



Minutes

Policy Review Committee

Venue:	Committee Room
Date:	18 December 2012
Present:	Councillor M Jordan (Chair), Councillor K Ellis, Councillor R Musgrave, Councillor R Packham, Councillor I Reynolds, and Councillor Mrs A Spetch
Apologies for Absence:	Councillor Mrs E Metcalfe
Officers Present:	Karen Iveson, Executive Director (S151); Sarah Smith, Business Manager; Keith Cadman, Lead Officer - Contracts and Richard Besley, Democratic Services

29. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest at this time.

30. Chair's Address

The Chair welcomed everyone to the reconvened meeting from 10 December.

31. PR/12/13 – Chargeable Green Waste Collections

The Executive Director (s151) outlined the background of the report that received by the Executive on 6 December 2012 and reviewed the discussion of the Committee at its last meeting.

The Chair invited the Officers to highlight the key issues from the report and the decisions on options taken last time.

Business Manager, Sarah Smith, confirmed that direction had been given on payment year to be a twelve month period when service starts, that there would be no concessions and there would be full charge for second and subsequent bins.

A suggestion that no part year charge be implemented, similar to the model introduced by Rushcliffe Council, had been discussed however, the Committee had originally felt that a part year discount may be considered for new properties only. On review the Committee agreed to rescind that proposal and recommend no part year charge.

The Business Manager outlined that no decisions as yet had been made on the practicalities on unused bins and identifying them.

The Officers had discussed with Rushcliffe Council its handling of unused bins. They had taken the decision to leave unwanted bins in situ, unless otherwise instructed by the resident to remove them. As take up by residents of Rushcliffe had been good the numbers were small. A benefit of leaving green bins in place was that they acted as marketing tool, providing a reminder of the service and also meant that any latecomers to the scheme did not need to have a bin re-issued and there were no significant storage costs.

The Officers highlighted that the discussions with Rushcliffe Council confirmed that their decision was very similar to the proposals intended for Selby by way of timescale and preparation.

Rushcliffe Council had reached a decision by March and implemented in July allowing a three month period of registration, with all necessary paperwork prepared in advance.

They had no clear increase in tonnage at their Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) and no high increase in residual waste or fly tipping. There had been no instances of pockets of resistance as take-up has been standard across their whole district and no increases in demand for replacement bins with residents reflecting a sense of care through ownership.

The communication strategy adopted by Rushcliffe was to undertake a leaflet drop in each of the first three months. These were supplemented by online support, media campaign and targeted information at their contact centres, etc with posters, promotions.

Officers confirmed that, like Selby, Rushcliffe was a two tier Local Authority area and predominantly rural though neighbouring a large urban metropolitan authority (Nottingham City Council) and that prior to charging they offered a similar operation to our own current collections. The Committee again considered the funding structure and cost comparisons and felt opposed to a price based on cost recovery and a price should be offered on value.

The Executive Director (s151) outlined that comparative prices had been considered and that a price of £26 - £30 per annum compared favourably.

Officers confirmed that the Council could only recover the cost of collection.

The Committee were concerned that the cost assumptions where identified were based on percentage of take-up rates or total properties and asked for clarification and revised figure for the next meeting.

Officers were also asked whether figures were available to compare the take-up rate with Council Tax bandings of properties and the effect on the Enterprise contract if the service was cancelled. It was confirmed that discussions would be required with Enterprise.

The Officers agreed to look at the recasting of the assumption figures for total figures for the district, to study the County paper to look at those who had moved from free to a charge, to ascertain why Newark and Sherwood Council have no collection scheme and the impact of a penalty clause on the Enterprise contract.

The Chair reviewed the decision from the previous meeting to undertake consultation and the Executive Director (s151) confirmed that the Budget proposals would be subject to public consultation.

In summary, the Committee agreed the following points:

- i) Following discussion it was agreed to amend the proposal from the previous meeting and not to offer a part year discount;**
- ii) Agreed to leave unwanted bins in situ unless requested;**
- iii) Agree to opt for the most cost effective method of identifying the unwanted bins – sticker or tag;**
- iv) Agreed that any consultation include a reasonable sample of the public;**
- v) If a charging policy was introduced to recommend to the Executive a maximum charge of £26.00 be made in the first year irrespective of take-up rate.**

The meeting closed at 6:35pm