

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at the Council Offices, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 12 February 2019 commencing at 4:30 pm

Present:

Chair
Vice Chair

Councillor P W Awford
Councillor R E Allen

and Councillors:

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

also present:

Councillors J Greening and J R Mason

OS.72 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 72.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was advised to those present.
- 72.2 The Chair welcomed the Healthwatch Gloucestershire Manager and Healthwatch Gloucestershire Volunteer Officer to the meeting and indicated that they were in attendance for Agenda Item 8 – Gloucestershire Healthwatch. He also welcomed the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel who was in attendance for Agenda Item 7 – Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel Update - and the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment who was a Member of the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group, the report of which would be considered at Agenda Item 12. In addition, it was noted that the Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing was present as an observer.

OS.73 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

- 73.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H C McLain, P E Stokes and M G Sztymiak. There were no substitutions for the meeting.

OS.74 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 74.1 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.

74.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
P W Awford	Item 10 – Annual Review of the Effectiveness of the Council's Involvement in the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the room for consideration of this item.
K J Cromwell	Item 10 – Annual Review of the Effectiveness of the Council's Involvement in the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the room for consideration of this item.

74.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

OS.75 MINUTES

75.1 A Member referred to Minute No. OS.69.5 which related to a concern that had been raised in respect of the layout of the Planning Key Performance Indicators report and the fact that the Committee had previously agreed that a standard template, with a smiley face system, should be used for performance reports; this comment had also been made in relation to subsequent reports that had been considered at that meeting and the Member sought assurance that this was being addressed. The Chief Executive advised that, whilst it was not possible for every report to be in the same format due to the differing nature of what was being reported, it was intended to look at all Committee reports to ensure that information was clear, straightforward, understandable and consistent.

75.2 The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2019, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

OS.76 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

76.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 11-13. 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.

76.2 It was

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

OS.77 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19

77.1 Attention was drawn to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2018/19, circulated at Pages No. 14-19, which Members were asked to consider.

77.2 It was

RESOLVED That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2018/19 be **NOTED**.

OS.78 GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL UPDATE

78.1 Members received an update from the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel on matters discussed at the last meeting of the Panel held on 4 February 2019.

78.2 Members were advised that the meeting had a reduced Agenda with focus on a presentation regarding the Police and Crime Commissioner's priority of Safe and Social Driving and the proposed Police precept for 2019/20. In addition, an update had been given on the tri-force work between Wiltshire, Gloucestershire and Avon and Somerset; unfortunately, it had now been decided that there would no longer be a tri-force command for firearms officers. This service - along with the roads policing and dogs' sections which were also no longer tri-force services - would now return to their respective forces.

78.3 In terms of work currently being recommissioned by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, it was noted that a new contract for victim services would be granted in April 2020. All community rehabilitation companies would have their contracts terminated at the end of 2020 and the new service would be regionally organised to provide greater local provision, oversight and accountability.

78.4 With regard to the Police precept, the Council's representative advised that the most important information to note was the agreed 10.6% increase – the equivalent of £24 for a Band D tax payer; this would raise an extra £4.1M which the Chief Constable would invest in providing at least 80 additional officers and staff. The Police and Crime Commissioner's staff would increase by four - an Independent Appeals Officer, a Research and Information Officer, a Commissioning and Contracts Officer and a Road Safety Co-Ordinator - at a cost of £100,000, with the Road Safety Co-Ordinator being shared with the County Council. The Commissioner's fund of just over £1M would continue. The Chief Constable had stated that the £4.1M would be invested in extra officers and staff to: improve contact with the Police; improve emergency response; provide more officers for roads policing; help combat serious and organised crime; meet the increasing demands in child and adult safeguarding; support detectives in investigation teams; and support prosecutions. The Panel had unanimously approved the precept increase but had made an additional comment to support moves to request that the government seek financial contributions from large IT/social media companies whose platforms contributed to the increased amount, and complexity, of crime.

