

Public Document Pack

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr

Bridgend County Borough Council



Swyddfeydd Dinesig, Stryd yr Angel, Pen-y-bont, CF31 4WB / Civic Offices, Angel Street, Bridgend, CF31 4WB

*Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg.
Rhowch wybod i ni os mai Cymraeg yw eich
dewis iaith.*

*We welcome correspondence in Welsh. Please
let us know if your language choice is Welsh.*



Gwasanaethau Gweithredol a Phartneriaethol / Operational and Partnership Services

Deialu uniongyrchol / Direct line /: 01656 643148 /
643147

Gofynnwch am / Ask for: Andrew Rees

Ein cyf / Our ref:

Eich cyf / Your ref:

Dyddiad/Date: Thursday, 16 November 2017

Dear Councillor,

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3

A meeting of the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 will be held in the Council Chamber - Civic Offices Angel Street Bridgend CF31 4WB on **Wednesday, 22 November 2017 at 9.30 am.**

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence
To receive apologies for absence from Members.
2. Declarations of Interest
To receive declarations of personal and prejudicial interest (if any) from Members/Officers in accordance with the provisions of the Members Code of Conduct adopted by Council from 1 September 2008 (including whipping declarations)
3. Approval of Minutes 3 - 12
To receive for approval the minutes of a meeting of the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 dated 13 September 2017
4. Forward Work Programme Update 13 - 38
5. The Council's New Waste Contract 39 - 60
Invitees:

Mark Shephard – Corporate Director Communities
Zak Shell – Head of Neighbourhood Services
Joanne Norman – Finance Manager
Cllr Hywel Williams – Deputy Leader
Cllr Richard Young – Cabinet Member Communities
Maz Akhtar- Regional Manager Kier
Julian Tranter – Manager Director Kier
Claire Pring – Contract Manager Kier
6. Urgent Items
To consider any item(s) of business in respect of which notice has been given in accordance with Part 4 (paragraph 4) of the Council Procedure Rules and which the person presiding at the meeting is of the opinion should by reason of special circumstances be

By receiving this Agenda Pack electronically you will save the Authority approx. £1.20 in printing costs

transacted at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

Yours faithfully

P A Jolley

Corporate Director Operational and Partnership Services

Councillors:

SE Baldwin
TH Beedle
N Clarke
P Davies
RM Granville
DG Howells

Councillors

A Hussain
DRW Lewis
DG Owen
RMI Shaw
JC Spanswick
RME Stirman

Councillors

G Thomas
E Venables
MC Voisey
JE Williams

Agenda Item 3

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - WEDNESDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2017

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBER - CIVIC OFFICES ANGEL STREET BRIDGEND CF31 4WB ON WEDNESDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2017 AT 9.30 AM

Present

Councillor JC Spanswick – Chairperson

SE Baldwin
DRW Lewis
JE Williams

N Clarke
G Thomas

P Davies
E Venables

DG Howells
CA Webster

Apologies for Absence

A Hussain, RL Penhale-Thomas, RMI Shaw and RME Stirman

Officers:

Sarah Daniel	Democratic Services Officer - Scrutiny
Andrew Hobbs	Group Manager - Street Works
Satwant Pryce	Head of Regeneration and Planning
Andrew Rees	Senior Democratic Services Officer - Committees
Mark Shephard	Corporate Director - Communities

Invitees:

Andrew Hobbs	Manager - Street Works
Satwant Pryce	Head of Regeneration and Planning
Councillor CE Smith	Cabinet Member Education and Regeneration
Mark Shephard	Corporate Director - Communities

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor N Clarke declared a personal and prejudicial interest in paragraph 4.45 of agenda item 4 – Bridgend as a Place to Work, Live and Visit as her husband is a director of the Harbourside Community Interest Company and advised that she would withdraw from the meeting should this development be discussed.

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 of 17 July 2017 be approved as a true and accurate record.

8. DEVELOPING BRIDGEND AS A PLACE TO WORK, LIVE AND VISIT

The Scrutiny Officer introduced the report of the Corporate Director Communities on Developing Bridgend as a place to work, live and visit. She stated that the report contained information on tourism and events, street scene and cleansing the public realm.

The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that the report focused on the delivery of services in street scene (public realm cleaning; public toilet provision and green spaces) and tourism and events which were set within the context of significantly reduced resources and how it impacted on the public and businesses in the County Borough.

Street Scene (Public Realm Cleaning)

The Committee questioned the time the mechanical road sweeper operates in the town centres and why Pencoed town centre was not included within the town centre street sweeping programme. The Group Manager Street Works informed the Committee that the Council has three mechanical road sweepers which were deployed to town centres early in the mornings, usually between 7.00am – 7.30am and are used as and when required. The Council also deploys smaller mechanical street sweepers which are used to clean the streets of town centres on a daily basis, however there was no particular time when they would be operating.

The Committee referred to the targeted approach adopted for street cleaning/litter picking and asked whether there is a minimum number of times when street cleaners would be deployed to residential streets which are cleaner. The Group Manager Street Works stated that cleaner streets were cleaned on a demand led basis and where street cleaning crews identify streets which require particular attention. Some streets in the county borough would be cleaned if a complaint is received but may not necessarily be cleaned if the service was not aware of complaints.

The Committee questioned the action taken each autumn to deal with falling leaves and tree branches. The Group Manager Street Works stated that large sweepers are deployed to sweep leaves, whilst highway maintenance would be deployed to remove tree branches and trees which have fallen which pose a concern to safety. The Committee asked whether there is a schedule in place to tackle known hotspots. The Group Manager Street Works stated there is no specific schedule in place but the service would target known areas where problems often occur. The Committee questioned what steps would be taken when branches obscure warning lights at Pencoed level crossing. The Group Manager Street Works commented that highways maintenance will prioritise removing branches which would obscure warning lights based on public safety. The Committee questioned the steps that would be taken to remove or cut back trees which obscure directional and warning signs on highways. The Group Manager Street Works commented that this would be dealt within available resources, but due to financial constraints the Council could no longer carry out maintenance to the extent it could previously. The Cabinet Member Communities informed the Committee that it was right to be concerned; however the Communities Directorate's budget had been squeezed affecting the ability of the service to clear and cut back branches to the extent it had done previously. He stated that due to the large cuts to the budget the service had to react to requests as opposed to being able to carry out regular maintenance.

The Committee questioned whether the Council only responded to referrals or complaints from the public to clear footways. The Corporate Director Communities stated that the service no longer has a cyclical maintenance programme and had to move to a service which was more demand led due to the large number of cuts to the Communities Directorate. He informed the Committee that the Directorate was having to manage its resources in the most effective way having regard to public safety as the main priority. The Committee questioned whether this approach could lead to an increase in the number of claims received. The Corporate Director Communities stated that the Directorate has inspectors who look at safety and that it was a matter of prioritising and making the best use of available resources.

The Committee requested clarification of when and where the wet van is deployed and are there incidences of graffiti in certain areas. The Group Manager Street Works clarified that the wet van is used to remove graffiti; the vehicle is also used to clean car parks and remove litter from roads and operated on a demand led basis. The Group

Manager Street Works stated that graffiti was not a large problem in Bridgend and was not concentrated to any particular area. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that swift action is taken to remove graffiti which is offensive.

The Committee expressed its concern at what seemed to be a reluctance to prosecute people who fly tip and drop litter. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that the bar to gaining a successful prosecution is high due to the proof required. He stated that some local authorities have procured external companies to assist in enforcement and prosecutions for fly tipping. He also informed the Committee that limited resourcing in Legal Services and the Communities Directorate affected fly tipping being the subject of prosecutions. The Committee asked whether the Council worked closely with large scale fast food outlets to prevent the public littering and whether the consequences of littering could be displayed on their packaging and highlighted in the local media. The Corporate Director Communities stated that the Council works, for example, with McDonalds who have staff who litter pick around their premises. The Council also attempts to engage with other retailers in respect of littering which emanate from their premises. The Corporate Director Communities also informed the Committee that he sits on a Welsh Government Ministerial Board and one of the matters under consideration is to whether it is possible and desirable to levy a tax on retailers in respect of littering.

The Committee questioned the lack of data showing the number of fly tipping incidents reported from December 2016 to March 2017. The Corporate Director Communities undertook to provide the data on fly tipping figures to the Committee.

The Committee questioned whether officers responsible for educating the public on recycling in the waste contract could also take on the role of enforcement. The Corporate Director Communities stated that enforcement would be in the last resort and officers would prefer to educate the public in respect of compliance with recycling. However there would be a time when enforcement would have to take place where there was a wilfulness not to comply and officers would take enforcement action, but there remained the burden of proof to achieve a successful prosecution. A member of the Committee stated that Neath Port Talbot Council undertake more enforcement and prosecutions than all other local authorities in Wales combined. The Committee requested that it be provided with data on enforcement action taken by the Council.

The Committee referred to Valleys to Coast (V2C) taking street cleaning services back under their control from the Council and questioned the arrangements the Council had with V2C to ensure those streets were cleaned to the required standard especially in streets where there were properties in private ownership. The Group Manager Street Works stated that under the stock transfer, V2C took over responsibility for cleaning their land and that they would also have responsibility for setting the standards they wished to adhere to for cleaning. The Committee questioned whether the Council had recourse to hold V2C to account. The Group Manager Regeneration, Development and Property Services clarified that V2C would have responsibility for land in their ownership. Levying service charges on owner occupiers is one course of action V2C could take for litter and grass cutting.

The Committee questioned whether the use of technology could be made via an app and bins requiring emptying on a more frequent basis could be numbered akin to lamp standards to assist Members and the public in making more accurate requests for emptying. Some local authorities use an app which allows for more targeted intervention and creates greater civic duty. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that the Council has a programme of digitisation and the application of technology for reporting requests for service could be considered in the future. The Committee considered there is a knowledge gap on which bins need

emptying on a more regular basis. The Group Manager Street Works informed the Committee that the application of a digital platform would prove useful, the support of ICT would be crucial to developing the use of technology. The Corporate Director Communities stated that the digitalisation programme has a list of priorities for services to move to a digital platform. The Group Manager Street Works confirmed that a targeted approach would prove a good use of resources and that he was constantly looking at achieving best value and the best outcomes. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee there is an intelligence system in place to prioritise bin emptying etc. but it was not digitised.

The Committee questioned whether there is a media campaign in place regarding littering. The Corporate Director Communities confirmed there is an earmarked reserve for a one-off media campaign associated with the role out of the Councils new waste services contract but that there was no separate budget for litter campaigns.

Street Scene (Public Toilet Provision)

The Committee requested details of the amount of take up in the comfort scheme by businesses and questioned how businesses would be aware of the existence of the scheme and how the public would know which premises are participating in the scheme to enable them to use the facilities. The Group Manager Street Works stated that the comfort scheme had recently been re-introduced but take up by businesses had been limited. The maximum £500 grant was based on a points system. A member of the Committee stated that Porthcawl Town Council had awarded two businesses in Newton £500 each due to the absence of public conveniences. The Cabinet Member Communities reminded the Committee of the role Town and Community Councils can play in taking responsibility for public conveniences through the Community Asset Transfer process, which would enable the facilities to remain in the public domain.

The Committee questioned the reason for the early closure of the public conveniences at Maesteg Bus Station and the reason for the facilities being closed altogether on occasions. The Corporate Director Communities stated that facilities had been closed early on a temporary basis due to staff shortages which had been since addressed. The facilities being closed altogether was attributed to water leakage, a limited amount of work was carried out to make the facilities operational pending the redevelopment proposals in the town hall in the centre of Maesteg taking place.

The Committee expressed concern that urinal facilities across the County Borough had been removed resulting in a lack of facilities being open to the public. The Group Manager Street Works stated that the urinal facilities had been removed due to their poor condition. The Committee also expressed concern that the sites of former public conveniences had been sold prior to the facilities being offered to Town and Community Councils. The Group Manager Street Works confirmed that Town and Community Councils were consulted prior to any decisions of the public toilets being demolished or sold. Public convenience provision in the County Borough had been reviewed and consultation taken place with Town and Community Councils on their possible transfer. He stated that the urinals would firstly have been offered to Town and Community Councils prior to the disposal or demolition of the sites.

The Committee questioned the impact the White Paper on public health could have on the provision conveniences whereby Town and Community Councils have taken responsibility via a Community Asset Transfer. The Corporate Director Communities stated that his understanding was that there is a requirement on local authorities to ensure there is adequate provision and that there is a strategy put in place for public convenience provision, but that Local Authorities did not necessarily have to directly provide public conveniences. In response to a question as to whether bus companies

pay fees to the Council to use bus stations, the Corporate Director Communities stated that this was the case. The Committee questioned whether the Council would consider charging for the use of public conveniences. The Corporate Director Communities stated that charging may be considered as one option as part of the public conveniences strategy.

