucestershire County Council land;
 - further digitalisation of maps and routes to include site hazards etc; and
 - working with partners, including parish councils and housing associations, to look for opportunities to optimise efficiency.

5. DELEGATED POWERS

To report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as and when required.

All issues that require a decision will be reported to the Executive Committee and/or Council.

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	12 February 2019
Subject:	Trade Waste Report
Report of:	Head of Community Services
Corporate Lead:	Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment
Number of Appendices:	2

Executive Summary:

The Council currently provides a limited trade waste service to the businesses across the borough. The commercial trade waste service is operated by Ubico and currently employs two operational staff - one driver and one loader working over a four day week. Administration of the service is absorbed into the existing administration service provided for all waste collection services, whilst invoicing, taking receipts and the processing of payments remains with the Council. Appendix 1 sets out the current position and operation of the Council's Trade Waste Service and Appendix 2 provides an action plan for further developing the service.

Recommendation:

To CONSIDER the current position in respect of trade waste and to DETERMINE monitoring arrangements of the action plan for further developing the service.

Reasons for Recommendation:

To ensure Member involvement in the implementation of the Trade Waste Action Plan.

Resource Implications:

The Council's trade waste service currently operates at a deficit, estimated to be £36,100 for 2019/20. This level of deficit only reflects the direct costs of delivery and does not include Council overheads in terms of management and administration. Given the Council's drive to act with a more commercial focus, it is important that existing commercial services are delivered at a cost neutral position as a minimum, with the intention to deliver a surplus in future years. This report sets out a number of options to start this journey.

It should be noted that there is currently no dedicated marketing resource to further develop the service, although this requirement is currently being met from existing Council budgets. A small budget may be needed for marketing the service which, again, will be met from existing Council resources in the new year but may require an ongoing budget in future years.

If the Council wishes to further develop the service to delivering a trade recycling service then additional resource, both in terms of vehicle and staffing, would be necessary. This opportunity would be subject to the development of a business case which would detail all aspects of the proposal.

Legal Implications:

Under Sections 33-34 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, all businesses have a responsibility to ensure that their waste is stored securely and disposed of properly. This responsibility requires that a business must ensure that its waste is only transported and disposed of by a person licensed for waste transport and disposal.

Under Section 45(1)(b) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (“the Act”) the Council has a duty to collect commercial waste from any premises where the occupier has requested it.

Section 45(4) of the Act makes any person who has made such a request liable to pay a reasonable charge to the Council for the collection and disposal of the waste. The Council has a specific duty to recover the charge, unless it considers it inappropriate to do so.

The term “reasonable charge” is not defined in the Act or elsewhere. In this context it should be taken as meaning comparable with charges made by waste collection authorities performing the same service. There is no prohibition on making a profit from the service but the requirement for charges to be reasonable may act as a constraint on the level of income that can be obtained.

Risk Management Implications:

Gaining too many additional customers is a risk as there is limited capacity to further significantly expand the service.

Performance Management Follow-up:

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee may wish to monitor progress of the action plan and further service developments.

Environmental Implications:

None arising directly from this report.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Council currently provides a limited trade waste service to business within the Borough – the current number of customers is approximately 450.
- 1.2 The Council currently offers no commercial waste recycling service to any of its commercial customers, although it will facilitate this type of collection via a third party on request. Current trade waste collections are based on a once weekly collection with customers able to choose from a variety of container sizes including a pay as you throw sack system.
- 1.3 The service currently runs at a loss and in 2017/18 cost £298,000 to deliver and generated an income of £267,000, meaning a loss of £31,000.
- 1.4 There is some capacity within the service to facilitate additional customers, this capacity equates to about 3-4 days per month.

2.0 SERVICE DEVELOPMENT

2.1 There are a number of options for further development of the service including:

- Tewkesbury Borough Council direct marketing;
- working more closely with neighbouring authorities within the county; or,
- working more closely with Ubico to further develop the service.

2.2 Direct marketing to our local businesses is already underway and a Trade Waste promotional leaflet will accompany all Council Tax bills going out in March.

2.3 Environmental Health staff currently promote the service whenever they have dealings with a local business and the Growth Hub is promoting the service to businesses that are seeking advice or start-up information.

2.4 Any expansion of the service needs to be undertaken with the current service capacity in mind. Marketing of the service needs to be targeted to geographic areas where we already have a customer base.

2.5 Further work is currently underway alongside our neighbouring local authorities and Ubico to further develop the service to explore expanding the service with the potential of delivering a trade recycling service.