78.5 A Member expressed his disappointment that the tri-forces had failed as, generally, sharing services made a positive difference in his experience. He went on to question what was happening with the consultation from the Police and Crime Commissioner regarding the proposed change to the governance of the Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service. The Council's representative explained that he had reported Tewkesbury Borough Council's response and encouraged fellow colleagues on the Police and Crime Panel to ensure that other local authorities had done the same; whilst there had been a long Police and Crime Panel session regarding the Police and Crime Commissioner's intentions, the decision as to whether the report would be submitted was entirely down to the Police and Crime

Commissioner. Another Member indicated that West Mercia and Warwickshire forces were also separating, and he questioned if this was a directive from somewhere. The Council's representative advised that he did not think that was the case, rather the tri-forces had not been working as envisaged.

78.6 The Chair thanked the Council's representative for his report and indicated that it would be circulated following the meeting along with the presentation on Safe and Social Driving. It was

RESOLVED That the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel Update be
NOTED.

OS.79 GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTHWATCH

79.1 The Chair invited the representatives from Healthwatch Gloucestershire to make their presentation to the Committee.

79.2 The Healthwatch Gloucestershire Manager advised that Healthwatch was a statutory service which covered the whole country – there were 152 in England. The Gloucestershire team was comprised of four staff based locally in the office and 20-30 volunteers who supported their work. Central resources were shared with Healthwatch Somerset and West Dorset and they had also received additional support from Healthwatch Wiltshire which had now moved on to another provider. Gloucestershire Healthwatch listened to people's experiences of health and social care and used this to identify trends across the county. It was then able to go back to commissioners or providers to try and influence change. Priorities were developed on an annual basis depending on what was being reported by the public, care providers, scrutiny committees and Healthwatch England – Healthwatch Gloucestershire's national umbrella organisation. In terms of current work, a survey was being undertaken focusing on mental health services, which was a priority both locally and nationally and would continue to be on the agenda for the remainder of the contract. In the coming months, Healthwatch Gloucestershire would be working with the Clinical Commissioning Group in relation to the local response to the NHS Long Term Plan which required public engagement.

79.3 The Healthwatch Gloucestershire Volunteer Officer advised that her role was to train volunteers across the country to support the work which was done in each district. Community volunteers were based at hospitals, libraries and community events where they talked to people about their experiences and listened to stories about health and social care. Volunteers also represented Healthwatch Gloucestershire on Patient Participation Groups (PPGs) and at other meetings. There were currently only two volunteers covering the Tewkesbury Borough area and she welcomed suggestions from the Committee as to where other links could be made to ensure that the opinions of local residents were represented.

79.4 A Member questioned whether the number of volunteers had declined and, if so, what the reasons were for that. The Healthwatch Gloucestershire Manager explained that there had been a natural shed of volunteers as a result of a change of contract from the previous providers in April 2017. There were currently around 40 volunteers on the books, of which 20-30 were active – the two areas least represented in Gloucestershire were Tewkesbury Borough and the Forest of Dean but she was unsure if there was a particular reason for this. A Member asked what were considered as the main barriers to volunteering and whether the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) was a factor. In response, the Healthwatch Gloucestershire Volunteer Officer indicated that their volunteers usually had an interest in health and social care so they tended to be ex-health professionals or those who had experienced health issues; GDPR was not a particular issue for Healthwatch Gloucestershire.