Street Scene (Green Spaces)

The Committee questioned the reason for the height of grass cutting being specified to 50mm since the service had been outsourced as opposed to cuts being 25mm previously as cutting grass shorter would result in less cuts having to be made and less complaints being received. The Group Manager Street Works stated that grass cutting in open spaces had been market tested and an external contractor appointed to carry out the service on behalf of the Council. He explained that a specification had been prepared based on a 50mm cut following advice that better rates would be received and that it was necessary to procure services within the parameters of the available budget. The lower the cut more expensive the service would be. The Corporate Director Communities stated that market intelligence suggested that a cut to 25mm would take longer and result in a greater frequency of cuts. The Group Manager Street Works stated that externalising grass cutting was a consequence of budget cuts. The Committee questioned whether a specification of a 25mm cut had been requested. The Corporate Director Communities stated that the advice received was to tender based on a 50mm cut and was about managing the resources available. He also stated that V2C had determined that it would grass cut more frequently. The Committee considered that if the service was delivered in-house there would not be a need for specifications for grass cutting. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that the evidence was that operating the grass cutting service in-house would prove less efficient. The Cabinet Member Communities stated that he would prefer for the service to be delivered in-house, however cuts would have to be found elsewhere in the Directorate in order to do that. The Corporate Director Communities stated that when an analysis was carried out on the grass cutting service, it was found to be cheaper to externalise the service.

The Committee questioned whether the service was tendered on a like for like basis to that when it was delivered in-house. The Group Manager Street Works stated that outsourcing the service allowed for indirect savings to be made such as the rationalising of the depots, the levels of plant and equipment and the number of supervisors and managers had been reduced. He stated that a balance had to be struck in the use of resources and that horticultural services had been retained in-house. The Committee expressed its concern that the contractor was not providing the same level of service to that provided previously in-house. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services stated that the point was that the purpose of outsourcing was to make a saving and in order to do so a service reduction was necessary. A comparison was made on a 'like for like' basis and that saving was overall significantly greater with the service carried out externally. A member of the Committee stated that the level of service had improved. The Committee commented that it had been necessary to increase the payment made to the contractor in the second year of the contract. The Committee expressed concern that the tender placed a greater emphasis on price than quality. The Group Manager Streetworks commented that this was a reflection on the current economic conditions where savings had to be achieved, but that the quality of the service was also important and was monitored.

The Committee expressed its concern at the introduction of a more relaxed regime of maintenance to roundabouts and believed that the meadow effect had resulted in non-native flowers and plants being introduced and it was questionable whether it had

improved biodiversity value. The Group Manager Street Works stated that both practices of meadow and herbaceous regimes had been introduced.

Tourism and Events

The Committee expressed concern that staffing of the tourism section had been reduced from eleven to one officer and they questioned the decision to do this in light of tourism playing a significant part of the economy in the County Borough and particularly the need to review the Destination Management Plan (DMP). The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services stated that the DMP is to be reviewed this year and due to the lack of resources in the tourism section a light touch review was proposed. There was a need to review the DMP in order to draw external funding. The Committee commented on the importance of reviewing the DMP due to the emphasis placed by the Welsh Government in the Visit Wales National Tourism Strategy. The DMP was also important in attracting investment and visitors to ensure the vibrancy of the town centres in the County Borough.

The Committee asked whether the Council collaborated on tourism with neighbouring authorities and other partners such as Visit Wales. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services stated that the Council works with Vale of Glamorgan Council on the heritage coastline. It is also in collaboration with eight local authorities with officers promoting the region at trade events and coach tour operators. She stated that the one member of staff in tourism deals with local issues, such as signage for events and operational matters. The Authority has a contract with a PR company that ensures the County Borough's name gets into the press on a regular basis.

The Committee questioned whether collaborative work was being undertaken to promote heritage. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services stated that a great deal of work is done to conserve historic buildings. She stated that the recent conservation work carried out in Porthcawl had been funded through THI. There had been less focus on heritage and more focus on the coast as it drives economic numbers and spend. She stated that deriving money from visitors to heritage sites was more difficult as investment would need to be made in developing eating and shopping facilities to enable spending to be made by visitors. The Committee congratulated officers for securing THI funding to add to the vibrancy of the town centres.

The Committee requested an explanation of Bridgend Bites. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services informed the Committee that she could provide the Committee with a report on Bridgend Bites which is a promotional site. The report would include data on its usage by businesses and the public.

The Committee congratulated officers on attracting major events such as the Urdd Eisteddfod, Senior Open Championship and the Elvis Festival and questioned the return on each £1 of investment. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services informed the Committee that the return in investment was variable. She stated that the 204 Senior Open Championship had seen an economic impact of £2.16m on the Welsh economy, whilst television coverage had brought in media value of £5m. The return by the Council had proven worthwhile as the Council had invested £50k in the event, with the Welsh Government having invested significantly more. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services stated that the Council does not provide direct investment to the Elvis Festival but incurs the costs of road closures and traffic orders. The Committee questioned the reason why the Council does not invest more in tourism and not reduce staff given the return on investment. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services concurred that more investment was

made the greater the return, however due to budget constraints she tried to deliver the best service possible with the resources available. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that one of the challenges is that the overall benefit to the local economy would not be reflected in the Council's accounts.

The Committee requested an update on progress on the Salt Lake car park. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services stated that officers are working on a marketing plan and negotiations on an owner's agreement with the Evans family as previous attempts to attract a large scale superstore had fallen through due to a fall in that market. However, since then, officers had moved on to other projects with the development of the marina and THI funding to deliver the harbourside project. The Committee questioned whether the Salt Lake car park had been considered for hotel developments which would add to the number of bed spaces available in the area during the Senior Open. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services informed the Committee that she had recently become aware that Stockton Council had recently developed a hotel in partnership with the Hilton group. She stated that the market for hotels was currently weak, but commented that local authorities were starting to become involved in delivering commercial developments; however the consequences of failure would affect the reputation of the local authority. The Corporate Director Communities advised that delivering a hotel on that site could only be achieved with the mutual agreement of the Evans family as part of the overall Owners Agreement. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services stated that a mix of public and commercial development would create employment and apprenticeship opportunities.

The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that the Directorate was having to operate with significantly less staff and resources than previously and having to make difficult choices and that any further cuts to its revenue budget would have very serious consequences in terms of the delivery of valued public services.

The Committee thanked the invitees for their contributions.

Conclusions

Comments

Members thanked Officers for their attendance at the meeting and congratulated them and their colleagues on their continued efforts in attracting events to Bridgend County Borough such as the Urdd Eistedfodd, the Senior Open Golf and the Elvis Festival in Porthcawl.

Members were concerned that there were many overgrown trees, branches and hedges in the Borough obscuring road signs, directional signs and road warning signs that warn motorists of road dangers ahead making for potentially hazardous driving conditions for the public

Members remained concerned that BCBC were not actively prosecuting people who drop litter and fly tip their rubbish. Members appreciated that Officers were instead focussing on anti-litter campaigns but urged officers to use their powers and prosecute repeat offenders which they thought would also act as a deterrent for future offending

Members encouraged the update of the Destination Management Plan to fulfil Welsh Government requirement in terms of accessing funding opportunities

Members encouraged joint working with other Local Authorities to promote tourism opportunities and were pleased to hear of BCBC's collaboration with Visit Wales on

tourism projects and asked that Officers continue this work to promote the heritage of Bridgend County Borough.

Members were concerned that subject to budget reductions over recent years, there was now only one member of staff that worked on tourism for BCBC. Members stated that they felt this was a service that should be invested in to make Bridgend a better place to work, live and visit and improve the economic prosperity of the Borough.

Recommendations

The Committee recommended:

- That officers explore with colleagues in the IT department, the development of an app for the public to use, to easily report incidents such as bins needing to be emptied in specific areas, therefore allowing officers to be more effective and take a targeted approach with budgets being reduced.
- The numbering of all public bins for ease of reporting when they need to be emptied and to easily identify trends
- That officers work collaboratively with Town and Community Councils to promote the Comfort Scheme to businesses and make the public aware of which businesses are signed up to the scheme. Members also recommended working on communications with Town and Community Councils to take over the running of public conveniences under the Community Asset Transfer Scheme to enable them to stay open.
- A full review of the grass cutting contract for Highways services to ensure the service we are receiving is of the standard set out in the contract. They recommended Officers explore the costs of bringing the service back in house on a like for like basis to ensure the Authority were receiving a quality service.
- A review of the Biodiversity Value in open spaces and highway grass verges as Members were concerned at the introduction of a more relaxed regime of maintenance to roundabouts and believed that the meadow effect had resulted in non-native flowers and plants being introduced and it was questionable whether it had improved biodiversity value.
- That no further cuts are made to this Directorate. Members were concerned that the Directorate had taken unproportioned budget reductions when compared with other Directorates. Members were extremely concerned that further cuts would result in the deterioration of public facing services and some services not being able to function at all.

Further Information requested

Members requested to receive data of incidents of fly tipping in the Borough from December 2016 to date.

Members asked to receive data on the enforcement action that had been taken by BCBC officers for incidents of fly tipping and littering, including how many incidents of each had been prosecuted in the last year and if they had comparable data with other Local Authorities.

Members requested to receive information on the success of the Bridgend Bites and Social Media pages for Bridgend Council including how the information is promoted to the public, the response from the public, and traffic visiting the site.

9. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Scrutiny Officer reported on the items prioritised by the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee which included the next item delegated to this Committee to consider. She also presented a list of further potential items for comment and prioritisation requested the Committee identify any further items for consideration using the pre-determined criteria form.

Conclusions

- (1) That the Committee identified additional information to be provided under the next item delegated to it in the Forward Work Programme as well as any invitees it wished to attend to assist in the investigation;
- (2) That the Committee identified further detail for inclusion on the other items in Table 2, namely, Town Centre Regeneration and the Economic Prosperity of Bridgend County Borough;
- (3) The Committee prioritised Town Centre Regeneration; the Economic Prosperity of Bridgend County Borough; Empty Properties and Community Asset Transfer for formal prioritisation and for the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee to designate back to the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committees;
- (4) Identified Waste as a suitable item for Webcasting from the overall Forward Work Programme;
- (5) Agreed to use the criteria form for any additional items for future consideration on the Scrutiny Forward Work Programmes.

10. URGENT ITEMS

There were no urgent items.

The meeting closed at 1.00 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO THE SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3

22 NOVEMBER 2017

REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR – OPERATIONAL AND PARTNERSHIP SERVICES

FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

1. Purpose of the Report

- a) To present the items prioritised by the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee including the next item delegated to this Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
- b) To present the Committee with a list of further potential items for comment and prioritisation;
- c) To ask the Committee to identify any further items for consideration using the pre-determined criteria form.

2. Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives / Other Corporate Priorities

- 2.1 The key improvement objectives identified in the Corporate Plan 2016–2020 have been embodied in the Overview & Scrutiny Forward Work Programmes. The Corporate Improvement Objectives were adopted by Council on 1 March 2017 and formally set out the improvement objectives that the Council will seek to implement between 2016 and 2020. The Overview and Scrutiny Committees engage in review and development of plans, policy or strategies that support the Corporate Themes.

3. Background

- 3.1 Under the terms of Bridgend County Borough Council's Constitution, each Overview and Scrutiny Committee must publish a Forward Work Programme (FWP) as far as it is known.
- 3.2 An effective FWP will identify the issues that the Committee wishes to focus on during the year and provide a clear rationale as to why particular issues have been selected, as well as the approach that will be adopted; i.e. will the Committee be undertaking a policy review/ development role ("Overview") or performance management approach ("Scrutiny").

Feedback

- 3.3 All conclusions made at Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee (SOSC) meetings, as well as recommendations and requests for information should be

responded to by Officers, to ensure that there are clear outcomes from each topic investigated.

- 3.4 These will then be presented to the relevant Scrutiny Committee at their next meeting to ensure that they have had a response.
- 3.5 When each topic has been considered and the Committee is satisfied with the outcome, the SOSC will then present their findings to the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee (COSC) who will determine whether to remove the item from the FWP or to re-add for further prioritisation at a future date.
- 3.6 The FWPs will remain flexible and will be revisited at each COSC meeting with input from each SOSC and any information gathered from FWP meetings with Corporate Directors and Cabinet.

