BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **BABERGH CABINET** held in the Elisabeth Room - Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Thursday, 13 December 2018

PRESENT:

Councillor: John Ward (Chairman)
Jan Osborne (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Kathryn Grandon
Nick Ridley
Simon Barrett
Margaret Maybury
Derek Davis

In attendance:

Councillor(s):

C Arthey
S Carpendale
A McCraw

Officers:
Chief Executive (AC)
Strategic Director (JS)
Assistant Director - Assets and Investments (EA)
Assistant Director - Corporate Resources (KS)
Corporate Manager - Procurement (RHG)
Corporate Manager - Democratic Services (JR)
Corporate Manager - (Performance) (KC)

Apologies:
Tina Campbell
Frank Lawrenson

83 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY COUNCILLORS

83.1 There were no declarations of interests.

84 BCA/18/47 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8 NOVEMBER 2018

It was Resolved:

That subject to the spelling of Councillor Simon Barrett being amended in Minute 80.23 and 80.26 the Minutes were approved as a true record.

85 TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PETITION SCHEME

85.1 There were no petitions received.

86 QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS

86.1 There were no questions received.

87 MATTERS REFERRED BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY OR JOINT AUDIT AND STANDARDS COMMITTEES

87.1 There were no matters referred by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the Joint Audit and Standards Committee.

88 BCA/18/48 FORTHCOMING DECISIONS LIST

88.1 The updated forthcoming decisions list was noted.

89 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (WHICH TERM INCLUDES THE PRESS)

It was Resolved:

That pursuant to Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the business specified in the report on the grounds that if the public were present during that item, as it is likely that there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

90 BCA/18/52 BABERGH FORMER HQ SITE DEVELOPMENT

90.1 Councillor Ward introduced the report and **MOVED** the recommendations in the report, which Councillor Simon Barrett **SECONDED.**

91 RE-ADMITTANCE OF THE PUBLIC

It was Resolved:-

That the public be readmitted to the meeting.

92 BCA/18/49 QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE OUTCOME REPORTING

92.1 Councillor Davis introduced the report and **MOVED** the recommendations in the report which Councillor Jan Osborne **SECONDED**.

92.2 Councillor Davis stated that the Quarter 2 Performance Report to Cabinet continued to be refined to ensure that it was capturing the most appropriate performance measures. Within the report eight areas had been highlighted as having exceptionally good performance and four areas where performance had not met the targets that were set. Within the appendices were details of the measures that had been put in place to improve these. Overall, he felt that this was a good

Quarter 2 Performance Report.

92.3 Councillor Simon Barrett queried the 100% success rate of legal challenges and ask if the Council were being robust enough or whether they were only taking on the safe legal challenges?

92.4 In response Councillor Davis stated that he had been assured by Legal Services that they would take on everything, cost was not an issue and that they would robustly defend any issue that they needed to.

92.5 Councillor Grandon raised concerns related to the increase in time for planning searches and the financial and reputational issues that might arise from this.

92.6 In response Councillor Davis stated that the previous target had been fifteen days, but this had recently been lowered to ten days. Currently the Council was working slightly below this. Overall the Council was still improving and would improve further, this was helped by setting the officers harder targets to reach.

92.7 Councillor Carpendale queried under the housing section HD01 how many children were involved in the 22 households that were in temporary accommodation?

92.8 In response Councillor Jan Osborne told Cabinet that she did not have those figures to hand currently, however she would find out and report back to Councillor Carpendale. She has also requested that an indicator be added on the number of children in temporary accommodation going forward.

92.9 Councillor Arthey congratulated Councillor Davis on the reduction in the length of time it took to answer calls but felt that it was still taking far too long

92.10 In response Councillor Davis told Cabinet that the Assistant Director for Customer Service and her team had worked extremely hard to get these times reduced, the figures that were already coming through for the next performance report were already reflecting a further reduction in these times.

It was Resolved:-

That the performance report and the performance outcome information tabled at Appendices A to G of the report be agreed as adequately reflecting Babergh District Council's performance for July – September 2018.

Reason for Decision:
To provide assurance that the Council is meeting its performance objectives.