- 79.5 A Member suggested that it would be beneficial for Gloucestershire Healthwatch to speak to the community teams within Tewkesbury Borough Council who would be aware of neighbourhood projects in the area. The Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing advised that the Prior's Park Neighbourhood Project had a community engager who worked with Green Square and she suggested this was another avenue Healthwatch Gloucestershire might wish to explore. Another Member pointed out that there were three food banks in the borough which could also be an important source of information. A Member queried whether links could be made with the Fire Service and the Healthwatch Gloucestershire Manager confirmed there had been links in the past and Healthwatch did signpost people to the 'Safe and Well' scheme. The Deputy Chief Executive indicated that he would be happy to put the representatives in touch with relevant officers, in addition, he was Co-Chair of the Financial Inclusion Partnership so there may be an opportunity for Healthwatch Gloucestershire to go along to one of those meetings. In terms of volunteers, there could be scope for Tewkesbury Borough Council staff to help on volunteering days and the Gloucestershire Volunteer and Community Sectors (VCS) Alliance was based at the Public Services Centre. He undertook to investigate the various opportunities for links with Gloucestershire Healthwatch following the meeting.
- 79.6 The Chief Executive indicated that the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group was doing a lot of work around the NHS Long Term Plan and revisions to the GP network in Gloucestershire. There was a move to develop local integrated health partnerships at a district level, based on the partnerships already in place and, if that was the case, he questioned whether that was something that Healthwatch Gloucestershire would be able to engage in. The Healthwatch Gloucestershire Manager confirmed that trained volunteers sat on the Clinical Commissioning Group boards and supported Healthwatch Gloucestershire in ensuring that members of the public had their voices heard. The NHS 10 year plan was a key piece of work for Healthwatch England and Healthwatch Gloucestershire would be carrying out considerable engagement alongside the Clinical Commissioning Group in that regard whilst taking care to minimise duplication.
- 79.7 The Chair thanked the representatives from Healthwatch Gloucestershire for attending and it was
- RESOLVED**
1. That the update from Healthwatch Gloucestershire be **NOTED**.
 2. That the Deputy Chief Executive investigate the various opportunities for links with Gloucestershire Healthwatch following the meeting.

OS.80 GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE

- 80.1 Members received an update from the Council's reserve representative on the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee on matters discussed at its last meeting held on 15 January 2019.
- 80.2 Members were advised that the Committee had been asked to note a petition that had been presented at the Gloucestershire County Council meeting on 28 November 2018 in response to concerns about x-ray services at North Cotswolds Hospital in Moreton-in-Marsh. The petition related to grave concerns that the NHS acute trust would be reducing radiology services from around 30 hours to eight hours per week which could have significant repercussions for minor injury units involving breaks or fractures which would require making travel arrangements to Cheltenham or Gloucester, should the service be reduced. The petition sought to

maintain the current level of local x-ray services and ensure that the North Cotswold Hospital continued to serve the residents of Moreton-in-Marsh and surrounding villages. The Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee had debated the petition and it had been agreed that the Committee would write to the Clinical Commissioning Group and Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust requesting restoration of the radiology at North Cotswold Hospital in Moreton-in-Marsh.

- 80.3 The Committee had also received a presentation from the 2gether NHS Foundation Trust on emergency mental health care services in Gloucestershire. Representatives from partner organisations in Kingfisher Treasure Seekers and Swindon and Gloucestershire Mind had been in attendance. The Committee had noted some of the initiatives emerging from the Gloucestershire Mental Health Crisis Care Continuous Action Plan and had acknowledged the commitment and dedication from organisations participating in the multi-agency partnership and the progress being made. Attention had been drawn to the publication of the NHS Long Term Plan on 7 January 2019 and the priorities set out by NHS England for healthcare provision over the next 10 years.
- 80.4 Members were informed that an additional Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be held on 20 February 2019 at the request of the Committee in order to gain a better understanding of the proposal to pilot the reconfiguration of general surgery services across Gloucestershire Royal Hospital and Cheltenham General Hospital. The second item of business would be in relation to Motion 825 - 'Protecting Gloucestershire Hospitals' Walk-In Services which had been debated at the Gloucestershire County Council meeting on 28 November 2018 and had been referred to the Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee for further discussion. The Council had noted the value that communities placed upon Accident and Emergency Units, both in Gloucester and Cheltenham; the enormous and varied contributions made by the seven minor injury units spread across Gloucestershire; and the great value communities across Gloucestershire placed upon having hospital facilities close by. It was further noted that all walk-in centres, urgent care centres and minor injury units would be rebranded as Urgent Treatment Centres by the end of 2019 and the Council had resolved to write to the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group to appeal in the strongest possible terms that none of the services currently on offer to walk-in patients at any of the nine hospitals be removed, and that Cheltenham General Hospital not be further downgraded to an Urgent Treatment Centre from an Accident and Emergency department.
- 80.5 A Member queried whether the Committee had taken into account that radiology cuts were due to a national staff shortage and not for cost saving purposes. The Council's representative confirmed that the Committee was aware of this and would be asking for action to be taken to encourage more radiologists.
- 80.6 The Chair thanked the Council's representative for her update and indicated that it would be circulated to the Committee following the meeting. It was subsequently

RESOLVED That the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee update be **NOTED**.

