

**Questions raised by Overview and Scrutiny Committee at meeting held on
12 June 2018**

Questions raised by Overview and Scrutiny	Response from officers
Performance Tracker - Priority: Finance and Resources	
<p>P56 – Objective 3 – Action b) – Undertake a review of the discretionary trade waste service to ensure that it is operating on a viable commercial level – A Member raised concern that this action had been delayed and he questioned why it was not being prioritised given that this had been highlighted as a potential opportunity to generate money for the Council. He also questioned why the results of the marketing exercise had not been brought to Members so they could at least see what had been done to date.</p>	<p>The Head of Community Services explained that, whilst waiting for the final Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) report that had been commissioned by the Council, it had been intended to do some initial marketing to try to uplift the amount of trade waste contractors; unfortunately, this had been delayed by an Officer going on maternity leave, which obviously could not be planned for. Notwithstanding this, a different report had been commissioned by Ubico on behalf of the Joint Waste Team and it was felt that it may be advantageous to see if there were opportunities for joint working. One of the partners was looking at the potential for a county-wide service and conversations were taking place with them to establish if this would be more beneficial than Tewkesbury Borough Council running its own service. He advised that the garden waste project was now in its final stages so there would be additional resources available for the trade waste project and he confirmed that the results would be brought back to Members by December 2018.</p>
<p>P57 – Objective 4 – Action b) Deliver the Council's asset plan – A Member noted that the MAFF and Prior's Park garage sites were included in the list of items within the plan but neither had been delivered and therefore he did not feel a happy face was justified.</p>	<p>The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that, overall, delivery of the asset plan was on track. A report on the MAFF site would be considered by the Executive Committee in July and there was ongoing engagement and discussion with Severn Vale Housing Society in relation to the Prior's Park garage sites which could be brought back to Members as it developed.</p>
Performance Tracker – Priority: Economic Development	
<p>Page No. 62 – Objective 4 – Action a) Develop a regeneration plan for Tewkesbury Town – A Member noted that the target date had been amended and questioned the significance of the new September date.</p>	<p>The Head of Development Services advised that this was in line with the Tewkesbury Town Regeneration Partnership meeting. She explained that there was a draft plan which had been shared with the Partnership but it was important to ensure it was right before it was made public.</p>

<p>Page No. 62 – Objective 4 – Action b) Deliver a programme with partners to progress Healings Mill and other key sites to support the regeneration of Tewkesbury – A Member raised concern that it was taking some time to draw up a programme of action and sought clarification as to why.</p>	<p>The Head of Development Services explained that the action plan was constantly moving and a number of conversations were taking place with various parties including the owner, Homes England, the Environment Agency and Historic England etc. The Council’s new Conservation Officer had been tasked with looking at the conservation and heritage aspect of the programme. Unfortunately, a lot of things were out of the Council’s control but she provided assurance that Officers would continue to drive the project forwards.</p>
<p>Performance Tracker – Priority: Housing</p>	
<p>P67 – Objective 3 – Action b) Work with partners, infrastructure providers and developers to progress the delivery of key sites – A Member questioned why there was a happy face against the progress when the comments section stated that the JCS transport strategy (May 2017) had identified requirements for strategic allocations but funding had not been secured for the A38/A40 link road which was a key piece of infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Head of Development Services advised that this action was multi-faceted and covered several different sites. There had been positive discussions in respect of other sites which was the reason it was considered to be performing well and Officers continued to look at other opportunities for funding across the board. The Member was of the view that the happy face was not appropriate given that the link road was a major piece of infrastructure which would affect three of the strategic allocations. The Deputy Chief Executive took this point and indicated that the action could be split up and he undertook to ensure this was reflected in future reports.</p>
<p>P68 – Objective 4 – Action b) Deliver 150 affordable homes each year – Whilst it was commendable that 233 affordable homes had been delivered, a Member questioned whether the target had been set too low.</p>	<p>The Head of Community Services advised that the target that had been set was a realistic one based on what it was thought could be delivered. Officers were reviewing the target to reflect what the Council could deliver with its partners. The Chief Executive indicated that this was something which had also been picked up by the Executive Committee. It was accepted that the target needed to be refined to split up the different housing types and tenures so that it was more meaningful for Members.</p>

Performance Tracker – Priority: Customer-focused services	
<p>P74 – Objective 1 – Action c) Review garden waste arrangements to improve the renewal and payment process – A Member noted that the new garden waste project had generated over £722,000 and she questioned how much it had cost to implement.</p>	<p>The Head of Community Services indicated that he did not have that information to hand but he would update Members following the meeting.</p>
Key Performance Indicators for Priority: Customer Focused Services	
<p>P84 – KPI 29 – Percentage of waste recycled or composted – A Member noted that progress was being made with the construction of the ‘Energy from Waste’ plant at Javelin Park and he queried how this would affect the Council’s performance.</p> <p>Another Member indicated that supermarkets had made a commitment to reduce the amount of packaging used by 40% by 2020 and, although the percentage was less than the previous year, the amount of waste which could be recycled was also less so the fact the target for the year had been exceeded was very positive.</p>	<p>The Head of Community Services advised that there had been a reduction in recycling rates where ‘Energy from Waste’ plants had been set up in other parts of the country. Nevertheless, the Council would continue to promote and encourage recycling. He reminded Members that recycling was only one part of the waste hierarchy – the first option was to either not use or re-use; therefore, in an ideal situation there would be no waste to recycle or take to landfill. It was noted that ‘Energy from Waste’ would reduce landfill to zero.</p>