

11 January 2016

Committee	Overview and Scrutiny
Date	Tuesday, 19 January 2016
Time of Meeting	4:30 pm
Venue	Committee Room 1

ALL MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ARE REQUESTED TO ATTEND



**for Sara J Freckleton
Borough Solicitor**

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 (staff should proceed to their usual assembly point). 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.



	Item	Page(s)
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.	
4.	MINUTES	1 - 15
	To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2015.	
5.	CONSIDERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN	16 - 20
	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.	
6.	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16	21 - 24
	To consider the forthcoming work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	
7.	SYRIAN REFUGEES MOTION	25 - 36
	To recommend to Council whether or not the Motion to work with partners across Gloucestershire to assist displaced Syrian families to settle within the county should be supported.	
8.	GLOUCESTERSHIRE JOINT WASTE COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN	37 - 46
	To consider the progress made to date in relation to the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee Action Plan.	
9.	FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT GROUP MONITORING REPORT	47 - 57
	To consider progress against the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan.	
10.	ENVIRO-CRIMES REVIEW MONITORING REPORT	58 - 61
	To consider progress against the recommendations arising from the Enviro-Crimes Review and to approve closure of the review.	
11.	DISABLED FACILITIES GRANTS REVIEW UPDATE	62 - 65
	To consider the progress of the Disabled Facilities Grants Review.	

DATE OF NEXT MEETING
TUESDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2016

COUNCILLORS CONSTITUTING COMMITTEE

Councillors: P W Awford (Chairman), Mrs G F Blackwell (Vice-Chairman), G J Bocking, K J Cromwell, Mrs J E Day, R D East, D T Foyle, Mrs R M Hatton, Mrs H C McLain, T A Spencer, Mrs 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

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 Chairman 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, 1 December 2015 commencing at 4:30 pm

Present:

Chairman

Councillor P W Awford

and Councillors:

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

also present:

Councillor R E Garnham

OS.52 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 52.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was taken as read.
- 52.2 The Chairman welcomed Councillor R E Garnham, the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel, to the meeting and indicated that he would be providing an update on the last meeting of the Panel at Agenda Item 8.

OS.53 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

- 53.1 Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mrs G F Blackwell (Vice-Chairman) and M G Sztymiak. There were no substitutions for the meeting.

OS.54 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 54.1 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.

54.2 The following declaration was made:

Councillor	Application No./Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
P W Awford	Item 9 – Performance Management – Quarter 2 2015/16	Is a non-pecuniary member of the National Flood Forum. Is a Borough Council representative on the Lower Severn (2005) Internal Drainage Board. Is a representative on the Severn and Wye Regional Flood and Coastal Committee and on the Wessex Regional Flood and Coastal Committee.	Would speak and vote.
Mrs P E Stokes	Item 7 – Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee Update.	Is a member of Healthwatch.	Would speak and vote.

54.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

OS.55 MINUTES

55.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2015, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

OS.56 CONSIDERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

56.1 Attention was drawn to the Executive Committee Forward Plan, circulated at Pages No. 13-15. 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.

56.2 It was noted that the Customer Services Strategy was due to be considered at the Executive Committee meeting on 13 January 2016, however, it had been suggested that it would be more appropriate for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to review the strategy first in order for its feedback to be taken into account by the Executive Committee. The Communications and Policy Manager advised that an Overview and Scrutiny Committee workshop to review the strategy was being arranged for early January and it was intended to include an item on the Agenda for the next available Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting to discuss the findings; this was likely to be the meeting on 23 February 2016. On that basis the Executive Committee would consider the Customer Services Strategy at its meeting on 6 April 2016 and the Forward Plan would be updated accordingly.

56.3 A Member sought clarification as to whether the item in respect of Cemetery Provision, due to be considered at the meeting on 13 January 2016, related to Tewkesbury Town or Tewkesbury Borough. In response, the Finance and Asset Management Group Manager confirmed that it related to provision within Tewkesbury Town.

56.4 It was

RESOLVED That the Executive Committee Forward Plan be **NOTED** subject to an amendment to show that the Customer Services Strategy would be considered at the meeting on 6 April 2016 as opposed to 13 January 2016.

OS.57 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16

57.1 Attention was drawn to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2015/16, circulated at Pages No. 16-17, which Members were asked to consider.

57.2 The Chief Executive indicated that the Annual Waste & Recycling Action Plan 2015/16 had been due to be considered by the Committee at the current meeting, however, it would now be incorporated into the Joint Waste Partnership Action Plan which would be included as an Agenda item for the meeting on 19 January 2016. A Member queried whether it would be possible to amend the Work Programme so that it was easy to see when items had been removed or delayed and the Democratic Services Group Manager undertook to ensure that the format of the Work Programme was revised on that basis.

57.3 The Chairman queried whether it was necessary to include an item to discuss the progress of the Joint Core Strategy. The Chief Executive explained that a full update had been provided to the Executive Committee at its meeting the previous week and a range of actions had been agreed in order to expedite the examination process. He felt that this was all that could be done at the present time. A Member queried if the other Joint Core Strategy authorities had a view on the current situation and was advised that this had been discussed at the Joint Core Strategy Member Steering Group which had been held the previous day. The meeting had demonstrated that the other authorities were equally concerned about the lack of progress being made and it was thought that they would support Tewkesbury Borough Council in the actions proposed by the Executive Committee.

57.4 It was

RESOLVED

1. That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2015/16 be **NOTED**.
2. That the format of the Work Programme be revised to show more clearly when items had been removed or delayed.

OS.58 GLOUCESTERSHIRE HEALTH AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE

58.1 Members received an update from Councillor Mrs J E Day, the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee, on matters discussed at the last meeting of the Committee held on 3 November 2015.

- 58.2 Councillor Day advised that the Care Quality Commission Inspection Report had been presented to the Committee and had indicated that the overall rating for the Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust was 'requires improvement'. Whilst the Committee had recognised the importance for the people of Gloucestershire to be aware of how their health and social services were rated by the Care Quality Commission, it was also important to be clear that it had been recognised that it was a very caring organisation with staff who treated people with kindness, dignity and respect, and who were consistently exceptional at the community hospitals. The Committee Members hoped that staff morale was not adversely affected by the overall rating.
- 58.3 The Committee had welcomed the Head of Operations from the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust to the meeting to inform Members of progress since the implementation of the Out of Hours Service on 1 April 2015. It was clear that it had been a challenging time for the service, particularly regarding the staffing of the Primary Care Centres which had been closed on occasions during the period. The target for the service was that people should not have to travel more than 30 minutes but analysis had shown that the closures had resulted in 15 people having an extended journey. The Committee had been informed that ensuring that the Primary Care Centres in the main urban areas of Gloucester and Cheltenham were fully staffed was a priority. As the service was not meeting the National Quality Requirements, and given the Committee's concerns regarding the delivery of this service, it had been agreed that the Committee would receive a further update in six months.
- 58.4 It had been positive to hear that the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust was in discussion with the Council's Chief Fire Officer to identify options for joint working in Gloucestershire. The Trust was also funding the training of 30 Emergency Care Assistants to become paramedics; the cohort was due to qualify in 2016 and would be followed by another 30. The Committee was informed that 50% of the new paramedics would be based in Gloucestershire. The Trust had also been selected by the Department of Health to pilot a new way for ambulance services to respond to 999 calls – Dispatch on Disposition. This pilot had proved successful and was now being extended to other ambulance services. It was also pleasing to note that the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust was the best performing English ambulance trust for 999 calls resolved over the telephone and for the percentage of patients cared for through alternative healthcare pathways, avoiding unnecessary admissions to hospital emergency departments. The Committee had raised concern about the poor response times in the rural areas, but it was important to acknowledge that the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust was performing well overall against its targets. Going forward it would be interesting to see whether the increase in the number of paramedics and the work with Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service made a real difference on the ground.
- 58.5 The Chairman thanked the Council's representative for her presentation and indicated that the update would be circulated to Members via email following the meeting. It was

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

OS.59 GLOUCESTERSHIRE POLICE AND CRIME PANEL UPDATE

- 59.1 Members received an update from Councillor R E Garnham, the Council's representative on the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel, on matters discussed at the last meeting of the Panel held on 5 November 2015.
- 59.2 Councillor Garnham advised that the meeting had opened with a tribute being paid to Graham Robinson, a former Independent Member of the Panel, who had recently passed away. The main Agenda items had been an extended Chief Executive's report and the Police and Crime Plan Highlight Report which the Panel had requested be provided by the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- 59.3 The Chief Executive's report had focused on two recent Constabulary Inspections that had been undertaken by Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary (HMIC) and Her Majesty's Inspection of Prisons (HMIP). The first report had covered efficiency and had given the Constabulary an overall rating of 'good' and stated that the force was "very well prepared to face its future financial challenges". The Constabulary had also been commended for producing a balanced budget and for having a "good understanding of the likely financial position through to 2018/19". The second inspection was a joint inspection of the new Custody Centre at Waterwells by HMIC and HMIP. The main item reported was that the Police and Crime Commissioner, and the Police Chief Officer Group, should work with Gloucestershire County Council and youth services to ensure that young people were not unnecessarily detained in Police cells. One Member had noted that there were 74 instances of Police cells being used as a 'place of safety' for people detained under the Mental Health Act. Additional work had followed on this matter since the Police and Crime Panel meeting and both Councillor Garnham and Councillor Ian Dobie, Chairman of Health Scrutiny at Gloucestershire County Council, had visited the Custody Suite on 26 November which had prompted further work. The Chief Executive's report had continued to discuss consultation on greater co-operation between 'blue light' services and also the arrangements for the Police and Crime Commissioner elections in May 2016. The Chief Executive had highlighted that the Police and Crime Commissioner's office must conduct its business in relation to the election with complete fairness and transparency, whilst still continuing to support the Commissioner in his normal role.
- 59.4 The Panel had welcomed the Police and Crime Plan Priorities Quarterly Highlight Report which was 31 pages long but gave scope for many questions to be asked regarding current performance. There were two questions of particular interest, the first of which related to how the Commissioner satisfied himself with regards to outcomes from the projects and details had subsequently been provided about the arrangements in place, for instance, a funding panel that looked at the bids and evaluated them against criteria that included relevance to the plan, value for money and sustainability etc. The second question had related to the increase in the abandoned call rate in relation to 101 calls. The Panel had been informed that there had been some technical issues with the ICT system which had led to some calls being lost but there would be ongoing work to improve the service.
- 59.5 The Panel had also received a more comprehensive financial report, compared to previous Panel meetings, which showed that revenue account was forecasting an underspend of £0.092M; reserves were forecast to be at £22.794M at 31 March 2016; and the capital programme had a forecast spend of £7.237M in the current financial year. At present there remained £8M of uncommitted reserves in the revenue support reserve fund and £6.187M in the general reserve. The Panel had noted that the Police and Crime Commissioner had been consulting on a possible 2% precept increase for the 2016/17 budget on the basis of cuts of between 25% and 45%.

- 59.6 A presentation had been received from Phil Sullivan, the Police and Crime Commissioner's Lead on the 'Older but not Overlooked' priority. The report had covered rural isolation, fear of crime, Police Community Support Officers, and the use of Village Agents, amongst other matters. He had also highlighted how funding from the Police and Crime Commissioner's office could often be match funded under this particular priority. It was noted that the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel would be held on 18 January 2016 and would be an additional meeting to consider any early papers regarding budget setting in February.
- 59.7 A Member understood that the Police and Crime Commissioner had committed to protect funding for the Police. In response, Councillor Garnham explained that, whilst funding was being protected, the Police and Crime Commissioner had indicated that it would be necessary to increase the precept by 2% in order to guarantee a standstill position. Another Member had heard a radio report regarding the precept during which the interviewer had stated that a 2% increase would be enough to employ an additional 20 Police Officers; he queried whether that was where the money was intended to be spent. Although he did not know for sure, Councillor Garnham advised that it was unlikely to be that straightforward as there were a number of other demands.
- 59.8 A Member questioned what advice should be given to people who called the 101 number but were subsequently 'lost in the system' and Councillor Garnham advised that, if it was an emergency, they should ring 999. He tended to test out the 101 system if he needed to contact a Police Officer and encouraged other Members to do the same. A Member indicated that she had used the 101 service recently and had found it to be very efficient. The Chief Executive took the opportunity to remind Members that an email had recently been circulated to Members via Democratic Services providing an operational telephone number for the Police; he stressed that this was not for use by members of the public but Members could use it during office hours if they needed to contact the Police.
- 59.9 A Member stated that there were community safety related schemes in Tewkesbury Borough that had received funding from the Police and Crime Commissioner's fund which had been granted over a three year period running until 2017. As such, he questioned what would happen to the funding that had already been pledged should the Police and Crime Commissioner change as a result of the May elections. The Council's representative understood that the intention was that those items would continue to be funded but he undertook to seek a response from the Police and Crime Commissioner's office.
- 59.10 The Chairman thanked the Council's representative for his presentation and indicated that the update would be circulated to Members via email following the meeting. It was

RESOLVED That the feedback from the last meeting of the Gloucestershire Police and Crime Panel be **NOTED**.

OS.60 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT - QUARTER 2 2015/16

- 60.1 The report of the Corporate Services Group Manager, circulated at Pages No. 18-71, attached performance management information for quarter 2 of 2015/16. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee was asked to review and scrutinise performance information and, where appropriate, identify any issues to refer to the Executive Committee for clarification or further action to be taken.