OS.81 ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COUNCIL'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH, COMMUNITY AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

- 81.1 The report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 20-23, asked Members to consider the effectiveness of the Council's continued involvement in the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee and, subject to the Committee being satisfied that value for money was being achieved, Officers be authorised to make the payment of £2,500 from the Council's base budget as its 2019/20 contribution to the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 81.2 The Chief Executive advised that Tewkesbury Borough Council made a contribution towards the funding of the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee and was represented on that group by a Member nominated by the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee who reported back on its work and the action being taken at a county level. Page No. 22, Paragraph 3 of the report set out the work that had been carried out during 2018/19 and he confirmed there were no issues from an officer perspective to prevent making a recommendation that Tewkesbury Borough Council continue to play a role in the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 81.3 The Council's reserve representative on the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee felt it was essential that Tewkesbury Borough Council continued to be represented on the Committee which received a wealth of reports on vital issues which impacted the lives of people in the borough. There were major changes in the pipeline with the introduction of the NHS Long Term Plan and it was crucial that Tewkesbury Borough Council was involved in those discussions. The Council's representative on the Committee echoed these sentiments and it was subsequently

RESOLVED That Officers be authorised to make the payment of £2,500 from the Council's base budget as its 2019/20 contribution to the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

OS.82 TEWKESBURY BOROUGH NEWS REVIEW

- 82.1 The report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 24-36, gave an update on the implementation of the recommendations arising from the review of the Tewkesbury Borough News. Members were asked to consider the progress that had been made and how the arrangements had worked over the initial 12 month period.
- 82.2 The Corporate Services Manager reminded Members that an Overview and Scrutiny Working Group had carried out the review of the Tewkesbury Borough News during 2017 and the final report was attached at Appendix 1 to the report. The specific recommendations set out in the report were: to move from a newspaper to a magazine format; to publish two editions per year as opposed to three; to work with Wychavon District Council on the design work for a 12 month period; to engage with Town and Parish Councils which did not currently submit articles; and to seek to maximise income from advertising. The outcomes for each recommendation were set out within the report with a status key next to each section to indicate overall success. Members were informed that the new format had been well received and cost savings had been achieved; however, Paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 of the report demonstrated that some work was still needed in relation to maximising income from advertising and engaging with Town and Parish Councils and the proposed actions to address this were detailed within those sections. The

next step would be to enter a formal competitive exercise – this process had commenced and the tender would be live on the Council’s website by the end of the week.

82.3 A brief debate ensued in relation to delivery of the Tewkesbury Borough News during which several Members indicated that they had not received a copy. The Corporate Services Manager advised that a distribution company was used for delivery and she would raise this with them following the meeting. She undertook to send a digital version to Members following the publication of each edition so they knew when to expect it and could advise her if they did not receive a hard copy. In response to a query, she explained that the next edition would be published in June which was slightly later than usual due to the Borough and Parish Elections in May; usually editions would be published in spring and November. Another Member pointed out that all Councillors would have received an email asking if they had any contributions to make to the magazine, as well as an email requesting feedback on the new format – she personally felt she had a lot of opportunity to feedback to officers and the communications had certainly been sent out to all Members.

82.4 A Member felt it would be beneficial to include a section for readers’ feedback and the Corporate Services Manager welcomed this suggestion. It was

RESOLVED That the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations arising from the Tewkesbury Borough News Review be **NOTED**.

OS.83 GRASS CUTTING IMPROVEMENT PLAN

83.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group, circulated at Pages No. 37-56, which asked the Committee to adopt the Working Group’s report and recommend to the Executive Committee that it be approved.