4. Current Situation / Proposal

- 4.1 Attached at **Appendix C** is the overall FWP for the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committees which includes the topics prioritised by the COSC for the next set of SOSCs in Table A, as well as a list of topics that were deemed important for future prioritisation at Table B. This list has been compiled from suggested items from each of the SOSCs at previous meetings as well as the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It also includes information proposed from Corporate Directors, detail from research undertaken by Scrutiny Officers and information from FWP Development meetings between the Scrutiny Chairs and Cabinet.
- 4.2 The Committee is asked to first consider the next topic they have been allocated by the COSC in Table A and determine what further detail they would like the report to contain, what questions they wish Officers to address and if there are any further invitees they wish to attend for this meeting to assist Members in their investigation.
- 4.3 The Committee is also asked to then prioritise up to six items from the list in Table B to present to the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee for formal prioritisation and designation to each Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the next set of meetings.
- 4.4 As part of this, Members are asked to also consider the completed criteria forms attached at **Appendix B** that have been put forward by individual Members of the Committee and determine whether they wish to agree to add these proposed items to the FWP.

Corporate Parenting

- 4.5 Corporate Parenting is the term used to describe the responsibility of a local authority towards looked after children and young people. This is a legal responsibility given to local authorities by the Children Act 1989 and the Children Act 2004. The role of the Corporate Parent is to seek for children in public care the outcomes every good parent would want for their own children. The Council as a whole is the 'corporate parent', therefore all Members have a level of responsibility for the children and young people looked after by Bridgend.

- 4.6 In this role, it is suggested that Members consider how each item they consider affects children in care and care leavers, and in what way can the Committee assist in these areas.
- 4.7 Scrutiny Champions can greatly support the Committee in this by advising them of the ongoing work of the Cabinet-Committee and particularly any decisions or changes which they should be aware of as Corporate Parents.

Identification of Further Items

- 4.8 The Committee are reminded of the Criteria form which Members can use to propose further items for the FWP which the Committee can then consider for prioritisation at a future meeting. The Criteria Form emphasises the need to consider issues such as impact, risk, performance, budget and community perception when identifying topics for investigation and to ensure a strategic responsibility for Scrutiny and that its work benefits the organisation.

5. Effect upon Policy Framework & Procedure Rules

- 5.1 The work of the Overview & Scrutiny Committees relates to the review and development of plans, policy or strategy that form part of the Council's Policy Framework and consideration of plans, policy or strategy relating to the power to promote or improve economic, social or environmental wellbeing in the County Borough of Bridgend. Any changes to the structure of the Scrutiny Committees and the procedures relating to them would require the Bridgend County Borough Council constitution to be updated.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1 There are no equality implications attached to this report.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 There are no financial implications attached to this report.

8. Recommendations

- 8.1 The Committee is recommended to:
- (i) Approve the feedback from the previous meeting of the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 and note the list of responses including any still outstanding attached at Appendix A;
 - (ii) Identify any additional information the Committee wish to receive on their next item delegated to them in the FWP including invitees they wish to attend to assist Members in their investigation;
 - (iii) Consider the completed criteria form attached at Appendix B and determine whether they wish to agree to add the proposed items to the FWP;

- (iv) Identify any further detail required for all items in the overall FWP at Appendix C, Table B;
- (v) Prioritise up to six items from Appendix C;
- (vi) Identify suitable items for Webcasting from the overall Forward Work Programme.

PA Jolley

Corporate Director - Operational and Partnership Services

Contact Officer: Scrutiny Unit

Telephone: (01656) 643695

E-mail: Scrutiny@bridgend.gov.uk

Postal Address Bridgend County Borough Council,
Civic Offices,
Angel Street,
Bridgend.
CF31 4WB

Background documents

None.

Date of Meeting	Item	Members wished to make the following comments:	Response/Comments
		Members thanked Officers for their attendance at the meeting and congratulated them and their colleagues on their continued efforts in attracting events to Bridgend County Borough such as the Urdd Eistedfodd, the Senior Open Golf and the Elvis Festival in Porthcawl.	Noted
		Members were concerned that there were many overgrown trees, branches and hedges in the Borough obscuring road signs, directional signs and road warning signs that warn motorists of road dangers ahead making for potentially hazardous driving conditions for the public	Noted, explained at the meeting that work had to be prioritised in view of limited resources but that safety was the number one criteria
		Members remained concerned that BCBC were not actively prosecuting people who drop litter and fly tip their rubbish. Members appreciated that Officers were instead focussing on anti-litter campaigns but urged officers to use their powers and prosecute repeat offenders which they thought would also act as a deterrent for future offending	There is a proposal approved by Cabinet to procure an external company to take on this role in due course
		Members encouraged the update of the Destination Management Plan to fulfil Welsh Government requirement in terms of accessing funding opportunities	An initial 'light' review is proposed as much of the Destination Management Plan is still relevant
		Members encouraged joint working with other Local Authorities to promote tourism opportunities and were pleased to hear of BCBC's collaboration with Visit Wales on tourism projects and asked that Officers continue this work to promote the heritage of Bridgend County Borough.	Noted

13-Sep-2017

Developing Bridgend as a place to live, work and visit

<p>Members were concerned that subject to budget reductions over recent years, there was now only one member of staff that worked on tourism for BCBC. Members stated that they felt this was a service that should be invested in to make Bridgend a better place to work, live and visit and improve the economic prosperity of the Borough.</p>	<p>Noted - this point potentially could be made as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy approval process but would of course require that savings were made elsewhere instead</p>
<p>Members wished to make the following recommendations</p>	
<p>That officers explore with colleagues in the IT department, the development of an app for the public to use, to easily report incidents such as bins needing to be emptied in specific areas, therefore allowing officers to be more effective and take a targeted approach with budgets being reduced.</p>	<p>This is already in scope as part of the Council's Digitisation Programme over the coming years</p>
<p>The numbering of all public bins for ease of reporting when they need to be emptied and to easily identify trends</p>	<p>This option will be investigated and considered</p>
<p>That officers work collaboratively with Town and Community Councils to promote the Comfort Scheme to businesses and make the public aware of which businesses are signed up to the scheme. Members also recommended working on communications with Town and Community Councils to take over the running of public conveniences under the Community Asset Transfer Scheme to enable them to stay open.</p>	<p>Ongoing engagement already happening with many of the relevant Town and Community Councils re: CAT of public toilets. Public toilet strategy being formulated after initial public consultation exercise. The reinvigoration of the Comfort Scheme is potentially likely to be part of that strategy.</p>
<p>A full review of the grass cutting contract for Highways services to ensure the service we are receiving is of the standard set out in the contract. They recommended Officers explore the costs of bringing the service back in house on a like for like basis to ensure the Authority were receiving a quality service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No scope/ capacity currently for a 'full review' · Monitoring does take place to ensure performance meets contractual standards · When contracts are due to end periodically the option of bringing services back in house will be considered but on a like for like basis the option was previously more expensive overall

<p>A review of the Biodiversity Value in open spaces and highway grass verges as Members were concerned at the introduction of a more relaxed regime of maintenance to roundabouts and believed that the meadow effect had resulted in non-native flowers and plants being introduced and it was questionable whether it had improved biodiversity value.</p>	<p>The use of mixed seed varieties of flowering plants, sourced from overseas is now common practice amongst Councils. This increases nectar and pollen sources for pollinators. It has been well received by the public at large. The Council is of course able to end this practice, and allow those areas that are currently seeded to either revert to natural conditions or to be cut as part of the Council's current highway grassed verge cutting regime, as outlined to scrutiny at the meeting.</p>
<p>that no further cuts are made to this Directorate. Members were concerned that the Directorate had taken unproportioned budget reductions when compared with other Directorates. Members were extremely concerned that further cuts would result in the deterioration of public facing services and some services not being able to function at all.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Further Information Requested</p>	
<p>Members requested to receive data of incidents of fly tipping in the Borough from December 2016 to date</p>	<p>Attached</p>
<p>Members asked to receive data on the enforcement action that had been taken by BCBC officers for incidents of fly tipping and littering, including how many incidents of each had been prosecuted in the last year and if they had comparable data with other Local Authorities.</p>	<p>Attached</p>
<p>Members requested to receive information on the success of the Bridgend Bites and Social Media pages for Bridgend Council including how the information is promoted to the public, the response from the public, and traffic visiting the site</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		<p>Members requested the following further information to be included in the Waste report to their next Committee meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information on the work of the education and enforcement officers that were recruited. More specifically relating to the education side of their work. Where have they been? How have they engaged with the public? Have they visited any homes? How many officers are there? When is enforcement going to start? 2. Use of vehicles to collect waste and recycling. Do we now have sufficient amount of vehicles? Members were concerned that transit vans were being used for the collection of purple bags and asked for the rationale for this? 3. Information on the Household Waste recycling centres. How has the change in contract impacted on the centres and the staff that work there. Members were concerned at the reported increase in wait times reported by their constituents at the centres. Has there been any increase of staff at these centres? Are the public generally complying with the new way in which the centres work? i.e separating and sorting their waste. 4. How are the areas where communal waste is collected being managed? How are they complying with the new restrictions? Are they generally compliant? What problems are being reported? Members were particularly concerned with Wildmill area. 	<p>These questions will be addressed as part of the Waste Scrutiny report to be presented to Members in due course</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

NUMBER OF REPORTED FLY TIPPING INSTANCES ON COUNCIL LAND – 2015 to 2017

Month	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
April	83	79	52
May	68	73	56
June	77	69	91
July	57	63	94
August	51	61	97
September	42	63	82
October	63	55	
November	47	57	
December	51	65	
January	60	62	
February	62	56	
March	73	57	
	734	761	

The table sets out the monthly recorded fly tipping incidents on land where the Council holds a duty to remove such materials. Between 2015/16 to 2016/17 the figures reveal a slight increase in the annual total, with no discernible pattern between the years.

For 2017/18 and immediately prior to the roll out in June of the Council's two bag rule this pattern is broadly repeated before reported fly tipping numbers increase through June into August with a fall in numbers during September. It is too early at this time to draw any conclusions from this data or to make any projections of the medium or long term trend in reported fly tipping incidents.

A degree of caution also needs to be exercised around the interpretation of the recorded figures during this period, as they include fly tipping reports submitted by the public, which are in fact missed waste collections or refuse sacks presented on the wrong day. Members will recall that during the period in question the Contractor changed the collection days for around half of the households across the County Borough. This led to numerous reports of missed collections, a number of which would have inevitably been recorded as fly tipping, unfortunately there is no way of separating these instances out from the overall figures.

Ordinarily when changes to the way in which waste materials are collected from households, a small initial spike in reported fly tipping is experienced. It will therefore be important moving forward, that this continues to be monitored closely, as the new collection service beds in.

This page is intentionally left blank

LOCAL AUTHORITY FIXED PENALTY NOTICE DATA - 1 APRIL 2015 TO 31 MARCH 2016

Isle of Anglesey County Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	5	5	0	0	0	£ 250.00	0	
Dog Fouling	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	5	5	0	0	0	£ 250.00	0	
Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	1380	765	426	33	156	£ 82,745.00	0	
Dog Fouling	30	14	2	13	1	£ 1,475.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	1410	779	428	46	157	£ 84,220.00	0	
Bridgend County Borough Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	6	4	0	0	2	£ 400.00	0	
Dog Fouling	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	7	4	0	0	3	£ 700.00	3	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	3	2	0	0	1	£ 200.00	0	
Totals	16	10	0	0	6	£ 1,300.00	3	
Caerphilly County Borough Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	178	151	5	11	8	£ 10,275.00	0	3 FPNs for littering were referred through the Youth Intervention Programme run in partnership with the Youth Offending Team.
Dog Fouling	32	28	4	0	0	£ 1,425.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	210	179	9	11	8	£ 11,700.00	0	

Cardiff Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	398	308	9	0	81	£ 24,640.00	0	
Dog Fouling	51	36	0	0	15	£ 2,880.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	120	101	0	0	19	£ 8,080.00	0	
Totals	569	445	9	0	115	£ 35,600.00	0	
Carmarthenshire County Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	138	123	6	3	6	£ 5,975.00	0	
Dog Fouling	30	27	2	0	1	£ 2,025.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	7	6	0	0	1	£ 300.00	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	69	63	4	1	1	£ 3,300.00	0	
Totals	244	219	12	4	9	£ 11,600.00	0	
Ceredigion County Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Dog Fouling	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	

