

BABERGH AND MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCILS

Minutes of the meeting of the **JOINT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** held in the King Edmund Chamber - Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Thursday, 19 September 2019

PRESENT:

Councillors:	Susan Maria Ayres	James Caston
	Kathryn Grandon	Lavinia Hadingham
	Alastair McCraw	Mary McLaren
	Andrew Mellen	David Muller
	Adrian Osborne	Keith Scarff – Vice-Chair
	Keith Welham - Chair	

In attendance:

Officers: Assistant Director – Planning and Communities
Corporate Manager - Waste Services
Senior Governance Officer
Corporate Manager - Democratic Services
Professional Lead - Key Sites and Infrastructure

Apologies:

Councillor Jane Gould

2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

2.1 There were no declarations of interests.

3 JOS/19/14 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 AUGUST 2019

3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on the 19 of August 2019 be confirmed and signed as a true record with the follow amendment:

Paragraph 9.45: 'agreed' to be replaced with 'discussed'

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

4.1 None received.

5 QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

5.1 None received.

6 QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS

6.1 None received.

8 JOS/19/16 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) EXPENDITURE FRAMEWORK REVIEW

8.1 Councillor Clive Arthey, Cabinet Member for Planning and Member of the CIL Member Working Group, introduced the report and outlined the main points of the report. He then welcomed the witnesses to the Committee. The witnesses were:

- Robin Morley – Parish Councillor for Cockfield Parish Council
- James Cutting – Head of Planning at Suffolk Country Council
- Daniel Turner – Representative for the Clinical Commissioning Group – Health
- Chris Crisell – Representative for Clinical Commissioning Group
- Steve Holman – Representative for Network Rail
- Clive Arthey – Member of the CIL Member Working Group

8.2 Robin Morley, Parish Councillor for Cockfield Parish Council outlined the amount of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding applied for and received for Cockfield Parish Council. He said the village had already spent all the Section 106 received. He detailed the various projects which had been funded by CIL and how they had benefitted the community. The total amount of funding applied for during the last few years were approximately £58,000. It had been possible to apply for this funding as the village had grown by nearly 20% due to new developments.

8.3 In response to Councillor Mellen's question, Mr Morley clarified the different funding streams which made the collective sum of £58,000 being a combination of Section 106, CIL, funding from Babergh District Council and the Cockfield Parish Council.

8.4 Councillor Arthey recommended that any community applying for funding should contact the CIL team at the District Council as they had been supportive and provided useful advice. He stated that in his role as a Cabinet Member, he would like to congratulate Christine Thurlow and her team for the work they had undertaken for the CIL funding scheme and the current review.

8.5 James Cutting – Head of Planning for Suffolk County Council detailed the work he undertook. He explained the programming of infrastructure projects and the department's work with businesses, developers and other stakeholders. He explained how funding was allocated and that the department advised stakeholders on how to spend the funding provided. He was mindful that the application process for schools did not become too cumbersome. CIL and Section 106 funding were part of a variety of funding available to schools.

8.6 Councillor Grandon enquire whether CIL could be spent on additional items on top of Government funding or if the funding could only be used on

essential projects. Mr Cutting responded that fundamental expenditure was part of the education funding. However, additional resources were often required to maintain schools and CIL could form a part of such projects.

- 8.7 In response to Councillor Field's concern for Section 106 funding and CIL, Tom Barker, Assistant Director for Planning and Communities, provided a brief clarification of CIL and Section 106 funding, the application process and the funding options.
- 8.8 Councillor Mansel enquired how academies applied for CIL funding, since they were no longer under SCC. In response Mr Cutting responded that SCC still maintained a strategic function in the area, which made it possible to identify specific requirements. The SCC CIL funding team worked with academies and assisted them in applying for grant funding.
- 8.9 Councillor McCraw asked for clarification for relationship between the construction of new bus stops and the changes in bus services in the District.
- 8.10 He also enquired if there was a maximum amount for a single application for CIL.
- 8.11 Mr Cutting explained that the amount of funding depended on the projects. However, the current total funding for some of the upcoming projects amounted to millions of pounds. The SCC worked with the District Councils to assess the needs to avoid delays in the funding provision.
- 8.12 Further questions regarding bus stops ensued and Mr Cutting explained that infrastructure for bus stops was being developed and therefore some bus stops were being constructed for possible future bus services.
- 8.13 The Assistant Director for Planning and Communities reiterated that CIL was a mechanism for securing infrastructure funding.
- 8.14 The Professional Lead - Key Sites and Infrastructure outlined the work conducted for current funding applications. She then informed Members that a review was being undertaken in the CIL Member Working Group, which included the application process.
- 8.15 Daniel Turner – Representative for the Clinical Commissioning Group – Health outlined CIL funding for the provision of health across Suffolk and the development of health centres and GP Surgeries. He explained that CIL Funding was an important part of this process as NHS funding was restricted.
- 8.16 Chris Crisell – Representative for the Clinical Commissioning Group, explained that his department develop strategies for CIL funding and approached GP surgeries to provide advice on how to apply for funding.
- 8.17 In response to Councillors questions Mr Crisell clarified that funding for GP Surgeries were primarily to provide services but community elements were considered an important part of CIL funding application.

