

Dorset Waste Partnership Joint Committee

Minutes of a meeting held at The Salthouse, West Bay Road,
West Bay on 14 September 2015.

Present:

Members

Christchurch Borough Council
Margaret Phipps

Dorset County Council
Peter Finney
Robert Gould

East Dorset District Council
Mike Dyer

North Dorset District Council
Michael Roake (Vice-Chairman)
Graham Carr-Jones

Purbeck District Council
David Budd
Graham Brown

West Dorset District Council
Anthony Alford (Chairman)
Alan Thacker

Weymouth & Portland Borough Council
Stewart Pearson
Ian Roebuck

Also in attendance as observers:


Kevin Brooks, Substitute Member - Weymouth & Portland Borough Council
Timothy Yarker, Substitute Member - West Dorset District Council

Officers of the Dorset Waste Partnership

Bill Davidson (Head of Strategy)
Grace Evans (Clerk)
Andy Smith (Treasurer)
Paul Ackrill (Finance and Commercial Manager)
Karyn Punchard (Streetscene Manager)
Michael Carhart-Harris (Senior Public Relations Officer)
Denise Hunt (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

Other Officers Attending

Steve Mackenzie (Purbeck District Council)
Rebecca Kirk (Purbeck District Council)
Mike Harries (Dorset County Council and Chairman of DWP Management Board)
Lindsay Cass (Christchurch Borough and East Dorset District Councils)
Robert Firth (North Dorset District Council)
Graham Duggan (West Dorset District and Weymouth & Portland Borough Councils)

- (Notes: (1) Publication In accordance with paragraph 8.4 of Schedule 1 of the Joint Committee's Constitution the decisions set out in these minutes will come into force and may then be implemented on the expiry of five working days after the publication date. Publication Date: **21 September 2015**.
- (2) The symbol () denotes that the item considered was a Key Decision and was included in the Forward Plan.
- (3) These minutes have been prepared by officers as a record of the meeting and of any decisions reached. They are to be considered and confirmed at the next meeting of the Joint Committee to be held on **27 October 2015**.

Apologies for Absence

59. Apologies for absence were received from Sally Derham-Wilkes (Christchurch Borough Council), Stephen Butler (East Dorset District Council), David Walsh (North Dorset District Council) and Peter Webb (Purbeck District Council).

Code of Conduct

60. There were no declarations by members of any disclosable pecuniary interests under the code of conduct.

Minutes

61. The minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2015 were confirmed and signed.

Representations to the Joint CommitteePublic Speaking

62.1 There were no public questions received at the meeting in accordance with Host Authority Standing Order 21(1).

62.2 There were no public statements received at the meeting in accordance with Host Authority Standing Order 21(2).

Petitions

63. There were no petitions received in accordance with the Host Authority's petition scheme at this meeting.

Forward Plan

64.1 The Joint Committee considered a report by the Head of Strategy of the Dorset Waste Partnership which included the forward plan.

64.2 Members were informed that an additional item regarding the renewal of contracts relating to disposal of waste would be added to the forward plan for December 2015 due to the conclusion of existing landfill waste contracts in August 2016.

64.3 It was confirmed that negotiations were taking place to direct waste for treatment at NES Canford and landfill sites further afield. An assessment of transport costs was also being undertaken in comparison with the existing facility at the Trigon waste landfill site in Wareham.

64.4 Members asked about the impact on the budget and it was explained that although it was not possible to know the precise budget figure as early as October, the best budget assumptions would be considered in the Medium Term Financial Plan at the meeting on 27 October 2015.

64.5 Members also asked whether the Committee would make a decision on the provision of gull proof bags at the meeting on 14 December 2015 and it was confirmed that a decision would be required in order to adopt a standard approach. The Chairman asked officers to reflect on whether such a decision should be taken more urgently so the budgetary implications could be considered at the October 2015 budget meeting.