60.2 The performance management report comprised the Council Plan Performance Tracker, the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) set, the Revenue Budget Summary Statement, the Capital Monitoring Statement and the Reserves Position Summary. With regard to the Performance Tracker, attached at Appendix 1, Members were informed that the majority of actions were progressing well and Paragraph 2.3 of the report highlighted a number of achievements since the last update including: establishing an internal project team to review how the Council dealt with complaints; the start of work on the Riverside Walk; review of waste and recycling collection linked to the fleet procurement project; and the new leisure centre build remaining ahead of schedule with a successful open day held for over 100 members of the public. In terms of those actions which were not going as well as planned, Members were informed that they were all areas which had been flagged in quarter 1.

60.3 Members raised the following queries in respect of the Performance Tracker:

Priority: Use Resources Effectively and Efficiently

P27 – Objective 1 – Action b
i) £ saved in accordance with corporate savings programme target – A Member noted that there had been an increase in the overpayment of housing benefit and he questioned how frequently that happened.

The Finance and Asset Management Group Manager advised that overpayments were made to claimants every year, mainly due to claimant error e.g. failure to notify of change of circumstances. As a result of the systems review of the service, and the introduction of real-time information from the Department of Work and Pensions, these instances were being picked up more quickly than they had been in previous years which would lead to an improvement in the longer term.

The Member questioned whether it was difficult to get the money paid back and he was informed that, whilst the majority of money was recovered, the main problem was the length of time it took. The people who tended to be affected did not necessarily have a great deal of money in the first place and there were rules about the amount which could be taken each week in terms of benefit recovery. Whilst the Council was doing more to recover greater amounts, and very little was written off, it did tend to come in over a longer period. It was easier to recover smaller amounts than one which had been allowed to grow so it was hoped that this would continue to improve over time.

P28 – Objective 2 – Action a)
Rationalise office accommodation through new ways of working and to increase rental income – A Member raised concern that the top floor of the Council Offices building remained vacant and he felt that it would be preferable to rent it in order to generate income.

The Chief Executive highlighted the importance of finding the right client which would add to the public sector service centre being created within the Council Offices building. Discussions were ongoing with a number of agencies and the outcomes would be reported back to Members in due course. Officers were currently working with Gloucestershire County Council with a view to sharing a legal service, subject to the business case which was currently being worked up. If it was successful, the One Legal department would triple in size and it would be necessary to find appropriate accommodation for the additional staff which would be based at the Council Offices in accordance with the business case; the top floor and the ground floor of the Council Offices building were both potential options. He understood Members' concerns regarding loss of income and provided assurance that provisions were being made in the budget for next year.

P29 – Objective 3 – Action b)
Improve complaints handling, including learning from complaints received to improve service delivery – It was noted that Members had received an email the previous week which the Deputy Chief Executive had advised Members she would be responding to on their behalf and he sought clarification on the situation.

The Deputy Chief Executive advised that a Freedom of Information request had been emailed to all Councillors and Members had been advised that they did not need to respond as Officers would be responding on behalf of the Council. The Chief Executive highlighted the importance of providing a co-ordinated response but assured Members that they would be advised if there were any particular issues that needed to be brought to their attention in such circumstances. The Chief Executive confirmed that Members would be informed if Officers were intending to issue a response on behalf of the Council and they would be copied into responses when appropriate.

Priority: Improve Recycling and Care for the Environment

P36 – Objective 2 – Action a) Promote waste minimisation and aspire to increase our recycling rate through working with our residents and communities on promotional campaigns – A Member noted that waste to landfill had increased and he questioned how this was being tackled.

The Deputy Chief Executive explained that recyclate was becoming increasingly contaminated which could cause problems when it reached the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF); there had been instances where material could not be recycled due to the level of contamination. Needles were a particular problem and Officers were working with a number of partners, including registered social landlords and Turning Point, an alcohol and drug misuse service, to identify problem areas and to make improvements. She confirmed that all recyclate was currently going into the MRF as normal.

In terms of trying to encourage people to recycle, stickers had been used on residual waste bins where people were not putting out a food waste caddy for collection and there had been a 20% increase in food waste recycling as a result. The Joint Waste Team would be discussing further initiatives at its next meeting, including some of the methods featured on the recent BBC programme presented by Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall. A Member indicated that he had done some research into the recycling rates of neighbouring local authorities and he felt that Tewkesbury Borough Council was performing well in comparison.

P40 – Objective 5 – Action a) Work with areas prone to flooding to build community resilience – The Chairman indicated that he had received a request from a resident of Tirley asking for several questions to be raised at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding the work being carried out to attenuate flooding in the area and he questioned how this should be addressed.

The Chief Executive indicated that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was not a decision-making body, it was a scrutiny and review body, and therefore responding to public questions on decisions of the authority was outside of its remit and rested with the Executive Committee and Council where decisions on policy, practice and procedure were made. The questions were in relation to an operational matter which would normally warrant an Officer response; however, Officers had not yet had sight of the questions and therefore would not be in a position to respond at the present meeting. On that basis, he felt that the most appropriate way forward would be to refer the questions to the relevant Officers and to take a response to the Flood Risk Management Group meeting on Monday 14 December for Members to consider.

Priority: Provide Customer Focused Community Support

- P43 – Objective 3 – Action a) Agree approach and programme of work for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – A Member sought an update on the progress of the CIL.
- The Deputy Chief Executive explained that the Council had been working on a CIL with its Joint Core Strategy partners as there would be implications for cross-boundary sites. A Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule had been out to consultation in the summer to ask for comments on the suggested charges. It was very important to get the balance right otherwise CIL would become unviable; if the charges were set too high, developers would not be able to afford to build, and if charges were too low, development would become unsustainable. Members were informed that 30 responses had been received from developers and the next big step would be to decide whether to charge for strategic allocations; there was now a question mark over whether CIL was the best mechanism for obtaining contributions for strategic sites and the infrastructure which would be required within them. In terms of delivery, until the outcome of the JCS Examination was known, it was very difficult to make any decisions in relation to CIL charges. The Deputy Chief Executive was hopeful that the report in December would give a clear direction for Officers to move on to the next stage of consultation in respect of the CIL.
- P48 – Objective 5 – Action b) Progress the work streams for a new leisure facility – A Member noted that an open day had been held for members of the public and he asked if Members would have the opportunity to visit the new leisure centre.
- The Finance and Asset Management Group Manager indicated that the leisure centre was progressing all the time and he undertook to arrange a Member tour in the New Year to which Parish Councils could also be invited.

Priority: Develop Housing Relevant To Local Housing Needs

- P50 – Objective 2 – Action b) To deliver a programme of affordable homes in partnership with Parish Councils, developers and registered providers to meet the needs of clients in rural communities – A Member indicated that his local Parish Council was very upset as the work which had been done on the Shurdington site had been brought to a standstill.
- The Deputy Chief Executive recognised that a lot of good work had been done on the Shurdington garage sites which had been temporarily suspended in order to carry out a review of assets to see if there was any potential to combine certain sites in order to direct development more efficiently. It was anticipated that the work on the garage sites would restart quite quickly.

- 60.4 Attention was drawn to the KPIs, attached in full at Appendix 2 to the report, and Members were informed that the status of each indicator was set out at Paragraphs 3.1-3.2 of the report. Key areas of interest included KPI 7 which showed a significant decrease in the number of homeless applications compared to quarter 2 in 2014/15; KPI 11 which showed that the average number of sick days taken had dropped significantly compared to the previous year; KPIs 12-14 which related to planning processing times and confirmed that all three targets were unlikely to be achieved by the end of the year and processing times were down compared to the previous year; KPIs 15 and 16 which demonstrated that processing times for benefit applications were the best ever and continued to improve; and KPI 30 which set out that 40 new build affordable homes had been delivered during the quarter which was a continued improvement in the total number delivered.
- 60.5 During the debate which ensued, Members raised the following queries in relation to the KPIs:
- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>P55 – KPI No. 7 – Total number of homeless applications accepted – A Member felt that the hard work which had been done in this area should be noted.</p> | <p>The Housing Services Manager reiterated that a lot of hard work had been done to increase homeless prevention activities and she undertook to pass this comment on to the team.</p> |
| <p>P56 – KPI No. 11 – Average number of sick days per full time equivalent – A Member was delighted to note the improvement in relation to sickness absence.</p> | <p>The Chief Executive indicated that he was also very pleased to see that the sickness absence levels had reduced. This was an area which was carefully monitored and the Corporate Leadership Team did try to address any issues which could give rise to stress e.g. increased workloads. It was noted that the Agenda for the Council meeting on 8 December included an item on the review of the Development Management Team staffing structure which it was hoped would address the problems with resources in that area. The Chairman indicated that Planning was an area which the Committee may wish to look at, in light of the concerns which had been raised by Members in recent months, however, he felt that it would be inappropriate to do so before the actions arising from the review had been implemented.</p> |
- 60.6 The Financial Budget Summary for quarter 2 showed a small surplus of £20,236 against the budgeted profile. Page No. 23, Paragraph 4.2, set out the summary of the Council's position split into the main types of expenditure. Savings had been made in relation to staffing costs, transport and premises and £302,000 additional income had been generated above budget projection via housing benefit payments and income from Planning, One Legal and garden waste. Treasury management continued to show an under-recovery against budget and was still impacted by the limited available cash balances as a result of the Virgin Media refund and the cost of the leisure centre. In terms of the overall budget position for Group Managers, there was an underspend of £292,000 and a summary position for each Group Manager was set out at Appendix 3 to the report. In response to a query regarding the £50,163 overspend on supplies and services, the Finance and Asset Management Group Manager advised that this related to disbursements i.e.

additional work undertaken by One Legal in the first six months of the year. These additional costs were being recovered through income as costs were recharged to the various clients.

60.7 The capital budget position for quarter 2 was set out at Appendix 4 to the report and Members were asked to note the figures in relation to the leisure centre build which was ahead of schedule but within budget. Members were informed that work on the Riverside Walk had commenced in November and that would be reflected in the figures for quarter 3, as would recovery of the Repair and Renew grant funding from the Government. Appendix 5 contained a summary of the current usage of available reserves.

60.8 In response, the Finance and Asset Management Group Manager indicated that there would be consultation in the New Year as to the future of the New Homes Bonus as there was a proposal from the Government to use some of the current allocation to support health expenditure at an upper tier level. Any reduction in New Homes Bonus would affect the Council's position and this would be reflected in its consultation response. In relation to a query regarding the Virgin Media revaluation, Members were informed that valuations were carried out by the Valuation Office Agency; the Council had no input into valuation and no right of appeal, although it did have a financial interest under the new scheme introduced in 2013. A Member questioned whether an assessment had been made as to how many other companies were likely to appeal and the Finance and Asset Management Group Manager indicated that an assessment was carried out on a monthly basis and an estimate was made on the basis of business type, success rate etc. It was worth noting that a 21% provision had been estimated in relation to Virgin Media, however, it had actually been over 40%. The Chief Executive reminded Members that a decision had been taken not to enter into the Gloucestershire business rates pool next year due to the outstanding risk of the Virgin Media account. By not being included, the Government would pick up the safety net payment as opposed to the members of the pool.

60.9 Having considered the information provided, it was

RESOLVED That the performance management information for Quarter 2 2015/16 be **NOTED**.

OS.61 PEER CHALLENGE ACTION PLAN MONITORING REPORT

61.1 Attention was drawn to the Peer Challenge Action Plan Monitoring Report, set out at Pages No. 72-101, which outlined the progress made in delivering the recommendations within the Peer Challenge Action Plan. Members were asked to consider the report.

61.2 Members were advised that the Council's peer challenge had taken place during November 2014 and the process had been an excellent learning opportunity for the Council, providing an external health check of the Council's position and how it was set up to meet its future challenges. Following the challenge, a formal report had been received, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, which summarised the findings of the challenge team. The report included a number of recommendations for further improvement and the Council had approved an action plan to progress these recommendations on 19 February 2015. The action plan and a summary of progress in delivering the recommendations was set out at Appendix 2 to the report. This confirmed that all of the actions were being progressed, the majority via the ongoing work around the development of the new Council Plan. The intention was to make the Council as effective as possible, and to ensure that there was adequate training in place, and work would be ongoing.

61.3 In terms of training, the Chairman indicated that he had recently attended some speed reading training in his role as a Gloucestershire County Councillor which he had found very useful and he suggested that it might be something which other Councillors would also benefit from. The Democratic Services Group Manager indicated that she was aware of the training and was looking to organise something for Borough Councillors in the New Year.

61.4 It was

RESOLVED That the progress made in delivering the recommendations within the Peer Challenge Action Plan be **NOTED**.

OS.62 HOUSING, RENEWAL AND HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY REVIEW MONITORING REPORT

62.1 The report of the Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager, circulated at Pages No. 102-128, set out the achievements to date in respect of the outcomes identified in the Housing, Renewal and Homelessness Strategy 2012-16 Action Plan. Members were asked to consider the report.

62.2 The Housing Services Manager explained that the Homelessness Act 2002 and the Local Government Act 2003 required all Councils to develop a strategy that set out their policies, commitments and programme for a wide range of housing matters. The Housing, Renewal and Homelessness Strategy 2012-16 was developed by an Overview and Scrutiny Working Group and adopted by the Council in September 2012. In terms of the key activities that had been achieved over the last 12 months, 145 new build homes had been completed with a mix of property types and tenures, of which 24% had been developed to the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 of higher efficiency standards, or equivalent standard; all other homes had met the minimum requirement of Level 3 which was now Building Regulations standard for all homes. A total of 13 affordable properties had been delivered using the cross-subsidy model in Winchcombe and Badgeworth and two rural exception developments were in the planning system for the Parishes of Minsterworth and Sandhurst, both of which would achieve new affordable housing as well as market housing for families and smaller accommodation for downsizers.