Conwy County Borough Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	2617	1903	377	25	108	£ 141,000.00	0	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action - because of the time taken to decide to progress with cases to Court, the decision may fall outside the accounting year timeframe.
Dog Fouling	129	99	15	0	5	£ 8,500.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	2746	2002	392	25	113	£ 149,500.00	0	
Denbighshire County Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	160	92	1	63	4	£ 6,900.00	0	
Dog Fouling	108	76	0	24	8	£ 5,700.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	11	10	0	0	1	£ 750.00	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	4015	2667	238	958	152	£ 200,025.00	0	
Totals	4294	2845	239	1045	165	£ 213,375.00	0	
Flintshire County Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	6	5	0	0	1	£ 250.00	0	
Dog Fouling	25	18	5	1	1	£ 925.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	86	70	7	2	7	£ 3,650.00	0	
Totals	117	93	12	3	9	£ 4,825.00	0	
Gwynedd Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	86	67	13	4	3	£ 3,505.00	0	
Dog Fouling	38	27	5	0	5	£ 1,620.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	3	3	0	0	0	£ 150.00	0	
Totals	127	97	18	4	8	£ 5,275.00	0	

Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	2	1	0	0	1	£ 60.00	0	
Dog Fouling	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	2	1	0	0	1	£ 60.00	0	
Monmouthshire County Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Dog Fouling	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	276	190	0	0	86	£ 14,719.00	0	
Dog Fouling	34	29	2	3	0	£ 2,175.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	310	219	2	3	86	£ 16,894.00	0	
Newport City Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	822	553	137	30	102	£ 41,475.00	0	
Dog Fouling	13	6	3	1	3	£ 450.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	5	5	0	0	0	£ 250.00	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	840	564	140	31	105	£ 42,175.00	0	

Pembrokeshire County Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Dog Fouling	3	3	0	0	0	£ 225.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	3	3	0	0	0	£ 225.00	0	
Powys County Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Dog Fouling	1	1	0	0	0	£ 75.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	1	1	0	0	0	£ 75.00	0	
Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	2651	1832	479	118	211	£ 147,465.00	11	RCT do not distinguish between litter and any other litter.
Dog Fouling	4	4	0	0	0	£ 300.00	0	No further action cases are a result of false details being provided, unknown medical conditions at the time of issue, deceased persons, wrong information recorded by officer, insufficient evidence to prosecute etc.
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	RCT offer payment plans and as a result the ' amount collected' includes partial payments of persons who have failed to adhere to their payment plan and have been taken to court.
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	8	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	2655	1836	479	118	211	£ 147,765.00	19	

Swansea City and County Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	2691	1975	379	248	*21	£ 101,665.55	0	The figures shown are for fixed penalty notices issued by the Private Enforcement Company 3G. Figures for fly-posting are unable to be provided.
Dog Fouling	5	4	1	1	0	£ 300.00	0	* No further court action is being taken as fixed penalty notice withdrawn for medical reasons.
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	2526	1919	**	240	19	£ 92,500.00	0	** Currently individual prosecutions for smoking related litter are not recorded.
Totals	5222	3898	380	489	40	£ 194,465.55	0	
Torfaen County Borough Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	10	8	0	1	1	£ 600.00	0	
Dog Fouling	3	2	1	0	0	£ 150.00	0	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	Smoking related litter is not recorded separately by this council.
Totals	13	10	1	1	1	£ 750.00	0	
Vale of Glamorgan Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	33	18	0	7	8	£ 1,350.00	62	
Dog Fouling	3	0	2	1	0	£ -	19	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Totals	36	18	2	8	8	£ 1,350.00	81	
Wrexham County Borough Council	No of fixed penalties issued	No of fixed penalties paid	No of cases of non-payment taken to court	No of cases of non-payment awaiting court action	No of cases of not paid where no further court action is being taken	Amount Collected (£)	No of warning letters issued (optional)	Explanations / Notes
Litter	13	4	0	1	1	£ 300.00	7	
Dog Fouling	4	2	0	0	0	£ 150.00	2	
Graffiti	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Fly-posting	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Noise	0	0	0	0	0	£ -	0	
Smoking related litter	30	23	0	2	3	£ 1,725.00	2	
Totals	47	29	0	3	4	£ 2,175.00	11	

Total Number of Fixed Penalty Notices Issued by Local Authorities in Wales: 2007 - 2016

Local Authorities	No of fixed penalties issued 2015-16	No of fixed penalties issued 2014 -15	No of fixed penalties issued 2013 -14	No of fixed penalties issued 2012 -13	No of fixed penalties issued 2011 -12	No of fixed penalties issued 2010 -11	No of fixed penalties issued 2009 -10	No of fixed penalties issued 2008 -09	No of fixed penalties issued 2007 -08
Isle of Anglesey County Council	5	2	16	13	2	5	11	0	4
Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council	1,410	1,545	1,440	2,262	1,198	17	12	0	10
Bridgend County Borough Council	16	18	59	66	66	57	137	163	552
Caerphilly County Borough Council	210	318	286	431	195	105	101	134	111
Cardiff Council	569	300	727	612	150	88	70	269	409
Carmarthenshire County Council	244	256	487	381	220	227	137	204	124
Ceredigion County Council	0	2	2	2	4	4	5	7	5
Conwy County Borough Council	2,746	2,512	2,359	842	130	224	105	153	98
Denbighshire County Council	4,294	3,371	3,168	1,730	272	238	78	0	45
Flintshire County Council	117	241	73	0	3	11	1	0	0
Gwynedd Council	127	102	97	360	214	185	96	0	116
Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council	2	2	0	3	4	0	11	25	24
Monmouthshire County Council	0	0	2	3	1	0	2	0	19
Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council	310	355	329	290	202	428	422	431	410
Newport City Council	840	298	301	110	111	127	62	0	9
Pembrokeshire County Council	3	5	4	4	3	3	5	0	5
Powys County Council	1	3	5	0	0	0	5	0	4
Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council	2,655	1,339	254	460	278	259	259	0	160
Swansea City and County Council	5,222	2,744	2,263	27	25	23	20	0	23
Torfaen County Borough Council	13	593	1,516	322	8	38	25	86	26
Vale of Glamorgan Council	36	41	73	1,330	60	37	56	31	73
Wrexham County Borough Council	47	199	137	197	204	275	412	367	654
Totals	18,867	14,246	13,598	9,445	3,350	2,351	2,032	1,870	2,881

The information provided shows a comparison of the number of fixed penalty notices issued by each Local Authority in Wales for 2015/16 (the last published data) in the areas of litter, dog fouling, graffiti, fly tipping, noise and smoking related litter.

There are huge variances across Wales with generally those authorities who have issued large numbers of enforcement notices employing external companies to take on the function on their behalf.

Bridgend has issued relatively few penalty notices over recent years (certainly compared to 10 years ago) predominantly down to resourcing issues not just in the service but also within Legal to progress cases. A recent Cabinet report proposed that Bridgend consider procuring an external company to address this.

This page is intentionally left blank

Potential items proposed for the Forward Work Programme - questions to consider	
Proposed Item	The budgetary impact of Parc Prison on BCBC
Is this item within the remit of the Committee?	Yes
How does it fit with the Corporate Priorities?	The One Council approach as it touches many sections of BCBC I presume.
Is it a public interest item?	Yes
What are the questions that need answering?	How much core funding does BCBC receive to deal with the impact of a prison being located within its boundary? What is the true cost of servicing this need? Is there is a different impact due to Parc Prison being privately run as opposed to being run by the Prison Service?
Then:	
What is the expected outcome from receiving the item?	Assess whether there is a budgetary pressure that should be covered by the Home Office and / or Welsh Government
What can be achieved?	Full breakdown of all costs incurred
What impact can Members have on this area?	Give members a better understanding so as to enable more informed decision making
What information should be reported to the Committee? I.e. data, case studies, examples of outcomes, challenges etc.	Data, case studies
How should information be presented at the meeting? I.e. PowerPoint/Prezi presentation, audio/visual formats, photos, graphics, charts, maps etc.	Possibly a presentation from the Home Office or a representative of the Prison Service or Parc Prison. Graphs and charts may be of help and perhaps to give comparisons around the country
Who should be invited to contribute to achieve a representative picture? I.e. front line staff, users, carers, young people, representatives from partner organisations, business	Third sector organisations who may link with the prison, social workers, housing officers

representatives etc.	
What is the proposed rationale for prioritising this item within the Scrutiny FWP?	To be able to fully understand the budgetary impact of something that does not appear to be within our control, but needs to be fully funded
Is the item particularly suitable for webcasting?	Possibly not

Scrutiny Forward Work Programme

Table A

The following items were previously prioritised by the Subject OVS Committees and considered by Corporate at its last meeting where the top three items were scheduled in for the next round of meetings:

Date	Subject Committee	Item	Specific Information to request	Rationale for prioritisation	Proposed date	Suggested Invitees	Prioritised by Committees	Invite Sent	Webcast
04-Dec-17	SOSC 1	Budget Consultation	To receive 2018-19 MTFS Proposals for Education and Family Support Directorate			Lindsay Harvey, Corporate Director - Education and Family Support; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member - Education and Generation; Nicola Echanis, Head of Education and Family Support.			
06-Dec-17	SOSC 3	Budget Consultation	To receive 2018-19 MTFS Proposals for Communities Directorate			Mark Shephard, Corporate Director - Communities; Cllr Richard Young, Cabinet Member - Communities; Zak Shell, Head of Neighbourhood Services; Satwant Pryce, Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services.			
07-Dec-17	SOSC 2	Budget Consultation	To receive 2018-19 MTFS Proposals for Social Services and Wellbeing Directorate			Sue Cooper, Corporate Director – Social Services and Wellbeing; Cllr Phil White, Cabinet Member – Social Services and Early Help; Jackie Davies, Head of Adult Social Care; Laura Kinsey, Head of Children's Social Care.			
12-Dec-17	SOSC 2	Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring the training being undertaken by professionals and volunteers to support and identify children and young people with mental health issues. Links with the Youth Offending Service – where these have ceased due to staffing issues, how there is a continued communication and joint up working between CAMHS and the YOS. <p>Links to transitional services and Adult Mental Health. Looking at how services were working together in cases where there is a direct impact from Adult Mental Health on children, such as parental alcohol or substance misuse or domestic abuse where children are involved.</p> <p>Data on what services are being offered and provided by schools.</p>		SOSC 1 - End of 2017/beginning of 2018 SOSC 2 - Priority in next set of meetings	Sue Cooper, Corporate Director – Social Services and Wellbeing; Lindsay Harvey, Corporate Director - Education and Family Support (Interim); Cllr Phil White, Cabinet Member – Social Services and Early Help; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration; Laura Kinsey, Head of Children's Social Care; Nicola Echanis, Head of Education and Family Support; NHS representative - Jo Abbott-Davies; Mark Wilkinson, Group Manager - Social Services & Wellbeing; Suzanne Sarjeant, Head of Pencoed Primary; Kaye King, Wellbeing Officer, Pencoed Primary; Jeremy Evans, Head of Heronsbridge; Dr Sylvia Fowler, Heronsbridge; Lorraine Silver, ALN Casework Manager; Representation from external agencies? Chair/Vice Chair of Health Board			
08-Jan-18	SOSC 2	Empty Homes	<p>How effective has this council been on bringing back into use empty properties over the last five years?</p> <p>Does this council have the appropriate policies and process in place to fully utilise the powers that we already have to tackle empty homes?</p> <p>What are the levels of empty homes across Bridgend?</p> <p>What is the potential loss of council tax receipts due to empty homes?</p> <p>Data on levels of empty properties and homes and how long they have been empty for</p> <p>Examples of case studies from Bridgend CBC</p> <p>Good practice from across wales</p> <p>Welsh Government policy</p>		Prioritised by SOSC 3 13 September 2017	Andrew Jolley, Corporate Director Operational and Partnership Services Mark Shephard, Corporate Director Communities Satwant Pryce, Head of Regeneration, Development & Property Martin Morgans, Head of Performance and Partnership Services Cllr Dhanisha Patel Welsh Government contacts? Helen Picton, SRS (VOG)			