- 8.18 The Assistant Director for Planning and Communities explained in response to Councillor Hadingham's question that the review of the CIL framework would identify areas in which to spend CIL funding. This would be a collaboration between the Parish Councils and Districts CIL funding pot.
- 8.19 Steve Holman - Representative for Network Rail outlined how CIL funding was applied not just to local projects but also on a cross authority basis and that an anticipate target for next year's CIL funding was £450M.
- 8.20 Members debated CIL funding and Councillor Welham asked if the CIL team could report back on how much CIL funding had been allocated, and if allocated funding was being spent.
- 8.21 The Professional Lead - Key Sites and Infrastructure responded that appendix B detailed all current projects. The infrastructure development plan had been published in June 2019, however the CIL Member Working Group had undertaken further work on this plan.
- 8.22 Councillor Welham referred to paragraph 4.9 (page 24) and emphasised the importance for all three infrastructure providers to work cohesively for the benefit of communities.
- 8.23 He also asked if Ward Members could be informed when applications for CIL funding were submitted within their wards.
- 8.24 Councillor Grandon enquired if considerations for communities were taken into account when CIL bids were made from Network Rail.
- 8.25 Mr Holman explained that consideration of all railway users was part of the planning of any long-term projects, including cost and impact on the communities, which would be affected of the proposed projects.
- 8.26 The Assistant Director for Planning and Communities advised Members that any decisions for bids for rail would be for the consideration for the Cabinet.
- 8.27 Councillor Filed enquired if there were any indications of rail infrastructure improvements and Mr Holman responded that a Governance for Railway Investment Project (GRIP) was being undertaken, which was a gateway decision making process. This process would identify and mitigate all types of risk embedding in all Network Rail workings.
- 8.28 Councillor McCraw asked if the CIL Bid process was part of this review and the Professional Lead for Key Sites and Infrastructures advised that work was being undertaken on procedures.
- 8.29 Members debated the resolution and the work of the CIL team. They agreed that the work should be endorsed and that there was a fit and proper process in place for the bidding and allocation of CIL Funds.

By a unanimous vote.

It was RESOLVED: -

That the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee endorses the work of the CIL team (and the CIL Member Working Group) and notes that a fit and proper process is in place in respect of the bidding and allocation of CIL funds.

7 JOS/19/15 WASTE COLLECTION ROUTE CHANGES JULY 2019

- 7.1 The Corporate Manager – Waste Services, introduce the Report and detailed how the change of waste bin collection routes had been implemented. He advised Members that after the first week of the route changes, calls to the customer Service Centre had resume to normal levels.
- 7.2 In response to Councillor Welham's question the Corporate Manager for Waste Services responded that lessons had been learnt for any future route changes. He added that the teams involved had work hard to ensure that the implementation of the new bin collection routes were executed as smoothly as possible.
- 7.3 Councillor Grandon thought that the report had been clear and was well written. She had received no complaints from her ward despite that refuse collection days had changed.
- 7.4 Several Members suggested that recycling stickers or leaflets for recycling material were distributed to households again. However, the Corporate Manager for Waste Services explained that cost had to be considered in relation to the benefits achieved for such projects. He added that nationally recycling processes varied across authorities but that in Suffolk the recycling processes were consistent between authorities.
- 7.5 Councillor McCraw enquired if there was a method of feedback from the Waste Service collection crews, as waste collection in one street had been completely missed. The Corporate Manager for Waste Services responded that SERCO collected and managed feed-back from the Waste Collection Service Teams and provided data sets of collections to the Councils.
- 7.6 Members discussed the method for logging missed bin collections and how the Call System was collecting data. Suggestions were made for a call-back to customers, who had been unable to get through to the call-centre.
- 7.7 Members also queried if the vehicles were fit for purpose and if extra vehicles and crews had been used during the route changing period, which was confirmed by the officer.
- 7.8 Councillor Mansel thought that there had been a missed opportunity for informing resident of how to recycle, as 65,000 residents had received a leaflet regarding route changes. She thought that recycling information could have been included in this despatch.