62.3 Members were informed that 132 disabled facilities grants had been completed between April 2014 and March 2015 at a value of £772,410. Partnership working across all six Gloucestershire Districts continued to facilitate solutions to health improvements, crime reduction and housing matters. Applications for social housing were banded according to housing need and a total of 424 properties had been let in the Borough in the financial year; the majority of households, 39%, were in silver band, with 36% in gold band, 23% in bronze and 2% in emergency band. A greater emphasis had been placed on homelessness prevention in line with the Government's 'Gold Standard' to enable those threatened with homelessness to avoid homeless crisis by staying in their existing home, where reasonable and affordable, and to move to a property of their choice in the private rented sector without the need for costly emergency accommodation. Following the presentation to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding the redeployment of financial housing options, Officers had successfully assisted the first applicants with deposits to move to alternative accommodation in areas where they wanted to live near to existing support i.e. families and schools. Three family households had been assisted with small deposits of £450-700 to move into private rented accommodation within the Borough, alleviating pressure on social housing in the area.

62.4 Members were informed that the six District Councils in Gloucestershire, together with the Police and Crime Commissioner, had piloted a 12 month sanctuary scheme in 2014 to offer target hardening and sanctuary room measures to residents wanting to remain in their homes but who were at risk of domestic violence. The pilot had been very successful and the scheme had subsequently been extended until March 2017. Seven households within Tewkesbury Borough had accessed assistance through the scheme during the pilot year and all continued to remain in their homes. All seven properties had received target hardening measures e.g. lock changes and minor adaptations, funded by the Police and Crime Commissioner. No households had required sanctuary measures which would have been part funded by Tewkesbury Borough Council. It was noted that all of those who benefited were female households; one household had declined assistance. A joint bid from the six District Councils in Gloucestershire to the Department for Communities and Local Government had recently been successful in securing £500,000 for 'places of safety' to provide self-contained emergency accommodation for those fleeing domestic abuse. 12 properties would be made available for that purpose across the County; Severn Vale Housing Society had agreed to provide two properties within Tewkesbury Borough and it was hoped that the first would be available later that month. A Member queried whether 12 properties was enough to accommodate all those fleeing from domestic violence and the Housing Services Manager indicated that, whilst two properties would be enough for Tewkesbury Borough, urban areas such as Gloucester were likely to require more and, as the properties were being shared across Districts, 12 properties would probably not be sufficient overall.

62.5 A Member raised concern regarding figures for rough sleepers and whether they took account of "sofa surfers" which, in her experience, were often younger people aged 16-24. The Housing Services Manager clarified that the rough sleeper statistics reflected only those people who were sleeping outside. She provided assurance that Officers worked closely with vulnerable young people from an early stage and she was not aware of anyone currently sofa surfing in Tewkesbury.

62.6 Having considered the information provided, it was

RESOLVED That the achievements to date in respect of the outcomes identified in the Housing, Renewal and Homelessness Strategy 2012-16 Action Plan be **NOTED**.

OS.63 UPDATE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM STRATEGY REVIEW

63.1 Attention was drawn to the update on the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy Review, circulated at Pages No. 129-135, which Members were asked to consider.

63.2 The Economic and Community Development Manager advised that the current Economic Development and Tourism Strategy 'Regenerating and Growing the Economy' was now at the end of its life and an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Working Group had been established to develop a new strategy. Councillor R A Bird had been elected as the Chairman for the Working Group and there had been one meeting to date. The purpose of the Working Group was to review current work; set priorities for the future; agree a time period for the strategy; and allocate required resources. It was noted that the work would include a review of the current Small Business Grant Scheme. Members had been made aware of the current landscape for economic development and tourism and, following discussions, the Working Group had agreed that growth was a key component to a new strategy and suggested an emerging vision "For Tewkesbury Borough to be

the engine that delivers growth in Gloucestershire”. Other key points, particularly in respect of tourism, included the need to support and make the most of larger attractions; utilise external funding opportunities for tourism attractions; and effective promotion of the area including associating with the Cotswold Tourism brand. There had been a discussion around how best to support the town centre and the need to look at infrastructure requirements around growth e.g. J9 and J10 of the M5 and the need to link with the work of the J9 Area Member Reference Panel. It was recognised that the emerging strategy should align with the Council Plan progress to ensure that they complemented one another; it was understood that economic development and growth would be a major focus within the new Council Plan. In terms of timeframe, it was agreed that the strategy itself should have a lifespan of five years but that the work would actually go way beyond that.

- 63.3 The next meeting of the Working Group would focus on four main topics: ensuring the vision aligned with the J9 Area Member Reference Panel; providing information on economic data/employment sectors; discussing funding opportunities; and a presentation from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), with particular focus on how the Council could best work with the LEP. In response to a query regarding timescale, the Economic and Community Development Manager indicated that it had originally been intended to have the second meeting before Christmas, however, it had not been possible to find a suitable date. On that basis, it was likely that the next meeting would now be held in January, subject to the availability of a representative from the LEP.
- 63.4 In response to a Member question regarding the employment growth in Gloucestershire, the Chief Executive explained that broadband provision for homes, and particularly businesses, would be a crucial consideration for many people thinking about relocating to the area. Work was ongoing with Government and internet providers regarding provision within the area and he suggested that this should be referenced in the strategy as it would become increasingly important. He advised that that the IT department of one of London’s teaching hospitals had recently relocated to Cornwall to make more effective use of space in the capital and this was something which should be taken into consideration in terms of the development of the Borough. The Economic and Community Development Manager indicated that there was currently a scheme in place for businesses that were struggling with their broadband provision and he encouraged Members to put them in touch with Officers if they were aware of any as there was a possibility of funding.
- 63.5 The Chairman noted that four of the six motorway junctions in Gloucestershire were within Tewkesbury Borough and the potential for employment growth was tremendous. He felt that the review of the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy was a crucial piece of work and it would be up to the Council to drive economic development for the success of the Borough. It was subsequently
- RESOLVED** That the update on the Economic Development and Tourism Strategy Review be **NOTED**.

The meeting closed at 6:30 pm

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

JANUARY 2016 TO JUNE 2016 (No Meeting in March/May)

REGULAR ITEM:

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

Addition to 13 January 2016

- Grant to Alderton.
- Procurement of Energy.
- Place Programme.
- Contract Procedure Rules.

Committee Date: 3 February 2016 (Note New Meeting Date)

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Budget 2016/17 including Treasury Management Strategy (Annual).	To recommend a budget for 2016/17 to Council.	Simon Dix, Finance and Asset Management Group Manager.	Yes – deferred from 13 January 2016.
Waste Review & Vehicle Procurement.	To consider the Waste Review & Vehicle Procurement and make a recommendation to Council.	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager.	Yes – deferred from 13 January 2016.
Land at Canterbury Leys, Tewkesbury.	To accept the surrender of leased land at Canterbury Leys, Tewkesbury.	Simon Dix, Finance and Asset Management Group Manager.	No.
Property Purchase.	To consider the purchase of property for investment purposes.	Simon Dix, Finance and Asset Management Group Manager.	No.
Transfer of Land at The Hangings, Tewkesbury.	To approve the transfer of land at The Hangings, Tewkesbury to Tewkesbury Town Council.	Simon Dix, Finance and Asset Management Group Manager.	No.

10

Agenda Item 5

Committee Date: 3 February 2016 (Note New Meeting Date)			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy.	To consider a request for an increased budget allocation to complete delivery of the JCS examination and its adoption.	Julie Wood, Development Services Group Manager.	No.

Committee Date: 6 April 2016			
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 2015/16.	To receive and respond to the findings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's review of the quarter three performance management information.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.
Flood Risk Management Group Terms of Reference and Action Plan (Annual Review).	To undertake an annual review of the Terms of Reference of the Flood Risk Management Group and action plan.	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager.	No.
Council Plan Update (Annual).	To recommend to Council.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.
High Level Service Plan Summaries (Annual).	To consider the key activities of each service grouping during 2016/17.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.
Policy for Localism Agenda on Revenues and Benefits.	To consider a new discretionary relief for Business rates under the Localism Agenda.	Richard Horton, Revenues and Benefits Group Manager.	No.
Cemetery Provision in Tewkesbury.	To review the options for the provision of cemetery facilities within Tewkesbury.	Simon Dix, Finance and Asset Management Group Manager.	Yes – deferred from 13 January 2016.

Committee Date: 6 April 2016			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Customer Services Strategy.	To approve a Strategy that will set out how the Council will provide a high quality customer service so we serve our customers in an open, inclusive and efficient manner.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	Yes - deferred from 13 January 2016 Meeting to allow for an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Review.
Revisions to the Redundancy and Redeployment Policy.	To approve amendments to the Redundancy and Redeployment Policy.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	Yes - deferred from 13 January 2016.

Committee Date: June 2016			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Appointment of Portfolio Holders and Support Members (Annual).	To approve the Portfolio Holders and Support Members for the forthcoming Municipal Year.	Lin O'Brien, Democratic Services Group Manager.	No.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16

REGULAR ITEM:

- **Executive Committee Forward Plan**
- **Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2015/16**

Addition to 19 January 2016

- Syrian Refugee Motion – Referred by Council.
- Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee Action Plan – supersedes the Annual Waste and Recycling Plan due to be considered at the meeting on 1 December 2015.

Deletion from 19 January 2016

- Health and Wellbeing Strategy Monitoring Report – Moved to 12 April 2016

Committee Date: 23 February 2016

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Citizens' Advice Bureau Presentation	Annual presentation – to ensure that the work carried out within the Borough provides value for money.	Julie Wood, Development Services Group Manager	No.
Performance Management – Quarter – Quarter 3 2015/16	Quarterly report – to review and scrutinise the performance management information and, where appropriate, to require response or action from the Executive Committee.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.
Environment Management Action Plan	To consider the Environment Management Action Plan which includes details of climate change, as requested by the Committee at its meeting on 20 October 2015.	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager.	No.

21

Agenda Item 6

NB Changes since the last meeting highlighted in bold.

Committee Date: 23 February 2016

Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Review of the Effectiveness of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee	To consider an action plan arising from a proposed Review of Effectiveness workshop.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.
Review of Customer Services Strategy.	To consider the findings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee workshop held on 11 January and to provide feedback to the Executive Committee.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.
Disabled Facilities Grants Review Report	To adopt the Disabled Facilities Grants Review Report and to refer it for consideration by the Executive Committee at its meeting on 6 April 2016.	David Steels, Environmental Health Manager.	No.
Annual Review of the Effectiveness of the Council's Involvement in the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee	To consider whether to authorise payment of the Council's contribution to the running costs for the forthcoming year.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.

Committee Date: 12 April 2016			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Revenues and Benefits Improvement Project	To consider - 12 month update on improvements made as a result of the systems thinking review in Revenues and Benefits, as requested by the Committee at the meeting on 7 April 2015.	Richard Horton, Revenues and Benefits Group Manager.	No.
Scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership	To consider - six month update.	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager.	No.
Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2016/17	To approve the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme for the forthcoming year.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.
Annual Overview and Scrutiny Report 2015/16	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.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.
Complaints Report	To consider - six month update.	Graeme Simpson, Corporate Services Group Manager.	No.

NB Changes since the last meeting highlighted in bold.

Committee Date: 12 April 2016			
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer	Has agenda item previously been deferred? Details and date of deferment required
Gloucestershire Families First Update	To consider - six month update.	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager.	No.
Review of Ubico	To consider - 12 month update following the transfer of waste services in April 2014, as requested by the Committee at its meeting on 7 April 2015.	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager.	No.
Flood Risk Management Group Monitoring Report and Terms of Reference	Quarterly monitoring report and approval of Terms of Reference and action plan for 2016/17 for referral to the Executive Committee.	David Steels, Environmental Health Manager.	No.
Health and Wellbeing Strategy Monitoring Report	To consider progress against the action plan.	Andy Sanders, Economic and Community Development Manager.	Yes – Moved from 19 January 2016 on the basis that the current Strategy comes to an end in March 2016.

PENDING ITEMS		
Agenda Item	Overview of Agenda Item	Lead Officer
Healthwise Gloucestershire Presentation	Requested following the Gloucestershire Health and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee Update on 20 October 2015.	

NB Changes since the last meeting highlighted in bold.

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	19 January 2016
Subject:	Syrian Refuges Motion
Report of:	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager
Corporate Lead:	Rachel North, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Cllr R E Allen, Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing
Number of Appendices:	1

<p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>Following referral of a Notice of Motion from the Council Meeting on 8 December 2015, asking the Council to help coordinate and support limited numbers of displaced Syrian families to settle within Gloucestershire, this report provides factual information on the potential impact on Gloucestershire and Tewkesbury Borough.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>To RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL whether or not the Motion to work with partners across Gloucestershire to assist displaced Syrian families to settle within the county should be supported.</p>
<p>Reasons for Recommendation:</p> <p>The Council, at its meeting on 8 December 2015, asked the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider, in more detail, the potential impact/implications of the resettlement of Syrian refugees on the Borough and to advise the Council whether to support the Motion based on this information and the role expected of the Borough Council as a non-stock holding authority.</p>

<p>Resource Implications:</p> <p>Funding is to be provided by the Home Office.</p>
<p>Legal Implications:</p> <p>No legal implications arising as a result of this report</p>
<p>Risk Management Implications:</p> <p>The resettlement process will be carefully monitored to ensure that Gloucestershire plays its part in the resettlement process in a fair and equitable manner both to the refugees and the residents of the Borough.</p>

Performance Management Follow-up:

Monitoring and update reports will be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Environmental Implications:

N/A

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 At its meeting on 8 December 2015, the Council received the following Motion and referred it to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration:

‘Tewkesbury Borough Council notes that more than six million Syrian people have been displaced by civil war within their homeland and three million have fled to neighbouring countries’.

