

Scrutiny Committee

Venue:	Committee Room
Date:	20 September 2011
Present:	Councillors I Chilvers, M Dyson, K Ellis, M Hobson Mrs W Nichols (Chair), C Pearson, D Peart and R Price (Vice Chair)
Apologies for Absence:	Councillor D Mackay
Also Present:	Councillors Mark Crane, Mrs D Davies, B Marshall (NYPA Member), Chief Inspector Anderson, Ian Wolstenholme (NYPA), Colin Moreton (CSP)
Officers Present:	Jonathan Lund, Deputy Chief Executive, Karen Mann, Democratic Services, Drew Fussey, Development Manager, Aimi Brookes, Senior Contracts Officer, Kelly Hamblin, Solicitor and Dylan Jones, Business Manager
Press:	1 member of the press in attendance

15. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

16. Minutes

RESOLVED:

To receive and approve the minutes of the Scrutiny Committee held on 27 July 2011 and they are signed by the Chair.

17. Chair's Address to the Scrutiny Committee

The Chair explained that changes to the Scrutiny Work Programme had been agreed at Full Council. However Nigel Adams MP was unable to attend the meeting on the 22 November and he was unable to arrange a

virtual meeting. A new date needs to be arranged, this would be discussed under item 10 of the agenda.

The Chair welcomed Chief Inspector Anderson (CI), Ian Wolstenholme from North Yorkshire Police Authority (NYPA), Colin Moreton from the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Drew Fussey, Selby District Council CSP Officer and Councillor Brian Marshall for the Crime and Disorder item.

18. Crime and Disorder Review – Report SC/11/4

CI Anderson informed the committee that he was the Chair of Selby District CSP as well as the Chief Inspector for Selby Area. Colin Moreton was the CSP Officer paid by Selby District Council.

CI Anderson presented the covering report which contained several key issues and attachments including a table of local priorities. The methodology for agreeing priorities was through the local community engagement forums and had been raised by members of the public. The service standards and performance reports had an abundance of information and crime performance data.

The Chair raised a question as to why poaching had been a priority for 18 months and why it was still an ongoing issue. She was informed that poaching and offences against animals had been a priority due to reports of rural crime from farm watch, rural watch and the community bringing it to the Police's attention. It was an ongoing problem and one that would be continuously monitored. CI Anderson explained that the operation would continue through the winter months. The Chair requested that the next report stipulates 'Poaching and Offences Against Animals' in the title to indicate its wider remit.

Councillor Pearson raised a question with regard to police response times. North Yorkshire Police had had to reduce back office staff provision to ensure front line staff were not reduced. The Service Standard report indicated that, within the rural area, the response time was within 20 minutes and urban areas within 15 minutes. 86% of calls met these response times. The Police would always try their best to respond to calls according to need and urgency.

Councillor Peart discussed Police response times to non emergencies for people aged 60 and over. He felt the figure indicated was too long for someone of this age to wait. CI Anderson explained that when a call was received it was checked whether the caller was vulnerable. If they are the response time was reduced, however most calls are responded to within 60 minutes.

Councillor Pearson raised an issue with the 0845 non emergency telephone number. CI Anderson explained that the 0845 telephone number would be replaced by 101 for non emergency calls by December

2011. The 101 telephone number would be a national telephone number that would be routed to the relevant call centre area. A publicity campaign would start next month informing members of the public in North Yorkshire of the changes.

Councillor Chilvers raised a question with regard to burglaries in Brayton and asked if there were any prevention initiatives coming forward. CI Anderson responded that there hadn't been a significant increase in burglaries in the Brayton area however, the local PCSOs can give crime prevention assistance to residents as and when required. CI Anderson also explained that there was a Ringmaster System in use allowing parish councils, members of neighbourhood watch and rural watch to receive messages by email or text alerting them to local crime and problems in the area.

Councillors heard that there was a national property database. Members of the public can mark their items and then register them on the database. The Police could then quickly reunite owners with any retrieved stolen items.

Councillor Dyson asked a question with regard to the 'Urinating in the Streets Bylaw'. Colin Moreton explained the Bylaw procedure and that there were 18 prosecutions ongoing due to the work of Selby District Council's Enforcement Officers and PCSOs. He added that the prospect of more publicity was being discussed.

CI Anderson explained that the CSP had been restructured and was now working with York. He also updated that the new Police Commissioner appointment would now go forward in November 2012 and not May 2012 as previously envisaged.

The Chair expressed her concern at Selby / York CSP service level agreement. CI Anderson explained that Selby is one of 6 partners in the CSP Partnership and delivery is enhanced due to the Service Level Agreement. There is one Police Authority member representative on the CSP. Tony Hargreaves and regular meetings also take place with the Councillors.

CI Anderson updated that every two weeks a meeting with various partner organisations including the Probation Trust, CSP, Police Authority, NY Police was held to discuss preventing and tackling crime in North Yorkshire.

The Chair mentioned that she was very concerned with regard to illegal parking in Selby town centre. The narrowing of Gowthorpe causes undue delays when cars are parked illegally. There are also problems with cars parking and driving down Finkle Street illegally. A working group of the Central CEF has been established to address this problem.