- 7.9 The Corporate Manager for Waste Services explained that it had been considered to send a leaflet to all residents, however it had been decided that the benefit of sending information to all 84,000 residents was outweighed by cost of the distribution.
- 7.10 Councillor Adrian Osborne stated that contaminated recycling bins were an issue in Sudbury and that the Waste Collection Service collection teams dealt with these issues well.
- 7.11 Councillor Muller queried several issues including that the residents had no confidence that the content of the recycling bins was recycled as some crews had collected recycling waste in the refuse collections.
- 7.12 It was clarified that collection crews had not been encouraged to tip recycling waste into the refused collections, and that this would be discussed with SERCO.
- 7.13 Councillor Caston felt that there had not been a huge disruption and that it should be remembered that the route changes had been to improve the efficiency of resources by shortening routes and distances to the waste collecting centres.
- 7.14 Councillor Jan Osborne – Cabinet Member for Housing asked that consideration be provided at the planning stage for new developments as access for the bin collection vehicles was hindered by narrow lanes and restricted access.
- 7.15 The Corporate Manager for Waste Services informed Members that all new planning applications were considered by the Waste Collection Service team.
- 7.16 Councillor Malvisi added that many elderly people live in rural areas, some of whom would have difficulties in organising bins for collection. She thought that new housing developments should take such issues into consideration.
- 7.17 Councillor Scarff enquired if the direct costs of the route change were covered by SERCO and if any indirect costs would be included in the normal charges for SERCO. He asked if penalty fees for items such as missed bin collections, would be incorporated in the new SERCO contract.
- 7.18 The Corporate Manager clarified that penalties fees were included in the new SERCO contract, but that any future route changes would not incur further charges.
- 7.19 Councillor Fleming commented that she did not agree with the risk factor in paragraph 7.1 in the report as a ‘high probability’ since mitigation was already underway and the new MERF recycling plant would be able to alleviate any risks.

- 7.20 Councillor McCraw stated that the risk factor in paragraph 7.1 detailed what the risk would be if the waste collection routes had not been changed.
- 7.21 Councillor Muller suggested that an article regarding waste should be included in Parish Magazines to encourage recycling.
- 7.22 Members discussed the recommendation and agreed that thanks should be extended to the Waste Collection Service team and that lessons learnt should be forwarded to the Senior Leadership Team for any future waste collection route changes or similar projects.

It was RESOLVED:

- 1.1 That the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee extend thanks for the report.**
- 1.2 That the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee commend the Waste Collection Service Team on the successful introduction of the new Bin Collection Routes.**
- 1.3 That the points learnt during the implementation of the new Bin Collection Routes be forwarded to the Senior Leadership Team for consideration in future similar projects.**

10 FORTHCOMING DECISIONS LIST

It was RESOLVED: -

That the Forthcoming Decisions List be noted.

9 JOS/19/17 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- 9.1 Councillor Jan Osborne briefly introduced the Information Bulletin, summarising the information provided and updating Members on recent developments.
- 9.2 The Corporate Manager for Tenant Services explained that the reduction in voids was working well and that it had been a team effort to achieve this. However, as the number of claimants increased there would be continued challenges for the team to deal with.
- 9.3 Members discussed the Information Bulletin and Councillor McCraw suggested that unless there were any changes in voids that no further reports be submitted to the committee.

It was RESOLVED:-

That no further Information Bulletin updates be submitted to the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee unless there are any significant changes in Voids

11 JOS/19/18 BABERGH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PLAN

1.1 Members discussed agenda item 11 and 12.

1.2 Councillor Ayres updated the Committee on the work of the Gipsy and Traveller steering group. The representatives would bring updates to the Committee in the future.

It was RESOLVED: -

That the Babergh Overview and Scrutiny Work Plan be noted.

12 JOS/19/19 MID SUFFOLK OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PLAN

It was RESOLVED: -

That the Mid Suffolk Overview and Scrutiny Work Plan be noted.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 12.19 pm.

.....
Chair