The Prime Minister and the United Kingdom government are keen to support twenty thousand refugees seeking sanctuary and have pledged £215m over the next five years to help rebuild their lives within this country.

I would ask Members of this Council to join with other agencies, including ‘Severn Vale Housing Trust’ and ‘GARAS’ to help coordinate and support limited numbers of displaced Syrian families settle within the County of Gloucestershire’

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 The UK is at the forefront of the response to the crisis in Syria and this expansion is part of the comprehensive approach to help refugees in the region, recognising that, for some people, the only solution is to bring them to countries like the UK.

2.2 The UK already has significant experience of resettling vulnerable people and the existing domestic resettlement mechanisms provide a basis for a relatively quick increase in numbers.

2.3 Over the coming weeks and months, the government will work with local authorities, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and others to put in place the full structures to ensure that the arrangements can be scaled up to meet the aim of bringing up to 20,000 Syrians over the lifetime of this Parliament.

2.4 The Syrian Vulnerable Person Repatriation is based on need, it prioritises those who cannot be supported effectively in their region of origin: women and children at risk; people in severe need of medical care and survivors of violence and/or torture; refugees with legal and/or physical protection needs; refugees with medical needs or disabilities; children and adolescents at risk; persons at risk due to their sexual orientation or gender identity; and refugees with family links in resettlement countries.

3.0 ELIGIBILITY AND SECURITY CHECKS

3.1 There will be three security checks made by the Home Office, along with border control, checks through Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) database, and biometric tests, to check against the Government’s Contest Strategy. Medical checks will be carried out by the Home Office. The intention is to buddy families up with Syrians and Refugees who are already living in the country. Cases will then be passed to local authorities who have indicated they will participate in the scheme. The local authority can accept or reject cases.

4.0 FUNDING

- 4.1** Funding has been secured through the Comprehensive Spending Review process to assist local authorities with costs. The first 12 months of refugees resettlement costs are funded on a tariff basis by the Government using the overseas aid budget and a guarantee has been made that funding would be available for year's two to five. The Chancellor has now confirmed that the Government will provide additional funding to assist with costs that they believe will be incurred by local authorities.
- 4.2** Year two funding will be allocated on a tariff basis over four years, tapering from £5,000 per person in year two to £1,000 per person in year five. The funding includes support for integration such as additional English language training as well as social care. Special cases will be provided with additional support for the most vulnerable persons.

5.0 GLOUCESTERSHIRE APPROACH

- 5.1** Within Gloucestershire, many districts and Registered Housing Providers have offered to house families. Properties will need to be carefully chosen based on access to services already provided in Cheltenham and Gloucester for refugees e.g. language lessons, faith groups, churches and charities.
- 5.2** The Leader of the County Council Mark Hawthorne and Richard Harrington MP, the Minister, has challenged the County of Gloucestershire to take a number of refugee families before Christmas. As a result, Gloucestershire has currently agreed on a coordinated countywide approach to Syrian Refugees and Stewart Edgar, Chief Fire Officer is the lead. Gloucestershire Action for Refugees and Asylum Seekers (GARAS), will lead on the support required to assist refugees as it has over 16 years of experience in dealing with this matter and is well placed to provide effective support.
- 5.3** Tewkesbury Borough Council, as a non-stock (housing) holding authority would have a very limited role.
- 5.4** As such, Officers have had discussions with our principal local social housing provider, Severn Vale Housing Society, and agreement has been reached that it would house one family from its stock in the early part of the New Year, subject to evaluation of how the process has worked and how the family fit in, and would consider further families on a one by one basis. Careful management of letting properties will take place to ensure that families already registered on Gloucestershire Homeseeker would not be disadvantaged. A maximum number of approximately five families are being considered an appropriate number.
- 5.5** Regular information sharing and coordination within the Public Service Centre to include all our partner agencies in the resettlement is ongoing, as Health, Police and Care Services are all required by Government to participate.

6.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 6.1** None

7.0 CONSULTATION

- 7.1** None

8.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

- 8.1** None

9.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

9.1 Syrian Vulnerable Persons Scheme.

10.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

10.1 None

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

11.1 None

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

12.1 None

13.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS

13.1 None

Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager
01684 272259 Val.Garside@tewkesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Syrian Refugee Settlement Programme



Home Office

Syrian Resettlement Programme

How many additional people will you resettle?

- The Government will expand the existing Syrian Vulnerable Person Scheme and intends to resettle 20,000 Syrians in need of protection during this Parliament.
- The UK is at the forefront of the response to the crisis in Syria and this expansion is part of our comprehensive approach designed as far as possible to help refugees in the region but recognising that for some vulnerable people the only solution is to bring them to countries like the UK.

How will the arrival of 20,000 be spread out?

- It will take several months to reach full capacity but when we do we would expect to bring in roughly several hundred refugees each month over the course of the Parliament, subject to continuing need and capacity.

How else is the Government supporting Syrians in need of protection?

- Our priorities are on continuing to provide humanitarian aid to those most in need in the region and actively seeking an end to the crisis. We believe this approach is the best way to ensure that the UK's help has the greatest impact for the majority of refugees who remain in the region and their host countries.
- As the brutal conflict continues in Syria, millions of people continue to be in need. Hundreds of thousands have been killed in the conflict between the Assad regime, extremist groups and moderate opposition groups. In response to the crisis, the UK has allocated over £1.1 billion since 2012 to meet the immediate needs of vulnerable people in Syria and of refugees in the region – more than any other country in the world except the United States. The UK is the only major country in the world that has kept its promise of spending 0.7% of our national income on aid and we should be proud of this. By the end of March 2015, UK support had delivered over 18 million food rations, each of which feeds one person for one month, provided access to clean water for 1.6 million people (peak month), and over 2.4 million medical consultations in Syria and the region.

How will the expansion of the programme operate?

- We already have significant experience of resettling vulnerable people and our existing domestic resettlement mechanisms provide a basis for a relatively quick increase in numbers. And we are already working with existing partners to ensure that we can begin to increase numbers as quickly as possible. Over the coming weeks and months, we will work with local authorities, the UNHCR and others to put in place the full structures to ensure we can scale up the current arrangements so that we can meet the aim of bringing up to 20,000 Syrians over the lifetime of this Parliament and deliver on the expansion that has been announced.

How long will the expansion take?

- Although we have simplified the process as much as we can the UNHCR must still assess each individual case before referring them to the Home Office. The Home Office must conduct visa checks and at the same time a place must be found in a local authority. We do all this already but it is important we get it right and scaling up a system like this in a way that protects the interests of all concerned, including local communities, will take a little bit of time.

How do you choose who comes to the UK?

- The Syrian VPR is based on need. It prioritises those who cannot be supported effectively in their region of origin: women and children at risk, people in severe need of medical care and survivors of torture and violence amongst others. We work closely with the UNHCR to identify cases that they deem in need of resettlement and we will continue this work to ensure we deliver our commitment to provide refuge to 20,000 Syrians.
- The UNHCR identifies people in need of resettlement based on the following criteria: women and girls at risk; survivors of violence and/or torture; refugees with legal and/or physical protection needs; refugees with medical needs or disabilities; children and adolescents at risk; persons at risk due to their sexual orientation or gender identity; and refugees with family links in resettlement countries.

How does the process work?

- UNHCR refer cases to the Home Office. We check they meet our eligibility criteria and carry out medical and security checks. We arrange exit visas from the host country and entry visas into the UK. At the same time, we pass the cases to a local authority who has asked to participate in the scheme. The Local Authority is asked to accept or reject cases. The referral forms give detail on family make up, age and specific needs. Further detail on any medical needs will follow shortly after via a full medical health assessment report. On accepting a case, local authorities then need to arrange housing, school places etc. In parallel we would agree an arrival date. We are working to make this process as quick as possible.

What if an area is new to resettlement?

- Local authorities will need to think carefully about whether they have the infrastructure and support networks needed to ensure the appropriate care and integration of these refugees. It would be worth speaking to existing resettlement areas to learn best practice. Regional Strategic Migration Partnerships can put you in touch.

How can local authorities find out more about the profiles and needs of the refugees they will be hosting?

- All cases will differ and it is very difficult to generalise. We do not have detail of the cases before UNHCR refer them to us. As soon as a local authority wants to participate, we will send these referrals that give detailed information on the individual cases. If authorities want a particular make up of cases, they should state this and we will do our best to match cases.

Will the 20,000 be on top of existing schemes?

- The Government will expand the existing Syrian VPR Scheme and we expect to resettle up to 20,000 Syrians in need of protection during this Parliament. This is in addition to those we resettle under Gateway and Mandate and the thousands who receive protection in the UK under normal asylum procedures.

How will these people be accommodated? Where will they go when they are here?

- The UK has been operating resettlement schemes for many years and we already have established and effective networks to accommodate and support resettled people. However, we recognise that the increase in numbers will require an expansion of current networks and the impact on local communities and infrastructure will need to be managed carefully. That is why we are working with a wide range of partners including local authorities and civil society organisations to ensure that people are integrated sensitively into local communities.
- Our existing dispersal policy is aimed at ensuring an equitable distribution of refugees across the country so that no individual local authority bears a disproportionate share of the burden. We are working closely with local authorities to ensure that this remains the case.

How will you ensure refugees are dispersed fairly and in a way that manages the impacts on local communities and services?

- We are determined to ensure that no local authority is asked to take more than the local structures are able to cope with. That is why we will be talking to local authorities and other partners over the coming weeks to ensure that capacity can be identified and the impact on those taking new cases can be managed in a fair and controlled way.

How will schools be supported to provide language support for refugee children?

- Financial support for English as an Additional Language (EAL) pupils is a matter for local discretion. The funding arrangements enable local authorities to allocate a proportion of their funding to schools on the basis of the number of pupils in each school who have EAL and who have been in the school system for a maximum of three years. The pupil rate for this is also decided locally and can therefore reflect specific challenges in the area. Schools can also use the additional money they receive through the pupil premium to raise the attainment of disadvantaged EAL pupils.
- Local authorities have the freedom to take account of high migration in their local funding formula, to address the additional costs of having a large number (over 10%) of pupils arriving at unusual times in the school year.
- Schools can access information about good practice in meeting the needs of EAL pupils - Ofsted has published some case studies showing good practice at schools with high proportions of pupils with EAL. Resources are also available from the National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum, an organisation that seeks to promote effective teaching and learning for EAL pupils in UK schools.

How will you ensure that there are enough schools places in areas where refugees are resettled?

- We have committed to investing £7bn on new school places over the next six years, and in the last Parliament funding for school places doubled to £5bn to create 445,000 additional places. Local Authority's are allocated funding for school places based on their own local data on school capacity and pupil forecasts, in which they take account of factors including rising birth rates, housing development, trends in internal migration and migration to England from elsewhere in the United Kingdom and from overseas. We continue to work with LAs to make sure that every child has a school place.

How can I become a foster carer for a refugee child?

- We are not expecting the refugees arriving in the first months of the scheme to include unaccompanied children, but if you are interested in finding out more about fostering, you might wish to contact your local authority. They can provide you with details about applying to foster for them. You can also find out more about fostering by contacting Fosterline, a government funded service providing independent advice and support for people considering becoming foster carers. In addition, you might wish to look at information about applying to foster that Fostering Network give on their website at: <http://www.couldyoufoster.org.uk/>.
- Further information for foster carers is also available on GOV.UK : <https://www.gov.uk/foster-carers>. This page sets out the process people should follow and explains how much financial support and training foster carers can get.

I am interested in adopting an unaccompanied refugee child?

- We are not expecting the refugees arriving in the first months of the scheme to include unaccompanied children. Even if we do support unaccompanied children in the future it is unlikely that adoption will be an appropriate option for these children. The United Nations and other humanitarian charities advise that no new adoption applications should be considered in the period after a disaster or from a war zone before the authorities in that State are in a position to apply the necessary safeguards. This is especially true when civil authority breaks down or temporarily ceases to function.
- It is not uncommon in an emergency or unsettled situation for children to be temporarily separated from their parents or other family members who may be looking for them. Moreover, parents may send their children out of the area for their safety. Premature and unregulated attempts to organise the adoption of such a child abroad should be avoided and resisted with efforts to reunite children with relatives or extended family being given priority. So whilst some lone refugee children may come to the UK for temporary care, we would wish to support them to be reunited with their parents or other relatives where this is possible.

How can people help now?

- People can already make donations to charities and volunteer to help local refugee support groups. We would encourage that to continue but we will also be consulting partners on options to do more - including ways to sponsor refugees alongside those supported by the government.
- People can also refer to the Government release on the GOV.UK website <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/syria-refugees-what-you-can-do-to-help--2>

The British Red Cross has created a Crisis Helpline on 0800 107 8727 to triage calls to appropriate organisations.