3.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

3.1 N/A

4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1 N/A

5.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

5.1 N/A

6.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

6.1 N/A

7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

7.1 N/A

8.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS (Social/Community Safety/Cultural/ Economic/ Environment)

8.1 N/A

9.0 IMPACT UPON (Value For Money/Equalities/E-Government/Human Rights/Health And Safety)

9.1 N/A

10.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS

10.1 N/A

Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Head of Community Services
01684 272259 Peter.Tonge@teWKesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Trade Waste – Current Position Report
Appendix 2 – Trade Waste Action Plan

Trade Waste – Current Position Report

1. Trade Waste – Background

- 1.1** Collecting and disposing of commercial waste must be arranged by business owners - business rates do not cover this.
- 1.2** Under the 'Controlled Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2012, waste created from business premises is classed as commercial waste. It is an offence for businesses to use the domestic kerbside waste and recycling service, public recycling bank sites, and household recycling centres to dispose of commercial waste.
- 1.3** Under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, all businesses - whatever their size - have a responsibility to ensure that their waste is stored securely and disposed of properly. This responsibility, known as 'duty of care', means that a business must ensure that its waste is only transported and disposed of by a licensed waste disposal company and that the relevant paperwork (known as Waste Transfer Notes, which are used to formally document all the waste which is moved) is kept as a record for a minimum of two years (this is a legal requirement).

2. Finances

Year	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Total Exp	310,204	292,093	298,302
Income	267,202	264,578	267,292
Net Exp	43,002	27,515	31,010

3. Service

- 3.1** The commercial waste service is operated by Ubico and currently employs two operational staff, one driver and one loader working 37 hours per week. The service is currently over a four day week. The crew and vehicle are used for other duties the 5th day such as mopping up missed collections etc. Administration of the service is absorbed into the existing administration service provided for all waste collection services. The service is operated separately but in parallel with the household waste collection service.
- 3.2** The Council currently offers no commercial waste recycling service to any of its circa 450 commercial residual waste customers and collections are currently based on a once weekly collection with customers able to choose from a variety of container sizes including a pay as you throw sack system.
- 3.3** The current makeup of the 450 customers is approximately 30 medium size businesses with the remainder being small or micro businesses, with all collections being carried out over the 4 working days the service operates. The service collects in the region of 1,200 tonnes of waste per year which is disposed of through Ubico at a local landfill site operated by Grundon Ltd.

4. Capacity

- 4.1 Analysing a number of week's activity provides a rough estimate of the current capacity within the service. Excluding the 5th day referred to above the service has an average of 3-4 days per month where it is not fully utilised.
- 4.2 Whilst there does appear to be some capacity in the business this is made up of a number of hours a day rather than a specific day or days completely free. Therefore we need to understand better where our customers are and target any marketing resource accordingly. If this is not done it may be that we gain a number of customers in outlying areas where we have no current customer base and this may be inefficient and not cost effective. It may also be the case that we need to reconsider how current rounds are structured to ensure that we are operating as efficiently as possible.

5. Current contractual requirements

- 5.1 Under the TBC / Ubico contract service specification various responsibilities are assigned to the partners with regard to trade waste as follows:

Council	Ubico
Setting policy and service charges	Setting up contracts with new customers on behalf of the Council
Invoicing customers	Provide a schedule of customer accounts for billing purposes
Raising invoices	Range of services provided according to requirements
Taking receipt of and processing payments	Assist the Council in promoting and marketing the service
Debt recovery	Collection of trade waste
Promoting & marketing the service	

6. Operational environment

- 6.1 Tewkesbury BC has historically set its trade waste prices annually with an annual price increase of 2%, although there was no price rise in 2016/17 and a rise of 5% in 2017/18. The 2019/20 proposed price increase is in line with RPI which as of September 2018 was 3.1%.
- 6.2 Many of TBCs competitors for this service are actively weighing and monitoring waste and altering process accordingly to ensure that customers are offered a cost-effective service.
- 6.3 A number of national and local waste companies operate within the area including:
- Smiths
 - Grundon Ltd
 - Biffa Waste Services
 - Sita

7. Marketing and promotion

7.1 Historically marketing and promotion of the services is minimal and generally limited to advertising the service on the Council's website, although periodic advertisements have appeared in the Borough news.

7.2 The Council has a number of Unique Selling Points (USPs) that Council trade waste services have to offer which other contractors cannot, such as:

- Competitive prices – no VAT charge;
- Ability to cater for a range of sized and types of businesses – a range of bin sizes and sacks to suit business's needs;
- A dedicated customer service team;
- State of the art waste vehicles – a reliable service;
- A trusted brand; and finally,
- Peace of mind that your waste will be disposed properly –the relevant legal documents to ensure that customers are compliant.