Page 34	10-Jan-18	SOSC 1	Schools Strategic Review	Post-16 Education – proposals being consulted upon to include the relationships between secondary schools and colleges	Scrutiny to act as consultee – vital to have Scrutiny input into any consultation and ensure precision when necessary if any changes proposed for schools	10 January 2017	Lindsay Harvey, Interim Corporate Director - Education and Family Support; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration; Nicola Echanis, Head of Education and Early Help; John Fabes; Mandy Paish, CSC Senior Challenge Advisor.			
	17-Jan-18	SOSC 3	Community Asset Transfer	How many CAT's have been completed. How many are in process and at what stages. What finance is remaining from the initial £1 million capital allocated several years ago to help improve community buildings and sports pavilions. What has been spent to date and on what. What support is available for businesses looking to undertake a CAT What has been the main reason for CAT's not being progressed beyond initial stages Is there appetite for the CAT process amongst the local communities. Is the process fair if one community has an active local group to progress a CAT, yet another community many not have an active group and hence lose out through no fault of their own. Need to have comparison data from other authorities along with examples of what has worked and not worked. Case study of some CAT's in BCBC Data required on condition of all BCBC sports pavilions and community buildings to have an understanding of the scale of the problem. Exploration of the introduction of definitive timeslines as to when the Council will no longer be able to support the assets		Prioritised by SOSC 3 13 September 2017	Mark Shephard, Corporate Director Communities Cabinet Member Education and Regeneration, Cllr Charles Smith Cabinet Member Communities, Cllr Richard Young Community Groups Guy Smith, Community Asset Transfer officer Sports club reps who may be in need of improved buildings / facilities but do not have the capacity to consider entering into a CAT agreement			
	07-Feb-18	SOSC 2	The Economic Prosperity of Bridgend County Borough	To include areas such as Economic Development, Worklessness Programmes, EU Funding for Skills. How are the Council proactively ensuring that we will benefit from the City Deal?		SOSC 3 - prioritised for next set of meetings 17/07/2017 13/09/2017 SOSC 1 - proposed waiting until the detail of the Revenue Support Grant are known before this item is considered. SOSC 2 - 18/09/2017	Darren Mepham, Chief Executive; Cllr Huw David, Leader Mark Shepherd, Corporate Director Communities; Cllr Richard Young, Cabinet Member – Communities; Satwant Pryce, Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services; Representative tbc from Bridgend College; Representative tbc from Bridgend Business Forum; Representative from Monmouthshire County Council.			SOSC 2 highlighted this item as suitable for webcasting.
	08-Feb-18	SOSC 1	School Standards Report 17-18	Annual school performance report from CSC	Annual school performance results form the basis of monitoring of schools which is a primary responsibility of Scrutiny.	Proposed to receive late January/early February once the school results have been formally published.	Lindsay Harvey, Interim Corporate Director - Education and Family Support; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration; Nicola Echanis, Head of Education and Early Help; Mandy Paish, CSC Senior Challenge Advisor; Mike Glavin, Managing Director CSC			

Page 35	12-Feb-18	SOSC 3	Town Centre Regeneration	<p>To provide members with information on the following responsibilities of the Council and how these are managed and can be developed with reduced resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking review – When is the car parking review going to be undertaken? Charges for staff car parking at all sites - has this been reviewed? If this was taken forward what income would this generate? • Residents Parking - when residents permit parking going to be rolled out? • Inconsiderate parking in the Borough - where are the problem areas? What are we doing to tackle these issues? Are we prosecuting? • Parking outside schools - How are we tackling bad parking at schools? Update on the introduction of the mobile camera van that was purchased to tackle such issues. What areas has this van been at. How many fines have been issued to date? • Pedestrianisation - particularly in Bridgend Town Centre. Outcomes of the consultation to allow traffic into the town • Business Rates • Strategic Building Investment • Disabled facilities 	<p>Prioritised by SOSC 3 17 July 2017 13 September 2017</p> <p>Prioritised by SOSC 2 18 September 2017</p>	<p>Mark Shephard, Corporate Director Communities Zak Shell, Head of Streetscene Satwant Pryce, Head of Regeneration</p>			SOSC 2 highlighted this item as suitable for webcasting.

Table B

The following items were deemed important for future prioritisation:

Item	Specific Information to request	Rationale for prioritisation	Proposed date	Suggested Invitees			Webcast
Advocacy Services for Children and Adults	<p>To include information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The outcome from the Advocacy Pilot Scheme • The current system • Social Services & Wellbeing Act • Regional Children Services advocacy • Adult Services – Golden Thread Project 		Pilot ends April. Therefore proposed date June 2018.	<p>Susan Cooper, Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing; Cllr Phil White, Cabinet Member – Social Services and Early Help; Jacqueline Davies, Head of Adult Social Care; Laura Kinsey, Head of Children’s Social Care; Richard Thomas, Strategic Planning and Commissioning Officer</p>			
Prevention and Wellbeing and Local Community Coordination	<p>To include information about the number of different initiatives that are available within the community as an alternative to statutory services.</p> <p>LCC projects to be referenced under a heading for each area – Ogmore, Llynfi and Garw Valleys – to ensure ease of reference to what projects are being carried out where.</p> <p>To include information on the work being undertaken with the 3rd Sector.</p>		Proposed date March/April 2018	<p>Susan Cooper Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing; Cllr Phil White, Cabinet Member - Social Services and Early Help Cllr Dhanisha Patel, Cabinet Member - Wellbeing and Future Generations; Jacqueline Davies, Head of Adult Social Care; Andrew Thomas, Group Manager – Prevention and Wellbeing.</p>			
Dementia Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include accurate and up to date figures on the people diagnosed with dementia in Bridgend County Borough for comparison with the number of people predicted to be living with dementia; • Provide Members with the information which can be found on the Local GP Dementia Register which highlights prevalence of dementia by area throughout the borough and type of dementia. The Panel recommend that these statistics are presented on a map diagram for ease of reference. If possible, Members wish that this data be elaborated upon to include age, and whether the numbers show if diagnosis was received prior to moving into the borough; • Provide an update on the review of joint intentions with health and the third sector and include information regarding the production of a dementia strategy and delivery plan - stating milestones, target dates and responsible officers. • Provide an update on existing discussions with nursing care providers in relation to the development of nursing residential care places for people with dementia; <p>Include facts and figures on people with dementia living in Cardiff as well as Neath Port Talbot and Swansea for comparison to Bridgend.</p> <p>Comparisons with other LAs such as Maesteg and the Vale on dementia awareness training to consider how successful the Authority has been in making Bridgend Dementia friendly.</p>		Members proposed that this be considered after Members have received Dementia Care Training in September/October	<p>Susan Cooper Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing; Cllr Phil White, Cabinet Member – Social Services and Early Help; Jacqueline Davies, Head of Adult Social Care; Representative from Age Concern Wales; Representative from ABMU; Representative from Bavo.</p>			Corporate highlighted this item as suitable for webcasting.

Safeguarding	<p>To include Safeguarding activity in both Children and Adult Services.</p> <p>To also cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Safeguarding Boards Bridgend Corporate Safeguarding Policy CSE DOLS <p>Report to provide statistical data in relation to service demands and evidence how quickly and effectively the services are acting to those needs.</p> <p>To evidence how the two services are working together and the impact on the LAC population.</p> <p>To receive the outcome of the in depth analysis which was currently being undertaken within the Council.</p>	<p>Members stressed that this subject must be considered by Scrutiny on their FWP as is a huge responsibility of the Authority and Scrutiny must ensure the work being undertaken to protect some of the most vulnerable people is effective and achieving outcomes.</p>	<p>Proposed date February 2018</p>	<p>Susan Cooper Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing; Cllr Phil White, Cabinet Member – Social Services and Early Help; Jacqueline Davies, Head of Adult Social Care; Laura Kinsey, Head of Children’s Social Care; Elizabeth Walton James, Group Manager Safeguarding and Quality Assurance</p>			
Residential Remodelling - Extra Care Housing Schemes	<p>Information on the Extra Care Housing Schemes. To include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose/model Changes to residential care Communication strategy <p>Possible site visit to extra care housing scheme and new site once work has begun.</p>		<p>Proposed date June 2018.</p>	<p>Susan Cooper, Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing; Cllr Phil White, Cabinet Member – Social Services and Early Help; Jacqueline Davies, Head of Adult Social Care; Carmel Donovan, Group Manager Integrated Community Services; Representative from Linc.</p>			
School Modernisation Band B	<p>To advise committee on the development of the strategic outline plan for band b of the 21st century schools modernisation programme</p>	<p>Scrutiny to inform the plans and refine the rationale for the development of the schools estate</p>	<p>Proposed by Officers - March 2018</p>	<p>Lindsay Harvey, Interim Corporate Director - Education and Family Support; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration; Nicola Echanis, Head of Education and Early Help; Gaynor Thomas, Schools Programme Manager</p>			
ALN Reform	<p>When the Bill has been further progressed, report to include consideration of the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How the Authority and Schools are engaging with parents over the changes to the Bill? What the finalised process is for assessments and who is responsible for leading with them? What involvement/responsibilities do Educational Psychologists have under the Bill? Has the Bill led to an increase in tribunals and what impact has this had? This is set against the context of the recent announcement by the Lifelong Learning Minister that instead of saving £4.8m over four years the Bill could potentially cost £8.2m due to an expected increase in the number of cases of dispute resolution. Given that the Bill focuses on the involvement of young people and their parents, what support is available for those involved in court disputes? Outcomes from the Supported Internship programme. Support for those with ALN into employment. Staffing - Protection and support for staff, ALNCO support, workloads and capacity. Pupil-teacher ratios and class sizes and impact of Bill on capacity of teachers to support pupils with ALN How is the implementation of the Bill being monitored; what quality assurance frameworks are there and what accountability for local authorities, consortiums and schools? 	<p>Needs revisiting to monitor implementation of the Bill and if needs are being met as well as impact on future budgets</p>	<p>Proposed by SOSC 1 to be revisited in next years FWP</p>	<p>Lindsay Harvey, Interim Corporate Director - Education and Family Support; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration; Nicola Echanis, Head of Education and Early Help. Michelle Hatcher, Group Manager Inclusion and School Improvement Third Sector Representatives</p>			

Early Help and Social Care	<p>The process into how the following information will be presented will be confirmed following meetings with both Directorates Corporate Directors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to date figures presenting the numbers of Looked After Children by Local Authority; • A breakdown of referral figures, to include statistics from local pre-school nurseries; • Outcome from the review undertaken by Institute of Public Care; • What services are being provided post 16, given that research indicates shows that children who have been looked after, have the increased probability that their children will also end up in the care system; • Outcomes from the following Residential Remodelling project work streams: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For moving out-of-country residential placements to in-county - Upskilling of three internal foster carers to provide intensive, therapeutic step down placements. - Review of the foster carer marketing and recruitment strategy at a draft/early stage to allow members input into the process <p>To evidence how the two services are working together and the impact on the LAC population.</p>					
Annual Recommendations/feedback Update to each SOSC	Update on all feedback that required follow up and recommendations - Cabinet and Officer ones		Proposed for March 2018 to inform next years FWP planning	None		
Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales (CSSIW) Inspection of Children's Services.	The Committee requested that they receive an information report detailing the progress of the plan and update Members whether or not the actions have addressed the issues raised by the Inspectorate.					
Emergency Housing	<p>Is the current emergency housing provided by BCBC meeting the needs of the service users? Is the current provision a good use of public resources? Should an alternative provision be made to ensure families, in particular children, achieve their potential.</p> <p>Service user numbers Service user demographic –ages, disabilities, gender Outcomes Challenges faced daily by families using provision –health, dentist, mental health, schools</p>			<p>Andrew Jolley, Corporate Director – Operational and Partnership Services; Martin Morgans, Head of Performance and Partnership Services Cllr Dhanisha Patel, Cabinet Member - Wellbeing and Future Generations;</p>		

The following items for briefing sessions or pre-Council briefing

Item	Specific Information to request
Overview of Direct Payment Scheme	<p>To update Members on the Direct Payments Process.</p> <p>How outcomes for individuals are being identified and monitored.</p> <p>What activities are being requested by individuals to enable them to achieve their personal outcomes.</p> <p>How the Direct Payments system is being monitored.</p> <p>To include clarification and further details on the exact costs of commissioning the IPC.</p>
Social Services Commissioning Strategy	<p>To include information on what work has taken place following the Social Services and Wellbeing Act population assessment.</p> <p>To also cover the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Annual Plan • <u>Bridgend Social Services Commissioning Strategy</u>
Western Bay Regional Report	Update on situation and way forward with WB and Regional Working?

This page is intentionally left blank

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL
REPORT TO OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3
22 NOVEMBER 2017

REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES

THE COUNCIL'S NEW WASTE CONTRACT

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To set out for the attention of the overview and scrutiny committee a summary of the current situation with regard to the new Waste Contract, including answers to specific questions highlighted by Members of the Committee.

2. Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives/Other Corporate Priorities

- 2.1 The provision of an effective and efficient household waste collection service aligns with all three of the Corporate objectives:
- **Supporting a successful economy**
 - **Helping people to become more self-reliant**
 - **Smarter use of resources**

3. Background

- 3.1 The Council's new recycling and waste collection service came into operation on expiry of the former waste services contract, at the end of March this year. The commencement of the new contract on the 1st April and the changes that were introduced to kerbside collections and the Council's Community Recycling Centres, put into effect the Council's response to the Welsh Government's Policies and Strategies for waste in Wales. In particular the new arrangements took into account the Welsh Government's challenging targets on recycling and associated fines for failing to meet them.
- 3.2 Due to the financial value of the contract the Council were required to comply with European Union procurement rules, which set out in detail the processes and procedures to be followed when procuring services, these rules are further supported by case law where these procedures have been challenged. On completion of the competitive procurement exercise Kier were appointed as the Council's waste services Contractor for the next seven years.
- 3.3 The new 7 year contract period started on 1st April 2017 but delays in awarding the contract meant that it was agreed it was sensible to allow more time before the implementation of the most significant changes. Therefore the main changes relating to the restriction of 'residual waste' to two blue bags per household, per fortnight were implemented with effect from 5th June 2017. This allowed greater time for the changes to be promoted and communicated, including a detailed information leaflet to every household and greater time for the contractor to mobilise

for the changes and in particular for the route and collection day changes which impacted on over half of the households in the County Borough.

4. Current Situation

4.1 The following detail seeks to answer the specific questions raised by Scrutiny Committee.

4.2 In general terms the performance of the contract has improved significantly since the roll out of the main changes in June 2017. The regular updates sent out to all elected Members over recent months have demonstrated this improvement. The early weeks of the contract, subsequent to the implementation of the main changes, were characterised by an unacceptable level of missed collections, significant problems with the performance of the call centre and an unexpectedly high level of requests for new recycling equipment leading in some cases to delays. All of this understandably led to considerable frustration for many residents and elected Members, as well of course to the Cabinet Members and officers directly involved in managing and overseeing the new contract.

4.3 Over recent months performance is much improved with the level of missed collections substantially reduced, the backlog of outstanding deliveries addressed and the call centre performance now generally in line with the contractual standard set out. There remain however significant pockets of under performance, in particular issues such as recurring examples of the same streets or individual houses being missed for particular collections or failing to receive deliveries. Therefore while the evidence suggests that the vast majority of households now consistently receive the service the Council has specified, there are outstanding pockets of poor performance the Council is still seeking to improve and resolve with the contractor. These matters are discussed and actioned at the regular contract meetings between the Council and Kier. This does however have to be viewed in the context of there being over 6 million collections per year from households within the County Borough which means that even a small number of misses can translate to a relatively significant number of complaints and queries. Based on the above both the Council and Kier are aware that there remains a considerable amount of work to do to entirely satisfy the requirements of the contract on a consistent basis and both are working diligently to achieve this .

4.4 The overall good news however is that the new contract has done what it was designed to do in substantially increasing the overall level of household waste that is recycled, and while it is still early days in the new contract, current performance levels would put the Council at or near the top of all Welsh Local Authorities for recycling performance.

4.5 Why the scheme was not rolled out over a number of months?

The decision not to phase in the new kerbside collection arrangements was taken after careful consideration of the implications of different mobilisation options with the appointed Contractor. In this instance, due to the extent of the proposed changes and the complications that would have been introduced had the change been phased in, it was decided, accepting that some difficulties might arise, to opt for the option to roll the new collections out across all of the County Borough from the 5th June.

In reaching this decision a number of factors were considered, these included:

- Consideration of productivity rates; It would have been less productive for crews to be picking up a combination of old and new containers over an extended period, and therefore potentially more expensive.
- Collection routes were changed for approximately 55% of properties across the County Borough, this meant that all collection rounds had changed to one extent or another even where day changes had not occurred.
- Length of disruption period. Phased rollouts have an inevitable extended disruption period compared to the chosen approach.

The rollout of new services inevitably leads to some degree of disruption in any new contract or significant change of waste collection methodology, and while some of the difficulties which surfaced during the initial mobilisation in June 2017 were worse than expected for a period of a few weeks and of course very regrettable, every effort was made to mitigate the impact with a series of detailed 'mobilisation' meetings held between the Council and the contractor prior to the start of the contract and on an ongoing basis subsequently. This resulted, in particular, once the main problems became apparent, in the deployment of additional staffing resource both in the call centre and in the number of operatives used by the contractor on the ground.

4.6 What is being done to address dignity issues for users of the Council's Absorbent Hygiene Products (AHP) service?

The Council made a pro-active and conscious choice to provide an additional fortnightly Absorbent Hygiene Product [AHP] Service following a public consultation exercise that showed strong support for this option. This additional service is not provided by most local authorities in Wales or the UK even where there are similar restrictions on the amount of 'residual waste' that can be presented at kerbside. It was implemented in recognition of the additional waste that households with young children and with residents with incontinence problems would produce and the greater difficulties some householders might therefore face with the introduction of a two bag per fortnight limit for residual or 'blue bag' waste. In the previous contract all AHP waste would have been disposed of in the residual waste stream. The advantage of the separate collection is that it allows this waste to be separated and to be recycled, thereby contributing to the Council's overall percentage of waste recycled. To be clear however those that do not wish to register for the separate collection do not have to do so and can continue, if they prefer, to place their AHP waste in their fortnightly collection of blue bags provided that they stay within the limits set out.

The specific rationale for the provision of the service was that information from the Welsh Government and some other Welsh Councils revealed that AHP products had recently become more easily recyclable, where they are collected separately to other waste materials. In seeking to maximise the Council's recycling performance, the new contract made provision for the separate collection and recycling of the materials, in a uniquely identifiable sack that enables the collection crews to identify the materials for collection and onward transport to the recycling facility. As far as the Council is aware all AHP household collection services require the presentation of a differently coloured sack at kerbside and all bidders for the contract offered a

similar solution, the service in Bridgend is virtually identical to the one successfully implemented in Rhondda Cynon Taf, including the nature and the colour of the bag. Cross contamination of the waste with other materials, would likely result in the load being rejected and sent to land fill if separate bags were not used.

Under the new contract, these materials are sent to Natural UK, Capel Hendre Industrial Estate, Ammanford, for recycling, where 82% of the material is recovered for reuse in the fibre board industry.

It is currently anticipated that up to 8500 households could eventually register for the scheme; currently 7720 households have come forward to receive the service. An average of approximately 100 requests a week for the service are still being received so at this stage the collection rounds are still changing each week causing some ongoing difficulties. An annual registration is required for the service to ensure it remains accurate and up to date.

In recognition that disposal of such materials for some adults in particular is a sensitive issue, where possible discreet collection points can be agreed with the Contractor. The dignity issues are taken very seriously by the Council and the Contractor and are dealt with on a case by case basis. The assessment methodology for this follows the same principles as assisted collections; a supervisor will visit the householder and agree where the AHP can be placed for collection. In order for a discreet collection to be made this process must be followed. AHP's sacks 'hidden' in the householder's garden, for example, will not be collected without the discreet collection being registered with the Contractor.

Additionally it should be noted that all householders receiving the AHP collection service can 'double bag' their waste to prevent the contents being visible through the translucent bags.

The Council is committed to ensuring that its waste collection services are delivered in such a way that, in so far as is reasonable, no individual or groups who fall under the provisions of the Equalities Act 2010 (or other hard to reach or socially excluded group) are negatively impacted. The Council provides advice and information in suitable formats, accessible by the blind and / or visually impaired. Where considered appropriate, upon request officers will visit properties to discuss householders' concerns and where possible make appropriate special arrangements which address those concerns. In reality this means that additionally, in very exceptional cases, special additional dispensations can be allowed by the Council to certain householders if they are unable to comply with the normal rules and limitations.

4.7 What is being done about streets and residences that the waste trucks aren't able to access?

The Contractor currently deploys a specialist restricted access vehicle on both residual waste collections and recycling collections. Some households in narrow lanes and streets, even under the previous contract, have never had their waste collected from outside their homes because it is not possible to safely do so.

With the recent changes to collection days the restricted access streets have become concentrated to certain days of the week, this has led to some round

revisions which the Contractor has addressed. There remain isolated examples, as there were in the previous contract, where for health and safety reasons it is not possible for a vehicle to access a narrow street or lane [sometimes unadopted] and in these circumstances the contractor continues to liaise with residents to find a mutually agreeable solution, but in some cases waste has to be presented communally at the bottom of a street or lane. In these circumstances the Contractor and/or the Council's waste education officers will communicate with the relevant households to ensure they are familiar with the correct arrangements.

4.8 What assistance and advice have residential homes been provided with to comply with the new waste collection service? How have the Education and Enforcement Officers engaged with the public? Where have they visited, have they visited any homes? How many officers are there? When is enforcement going to start?

Officers have engaged extensively with residential homes and also communal collection areas, such as in Wildmill, to assist residents in finding sustainable solutions to their recycling and refuse collection difficulties. For example in Wildmill additional collection points have been identified in agreement with the contractor and local elected Members. While it has not been possible to fully address all of the issues raised to date, officers continue to work to resolve any new and outstanding problems and liaise regularly with representatives from care homes and registered social landlords to improve the service.

Central to this work, are the Education and Enforcement Officers who are frequently deployed into such areas to work alongside the communities to improve their understanding of the service and to report back on issues which need to be resolved. Initially four temporary Education and Enforcement Officers were recruited to support the roll out of the new service. Recently this number was reduced to three to ensure that the available resource is spread and targeted effectively throughout the financial year within the available budget. To date they have:

- Visited several residential homes to advise on collection systems i.e. Llys Faen, Cwrt Gwalia, Brook Court etc.
- Worked with housing associations to provide advice and support
- Undertaken leaflet drops / door knocking
- Delivered presentations and attended community meetings
- Supported the Contractor by undertaking dispensation assessments
- Reviewed communal bin locations for suitability and capacity
- Addressed individual recurring problems - It should be noted that there has always been a problem with issues such as 'contamination' in communal waste collection areas. It is difficult to wholly resolve this as identifying which households are failing to recycle appropriately is not an easy task, but the measures identified above are intended to improve the situation.
- Investigated residual waste fly tipping – There has been a small increase in overall reported instances of fly tipping since the start of the new contract as was anticipated, but at this stage it is too early to assess any longer term trend. In particular many of the reported instances in the early part of the new contract were in fact missed collections and the data does not allow these occurrences to be separated. A more meaningful assessment will be

possible at the end of the financial year when the new contract is fully established.

The Council has always regarded enforcement action as a last resort reserved for when there is clear, obvious and wilful non-compliance with the Council's agreed waste policies. In the first instance it is far better that the education officers are deployed to speak to householders where, for example, there is non-compliance with the two blue bags per fortnight rule or there is regular contamination of recycling presented. In the first instance therefore the Council has taken the approach of allowing the system to become embedded in this way and importantly Kier have anecdotally reported very high levels of compliance with the new system, despite considerable scaremongering prior to its implementation that it would not or could not work. That is demonstrated by the significantly higher overall level of recycling and the corresponding reduction in waste destined for landfill. The overall position comparing recycling levels for this year compared to last is set out in **Appendix A**. It is likely however that the level of compliance will slip unless the Council and contractor over the next few months moves to a stricter interpretation of the waste policy and more closely address instances of non-compliance.

The Council recognises moving forward that it will, in the most serious cases, need the 'stick' of enforcement where necessary, to back up the work of the Education Officers, otherwise levels of compliance with the systems will slowly drop and have a consequential effect on recycling percentages.

It is therefore envisaged that in the new year the Council and contractor will move to stricter enforcement, following the pattern of initially 'sticker' additional bags presented at kerb side and giving appropriate warnings, providing assistance and help, before moving to any potential fines or enforcement action.

The process of enforcement is however challenging requiring a consistent approach and sufficient legal support to follow up any action that is taken. It is not envisaged therefore that wholesale enforcement action will be undertaken or necessary.

Notwithstanding this, as previously approved by Cabinet, work is currently underway to identify measures to strengthen the Council's street scene enforcement activity; these measures include the possible appointment of external support and or collaboration with other Councils. The option to expand the Council's in-house resources will also be considered as part of this review. It is likely that this process will be concluded to have a solution in place for the new financial year in April 2018.

4.9 To explore the possibility of co-ordinating the issues being raised through Member referrals.

A Member protocol in regards to reporting waste contract complaints has been issued to all Members. Unfortunately however this has had limited success as multiple recipients are often still being included in Member complaint e-mails, probably as a legacy of initial problems where elected Members felt compelled to escalate many issues to Senior Managers and to Cabinet Members. This does though lead to duplication of action to address matters or sometimes lack of action due to clarity issues around complaint ownership. A second protocol in relation to waste reporting will be issued to try and address the issue of "scatter gun" complaint

reporting and the associated problems and attempt to remove the escalation of matters as a 'norm'. It is important that this part of the service is 'normalised' as soon as possible because there is insufficient resource available to allow operational matters to be escalated as a matter of course. Understandably however better sustained and consistent performance will be required by the contractor for this to be realistically achieved, and it is clear that overall performance has improved significantly over recent months.