CI Anderson explained that PCSO's also act as traffic wardens. They have started to ticket illegally parked vehicles in the town centre. Access to Finkle Street was also monitored by PCSO's.

Councillor Dyson stated that cars park along Finkle Street, outside the Automatic Cash Machines, and park on pavements. He asked if an enforcement day along this road could be organised. CI Anderson explained that it would be possible however all signage must be placed accurately. An Order must sit behind the signage. Councillors Marshall and Peart were asked to look into this issue as County Councillors.

Councillor Hobson raised a question about drugs in Sherburn which he felt was increasing. CI Anderson explained that Sherburn has an excellent Safer Neighbourhood Team in place taking action. There had been several successful convictions for drug offences. Councillor Hobson suggested that good news with regard to convictions needed to be publicised more. CI Anderson explained that an article would be put in the Police locality newsletter, including crime figures, twice a year. He also suggested that Councillor Hobson raises these issues at community engagement meetings.

The Chair thanked the CI Anderson, Ian Wolstenholme, Colin Moreton, Councillor Marshall and Drew Fussey for attending the meeting.

RESOLVED:

To receive and note the report.

19.1st Interim Corporate Plan Progress Report – SC/11/5

Councillor Crane presented the report which he felt was good news and showed positive progress.

In response to a question regarding some performance gaps, Councillor Crane explained that once more information was available it would be added to future reports.

The Chair outlined that, in one instance, an external organisation had had problems in booking a meeting room. Councillor Crane responded that lessons can be learned from the issue raised and he would take it forward.

Councillor Pearson felt that the time taken to re let council properties was high. Councillor Crane agreed and felt it was unacceptable for properties to be unoccupied for 47 days. Most of the delays are caused by tenants leaving their homes in an unclean state. This can take a significant amount of time to put right.

Councillor Nichols asked if there was any impact of the new Choice Based Lettings scheme and whether this could be looked at closely. Councillor Crane would take this into consideration.

Councillor Peart asked why disabled grants take five months to process when the target was 4 and a half months. Councillor Crane explained that the process was very complicated. Councillor Nichols added that the referrals come from North Yorkshire County Council therefore, some of the work was outside the District Council's control.

RESOLVED:

To receive and note the report.

20. New Homes Bonus Scheme – Report SC/11/6

Jonathan Lund, Deputy Chief Executive, presented the report. He explained that additional funding for the the New Homes Bonus was available for four years commencing in 2011/12. and thereafter would be funded from the revenue support grant. The scheme promotes growth and the development of new homes in the area. It was hoped that Selby District Council would receive £445,000 in the first year. The updated Appendix A, tabled, showed potential funds across the CEF areas. It was suggested that the Executive consider this when allocating funding.

Jonathan Lund explained that only when the homes were built and occupied and the Council was receiving council tax payments can the bonus be received. .

Councillor Crane stated that he would be happy to return to Scrutiny Committee once the Executive had discussed the scheme. If the funding was not spent in the first year then it would be carried forward.

Councillor Peart suggested giving each CEF area £20,000 out of the £445,000 NHB funding, however it was felt that some of the CEF's have not spent the money already allocated to them. It was requested to find out how much each CEF currently had in their funding accounts.

Councillor Crane was thanked for attending the meeting and left.

RESOLVED:

- i) To receive and note the report**
- ii) To recommend the Executive to consider Appendix A and the points raised by the committee when developing the Policy**
- iii) To reconsider the matter once the Executive have considered a policy for the allocation of New Homes Bonus funding.**

21. Access Selby Service Provision – Waste Collection and Recycling Report – SC/11/7

Aimi Brookes, Senior Contracts Officer, presented the report. Councillor Pearson had submitted a number of questions to which she responded.

A national recycling scheme promoted by the manufacturers of plastic cartons only allocated five recycling banks in the district. They are distributed to Selby, Tadcaster, Sherburn, Cawood and Monk Fryston. They are emptied the first week of the month. Concern was raised with regard to the bank in Selby, and also with the paper bank, as it was always overflowing. The Senior Contracts Officer would speak to the contractor to ensure it was emptied more often.

The Senior Contracts Officer was asked whether there was a commercial basis for Selby District Council to provide a plastic cartons recycling scheme instead of relying upon the manufacturers scheme?. She would look into this.

The next question related to Communal Waste Facilities. Individual properties get their own refuse and recycling bins however flats have communal facilities. If residents request their own bins this can be investigated.

If residents require replacement recycling boxes, lids or nets these can be ordered through the Customer Contact Centre. There would be no charge for this.

The Senior Contracts Officer explained that it was a legal requirement to have one banksman with a driver to assist the bin wagons when reversing at the landfill site.

There are approximately 460 roadside bins throughout the district and most are emptied at least once a week, however Selby and Tadcaster town centres and some other high use areas are emptied once a day. The emptying programmes can be amended if required. The Senior Contracts Officer would circulate the programmes to Parish Councils for them to make comments and if evidence was gathered showing a need to visit roadside bins more often the contractor would be contacted.