93 BCA/18/50 PROPOSAL FOR A NEW INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENT FROM SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL FROM 2019 - 2024

93.1 Councillor Ward introduced the report and **MOVED** the recommendations in the report, which Councillor Maybury **SECONDED.**

93.2 In his introduction Councillor Ward informed Cabinet that the purpose of the report was to agree to a continuation of the Inter Authority Agreement which expired in April 2019, for a further 5-year period and to agree the revised Recycling Performance Payments for the various commodities from 2019 to 2024 as set out in 4.8 of the report. The agreement sets out a clear framework of how the Suffolk Waste Partnership would work together and agree funding for all authorities to budget with some certainty. There were 3 options for dealing with recycling arrangements and Suffolk has always opted for a Local Agreement, which had worked extremely well for the benefit of all Suffolk Waster Partnership partners.

93.3 The principles of the agreement were set out in 4.7 of the report and have not changed. The most significant change had been recycling performance payments made to the collection authorities for organic waste. These had reduced from a payment of £54.76 per tonne to £30 per tonne. This reduction was well sign posted and was a result of a significant piece of work undertaken by the Suffolk Waste Partnership over 3 years ago. This resulted in all other Suffolk Authorities apart from Ipswich moving to a subscription-based garden waster service. During the 3-year transition period Mid Suffolk and Babergh's recycling performance payments were preserved. All reductions have been incorporated into the budget process. The garden waste service still netted Mid Suffolk and Babergh approx. £250,000 per year each. The other changes in the payment schedule were for Bring site payments which would be reduced to £30 per tonne, however due to the 3rd party payments, Mid Suffolk and Babergh would each also receive a grant of £35,000 per year. Some additional changes were agreed, due to the uncertainty of the recycling commodity market globally, the waste collection authorities were totally exposed to any changes. Suffolk County County would now fund 50% of any increase above a £25 gate fee for materials and recycling facility and 100% above a £50 gate fee. This had limited the financial risk to the waste collection authorities.

93.4 The Suffolk Waste Partnership continued to work very successfully as a collaborative partnership and by endorsing the report provided that ongoing commitment.

93.5 Councillor Arthey, being the Council representative on the Suffolk Waste Partnership made a short statement explaining the background to the agreement and informed Cabinet that by joining with other authorities in Suffolk, the Council and the other authorities in the partnership had been able to make savings and secure considerable amounts of funding in order to make changes across Suffolk to a three-bin collection service which as a result of these and recycling initiatives had increased the recycling rates by nearly 50%. In simple terms the inter-authority agreement balanced out the amount that the County saved for having to landfill all energy from waste. And as a result of this the Council received a credit.

93.6 Councillor McCraw queried why the proposed payments per tonne for recycling performance payments for Ipswich Borough Council were £44.95 compared to everybody else getting £30 a tonne?

93.7 In response the Assistant Director for the Environment and Commercial Partnerships informed Cabinet that Ipswich Borough Council had a higher fee because they have declined to go to a subscription based service and there was an obligation for the County Council, because Ipswich put a certain amount of non-cooked food waste into their bins it was then classed as a municipal waste stream and therefore they got close to the statutory minimum for their organic waste disposal, whereas the other authorities had reached an agreement with the County to reduce the payment to £30 per tonne because it was largely garden waste.

It was Resolved:-

That the Council enters into a further 5-year period of the Inter Authority Agreement between the Waste Collection Authorities and the Waste Disposal Authority.

Reason for Decision:
Working collaboratively across the Suffolk Waste Partnership benefits both the Waste Disposal Authority and Waste Collections Authorities in setting out clearly both working arrangements and recycling performance payments.

94 BCA/18/51 MODERN SLAVERY POLICY

94.1 Councillor Ward introduced the report and **MOVED** the recommendations in the report which Councillor Simon Barrett **SECONDED**.

94.2 In his introductory speech, Councillor Ward stated that the proposed policy detailed the Council's commitment to eliminate modern slavery and contribute positively to ensure that its suppliers of goods, works and services do no use slavery in any form. The Policy would not only enable the Council to comply with the Modern Slavery Act 2015 but also the Modern Slavery (Transparency in Supply Chains) Bill, which would require two things of the Council. Firstly, to publish a Section 54 statement as specified in the Modern Slavery Act 2015 and secondly the Council would need to comply with the amendment to Regulation 57 of the Public Contract Regulations 2015.

94.3 Councillor Ward emphasised that the Council was already ensuring that their commissioning and procurement practices did not support slavery, the implementation of the Policy would formalise practices that were already in place. and the Council would only need to make minor changes to its terms and conditions to meet any future legal requirements.

By a unanimous vote

It was Resolved:-

That the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Policy on Modern Slavery be adopted.

Reason:
To enhance the Council's commitment to operate ethically and to contribute to the elimination of modern slavery.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 3.48 pm.

……..
Chair