Key facts and statistics on resettlement

- The UK operates three resettlement routes, Gateway, Mandate and the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation (VPR) Scheme, working closely with the UNHCR on each. The Gateway programme has run for 10 years and has resettled almost 6,400 people in that time, and aims to resettle around 750 people a year.
- On the VPR, we are working closely with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees to identify some of the most vulnerable displaced Syrians and bring them to the UK.
- The scheme is helping those in the greatest need who cannot be supported effectively in the region by giving them protection and support in the UK – the scheme prioritises people requiring urgent medical treatment, survivors of torture and violence, and women and children at risk. The current criteria for acceptance under the scheme will be expanded to ensure more of those in the greatest need are resettled in the UK.
- Since the first arrivals in March 2014 to the end of June 2015 (the last published figures), 216 people were relocated to the UK under the Syrian VPR scheme.
- Since the crisis began in 2011 we have granted asylum or other forms of leave to almost 5,000 Syrian nationals and dependants through normal asylum procedures.
- In response to the increase in asylum claims, the UK introduced a concession in October 2012 for Syrian nationals who are already legally present in the UK, allowing them to extend their leave or change immigration category without leaving the UK. This currently runs to 28 February 2016.

How does the current Syrian Vulnerable Persons Scheme work?

The UK sets the criteria and then UNHCR identifies and submits potential cases for our consideration. Cases are screened and considered on the papers and we retain the right to reject on security, war crimes or other grounds. Once the screening process has been completed a full medical assessment is conducted by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) in the host country. Full details of the case and medical history are sent to the local authority for assessment of need, including whether suitable accommodation and care are available locally. The local authority then provides details of the estimated costs.

Eligibility is then confirmed and IOM start the visa application process. UK Visas and Immigration International issue UK visas (3 months Leave Outside of the Rules) and on arrival, arrangements are made for Biometric Residence Permits to be issued with 5 years' humanitarian protection.

Worldwide trends

How many refugees are there worldwide?

- The UNHCR reports that by the end of 2014, the number of forcibly displaced individuals worldwide stood at 59.5 million. There are 19.5 million refugees worldwide. 51% of refugees were under 18 years old.

Where do most refugees come from?

- Syria is the world's largest source country of both internally displaced people (7.6 million) and refugees (3.88 million at the end of 2014). Afghanistan (2.59 million) and Somalia (1.1 million) are the next biggest refugee source countries. This is followed by Sudan (648,900) and South Sudan (616,200).

What are the reasons for refugee flows?

- The humanitarian situation in **Syria** continues to deteriorate. The number of people in need of humanitarian assistance now stands at 12.2 million, and four in every five Syrians live in poverty. Flagrant human rights violations, indiscriminate attacks against densely populated areas and targeting of civilian infrastructure, in particular aerial bombardment by the Assad regime, continues in violation of international norms.
- **Afghanistan** remains one of the poorest countries in the world, with 1 in 3 people living below the poverty line and without access to basic services or opportunities to support their families. The ongoing insurgency across many parts of the country means people are facing violence as part of their daily lives and has given rise to a sharp increase in population displacement. As of December 2014, UNHCR listed over 2.5m Afghans as refugees and over 800,000 Afghans are internally displaced.
- **Somalis** are the third largest group, following Eritreans and Sudanese, arriving in Europe from the East African region. They make up 9% of migrants to Europe. The main causes of migration from Somalia are understood to be spikes in insecurity and humanitarian need (driven by conflict and Al-Shabaab activity). There are also likely to be a significant number of 'economic migrants' looking for better economic opportunity than exists in Somalia. Large diaspora communities in the UK (thought to be 3-500,000) and elsewhere in Europe create a pull factor.
- We believe that **Sudan** is primarily a country of transit, though there are refugees fleeing conflict in Darfur. Numbers of economic migrants from Sudan are unknown - if someone claims to be from Darfur it is difficult to prove otherwise. The security services have periodic clamp-downs on Eritreans in Sudan (usually in Khartoum) with some forcible returns for not having the correct paperwork.

General Asylum Statistics

- There were 25,771 asylum applications (main applicants) in the UK in the year ending June 2015. (Including dependants, there were 32,508).
- In recent quarters, we have seen fewer applications from some countries with traditionally higher refusal rates (Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nigeria), and more from countries with higher grant rates (Eritrea, Syria, Sudan).
- In the year ending June 2015, the highest numbers of applications came from Eritrean (3,568), Pakistani (2,302) and Syrian (2,204) nationals (main applicants only). Including dependants, the largest number of asylum applications came from Eritrea (3,624), Pakistan (3,276) and Iran (2,533).
- Compared to the year ending June 2014, the number of initial decisions on asylum applications (main applicants) increased by 107% in the year ending June 2015, to 28,538 from 13,795. (Including dependants, initial decisions increased by 117%, to 38,373 from 17,697).
- The total number of outstanding initial decisions has fallen in recent quarters (main applicants only – Q3 2014: 18,149, Q4 2014: 17,067; Q1 2015: 12,878, Q2 2015: 12,368; main applicants and dependants – Q3 2014: 24,369, Q4 2014: 22,898; Q1 2015: 16,879, Q2 2015: 16,163).
- We are certifying more cases, thus refusing clearly unfounded cases a right of appeal in the UK. In the year ending June 2015, 14% of all refusals for main applicants were certified, unchanged from the year ending June 2014. (Including dependants, 15% of refusals were certified, compared with 14% in the previous year).

Support

- We currently support a total of over 36,000 asylum seekers (main applicants and dependants; sections 95, 98 & 4). At the end of June 2015, 30,457 asylum seekers and their dependants were being supported under Section 95.
- There are over 26,000 asylum seekers in dispersed accommodation, in over 200 local authorities. Our dispersal policy ensures a reasonable spread amongst those local authorities.

UASCs

- There were 2,168 asylum applications from Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children (UASCs) in the year ending June 2015, an increase of 46% from the year ending June 2014 (1,488). These applications represented 8% of all main applications for asylum.
- Despite the recent increase in UASC applications, they remain below the peak of 3,976 in 2008.

Resettlement

- In the year ending June 2015, 166 Syrians were relocated to the UK under the VPR scheme (216 since the scheme began in March 2014). This is in addition to almost 5,000 Syrians (including dependants) who have been granted protection under our normal asylum rules since the crisis began in April 2011.

- In the year ending June 2015, we resettled 640 refugees under the Gateway Resettlement Programme. Since 2004, we have resettled 6,380 refugees under the programme and we met our target in the last financial year (April 2014 to March 2015), resettling over 750 refugees.

Removals

- In the last two years (July 2013 to June 2015) there were over 8,500 enforced removals of people who had sought asylum at some stage (including dependants). In the same period there were over 5,500 voluntary departures of people who had sought asylum at some stage.

International comparisons

- The number of asylum applications to the EU in the year ending June 2015 was the highest it has been since 2002.
- There were an estimated 754,700 asylum applications by main applicants and dependants to the 28 EU countries in the year ending June 2015 (an increase of 65% on the previous year). Of these, the UK received 32,600 (4% of EU asylum intake) compared to 259,300 in Germany, 92,600 in Hungary and 78,400 in Sweden. In 2010, the EU received 241,100 applications for main applicants and dependants, and of this the UK received 22,600 (9% of EU asylum intake).
- The UK had the seventh highest number of asylum applications within the EU in the year ending June 2015 (fifth in year ending June 2014). In the year ending June 2015, Germany, Hungary, Sweden, Italy, France and Austria received more asylum applications than the UK.
- Asylum claims in Germany were eight times those in the UK (259,300 vs 32,600) in the year ending June 2015. Hungary had the second highest number of applications in the year ending June 2015 after being ranked ninth during the previous 12 months.
- When the relative size of resident populations of the 28 EU countries is taken into account, the UK ranked 16th in terms of asylum seekers per head of the population in the year ending June 2015 (it was also 16th in the previous year).

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	19 January 2016
Subject:	Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee Action Plan
Report of:	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager
Corporate Lead:	Rachel North, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Cllr J R Mason, Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment
Number of Appendices:	1

Executive Summary:

Tewkesbury Borough Council joined the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee (GJWC) at the end of 2014. The Committee has a three year action plan, running from 2015-18. The plan replaces the individual plans of each of the member authorities and therefore supersedes the Tewkesbury Borough Annual Waste and Recycling Plan which has been monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee since June 2012. Members are asked to consider the progress made in relation the GJWC Action Plan during 2015/16.

Recommendation:

To CONSIDER the progress made in relation to the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee Action Plan during 2015/16.

Reasons for Recommendation:

To inform Members of the progress being made against the GJWC Action Plan.

Resource Implications:

None for this report.

Legal Implications:

On 15 December 2014 the Council delegated certain services to the GJWC. The Joint Waste Team consists of Officers who report to the Committee and this report sets out progress against the agreed Action Plan during 2015/16.

Risk Management Implications:

None for this report.

Performance Management Follow-up:

Monitoring and update reports will be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Environmental Implications:

None for this report.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

1.1 The Joint Waste Team is comprised of the Officers who serve the Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee (GJWC) and make sure that services delegated to the GJWC are working well from the point of view of customers, the various legal and financial aspects of dealing with waste and street cleaning and, of course, finding the most environmentally suitable way of dealing with many types of recycling and waste being collected and dealt with in the County. The Officers were previously working for one of the partners. As the GJWC is not an organisation in itself, the Joint Waste Team Officers are employed by Gloucestershire County Council (as administrating authority) on behalf of the GJWC.

1.2 Five of Gloucestershire's local authorities are now members of the GJWC. Cheltenham Borough Council, Cotswold District Council, Forest of Dean District Council and Gloucestershire County Council joined in April 2013, when the Committee was first formed; Tewkesbury Borough Council joined this partnership at the end of 2014.

2.0 GLOUCESTERSHIRE JOINT WASTE COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN

2.1 The GJWC has a three year action plan, running from 2015-18. The plan replaces the individual plans of each of the member authorities and therefore supersedes the Tewkesbury Borough Annual Waste and Recycling Plan which has been monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee since June 2012.

2.2 The GJWC Action Plan outlines the key priorities and actions for the next three years. The critical purpose of this plan is to provide a mandate for the GJWC to consider and make decisions, according to set governance and budgetary principles, without constant reference back to the partner authorities.

3.0 GLOUCESTERSHIRE JOINT WASTE COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2015/16

3.1 The GJWC Action Plan for 2015/16 is set out in full at Appendix 1 and the key achievements are as follows:

- Food waste collection volumes have been increased by 20% following the delivery of the food waste initiative.
- The bulking of recyclable materials for Cheltenham Borough Council has been successfully taken over by Ubico and the Joint Waste Team is now responsible for the marketing and sale of materials which has increased revenue.
- The contract for collection of waste and recyclables in the Forest of Dean was extended to 2024 with a commitment to move to weekly recycling and include the collection of plastics bottles, cardboard, small items of Waste, Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) and textiles from the kerbside.
- The contract for the operation of the Household Recycling Centres has been extended until 2019.
- A service review has been carried out for Tewkesbury Borough Council in preparation for vehicle procurement in 2016/17.
- Agreement has been reached with Stroud District Council to support its service change in 2016.
- All partners were assessed and deemed to be compliant with the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2012.
- Support has been given to Cotswold District Council in the acquisition of a new depot site in South Cerney.
- Support has been provided to Gloucester City Council during the review of its recycling and refuse collection service.

4.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

4.1 Not applicable for this report

5.0 CONSULTATION

5.1 Not applicable for this report

6.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

6.1 Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Action Plans

7.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

7.1 Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2012
Revised Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC)

8.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

8.1 None in respect of this report

- 9.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS (Social/Community Safety/Cultural/ Economic/ Environment)**
- 9.1** The Revised Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC) strengthens measures that must be taken in relation to waste prevention and consideration of the whole life cycle of products and materials. It aims to further reduce the environmental impact of waste and increase the economic value of waste materials, and encourages greater levels of waste recovery.
- 10.0 IMPACT UPON (Value For Money/Equalities/E-Government/Human Rights/Health And Safety)**
- 10.1** None
- 11.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS**
- 11.1** None

Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager
01684 272259 Val.Garside@tewkesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Gloucestershire Joint Waste Committee Action Plan
2015/16

JWC Action Plan 2015/16

Partners	Project	Lead Officer(s)	When	Expected Outcome	Update December 2015
1. Engagement with customers					
1.1 All Partners	Engage in campaigns and activities to support waste minimisation and waste diversion in low recycling participation areas and engage with producers of excess waste.	AP	See Waste Marketing and Behaviour Change Programme	Support behaviour change, reduce waste and increase waste diversion. Aim to achieve higher participation in recycling services and reduce waste to landfill	County Wide No Food Waste Bin Sticking Campaign (apart from Stroud) to reduce residual waste and promote food waste participation - to be delivered August/ September. Further engagement with Low and No Recyclers was outlined at July and October JWC. Options based upon direct engagement with residents who don't recycle at a face to face level. Baseline monitoring work is being undertaken in an area of Coleford in order that we understand the exact nature of participation and non-participation in recycling services, and this information will be used to determine the most appropriate action to take. This will include consideration of approaches to to made in other areas of the county.
1.2 All Partners	Promote recycling opportunities using available media	AP		Increase waste minimisation and recycling performance	At CBC waste and recycling leaflets distributed to residents by members as part of the election campaign to help improve understanding of the service. In CBC press releases and photo calls are being planned for 'Foil' & 'Textiles/Shoes' recycling in the run up to Christmas. During 'Recycle Week' (22-28 June) the JWT promoted textile reuse and recycling. Christmas recycling campaign titled 'Lets give waste the heave ho ho....' gets underway in December.
1.3 CDC/CBC/FOD/TBC	Promote garden waste collection schemes	SW / RC / ML / JD	Feb 15 -Jun 15 Feb 16 -Jun 16	Increase uptake in garden waste service.	CDC, CBC, TBC & FODDC promoted garden waste service through bin hangers - an increase in subscriptions being seen across the board compared to last year.
1.4 CBC/CDC/FOD	Investigate the potential to retrieve non approved residual bins	RC / SW	From Spring 2015	Reducing waste to landfill	This project will now be incorporated into the wider Lo and No Recyclers 'Helping people to recycle' Project
1.5 GCC	Maintain and deliver the schools and community education programme	AP	See Waste Marketing and Behaviour Change Programme	Increased participation in 3Rs reduce, reuse, recycle	Schools education support is ongoing.
1.6 GCC	Develop and maintain the Master Composters and other community champion networks.	AP	March 15 to April 16	Build capacity within the community to encourage participation in recycling services	Master Composters continue to provide support to the JWT and 11 new Master Composters have been trained during 2015/16.