7.3 Other competitive edges that the Council may have over other traditional trade waste businesses are:

- The Council are often the first point of contact for new businesses to the area, particularly with the Growth hub in the PSC:
- Local service with excellent local knowledge:
- A reputable service provider; and,
- High quality, responsive, flexible and accessible services.

8. Current fees and charges ** As of 2019/20 the discount for DD customers has been removed.

Description	16/17 fee	17/18 fee	18/19 fee	19/20 fee
Schedule 1 Trade customers				
1) Sacks				
25	39.25	41.20	42.81	44.20
50	78.50	82.45	85.67	88.50
100	157.00	164.85	171.28	179.65
2) Invoiced TW Customers				
190 ltr bin	4.60	4.85	5.04	5.05
370 ltr bin	6.80	7.50	7.79	7.80
770 ltr bin	11.20	12.35	12.83	12.85
1100 ltr bin	14.70	16.25	16.88	16.90
3) DD TW Customers				**
190 ltr bin	4.60	4.60	4.79	5.05
370 ltr bin	6.80	7.15	7.40	7.80
770 ltr bin	11.20	11.75	12.19	12.85
1100 ltr bin	14.70	15.45	16.04	16.90

Description	16/17 fee	17/18 fee	18/19 fee	19/20 fee
Schedule 2 Trade Charities				
1) Sacks				
25	29.05	30.50	32.00	33.05
50	58.09	61.00	63.00	65.10
100	116.18	122.00	127.00	131.20
2) Invoiced Trade Charities				
190 ltr bin	3.24	3.40	3.53	3.55
370 ltr bin	4.50	4.75	4.94	4.95
770 ltr bin	6.47	6.80	7.07	7.05
1100 ltr bin	8.03	8.45	8.78	8.80
3) DD Trade Charities				**
190 ltr bin	3.24	3.25	3.36	3.55
370 ltr bin	4.50	4.50	4.69	4.95
770 ltr bin	6.47	6.45	6.71	7.05
1100 ltr bin	8.03	8.00	8.34	8.80
4) Inv Trade Charity shops				
190 ltr bin	3.24	3.40	3.53	3.55
370 ltr bin	4.50	4.75	4.94	4.95
770 ltr bin	6.47	6.80	7.07	7.05
1100 ltr bin	8.03	8.45	8.78	8.80
5) DD Trade Charity shops				**
190 ltr bin	3.24	3.25	3.36	3.55
370 ltr bin	4.50	3.25	4.69	4.95
770 ltr bin	6.47	3.25	6.71	7.05
1100 ltr bin	8.03	3.25	8.34	8.80

TRADE WASTE ACTION PLAN

	Action	Target Date	Responsible Officer	Status	Comments
1.	Map our customer base so that we know where to target our marketing campaign.	February 2019	Head of Community Services	☺	This is key as marketing in the wrong areas could negate any capacity of the service.
2 (a).	Carry out direct a direct, targeted marketing in the areas identified by the mapping above.	March – July 2019	Head of Community Services / Programme Officer – Corporate Services	☺	Trade waste leaflets are going out with all NNDR bills, meaning that every business customer in the Borough will receive a trade waste leaflet.
2 (b)	Further direct marketing using traditional and social media.	March – July 2019	Head of Community Services / Programme Officer – Corporate Services	TBC	Direct marketing needs to target specific audiences to further build on the coverage from the NNDR leaflets.
2 (c)	Ensure all Environmental Health Officers are promoting the service whenever they have contact with a business premises.	January – July 2019	Head of Community Services / Environmental Health Manager	☺	Officers distribute leaflets when they have business dealing. Need to develop method of measuring this element.
2 (d)	Use the Growth Hub to promote the Council's trade waste service.	January – July 2019	Head of Community Services / Growth Hub Manager	☺	Staff at the growth Hub are aware and promote the service. Need to develop method of measuring this element.
3.	Explore options of entering into a partnership with neighbouring Councils to expand our service into trade recycling.	June 2019	Head of Community Services / partner authorities	TBC	All Councils in the county carry out a trade waste service to a greater or lesser degree. All are looking to expand and grow their services. Full options appraisal by June 2019.

	Action	Target Date	Responsible Officer	Status	Comments
4	Explore options with Ubico to join up the trade waste service with other Councils.	June 2019	Head of Community Services / Managing Director (Ubico)	TBC	Ubico is currently working on proposals to further develop the trade waste services in partnership with one or more councils across the county. This may allow us to further develop the service and generate economies of scale across the partnership. Full options appraisal by June 2019.