83.2 The Chair of the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group indicated that the Working Group had been established by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in November 2018 and had subsequently met on three occasions. The Working Group had heard from both Tewkesbury Borough Council Officers and partners from Ubico and West Oxfordshire District Council which Members had found very informative. Grass cutting had commenced within the borough over the past two to three weeks, which was remarkably early compared to the previous year, and the Working Group was confident there would be a notable improvement during the 2019 season. He thanked Officers, Members and partners for their input and hard work over a short period of time. The Head of Community Services echoed these sentiments and reiterated that a number of improvements had already been put in place and Officers had been working closely with Ubico to establish how grass cutting was carried out within Tewkesbury Borough and elsewhere. The Working Group’s report was attached at Appendix A to the report and included a number of recommendations, set out at Pages No. 45-46; with regard to recommendation two – that electronic mapping be made a corporate priority in order to enable IT to complete this work by February 2019 – he was pleased to report that this was in hand and was expected to be completed by the end of the month. In addition, the Working Group had developed several Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which, if approved, Ubico would be committed to delivering. The KPIs included a set of standards which Ubico would be monitored on and Appendix 3 of the report provided a series of photographs which gave examples of what was expected. He went on to advise that the grounds maintenance work carried out in West Oxfordshire had generated a lot of discussion and the Working Group was keen to consider a number of projects which could generate further improvement, for example, a review of equipment and how it was sourced etc. On that basis, one of the report recommendations was for a Member Group to be established following

the Borough Council Elections in May 2019 to oversee delivery of the Council's grounds maintenance service and to consider and develop a number of potential longer-term projects.

- 83.3 A Member drew attention to Page No. 42 of the report and pointed out that the date of Meeting 1 was incorrect and should read: Meeting 1 – 6 December ~~2019~~ **2018**. The Head of Community Services undertook to ensure this was corrected prior to consideration by the Executive Committee. A Member went on to raise concern that Tewkesbury Borough Council was currently subsidising grass cutting for Gloucestershire County Council and he sought an explanation of the justification for that. In response, the Head of Community Services explained that Tewkesbury Borough Council maintained certain areas of land on behalf of the County Council, mainly highway verges, and these areas were currently cut at the same frequency as the rest of the Tewkesbury Borough Council-owned land despite the County Council only paying for two cuts per year. This had been raised at the Working Group meetings where Members had been of the view that it would be detrimental to the Borough Council's reputation to stop cutting these areas at the same frequency as the public assumption would be that Tewkesbury Borough Council was responsible for maintenance. Notwithstanding this, one of the Working Group recommendations was for a small piece of land currently maintained by Tewkesbury Borough Council on behalf of Gloucestershire County Council to be identified for cutting twice yearly and monitored to understand the likely impact of reducing the number of cuts in other parts of the borough in future which would ultimately be a decision for the Executive Committee. The Chair of the Working Group reiterated that the main aim of the Working Group was to ensure that the Council did not end up in the same position as it had done the previous year in respect of grass cutting; should the report and recommendations be approved by the Executive Committee, the new Member Group would consider further cost savings and efficiencies, including the impact of reducing the frequency of cuts of County Council-owned land. In response to a query regarding a potential conflict of interest for Borough Councillors who were also Gloucestershire County Councillors, the Head of Democratic Services advised that the Council's choice to cut the County Council's grass to the same level as its own within the borough was a matter for the Council to determine and the references in the report specifically did not present those dual-hatted Members with a conflict of interest. The Chief Executive explained that Tewkesbury Borough Council had approached the County Council with regard to making up the shortfall but the County Council had made clear it would not be doing that, therefore, it was a choice for Tewkesbury Borough Council as to whether it continued to cut those areas of grass at the same frequency as its own land - to date, the view had been taken that the land within the borough should be maintained to the same standard. This information had been provided to the Working Group to note and it was not necessary for Members to debate the point at the current meeting unless that was the will of the Committee. He provided assurance that Officers would continue to work with the County Council to try to secure an increased contribution but, unfortunately, this situation was not uncommon in his experience of working at other authorities. In response to a query in relation to how this would impact on the membership of the proposed Member Group, clarification was provided that this would not preclude dual-hatted Members from sitting on that Group.
- 83.4 A Member queried whether Tewkesbury Borough Council would be required to cut additional areas of land as new housing estates came forward. The Head of Community Services confirmed that was the case and one of the report recommendations was for the level of additional land that the Council adopted to be reviewed periodically and, where appropriate, for consideration to be given to increasing the grounds maintenance budget. The Member questioned whether it was possible to specify what type of grass was used by developers - for instance, slow-growing or drought-resistant - in order to assist with maintenance and the

Head of Community Services undertook to discuss this with colleagues in the Planning department outside of the meeting.