1.7	All Partners	Explore the opportunities to increase re-use through HRC shops, Swindon Rd recycling centre, community groups and other initiatives	TC / AP	March 15 to April 16	Push waste up the hierarchy	The establishment of 'Repair Cafés' has been investigated and we have met with several groups in order to progress this. There are currently no groups available to establish new Repair Cafés but we continue to engage with the existing groups with a view to developing opportunities to expand the work they do. An officer and volunteer visit to Frome in Somerset took place recently in order to see how volunteer groups organise themselves around the idea of a 'share shop' (set up to allow people to borrow rarely used tools and other items). It is possible that Transition Stroud will establish a similar scheme with our help. The establishment of a Reuse shop at Hempsted HRC is part of the site redesign planning application.
1.8	TBC	Review website and recycling pages to ensure information is relevant and up to date	JD	March 15 to May 15	Information provided is up to date and appropriate	All webpages have been reviewed and a number of pages have been redirected to the countywide webpage to reduce duplication and remain consistent within the RFG campaign. An emphasis has been made to reduce contamination in collections including needles and sharps, and reduction of general waste in the blue bin. Online reporting and ordering of containers has been expanded.
1.9	FOD/CBC	Actively explore options for adding new materials such as cardboard, plastics and cartons within kerbside collections	RC / SW	March 15 to April 16	Meet customer and partner aspirations as resources allow	Ubico currently looking at options available for recycling service delivery from 2017 which will be presented to CBC in due course. FODDC this is included in Action 2.6

2 Procurement

2.1	CBC	Assist Ubico to assess business case for new recycling vehicles	SW	Sept 15 to March 16	New fleet in service from 2017	SW - connected to 1.9
2.2	CBC/CDC	Materials recycling and sales project to market recyclable materials collected through the contracts	SW	Jan 15 to Sept 15 (CBC) Jun 15 to completion (CDC)	Maximise income for recyclable materials	CBC/Ubico Materials Bulking Facility went live on 17th October and the associated materials contracts are now in place. Income projections and reduction in operation costs look set to deliver anticipated budget savings in the business case, even though material prices have declined sharply since the project was approved.
2.4	GCC	Support the procurement of a new recycling/waste collection contract for premises (schools, offices, fire stations etc)	AP	March 15 to April 16	Contract to commence August 2016 - intention to add food waste. To be endorsed by JWC prior to sign off at GCC Cabinet	GCC has now let a contract for collection of food waste from schools and this commenced in September. Procurement for the main premises and schools waste and recycling contract will commence in January and the JWT are represented on the project team for this.
2.5	GCC	Carry out a review of the HRC contract and make a recommendation on the preferred procurement strategy	TC	March 15 to Sept 15	A report to Joint Waste Committee and GCC Cabinet on the options for the HRC contract	A JWC options report was considered on 3rd July and a final paper was considered by GCC Cabinet on 22nd July. The recommendation was to extend the existing contract with Kier for a further 2 years 8 months. A deed of variation has been drafted and is in the process of being approved.

2.6	FOD	FODDC waste and recycling collection, bring bank and bulking facility procurement and service design options project	RC	Sept 14 to Dec 16	A report to Joint Waste Committee and FoDDC Cabinet (Nov 15) on the options for the contract	A Service Options report was considered at October JWC and Service and Procurement Options were considered by FODDC Cabinet on 19 November. It was agreed to extend the waste and recycling collection service with Biffa Waste Services until 2024 and implement a service change to weekly kerbside sort with the addition of plastic bottles, cardboard, small WEEE and textiles in July 2016.
2.7	FOD	Research and analyse the procurement options for the FODDC street cleaning contract	RC	Sept 14 to Dec 16	A report to Joint Waste Committee and FoDDC Cabinet (Nov 15) on the options for the contract	A paper was considered at FODDC Cabinet on 19 November. It was agreed that Ubico be commissioned to deliver street cleaning services when the current contract expires in July 2018.
2.8	CDC/CBC/FOD/TBC	Review garden waste billing systems	JD/RC/SW	March 15 to Sept 15	Ensure systems for billing are the most cost effective for all partners	A system review has taken place at FODDC and CBC. Work is underway to produce a report setting out each partners process and identifying commonalities and areas for improvement. A further review may be required dependent on the outcome of 2020 project.

2.9	CDC/CBC/FOD/TBC	Review the overall procurement of receptacles for recycling, food waste etc. to ensure best value is achieved	JD/RC/SW	March 15 to Sept 15	A report to Joint Waste Committee setting out how to achieve best value from procuring receptacles.	CBC, CDC & TBC use the same framework for procurement. FODDC use ESPO Framework for procurement.
-----	-----------------	---	----------	---------------------	---	--

3 Operational review

3.1	GCC	Take steps to alleviate queuing at Hempsted HRC	TC	March 15 to April 16	Improved customer service	A planning application to improve for site layout at Hempsted has been submitted with input from the JWT. The proposed re-development will involve a Re-use shop and extra lanes to help alleviate queuing.
3.2	GCC/CBC	Explore new recycling opportunities at the Household Recycling Centres, including Swindon Road.	TC / SW	March 15 to Sept 15	Investigate the opportunities to recycle additional materials e.g. carpet, rigid plastic and consider the roll out of black bag opening to all HRCs	A review of the service is being carried out following the recent decision to continue with Kier as the main GCC contractor. Swindon Road is being included as part of the review. Given the timescales involved its likely that any improvements will be built into the 2016/17 business plan.
3.3	CBC/GCC	Investigate options to reduce landfill waste being received at Swindon Road Recycling Centre including targeting trade abuse	SW / TC	March 15 to Sept 15	Reduce residual and increase reuse and recycling	SW - connected to 3.2
3.4	GCC	Review the acceptance of trade waste at HRCs	TC	March 15 to Sept 15	Subject to findings of the review agree and undertake appropriate actions	The issue has been discussed with Kier and further work is needed to understand if there is a business case to expand the service in this way.
3.5	All Partners	Develop and deliver programmes to tackle fly tipping	RC	March 15 to April 16	Deter fly tippers	FODDC fly-tipping reduction project is continuing and Q1 to-date figures show a reduction in the number fly-tips and an increase in enforcement action; Q1 to-date - 1 statutory notice has been issued, 12 fixed penalty notices, 4 duty-of-care inspections and 186 stop and searches which led to 1 vehicle seizure and 1 formal caution. CDC has also recently prosecuted 3 offenders and publicised the activities being undertaken to target fly-tippers.
3.6	TBC	Review contract monitoring arrangements with MRF contractor	RC / RS	March 15 to May 15	Ensure contract and Waste Regulation compliance	Bimonthly contract monitoring meetings held, health and safety processes reviewed and monitored and sampling regime monitored to ensure compliance with MRF code of practice.
3.7	All Partners	Work with Ubico to ensure that business expansion does not have a detrimental effect on services.	SW / RC / TC	March 15 to April 16	A high standard of service delivery is maintained	Ongoing dialogue is underway with Ubico at a high level and a issues log is being maintained to keep track of any major issues which are causing concern
3.8	TBC	Identify new bring site opportunities (WEEE and textiles)	RC / JD	June 15 to Sept 15	Increased recycling and opportunities to de-pollute the waste stream	All sites have sufficient textile recycling banks, although there is still interest in the market for more banks. CFL bulb and battery banks already provided.
3.9	TBC	Work with local fast food retailers to encourage them to be proactive in clearing up takeaway litter	JD / TBC	October 15 onwards	Cooperation with retailers, a reduction in litter and a positive effect on the local environment	
3.10	TBC	Investigate options for new recycling and waste management schemes at the larger new development sites	JD / TBC	April 15 to Sept 15	Identify achievable options for new large scale developments for more sustainable waste management.	Discussions have been had with planning to consider suitable large developments which are within the planning system already. Examples of local authorities with schemes such as these have been identified.

3.11	GCC	Investigate options for recycling plastic bags arising from de-bagging at the AD plant.	TC	April 15 to Sept 15	Extracted bags are either recycled or sent to EfW plants.	Andigestion have now comissioned the de-bagging plant at Bishops Cleeve and so packaging waste can now be passed to potential recyclers to assess the market viability.
3.12	CDC	Develop options with a view to introducing a trial of 120L bins as a standard refuse container in new developments	SW	April 15 to Sept 15	Evaluate the impact on recycling of reduced residual capacity	Trial option being appraised in conjunction with other studies being completed around the country on 3-weekly refuse collections.
3.13	GWP Partners	Review the County wide collection of sharps and clinical waste collections	TC	March 15 to April 16	To determine the most cost effective way of providing these services	Contact with the NHS has been made and the review is in progress. The scheme involving pharmacies will continue during 2016/17 whilst a full review is carried out and additional data is gathered.

4 Infrastructure

4.1	CDC	Work with CDC and Ubico to support the mobilisation of the new depot	SW	March 15 to delivery	Mobilisation to enable the site to be used for service delivery	SW - ongoing
4.2	CBC/CDC	Support Ubico in mobilisation of bulking facilities	SW	March 15 to delivery	Deliver operational bulking facilities	Project complete in CBC. Waiting on progress with new depot in CDC.
4.3	GCC/CBC/TBC	Assess cost/benefits of Residual Waste Transfer in northern parts of the county	TC	March 15 to Sept 15	Arrangements for the delivery of residual waste to Javelin Park	Following modelling a paper was presented to the JWC in October 2015 further work is being done by Ubico to model the impacts of transfer.

5 Surveys/ Research

5.1	All Partners	Plan and carry out a residual waste composition analysis	AP	March 15 to delivery	Mobilise the waste sort project	Will be delivered as part of the EFW mobilisation project, likely to be 2016/17 or beyond.
-----	--------------	--	----	----------------------	---------------------------------	--

6 Contribution to Corporate Initiatives

6.1	All Partners	Report on waste reduction & recycling performance as required by individual partners	TC / RC / SW	Quarterly	Report performance corporately	Completed quarterly
-----	--------------	--	--------------	-----------	--------------------------------	---------------------

7 Strategic

7.1	All Partners	Encourage non GJWC partners to join the committee	SR	March 15 to April 16	Work with non-partners to understand the business case and other benefits of joining the GJWC	JWT are assisting Gloucester City with a review of their service and assisting with communications for the service change at Stroud DC. This work will help to show the benefits of joint working
7.2	All Partners	Undertake a review of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy	AP	March 15 to April 16	Complete and publish review	Initial scoping session with officers and SMG undertaken. Consideration of points raised at member workshop on the 19th November will enable us to determine our priorities and strategic challenges, which we may be able to develop further without the need for a full strategy review. It is therefore not proposed to commence a strategy review at this point in time.

7.3	All Partners	Appraise the pros and cons of kerbside sort, co-mingled (and hybrid) systems with particular regard to safety, material quality, performance, ease of use, regulatory compliance and affordability including review of successful models adopted outside Gloucestershire	AP	March 15 to April 16	Ensure that when assessing collection systems in respect of regulatory compliance and for future service specifications we recommend the most effective system for the collection of recyclables and food, garden and residual waste	All service TEEP assessments were completed prior to submitting compliance information to the EA in May. Further work has been undertaken to quantify specific issues relating to glass collections in Tewkesbury, and this will be further developed during their service during winter 2015/16.
7.4	All Partners	Transition of oversight of the residual waste treatment project to the JWT.	SR	March 15 to April 16	Transition plan to be agreed with GCC to cover the move from construction and commissioning to full operation.	With construction expected to commence in 2016, this will form part of the next business plan. JWT is providing support to the procurement team through this phase of the project.
7.5	All Partners	Lobbying for alternative ways to encourage and motivate residents to reduce residual waste	SR	After May 2015	Seek opportunities to lobby Government and others to make sure our voice is heard in the debate about waste issues	
	All Partners	Review JWT structure and implement changes	SR	Complete by Jul 2015	Carry out a review to ensure the JWT structure is fit for purpose.	In progress. Phase 1 to be completed by Nov 15
7.6	Glos City	Assist Gloucester City Council to undertake a review of kerbside collection services ahead of ordering replacement vehicles (links to 7.3). Scope of input to be agreed.	To be confirmed	To be confirmed, provisionally complete by Dec 2015	A report to Gloucester City Council by City officers on options with input from JWC as required and as agreed.	

UNPLANNED WORK

	TBC	Waste collection service review and vehicle fleet procurement	JD/RC	March 15 to April 16	Compliant waste and recycling collection service. A fleet of appropriate vehicles to collect refuse and recycling and maximise recovery.	A project team has been established including partner organisations (JWT, TBC and Ubico) and the service options appraisal is underway. 4 collection options to be reviewed inline with TEEP requirements for comingled collections and a comparison against a kerbside sort option.
	TBC	MRF procurement options appraisal	JD /RC	August 15 to April 2016	Understanding the MRF markets for future procurement requirements in line with the waste collection service review.	Discussions have been held with the incumbent contractor regarding the current markets and contracted gate fees.