Councillor Price submitted five questions and it was agreed that the answers would be obtained and set out in the minutes (see below):

1. What was Selby District's target for landfill reduction?

As part of the York and North Yorkshire Municipal Waste Management strategy 2006-2026 the waste partnership set a number of waste reduction and recycling targets. There are no specific targets for individual authorities regarding reducing waste to landfill but there were minimum performance standards with regards to the recycling of waste. The last target for Selby was 37.7% recycling and composting by 2009/10 which we achieved.

The partnership had set a number of waste reduction targets in the strategy which were reviewed earlier this year. The recommendation was that the formal review of waste minimisation targets would take place as part of a full review of the Municipal Waste Management strategy following the outcome of the waste PFI project.

2. On the basis of that now collected how much landfill tax was being saved?

North Yorkshire County Council is the Waste Disposal Authority and so is responsible for the cost of disposing of all residual waste, including landfill tax. They have provided us with the following figures:-

<i>Financial Year</i>	<i>Landfill Tax Paid*</i>	<i>Total Tonnage of Waste to Landfill^</i>
<i>2008/9 last full year of weekly refuse collections</i>	<i>£856,514.56</i>	<i>26,766 tonnes</i>
<i>2009/10 half year weekly & half year alternate weekly refuse Collections</i>	<i>£989,612.00</i>	<i>24,740 tonnes</i>
<i>2010/11 first full year of alternate weekly refuse Collections</i>	<i>£1,115,530.56</i>	<i>23,240 tonnes</i>

^These figures are all waste disposed of in landfill and will include things such as commercial waste and fly tipping that is not classified as 'household' waste.

**These figures are for landfill tax only and do not include the gate fee paid per tonne.*

In the last three years landfill tax has increased from £32.00 per tonne in 2008/9 to £40.00 per tonne in 2009/10 to £48.00 per tonne in 2010/11. This means that even though the amount of residual waste we have collected has reduced, there has been an increase in the amount of landfill tax paid by North Yorkshire County Council for the disposal of waste from Selby District. Had we not made the reductions in waste to landfill the amount of landfill tax paid would have been £170,000 more.

3. What are Enterprise's commercial gains from recycling?

The answer cannot be published as commercially sensitive.

4. What was Enterprise's profit margin from SDC?

The answer cannot be published as commercially sensitive.

5. Can the recycling of cans/plastic be extended to non profit making "commercial" organisations such as village halls, sports clubs?

Commercial recycling for glass and cans has been available for businesses since April 2007 and the collection of paper and card started a

few years prior to this. Registered charities are entitled to reduced cost collections. At present we are not able to provide commercial plastic collections but this is something that we are investigating. Full details are available via Access Selby.

The Chair thanked Aimi Brookes, Senior Contracts Officer, for attending the meeting.

RESOLVED:

- i) To receive and note the report**

22. Section 106 Agreements – Report SC/11/8

Dylan Jones, Business Manager, presented the report. Section 106 Agreements are part of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. He explained the process to the committee.

A discussion took place around the trigger points for large developments. Councillors were informed, by way of an example, that one trigger was set at the 200th home built for the Staynor Hall Development. The committee felt this trigger point was too high and asked if it could be revised for future developments. Dylan Jones would look into this.

In 2014 there would be a new Community Infrastructure Levy which would be a tariff rather than a 'need basis' facility. This would replace the Section 106 Agreements. The new system could be implemented prior to 2014.

All Section 106 monies are held by the Council in a non interest bearing account in line with the Section 106 rules. Scrutiny Committee requested a review of this, with a view to using an interest bearing account if legally possible. Dylan Jones explained that the Section 106 rules are very specific but he would review the situation.

A question was raised with regard to the maintenance of play areas built with Section 106 money. Dylan Jones responded that the developer has to maintain the area for a five year period, after which the district or parish council had the responsibility to maintain the area.

The Chair thanked Dylan and Kelly for attending and they left the meeting.

RESOLVED:

- i) To receive and note the report**
- ii) To recommend that consideration be given to banking s106 monies in an interest bearing account that would allow the accrued interest to serve the same purpose as the s106 monies.**

23. Scrutiny Committee Work Programme

The Chair explained that Nigel Adams MP was unable to attend the meeting on the 22 November and it was not possible to hold a virtual meeting. The Chair suggested organising a meeting in the New Year after consultation with the MP's office. Dates and times would be circulated in due course.

Further amendments were suggested which included adding Choice Based Lettings to the work programme on the 22 November 2011. Also to add to Access Selby Service Provision, the Customer Contact Centre and WLCT on the 22 November. Communities Selby would remain on the work programme for the 20 March meeting. The committee agreed to the changes. The work programme would be amended accordingly and circulated to the committee members.

RESOLVED:

- i) To receive and note the work programme**
- ii) To arrange a new meeting with Nigel Adams MP in the new year**
- iii) To update and circulate the work programme with the changes agreed**

The Chair thanked all for attending.

The meeting closed at 7.55pm.