After significant initial problems the performance of the call centre is now ordinarily within the acceptable contractual range but the nature of the service means that the contract still generates a few hundred calls, queries and complaints per week. This is however consistent with the last contract where an average of 190 calls were received daily on waste issues by the Council's call centre but of course these were largely under the radar as very few were escalated or copied around as issues are currently.

The new protocol is likely to recommend the Member referral system as the single contact point for elected Member queries [members of the public should firstly still use the e-mail addresses provided for normal queries and requests], and this will then allow better coordination and analysis of the issues being raised, rather than the multiple channels that are currently being used. The one caveat with using the Member referral system as the main source of raising issues and complaints is that it is by its very nature an administratively burdensome and relatively slow and expensive (because of the number of officers who 'handle' the referral and the written process that is required to respond and close the referral] method of raising issues. The system allows 10 working days as a matter of course to respond and sometimes longer when investigation is required. If therefore a resolution is required more quickly it may not always be a particularly effective way of raising concerns and getting them resolved, especially because within that 10 day period it is possible that a number of other collections may have already been made in that same location or street, for example. In view of this while obviously attempts will be made to deal with the more urgent queries as quickly as possible the system will be monitored and reviewed on an ongoing basis and improved, where possible, as necessary. It is hoped though that as the overall waste contract performs more consistently to a high standard that the necessity for member referrals will drop considerably.

4.10 **To receive details on how other Welsh Local Councils provide their waste collection services.**

Details of the collection arrangements of Welsh Councils are provided in **Appendix B** (Welsh Local Council Collection Arrangements). This data was made available by the Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA). From the list it can be seen that 11 of the 22 Welsh Councils, including Bridgend, are considered to be Welsh Government Blue Print Compliant and offer separate collection of paper, card, plastics and cans, utilising a range of container solutions. Welsh Government argue that this methodology is more efficient and cost effective and leads to less contamination of recycle. Some other Welsh Authorities would however dispute this.

In addition the Council offers a 'paid for' garden waste service for those who register and the AHP service covered earlier in the report.

Residual waste collection frequencies for Welsh Councils are either fortnightly or three weekly with 17 of the 22 Councils offering fortnightly collections in line with Bridgend. Conwy are currently trialling 4 weekly collections of residual waste in some areas. Containment of the waste varies between bags and wheeled bins or a combination of both. With regard to disposal capacity 15 of the 22 Councils offer waste disposal capacities of 80lts or less per household, Bridgend is consistent with this group offering 60lts per household/week.

All Welsh Local Authorities restrict the presentation of household domestic residual or 'black bag' waste in some way or another. It is anticipated that most Authorities will have to make further changes to their collection arrangements over the course of the next few years in order to continue to meet challenging Welsh Government statutory recycling targets, or else face substantial fines. The contractual arrangements in Bridgend whereby a 7 year contract is procured with an external company means that the majority of change happens in one go every seven years. Other Authorities, most of whom continue to run services in-house, will have the ability to make more gradual changes over a longer period if that suits them. The effect of this in recycling percentage terms tends to be that Bridgend improves its overall recycling percentage significantly at the start of the 7 year contract and moves to the top or near the top performance level of all Welsh Councils, but then tends to slip partially down that performance table towards the end of that 7 year cycle as other Authorities improve their relative performance. Unfortunately it is not realistic with an outsourced contract to devise and procure it in a way where significant change is made every year or two years. The procurement of the waste contract in Bridgend therefore has to future proof what will be required for that whole 7 year period.

4.11 **To receive details on how the Contractor plans the waste collection routes.**

Routes are planned by the contractor using local input and specialist routing software called webaspx.

To arrive at collection routes, the following data is utilised:

- Payload capacity of vehicle by material stream
- Tonnages to be collected per day per material stream
- Properties collected per day
- Route size per day
- Mileage per day
- Travelling times from depot to first collection and to tip point
- A prediction of traffic related lost time
- Tip turnaround times per day
- Crew lunch breaks
- Performance benchmarking against comparable contracts (e.g. properties per day)

This approach is consistent with other Council's methodology and is considered at this time to be industry best practice for refuse round design. However, like all modelling, once implemented some tweaking of rounds may be necessary if there is imbalance between rounds. When Kier introduce their new fleet of recycling vehicles towards the end of this calendar year, bespoke designed for the Bridgend contract, some changes to existing rounds will be required as the total number of

rounds will reduce because the overall capacity of the recycling vehicles will increase. However, the Council will ensure that the proposed changes are properly planned and communicated and appropriately evidenced before implementation to ensure they will work effectively with the correct resource levels, to minimise any further disruption to the public.

4.12 To receive details on the location of the Contractor's customer service centre staff?

Kier's customer contact centre for its waste contracts for English speakers is based in Torquay, Devon. The Welsh speaking contact centre is based at the Kier Tondu depot. The 'Welsh speaking' resource at Tondu is used less frequently and so the officer is also used as necessary for other administrative and performance monitoring tasks as we understand it.

4.13 On what basis was the three months expected disruption time at the commencement of the Contract accepted by the Council?

To be clear 'disruption time' was not written into the contract. However, when drafting the contract specification, it was considered appropriate and in line with understood waste sector experience, and specialist advice, to make proper provision for mobilising changes to the kerbside recycling and refuse services. Accordingly, provisions were included in the specification to suspend the application of a number of the performance standards for a period of 12 weeks from the Contractor's initial rerouting date. This decision was taken to allow sufficient time to implement and deal with any issues arising from rerouting. Equally however while the contract bedded in for that same 12 week period, the contractor agreed that they would not make any financial claim against the Council for collecting waste that is incorrectly presented, sorted or where too many bags are left out.

It is important when specifying contract conditions to consider the transfer of risk between the parties and how any Contractor might take account of this in his bid. It is highly likely, had the emphasis been placed on the contractor to perform fully from the initial rerouting date that he would have allowed for this in his financial bid, thereby increasing the cost to the Council. In circumstances where a bidding contractor considers the transfer of risk to be too great the Council was advised that they will elect to remove themselves from the process completely. With a limited number of companies currently providing waste services, this possibility was always to the fore when compiling the procurement documents and therefore it was sensible to take an approach that is regarded as normal in the industry in these circumstances. There are however also many other contractual provisions that were not subject to this suspension of contract performance standards. **Appendix C** concerning the contract performance covers how the contract is monitored and managed in response to specific questions posed by the Scrutiny Committee.

4.14 Do we have sufficient vehicles for the waste and recycling service? What vehicles are used for AHP collection, what rationale is there for the use of these vehicles?

It is important to note that the Council does not own any waste collection vehicles. The contract is an agreement to collect waste and recycling from the kerbside. The type of vehicle used is a matter for the contractor. Currently the requirements of

the service are being met with a mix of new and older vehicles from the previous waste services contract. Moving forward over the next few months the programme of vehicle replacement will continue, with the introduction of the new kerbside recycling vehicles. These vehicles have been built to the specific requirements of the service and have a greater carrying capacity than the current vehicles and will be phased in to use, to seek to minimise disruption.

The AHP service currently utilises two 3.5 tonne enclosed panel vans, with a third vehicle being introduced shortly for the service. Following high levels of registration for the AHP scheme at the start of the contract, registrations for the service continue to be received at a rate of approximately 100 properties per week. While this growth continues, it is difficult for the contractor to establish a base line of properties and to plan a long term solution, as this is dependent on collection weights of AHP and the number of properties registered to receive the collection. It is envisaged that the service numbers will settle early in the new year, at which point the Contractor will finalise his resource and vehicle plans for the AHP service.

4.15 How has the change in contract impacted on the Community Recycling Centres (CRC's)? Has there been a significant increase in waiting times at the sites reported? Has the contractor increased resources at the sites? Are the public generally complying with the new way in which the centres work? I.e. separating and sorting their waste.

Overall there has been a positive impact at the CRC's with waste reducing and recycling increasing. Details of the tonnages during June, July and August are presented for Scrutiny in **Appendix D** (Community Recycling Centres Performance).

Over this period there has been approximately a 11% reduction in tonnages received at the sites, with a 957 tonne reduction in non-recyclable (residual and bulky) waste tonnages going to the MREC for disposal. In the same period the figures reveal that recycling has increased by 254 tonnes.

The majority of residents are complying with the Council's Policy and are willingly separating their recyclable and non-recyclable waste for disposal either prior to arrival at the sites (preferable) or at the sites. Similar systems work effectively in other neighbouring local authorities including Swansea and Rhondda Cynon Taf [RCT]. Regrettably, there are a small number of householders who object to the scheme and who look to express their views more forcibly to the operatives. The Council is currently working with the Contractor to overcome these instances and a range of possible measures to deal with such situations is under consideration, including the provision of on person camera recorders of the type used by the Civil Parking Enforcement Officers.

It is difficult to provide an accurate assessment of whether waiting times have increased at the CRC sites since June but anecdotally the contractor believes they have not. At peak times it may still be necessary to wait for a short while but this is again not unusual and similar issues are reported by other local authorities in South Wales at some of their popular sites, including Caerphilly and Cardiff.

In the medium term the Council still has plans to replace its CRC site at Tythegston with a new modern facility. The lease at Tythegston has been extended, initially for

a further 2 years, while site investigations at potential new locations continue. The key to ensuring that the CRC sites are fit for purpose moving forward will be investment to create more modern, larger and efficient sites.

4.16 How are the areas where communal waste is collected being managed? How are they complying with the new restrictions? Are they generally compliant? What problems are being reported particularly in the Wildmill area?

Communal areas are currently provided with a set of five 240ltr wheeled bins for the separate collection of food waste, paper and cardboard, glass and mixed plastic and cans. Refuse collections may be provided using either a wheeled bin collection or refuse sacks dependent on the location. For the majority of areas recycling is collected at least weekly and refuse fortnightly.

The Education and Enforcement Officers are currently involved in carrying out an audit of communal areas across the County Borough, including for example Wildmill which is recognised as an unusual situation but is not new as similar issues were present in the previous contract. The results of the audit will confirm:

- The current bin provision in communal areas for recycling and refuse
- Compliant and non-compliant areas
- If support through education, will improve recycling
- If the provision already provided is insufficient

There are a number of communal recycling areas located around Wildmill. For refuse, the blocks of flats receive a wheeled bin collection service; all other areas have refuse sacks collected from various communal collection points.

The main issues being reported for Wildmill are:

- Non-collection of some recycling and / or refuse bins / sacks
- Waste dumped around communal collection points
- Fly-tipped refuse sacks
- Contamination of recyclates

Addressing issues at Wildmill requires a joint approach between the Council, Kier and the housing association, Valleys 2 Coast.

With regard to compliance with the Council's refuse and recycling policy in areas where there are communal collections, there is a mixed picture ranging from areas with high levels of compliance, to particular areas or estates where unfortunately there is much less compliance which leads to the contamination of the recycling. Generally the Council based on its experience of the previous contract, has found that it is more difficult to achieve levels of recycling in communal areas at a level comparable to that of the other households in the County Borough. It is understood that this is a pattern consistently found at a UK level.

The companies that eventually recycle the waste, place very tight controls over the levels of contamination that are present in the materials supplied to them, with any contaminated loads being sent to incineration, where the heat is used to generate power or to landfill.

What this means in practice, is where communal bins are not used correctly and the contents become contaminated with other waste materials the contents end up being diverted to the Materials and Recovery Energy Centre (MREC) for disposal rather than being recycled.

Notwithstanding efforts in the past and currently to achieve levels of compliance which do not lead to materials being rejected, discussions continue with regard to such locations to try and bring about a more effective and sustainable solution. It is not possible to provide a firm timeline or specific plan at this stage for further changes to the arrangements in Wildmill because this will be formulated following further liaison with local members based on feedback from residents and in particular with Valleys To Coast Housing Association.

- 4.17 A number of additional and very specific questions posed by members regarding the contractor's activities are better answered by the Contractor's representatives who have been invited to attend the meeting. These include, the number of staff employed and the basis of their employment, details of the training provided to staff, the processes for following up resident's requests and complaints, cover arrangements for holiday periods and various other issues relating to performance.