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	19 January 2016
Subject:	Flood Risk Management Group Monitoring Report
Report of:	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Group Manager
Corporate Lead:	Rachel North, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Councillor J R Mason, Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment
Number of Appendices:	1

<p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>This report contains an update on progress of the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan.</p>
<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Members are asked to CONSIDER progress against the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan.</p>
<p>Reasons for Recommendation:</p> <p>At a meeting of the Executive Committee on 25 March 2015, it was agreed that the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan progress be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a quarterly basis.</p>

<p>Resource Implications:</p> <p>Included in the report; met from existing allocated resources (the Council employs a Flood Risk Management Engineer).</p>
<p>Legal Implications:</p> <p>The Council has powers under Section 14A of the Land Drainage Act 1991 to undertake flood risk management work where it considers that the work is desirable having regard to the local flood risk management strategy for its area and where the purpose of the work is to manage a flood risk in the Council's area from an ordinary watercourse. The works that the Council is permitted to do under this section is wide-ranging and includes the construction or maintenance of existing works (which include buildings, structures, watercourses, drainage works and machinery).</p> <p>Where the works are to be carried out on land not owned by the Council, agreements should be put in place to cover consent of the owner for the works to be carried out and responsibilities for maintenance.</p> <p>The Council's contract rules will need to be followed when appointing contractors.</p>

Where there are joint projects, such as with the Environment Agency, the Council should enter into agreements which set out each party's obligations and responsibilities in relation to these projects, including ongoing maintenance of the works.

Gloucestershire County Council has made funding available to the district councils to give grants to residents affected by flooding.

Risk Management Implications:

Care must be exercised to ensure that no ongoing liability is attached to the Council for work on watercourses for which the Council has no direct responsibility through making a financial contribution or carrying out of works on a one-off basis. This will be achieved as part of the project management process.

Performance Management Follow-up:

The recommendation is that performance will be monitored through regular reports to the Flood Risk Management Group and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Environmental Implications:

Any work involving natural watercourses or the cutting back of trees or hedges will be carried out at the time of year that has least impact on wildlife and habitat (e.g. bird nesting season). Where necessary the appropriate licences will be applied for.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

1.1 At a meeting of the Executive Committee on 25 March 2015, it was agreed that the Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan progress be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a quarterly basis.

2.0 FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT GROUP ACTION PLAN

2.1 The action plan at Appendix 1 is based on land drainage projects monitored by the Flood Risk Management Group. The action plan is 'living' document to which funding or partnership opportunities can be added as and when they arise.

2.2 Tewkesbury Borough Council owns various parcels of land across the Borough and some of these have watercourses either running through them or adjacent to them. This means that Tewkesbury Borough Council is a 'riparian owner' with responsibilities to maintain these watercourses in good condition. In 2010 Tewkesbury Borough Council agreed to increase the land drainage revenue budget in order to allow for routine maintenance work to be carried out.

2.3 The Flood Risk Management Group last met on 14 December 2015. The action plan at Appendix 1 represents the report that was presented at that meeting. The plan now includes a table detailing potential future maintenance issues outside of the general maintenance on our owned watercourses i.e. collapsing, slipping banks, substantial erosion etc. The next meeting of the Group is scheduled for 14 March 2016.

3.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

3.1 None

4.0 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Funding opportunities are applied for and realised with the agreement of local communities, partners such as Gloucestershire County Council and the Environment Agency, and the Flood Risk Management Group.

5.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

- 5.1 The Council Plan 2012-16 contains the following priority within the section “Improve recycling and care for the environment”;
5. Continued work with partners to provide flood resilience measures;
- a) Work with partners to deliver flood alleviation projects funded by Gloucestershire County Council
 - b) Advise and signpost local communities when applying for external funding for flood resilience measures.

6.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

- 6.1 National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England (available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-management-strategy-for-england>).

Gloucestershire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (available from <http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/LFRMS>).

7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

- 7.1 Tewkesbury Borough Council employs a Flood Risk Management Engineer. Part of the post holder’s responsibilities is to identify flood risk management funding opportunities and submit bids, as well as to monitor progress on the action plan.

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

- 8.1 Flood risk management reduces the likelihood that local residents and businesses will have flood water entering their properties and the consequential impact that such an event would have on the health, welfare and finances of those affected.

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 Flood Risk Management Group Terms of Reference and Action Plan - Annual Review (Meeting of Executive, 25 March 2015)

Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: David Steels, Environmental Health Manager,
01684 272172 david.steels@teWKesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: Appendix 1 - Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan

Flood Risk Management Group Action Plan – December 2015 Update

i) “Live” capital projects

Table 1: Live Capital Projects

Location	Scheme / Works Description	Funding Source	Funding Allocated	Progress	Target Completion Date
Tirley	Flood attenuation measures	Gloucestershire County Council	£135,000	Verbal update to be given at meeting on progress and discussions with Parish Council.	Winter 2015
Chaceley	Diversion of drainage channel & reopening outfalls	Gloucestershire County Council	£45,000	Meeting to be arranged in the new year with Chaceley Parish Council to discuss project proposals and timescale. Preferred option being developed is to create a twin outlet utilising an existing field drain network which will ease pressure on the existing EA outlet at Chaceley Stock.	Spring 2016
Tewkesbury	Watercourse maintenance	Gloucestershire County Council / Environment Agency / landowners	£20,000	Discussions with relevant agencies – Tewkesbury Borough Council leading. Contractor quotes received. Agreement needed from landowners.	Est. January 2016

Location	Scheme / Works Description	Funding Source	Funding Allocated	Progress	Target Completion Date
Borough wide	Property level protection surveys to multiple properties in proximity to the River Severn	Gloucestershire County Council	£40,200	Jointly delivered scheme with the Environment Agency. Discussions taking place on project plan and locations. Result could be further funding applications with survey results	2016 (to be confirmed)

ii) Tewkesbury Borough Council Programme of Watercourse Maintenance

Tewkesbury Borough Council (TBC) owns various parcels of land across the Borough and some of these have watercourses either running through them or adjacent to them. This means that Tewkesbury Borough Council is a 'riparian owner' with responsibilities to maintain these watercourses in good condition.

In early 2010 TBC agreed to increase the land drainage revenue budget; in order to allow for routine maintenance work to be carried out.

Table 2: Completed Tewkesbury Borough Council owned watercourse maintenance works 2015 – 2016

	Location	Parish	Works	Estimated Length (m)	Cost
1	Kings Gate	Ashchurch Rural	Flail cutting of banks	181	£175.00
2	Bramble Chase	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks	330	£202.00
3	Bramble Chase	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks (adjacent Gabions)	50	£170.00
4	Finlay Way	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks	420	£202.00
5	Hayfield Way	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks	512	£252.00
6	Hayfield Way	Bishops Cleeve	Unblock outfall and ditch	sum	£1,019.75
7	Oldacre Drive	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks	250	£162.50
8	Oldacre Drive	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks (Second cut due to growth)	250	£158.00
9	Oldacre Drive (By pass ditch)	Bishops Cleeve	De silt	50	£1,000.00
10	Oldacre Dr/Millham Rd	Bishops Cleeve	Fallen Trees (Blocking watercourse)	sum	£550.00
11	Stoke Road	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting & de silt	55	£231.00
12	Tobyfield Close	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks (walk through cut)	20	£126.00
13	The Grange	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of vegetation (to allow survey)	50	£580.00
14	The Grange	Bishops Cleeve	Clear Blockage and trees (Abigail storm)	Sum	£450.00
15	Voxwell Lane	Bishops Cleeve	Flail cutting of banks	100	£446.00
16	Coopers View	Brockworth	Flail cutting of banks (walk through cut)	406	£407.00
17	Ermin Park	Brockworth	Clearance of fallen trees (Abigail storm)	Sum	£1,000.00
18	Green Way Road	Brockworth	Flail cutting of banks	50	£121.00

			(Balancing pond)		
19	Green Way Road/ Abbotswood Road	Brockworth	Flail cutting of banks	20	£65.00
20	Horsbere Brook	Brockworth	Rope Swing removal blockages cleared	Sum	£140.00
21	Horsbere Brook	Brockworth	Flail cutting of banks (walk through cut)	500	£2,500.00
22	Horsbere Brook	Brockworth	Fallen Trees	Sum	£1,450.00
23	Horsbere Brook	Brockworth	Trees cut back affecting light at Tamar Road	Sum	£880.00
24	Horsbere Brook	Brockworth	Fly tipping	Sum	£87.50
25	Grenville Close	Churchdown	Clear Blockages and fallen trees (Abigail storm)	Sum	£750.00
26	Parkside Close	Churchdown	Flail cutting of bank	66	£231.00
27	Pineholt	Hucclecote	De silt & flail cutting of bank (A lot of fly tipped material)	325	£3,459.40
28	Pineholt	Hucclecote	Flail cutting of banks (second cut due to growth)	325	£451.00
29	Rookery Road	Innsworth	Flail cutting of banks	8	£100.00
30	Fircoft Road	Longford	Flail cutting of banks	115	£165.00
31	Chargrove Lane	Shurdington	Blockage & vegetation removal (Nature Reserve)	180	£1,000.00
32	Bloody Meadow	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of banks	440	£212.00
33	Carrant Brook	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of banks	500	£230.00
34	Carrant Brook, Mitton	Tewkesbury	Split tree on watercourse	sum	£73.02
35	Cricket ground	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of banks	265	£294.00
36	Lankett Lane	Tewkesbury	De silt & flail cutting of bank (A lot of fly tipped material)	180	£418.70
37	Lincoln Green Lane	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of banks	550	£533.00
38	Lower Lode Lane	Tewkesbury	Fallen tree removals (from river Avon)	sum	£1,740.00
39	Lower Lode La/Bloody Meadow	Tewkesbury	Fallen tree removals (Blocking watercourse)	sum	£550.00
40	Mill Avon	Tewkesbury	Vegetation and tree clearance (Access difficult - by Glos Road)	sum	£7,020.00
41	Rails Meadow	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting	395	£230.00

42	Rails Meadow	Tewkesbury	De Silt	395	£3,950.00
43	St Marys Lane	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of bank & trees (Access difficult)	50	£800.00
44	The Vineyards	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of banks	446	£289.90
45	The Vineyards	Tewkesbury	Flail cutting of banks (second cut due to growth)	446	£276.00
46	Honeybourne Meadow	Woodmancote	Blockage removal + tree clearance	sum	£700.00
	-	-			£35,847.77

Table 3: Tewkesbury Borough Council owned watercourse maintenance works proposed 2015/16

	Location	Parish	Works	Estimated Length (m)	Cost
1	Grenville Close	Churchdown	Flail cutting of banks (walk through cut)	600	£3,000.00
2	Pineholt	Hucclecote	Clearance Around Pond Area	Sum	£520.00
3	Tip Road	Stoke Orchard	Flail cutting of banks and de silt	100	£1,500.00
4	Beauchamp Road	Walton Cardiff	Clearance of reeds	sum	£500.00
5	Crown Road	Walton Cardiff	Clearance of reeds	sum	£500.00
6	Honeybourne Meadow	Woodmancote	De silt concrete channel	sum	£1,000.00
7	Various Sites	Various	Footbridges over watercourses inspection and repairs	sum	£1,000.00
					£8,020.00

All works are subject to current quoted costs. Flail cutting and vegetation clearance will not be carried out during the bird nesting season (March 2016 – September 2016). Officers will chase up outstanding works to make sure complete by March 2016.

Table 4 – Insurance claim

	Location	Parish	Works	Estimated Length (m)	Cost
1	9 The Highgrove ()	Bishops Cleeve	Banks collapsing rear of garden adjoining The Grange Watercourse. Structural Engineers have been employed to work out budget costs and alternative schemes	N/A	£4,300.00

Table 5 – Forward Plan – Future Maintenance Issues

As per previous meetings and the above insurance claim at Table 4. It was agreed that officers would look at potential future maintenance issues outside of the general maintenance on our owned watercourses. I.e. collapsing, slipping banks, substantial erosion etc.

Below shows the current known watercourses that potentially will cost substantial monies to fix in the future.

	Location	Parish	Problem	Risks - property / life	Comments
1	9 The Highgrove (Structural Engineers - Employed to work out budget costs and alternative schemes)	Bishops Cleeve	Banks collapsing rear of garden adjoining The Grange Watercourse	High	Topographical survey work completed. Engineers working up a design/scheme to repair problem. Anticipated report end of December/January 2016
2	Finlay Way	Bishops Cleeve	Banks eroding (very sandy soil)	Low	Monitor. Big open space behind.
3	Abbotswood Road/Green Acre	Brockworth	Banks slipping adjoining neighboring properties	Medium	Monitor. On edge of rear garden boundary. Severn Vale Housing monitoring also.
4	Horsbere Brook	Brockworth	Collapsed gabion basket	Low	Monitor. Very deep and wide watercourse. Access issues.
5	Ermin Park	Brockworth	Steep bank with Trees	Low	Monitor. Very deep and wide watercourse. Access issues.
6	Pineholt	Hucclecote	Banks eroding	Low	Simple fix may be carried out here by using big stones to hold banks in place.
7	Mill Avon	Tewkesbury	Collapsed bank fenced off at Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury	Low	Monitor. Very deep and wide watercourse.

iii) Update on Grant Applications (including Flood Defence Grant in Aid)

Table 6: Update on Grant Applications (including Flood Defence Grant in Aid); Existing Schemes

Location	Scheme / Works Description	Funding Source	Funding Allocated	Progress	Target Completion Date
Bishop's Cleeve, Woodmancote and Southam	Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) on-going. SWMP has identified range of measures including diversion, storage and property protection	FDGiA	Estimated at ~ £1M	GCC is the lead authority tasked with progressing. Initial package of works being approved in association with Parish Council. These options will then be worked up, with detailed design to follow.	2020
Kenulf Road, Winchcombe	Individual Property Level Protection	FDGiA	£40,000	Complete	August 2015

iv) Capital Improvement to Properties in Tewkesbury Borough (Repair and Renew Grant)

At a previous of the Flood Risk Management Group, Members requested that progress on capital improvements to properties in Tewkesbury Borough should be included in the Action Plan for the Group.