83.5 It was subsequently,

RESOLVED That the Grass Cutting Improvement Plan Working Group Report be **ADOPTED** and **RECOMMENDED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE** for **APPROVAL**, subject to an amendment to correct a typographical error at Page No. 42 as follows: Meeting 1 – 6 December ~~2019~~ **2018**.

OS.84 TRADE WASTE

84.1 Attention was drawn to the report of the Head of Community Services, circulated at Pages No. 57-66, which set out the current position in respect of trade waste. Members were asked to consider the report and to determine monitoring arrangements of the action plan for further developing the service.

84.2 The Head of Community Services explained that the report gave a position statement on the Council's trade waste service and it was noted that it currently operated at a small deficit. There were several options for future development of the service and the action plan, attached at Appendix 2 to the report, showed how this could be achieved. Notwithstanding this, it should be borne in mind that there were limitations; whilst there was some capacity within the service to facilitate additional customers, this only equated to around three or four days per month so another vehicle would be needed if the service expanded significantly – there were options for this but there would clearly be cost implications. In the short term, it had been established that an additional 70 customers were needed for the service to break-even and a number of actions were proposed to achieve this such as a marketing campaign which included a trade waste leaflet being sent out with the National Non-Domestic Rate bills in early March. The Council's current customer base had been mapped on the system so it would be possible to identify other businesses in the vicinity which were not currently Council customers and they could then be targeted. Discussions were also taking place with partners - Ubico was coming up with a proposal for delivering a better service and Cheltenham Borough Council was keen to work closely together so both options were being explored alongside direct marketing.

84.3 A Member indicated that this report had been requested some time ago as it was quite apparent that the Council's trade waste service was not as good as it could be. He felt that it should not be too difficult to identify an additional 70 customers and considered that partnership working would be the best way forward. Another Member had noticed that Ubico was not the only provider collecting commercial waste – she had seen at least two other branded vehicles going to the same shops to make collections in her Ward – so there were certainly opportunities for the Council to enlist new customers. The Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment explained that the main difficulty was that the Council was competing against commercial organisations for custom and that would always be a problem. In his opinion, working with another local authority would be advantageous, particularly because of the rural nature of the borough which contributed to the high cost of running the service - his ideal scenario would be a county-wide trade waste service.

84.4 A Member questioned whether the Council really needed to run a trade waste service given that it was currently operating at a loss and considering the difficulties with competition for new customers. The Chief Executive felt this was a very good point and Members would be able to see from the report why trade waste had been a vexatious issue for many years. Based on Ubico's existing capacity, the service that could be provided would be limited and he confirmed that

it was currently costing the Council in the region of £31,000. Notwithstanding this, whilst there was enormous competition, the Tewkesbury Borough Council brand should not be underestimated in that it was recognised and trusted and, with greater marketing, it may be possible to increase the income level; however, there would be a ceiling on that with the limited resources available currently. It was noted that the Council did not offer trade waste recycling and this was a shortcoming of the service given that most businesses accepted they had a responsibility to recycle. If recycling was offered, it would be necessary to increase capacity and this would have to be discussed with Ubico and other local authorities. In his view, the action plan should be time-limited to enable a decision to be taken as to whether the Council could offer a sustainable, profitable trade waste service going forward or, potentially, whether that could not be achieved. Members agreed this was a sensible way forward. A Member suggested that another option would be an arrangement whereby someone else collected trade waste on behalf of the Council and the Head of Community Services undertook to include this within the action plan.

84.5 Having considered the views expressed, it was

RESOLVED

1. That the current position in respect of trade waste be **NOTED**.
2. That an additional action be added to the action plan to investigate the potential of another organisation collecting trade waste on the Council's behalf.
3. That the Committee review the progress made against the action plan at its meeting in December 2019 and make a recommendation on the long-term sustainability of a trade waste service going forward.

The meeting closed at 6:10 pm