5. Effect upon Policy Framework and Procedure Rules

- 5.1 There are no effects on the Policy Framework and Procedure Rules.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1 There is no impact on specific equality groups as a consequence of this report.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 There are no specific financial implications arising as a result this report.

8. Recommendation

- 8.1 Overview and Scrutiny Committee are asked to note the contents of the report and, if appropriate, comment on the outcomes to date.

Mark Shephard
CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES

Contact Officer: Andrew Hobbs, Group Manager Street Works
Telephone No: 01656 643416
E-mail: Andrew.Hobbs@bridgend.gov.uk

Background Documents: None

Appendix A - Recycling percentages from reported Waste Data Flow statistics

Reported Quarter	Recycled BCBC %	Reported Quarter	Recycled BCBC %
April - June 2016	57.33 %	April - June 2017	63.81 %
July - September 2016	57.08 %	July - September 2017	73.45 %

Appendix B - Welsh Local Council Collection Arrangements

Council	Category	Collection Type	Dry Recycling		Residual		
			Collection Frequency	Receptacle(s)	Collection Frequency	Receptacle	Disposal Capacity (Its)/Week
Anglesey	Rural	Blueprint	Weekly	Trollibocs/ stackable boxes	3 weekly	240l Wheelie Bin	80
Blaenau Gwent	Valley	Blueprint	Weekly	Trollibocs/ stackable boxes	3 weekly	240l bin	80
Bridgend	Valley	Blueprint	Weekly	3 Recycling sacks & Glass caddy	Fortnightly	2 bags per fortnight	60
Caerphilly	Valley	Single Stream	Weekly	Wheelie bin or Recycling Box	Fortnightly	240l wheelie bin or own bags	120
Cardiff	Urban	Single Stream	Weekly	Green bags	Fortnightly	140l Wheelie bin	70
Carmarthenshire	Rural	Single Stream	Fortnightly	Blue bags	Fortnightly	90l bag	45

Council	Category	Collection Type	Dry Recycling		Residual		
			Collection Frequency	Receptacle(s)	Collection Frequency	Receptacle	Disposal Capacity (Its)/Week
Ceredigion	Rural	Single Stream	Weekly	Clear bags	Fortnightly	240l Wheelie bin	120
Conwy	Rural	Blueprint	Weekly	Trollibocs/ stackable boxes	3 Weekly with 4 weekly trial 10k properties	240l wheelie bin	80
Denbighshire	Rural	Single Stream	Fortnightly	Blue wheelie bin/ bag	Fortnightly	180l bin/ pink sack	90
Flintshire	Urban	Blueprint	Weekly	1 box 3 bags	Fortnightly	140l bin	70
Gwynedd	Rural	Blueprint	Weekly	Trollibocs/ stackable boxes	3 weekly	240l or 3 black bags	80
Merthyr Tydfil	Valley	Blueprint	Weekly	Recycling box and sack	Fortnightly	140l bin	70

Council	Category	Collection Type	Dry Recycling		Residual		
			Collection Frequency	Receptacle(s)	Collection Frequency	Receptacle	Disposal Capacity (Its)/Week
Monmouthshire	Rural	Twin Stream	Weekly	red and purple recycling box +separate glass trial	Fortnightly	2 black bags per fortnight	
NPT	Valley	Blueprint	Weekly	Recycling box and separate clear bags	Fortnightly	140l bin	70
Newport	Urban	Blueprint	Weekly	2 recycling boxes and sack	Fortnightly	140l bin	70
Pembrokeshire	Rural	Twin Stream	Weekly	orange bag and box for glass	Fortnightly	140l black bags	70
Powys	Rural	Blueprint	Weekly	3 separate boxes	3 weekly	180l bin	60
RCT	Valley	Twin Stream	Weekly	separate clear bags	Fortnightly	120l bin	60

Council	Category	Collection Type	Dry Recycling		Residual		
			Collection Frequency	Receptacle(s)	Collection Frequency	Receptacle	Disposal Capacity (Its)/Week
Swansea	Urban	Multi Stream	Weekly	Green and pink bags alternate weeks	Fortnightly	x3 70l bags per fortnight	105
Torfaen	Valley	Non Blueprint Kerbside Sort	Weekly	Black box and blue sack	Fortnightly	140l bin	70
VoG	Rural	Single Stream	Weekly	Green box or blue sack	Fortnightly	black bags	
Wrexham	Urban	Blueprint	Weekly	2 recycling boxes and blue bag	Fortnightly	240l bin	120

Appendix C - Performance Management and Administration

The following questions relating to the Performance Management and Administration of the Council's new waste services contract have been raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

- a) How is the Kier contract managed and monitored?
- b) How is due diligence achieved?
- c) How are lessons learned and fed back into the process?
- d) What is the Chief Executive's role and influence?

a) How is the Kier contract managed and monitored?

The new waste services contract set out to, where appropriate, transferring responsibility for providing performance monitoring information to the Contractor, who is required to provide through reports to the Council a series of daily, weekly monthly etc. reports, which capture a host of performance and management detail. These reports cover a wide range of issues but include matters such as missed collections, outstanding deliveries, crew complaints etc.

In drafting the contract in this manner the Council was recognising the limited capacity within the service to carry out some tasks and instead designed the contract so that it should ordinarily, when the contract is running 'normally', be able to manage the performance of the service by exception; requiring less management capacity and resource in the process.

In general terms the Council has to now monitor and manage a lot of its contracts with external providers in this way (for example the HALO contract for Leisure Services and the AWEN contract for Cultural Services) where it seeks to avoid incurring significant expense by employing large contract management and monitoring teams in view of budgetary restrictions and the need to be as efficient as possible.

Directly linked to these reports provided by the contractor are contract defaults and penalties which, depending on how the Contractor has performed, accumulate, and on reaching defined trigger points give rise under the contract payment terms to financial deductions. This approach is common practice across public and private sector procurements of this sort. Clearly it relies however on regular and accurate reporting from the contractor which allows key issues to be identified and then, for example, education and enforcement resource to be targeted effectively, or appropriate improvement plans to be agreed with the contractor.

Notwithstanding the detail provided above the Communities Directorate has recognised over recent months that in view of the more complex nature of the new contract, giving rise for the potential for more significant non-compliance issues, a dedicated management resource within the Directorate would be

extremely helpful moving forward to maintain sufficient resources against the management and administrative requirements of the contract. This is particularly the case because the initial issues that emerged in the new contract have resulted in a greater requirement to assess, provide and report information than was originally envisaged. Accordingly, the Directorate is currently in the process of identifying a budget to support an additional resource in this area, to ensure ongoing effective contract monitoring and management and appropriate coordination and administration of contractual matters.

During the mobilisation phase of the new waste contract and moving forward regular formal and informal contract monitoring meetings at both operational and at senior management level have and will be held to discuss the delivery of the contract. In addition day to day discussions take place on a host of operational matters with the Contractor's senior and operational managers. These meetings and dialogue form a cornerstone for communications between the Council and contractor and are part of the contract monitoring requirements detailed in the contract documents.

At a more practical level the Council currently employs two cleaner streets officers, whose functions cover a range of activities and duties, including an element of waste contract monitoring on the ground. The two officers regularly undertake checks on the Contractor's performance helping to validate information that is being supplied by the Contractor. These officers are in addition to the specific education and enforcement officers employed by the Council around the contract as part of the agreed 'mobilisation' for which an additional one year budget was provided corporately.

In addition to this work the Cleaner Streets Officers will also respond to householders' complaints and deal directly with the public's concerns or requests for service. Though, as for other Council services, the functions undertaken by these two officers are many and varied and the available resource is limited.

The original contract submission included a number of 'method statements' which set out in detail how the contractor intended responding to various operational requirements and their operational plan for operating the 7 year contract. Obviously to an extent these plans may vary based on circumstance but they set out the basis for how the contractor will manage the contract locally. Waste contracts of this sort are the biggest and during the implementation of change, the most complex contract that the Council will procure. The contract includes for in excess of 6 million separate collections from households annually including fortnightly residual waste collections, weekly recycling collections and additional AHP and garden waste collections. It only requires a very small number of those collections to not be carried out as planned for complaints to be generated and for the contract to be perceived negatively. The Council's role is to ensure that the contract is delivered consistently to the required level and to work with the contractor to improve any part of the service that fails to meet the contractual standards, and if necessary apply sanctions to penalise the contractor if improvement fails to materialise. Broadly however a partnership approach is recognised as a better way of making sure the 7 year contract runs effectively rather than a confrontational approach.

b) How is due diligence achieved?

The approach outlined in a) which the Council has followed for monitoring and managing the operation of the waste services contract is not without its risks and the Council is required to undertake regular checks and audits on the data being supplied by the contractor using the resources available to it.

Separately, of course there was a process of due diligence carried out as part of the initial procurement process to ensure all of the short listed contractors could adequately fulfil the requirements of the specified contract, including issues such as financial security etc.

Internal audit will also play a key part in the due diligence attached to the management and administration of the contract. The Communities Directorate will, through its annual Audit Plan, be able to target specific parts of the Contract to provide the transparency and financial probity required of high value public sector service procurements. For example, ensuring the payment made for AHP collections matches the numbers of AHP collections registered with the contractor.

As with all contracts the waste contract contains provisions for and provides remedies to the Council where the Contractor's performance is considered to have fallen short of the service levels specified in the contract. This takes the form of cumulative penalty points which when certain levels are triggered result in financial penalties being applied. The contract also makes provision for dispute resolution and contract termination. It must be stressed that both routes should be considered extremely carefully before invoking the terms of the Contract in these areas.

c) How are lessons learned fed back into the process?

This is a challenging area for long duration public sector service procurements. These often detailed and challenging procurements that span several years and will often see those people who have been directly involved with the procurement move onto new roles or organisations. The political governance of the contracts, as well as the political makeup of the Council, can also change over the period. Generally at the start of the previous waste contracts the Council has experienced some degree of opposition and turbulence but that is normally overcome within the first year of any new arrangement or policy. This contract is the first time that residual waste has been restricted in the way that this contract dictates (2 bags per fortnight) and so some of the problems have been more acute. However anecdotal evidence from neighbouring Authorities demonstrates that even when a waste service is run in-house there is usually a level of initial disruption and some service failure despite on most occasions changes to rounds and collection methodologies often being introduced more gradually.

At a National Government level the legislative framework both directly relating to the area and consequentially through changes in policy associated with the delivery of local government services, can all impact on the decision making process. More specifically in the case of waste services the Welsh Government has placed a great deal of focus on this area and looks set to continue to do so,

affecting both the local and broader strategies for the provision of waste services.

Due to the high value and complexity of the waste services contract, any measurable change in the delivery model, would require a significant lead in time to plan and to secure a successful outcome.

The current contract has introduced a number of changes which are both new and unfamiliar to the Council. The customer contact centre service for waste calls has been transferred from the Council to the Contractor, with a view to improving efficiency by putting the Contractor directly in contact with the member of public making the service request, as opposed to the Council acting in a third party capacity. As detailed above the reporting requirements and contract non-performance deductions have been reviewed and changed. From the householders' perspective the more noticeable and obvious changes are to the Council's collection policy for residual waste and the changes to the containerisation of recyclable materials.

It will take some time after the contract has settled to fully understand the pros and cons of this approach, which will need to be fully reviewed prior to and as part of the decisions which will need to be taken prior to the end of the current seven year contract for the longer term delivery of waste services in Bridgend.

d) What is the Chief Executive's role and influence?

The Chief Executive (CE) has both a direct and indirect role in managing and administering the provisions of the contract. Dealing firstly with the direct responsibilities, the CE can be called on as part of the first stage in the dispute resolution process detailed in the contract, where the Supervising Officer and the Contract Manager for Kier are unable to reach a resolution to any specific matter. The CE and Managing Director (MD) of the Contractor are called on to review the details of the matter concerned and to try and reach a negotiated position. Of course where this fails the matter would be escalated further under the dispute resolution provisions of the contract.

Indirectly the CE has recently and more informally been in discussions with the MD of Kier to convey the concerns of the Council arising from the well-publicised difficulties during the initial mobilisation period. These discussions have been productive and the service is now much improved, however, ultimately the extent to which any influence can be brought to bear on the matter is governed by the provisions contained in the Contract.

Appendix D - Community Recycling Centres Performance

Material Stream	Month	Year 2016	Year 2017	Increase in Tonnage	Decrease In Tonnage
Non-Recyclable	June	700.98	460.54		240.44
	July	625.54	334.74		290.8
	August	810.7	384.38		426.32
Recycled	June	1462.51	1542.76	80.25	
	July	1415.21	1498.67	83.46	
	August	1550.77	1641.07	90.3	