Repair and Renew Grant

The Repair and Renew Grant is now complete; a debrief was given to Members at the meeting of the Flood Risk Management Group on 28 September 2015.

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	19 January 2016
Subject:	Enviro-Crimes Review Monitoring Report
Report of:	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Services Group Manager
Corporate Lead:	Rachel North, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Councillor J R Mason, Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment
Number of Appendices:	None

<p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>The report provides an update on progress against actions contained in the Environmental Crime Report, arising from a review by the Overview and Scrutiny Working Group review approved by the Executive Committee on 16 July 2014.</p>
<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>To CONSIDER the progress against the recommendations arising from the Enviro-Crimes Review and to APPROVE closure of the review.</p>
<p>Reasons for Recommendation:</p> <p>To improve the way that environmental crimes are investigated in Tewkesbury Borough. Improving recycling and caring for our environment is a key objective within the Council Plan.</p>

<p>Resource Implications:</p> <p>Environmental Health carry out fly-tipping and abandoned vehicle enforcement work within its current resources.</p> <p>Educational and promotional work in relation to dog fouling is carried out using existing resources, including the Environmental Health, Community Safety and Communications teams.</p> <p>Purchase of new signage for dog fouling and fly-tipping has been taken from existing budgets.</p>
<p>Legal Implications:</p> <p>The recommendations/actions may give rise to an increased demand for legal services in relation to prosecutions or legal advice.</p>

Risk Management Implications:

If the Council does not have in place effective arrangements for reducing the level of environmental crimes then there is a reputational risk due to resident's dissatisfaction leading to increased complaints and reported incidents.

Performance Management Follow-up:

The recommendations arising from all Overview and Scrutiny Reviews are monitored every six months.

The number of reported environmental crimes is monitored by means of a performance indicator.

Environmental Implications:

Implementation will result in an improvement in the environment.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

- 1.1** A review of the way in which Tewkesbury Borough Council investigates environmental crimes was undertaken by a Working Group of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The review considered the Council's approach in tackling environmental crimes, and considered what legislative powers were available in addition to those already employed. The resulting report set out the findings from the review and made recommendations in respect of how environmental crimes could be dealt with in the future. The report was considered at the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 10 June 2014 and adopted at the meeting of the Executive Committee on 16 July 2014.
- 1.2** The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has previously received considered updates on the progress against actions set out in the review report at the meetings on 13 January and 21 July 2015.

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CRIMES REPORT ACTIONS CARRIED OUT

- 2.1** In the report presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in July 2015, it was reported that all but two of the review recommendations had been completed. The outstanding recommendations at that time were:
- Organise a training session tailored to the Police, explaining how they can help in tackling dog fouling.
 - Carry out educational campaigns at local schools to make them aware of the dangers of dog fouling. Explore partnership working with other agencies.

- 2.2** In November, Tewkesbury Borough Council arranged a multi-agency 'Day of Action' in Churchdown, putting Officers in the community to highlight and tackle the following:
- issues relating to dog fouling;
 - issues relating to littering and fly tipping;
 - a 'drop-in' information stand in the GL3 Churchdown Community Centre;
 - Officers to patrol the streets; and
 - talking to dog walkers.
- 2.3** The day also served to promote volunteering for litter picking and the Council's 'Paws on Patrol' scheme to get dog walkers to observe and report crimes they may witness. The event was arranged with the very close cooperation and partnership of Churchdown Parish Council which provided a lead on many aspects of the day. The event was promoted widely through posters, literature, websites, social media, shops and schools. The Police were heavily involved, bringing a mobile vehicle to the GL3 car park to warn and inform the community about burglaries, and accompanying Tewkesbury Borough Council Officers on early morning and evening dog walking patrols, giving information to dog walkers, and others in the area, regarding the consequences of allowing dogs to foul, as well as information on how to report incidences of dog fouling they may witness. The exercise also served to educate those in the Police most likely to get involved in such issues, in what to do if they witness fouling. Severn Vale Housing Society was also involved in the day and helped to deliver messages combatting fly tipping and abandoned vehicles. It is planned to have another Day of Action in Spring 2016 in another Parish, yet to be confirmed, and for it to be repeated regularly.
- 2.4** A proposal was put to those attending the Town and Parish Council Seminar on 11 November 2015 for Tewkesbury Borough Council to work collaboratively on tackling enviro-crimes. The proposal is that Tewkesbury Borough Council leads on a project to employ an Officer to complement the work that both Tewkesbury Borough Council and the Parishes already carry out to tackle the issue. The Officer could:
- carry out regular patrols in dog fouling 'hot spot' areas;
 - promote in schools, local community groups and events etc;
 - serve fixed penalty notices;
 - help provide Officers with information to take prosecution actions; and
 - monitor the worst affected areas and make recommendations for actions including arranging campaigns.
- The extent of the work of the Officer is yet to be decided, and could be dictated by the wishes of the Parishes which would pay a contribution for the project to operate for a two or three year period. Tewkesbury Borough Council would contribute 'in kind' by being the employing authority and would coordinate the work and provide regular feedback to the Parishes. The Tewkesbury Borough Council contribution would be made using existing management resources within the Environmental Health Team. Initial feedback is that Parishes will support the proposal, although what is included in the project and how much has yet to be confirmed (for example, the Officer could have a wider monitoring and actioning role in relation to other enviro-crimes such as littering and fly-tipping). Members will be kept updated on the progress of this proposal through the quarterly performance management reports.
- 2.5** The above work means that all of the recommendations are now complete and Members are asked to approve closure of the review.

3.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

3.1 The Working Group considered a number of options and these are contained in its report.

4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1 None

5.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

5.1 Environmental and Housing Service Plan.
Council Plan 2012 – 2016.

6.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

6.1 Environmental Protection Act 1990.
Dog Fouling of Land Act 1996.
Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005.
Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

7.1 A resource was identified to deliver enviro-crime enforcement (and therefore to deliver the actions in the Environmental Crime Report) as part of the Direct Services service review, the allocated budget for this resource was transferred to Environmental Health early in 2015.

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

8.1 Implementation will result in an improvement in the environment and sustainability.

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

9.1 An Equality Impact Assessment was completed. Fly tipping and dog faeces in particular can pose serious risks to health.

10.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS

10.1 Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 10 June 2014 “Enviro-Crimes Review Report”
Executive Committee: 16 July 2014 “Review of Environmental Crimes”

Background Papers: Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 10 June 2014 “Enviro-Crimes Review Report”
Executive Committee: 16 July 2014 “Review of Environmental Crimes”

Contact Officer: David Steels, Environmental Health Manager,
01684 272172 david.steels@teWKesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: None

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Meeting:	19 January 2016
Subject:	Disabled Facilities Grants Review Update
Report of:	Val Garside, Environmental and Housing Group Manager
Corporate Lead:	Rachel North, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member:	Councillor J R Mason, Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment
Number of Appendices:	1

<p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>This report contains an update on progress of the Disabled Facilities Grants Review.</p>
<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Members are asked to CONSIDER the progress of the Disabled Facilities Grants Review.</p>
<p>Reasons for Recommendation:</p> <p>At a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 21 July 2015, it was agreed to establish a working group to review the Council's approach to Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs). Terms of Reference for the Working Group were also approved at that meeting.</p>

<p>Resource Implications:</p> <p>Officer time has been met from existing allocated resources. It is likely that the Working Group will meet for less than the maximum five sessions originally suggested.</p>
<p>Legal Implications:</p> <p>None as a direct result of this report. One Legal will be able to provide advice to the Working Group or Officers as required regarding the Council's duties and powers to provide DFGs.</p>
<p>Risk Management Implications:</p> <p>If the Council does not have in place effective arrangements for administering DFGs then there is a reputational risk of failing to comply with statutory requirements, leading to potential interventions from the Ombudsman or judicial review. The Council also contributes capital funds, therefore, there are financial risks to not administering grants effectively. There could also be customer dissatisfaction leading to increased complaints.</p>

Performance Management Follow-up:

The number and value of DFGs administered is monitored by means of a performance indicator and this is reported to Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a quarterly basis.

Environmental Implications:

None.

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

1.1 At a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 21 July 2015, it was agreed to establish a working group to review the Council's approach to Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG). That meeting's report also gave a brief overview of what DFGs are and why the Council administers them. The Terms of Reference are shown at Appendix 1 to this report. At the first meeting, Councillor T A Spencer was elected to chair the Working Group. Other Members are Councillors Mrs G F Blackwell, K J Cromwell and Mrs P E Stokes plus the Lead Member for Clean and Green Environment.

2.0 PROGRESS OF THE DISABLED FACILITIES REVIEW WORKING GROUP

2.1 A verbal update on progress was given at the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 20 October 2015 by the Chairman of the Working Group. The Group has met twice, the first time on 24 September and then on 30 November 2015. Invites were sent to other organisations and agencies which may be able to contribute. Although few were able to attend the meetings, all those invited have contributed positively to the review in the intervening period. Meetings have been attended by Officers from Environmental Health, Housing, Finance and Corporate Services.

2.2 The Working Group's meeting in September was an opportunity to give an overview of the existing process and financial arrangements, how we compare to other local authorities locally and what work was currently being undertaken to meet the Terms of Reference of the Working Group in improving the service, including discussions on improvements delivered jointly with other agencies. This included discussion of the work with Gloucestershire County Council which now helped to fund grants, rather than central government, through the relatively new Better Care Fund.

2.3 The second meeting continued the discussion on the improvements being carried out and then moved on to areas that may be considered as part of any action plan. Specifically the following subjects were discussed:

- a. Better and earlier information being given to those with a disability regarding their options, including assistance to move to a more suitable property or one that could be more easily adapted.
- b. Streamlining the application process and the correspondence sent once the grant has been approved.
- c. Potential improvements in the procurement of contractors and equipment, including benefits of using schedules of rates and alternatives to fixed equipment currently being provided.

2.4 It is proposed that the final meeting of the Working Group be held on Thursday 28 January and it is planned that this will include discussion of other external initiatives, including the work of the countywide Better Care Fund project group, with other complementary projects that help assist adults with a disability. The Working Group's report and action plan is planned to be presented at the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 23 February 2016. This is later than the December date noted in the Terms of Reference.

3.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

3.1 None

4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1 Gloucestershire County Council and Severn Vale Housing Society are both contributing to the work of the group and have expressed a wish to positively contribute to the improvement of the DFG process.

5.0 RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES/STRATEGIES

5.1 Council Plan 2012-16 – Priority 4 (Improve the quality of the housing stock): 'Work with Public Health to develop new approaches to enablement and adaptations for disabled people'.

6.0 RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICIES

6.1 Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996; Part 1, Chapter 1: 'Disabled Facilities Grants'.

7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (Human/Property)

7.1 Officer time to help facilitate the review.

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

8.1 Effective outcomes will have a positive impact on the most vulnerable people living in the Borough.

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

9.1 Effective outcomes will also have a positive impact on the cost of providing adaptations and will help ensure a safe and healthy environment for applicants.

10.0 RELATED DECISIONS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT FACTS

10.1 None.

Background Papers: None

Contact Officer: David Steels, Environmental Health Manager,
01684 272172 david.steels@teWKesbury.gov.uk

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Disabled Facilities Grants Review Working Group Terms of Reference

Disabled Facilities Grants Review – Terms of Reference

Introduction

An Overview and Scrutiny Working Group will be asked to work with Officers to review the Council's approach to dealing with Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs).

Purpose of the Review

1. To gain a clear understanding of:
 - a. The statutory and discretionary processes involved in allocating grants and how they are applied locally.
 - b. How grants are funded (including comparisons with other local authorities).
 - c. What agencies are involved in the processes and what role they fulfil (including the involvement of registered providers).
 - d. The potential use of previously adapted properties.
2. To consider the Council's current approach in administering grants, in particular how current practices impact on those who could or do benefit from applying.
3. To look at good practice elsewhere, especially those that provide cost effectiveness and good customer satisfaction.
4. To determine possible ways in which processes can be improved.

Who should we consult?

- Relevant Council Officers (e.g. Environmental Health, Housing, Finance).
- Other agencies involved in the delivery of services (e.g. occupational therapists, Safe at Home improvement agency, works contractors etc).
- Service user representatives.
- Housing providers (e.g. registered providers).
- Neighbouring authorities/good practice authorities.

Support

- David Steels.
- Kevin Wood.
- Corporate Services.
- Democratic Services.

How long will it take?

Aim to start review in September 2015 and complete by December 2015.

Outcomes

To deliver:

- an efficient system;
- best value for the Council; and
- appropriate levels of support for disabled residents.