Noted**Financial Report September 2015**

65.1 The Joint Committee considered a report by the Treasurer of the Dorset Waste Partnership (DWP) outlining a projected overspend of £686k at the end of the financial year, based on information available since the budget of £32.456m had been agreed in January 2015. The report also included progress on the support services improvement plan and latest capital budget monitoring information.

65.2 Members asked about the budget for hiring vehicles. It was explained that assumptions had been made in respect of vehicle hire during the previous financial year due to the expectation of this being necessary until hire vehicles were replaced by alternative provision. It was noted that a certain amount of vehicle hire would always be necessary due to unforeseen circumstances such as vehicle breakdowns as well as an ongoing replacement programme as vehicles reached the end of asset life.

65.3 It was confirmed that the full vehicle fleet had been purchased in respect of the “Recycle for Dorset” Scheme, with the exception of the narrow access vehicles and street cleansing fleet, the latter having been subject to delay.

65.4 The Chairman asked whether savings that could not be achieved would be carried forward in the 2016-17 budget. It was explained that savings that were not secure had been included in the £686k potential overspend figure. Within the savings plan, savings had been identified as “secure” and “not secure”, but with good prospects of achievement and some of these items would carry forward and be achieved in 2016-17.

65.5 In response to a question regarding the foreseeable market for recyclates and cost of treatment, officers advised that the situation had improved in recent times but there could be no certainty that the current cost of £10 per tonne would be maintained in the near future. The indices used in calculating costs indicated a downward direction in most recyclates with the exception of paper which remained buoyant and benefitted from high volumes.

65.6 The ability to know the financial picture was much improved from previous years and the great deal of work undertaken by officers in reaching this point was acknowledged by the Joint Committee. It was noted that the projected overspend of £686k related to some commitments arising from the previous financial year and that this fact should also be recognised in DWP communications.

Noted



Progress on the DWP Savings Plan

66.1 The Joint Committee considered a report by the Finance and Commercial Manager that provided an update on progress towards an overall savings target of £1.136m following assessment by the Senior Management Team in conjunction with consultants WYG. The report gave an overview of the status of each savings plan item and made a request for a business case for a change to the vehicle configuration in Tranche 1 and 2 areas for agreement by the Joint Committee.

66.2 Members were informed that there were 27 items included in the savings plan at different levels of progression. Any item representing a significant change to the service, such as lowering the frequency of residual waste collections, would be a matter for agreement not only by the Joint Committee, but by each of the partner councils.

66.3 Members expressed the view that removal of the Christmas tree collection would not be welcomed by the public and represented a small saving of £10k. Furthermore, it was suggested that an assessment of the existing contract for purchasing fuel might be undertaken to ensure the DWP was getting the best value for money. Members were informed that the DWP used the Dorset County Council framework for purchasing fuel in conjunction with other councils. To investigate whether the current arrangements represented best value for money would therefore be part of a wider exercise that would be of interest to all local councils and this matter would be referred to procurement colleagues.

66.4 Members felt that educational approaches had proven to be an effective measure that directly linked to a decrease in residual waste. They expressed concerns about the levels of investment in education and wanted to be clear about its purpose and outcomes. It was noted that the introduction of key performance indicators (KPIs) in this area

would provide evidence and demonstrate the outcomes and benefits of the educational activity. Members were informed that there was significant national intelligence to demonstrate a link between educational activity and amounts of waste diverted from landfill and consequential financial savings.

66.5 The Joint Committee was advised that the WYG Phase 2 report had shown the current tri-stream vehicles to be inefficient and the report also sought approval for a fully costed business case to replace the Tranche 1 and Tranche 2 vehicles that were now half way through their asset life. Members expressed disappointment that the incorrect choice of vehicle type had been made despite lengthy discussions and advice on this issue in the past. However, the need to evaluate the options in order to move forward was also recognised. Officers informed the Joint Committee that savings made by using different vehicles might outweigh the loss in capital investment and that other options would be explored, such as using different vehicle bodies on existing vehicle chassis.

Resolved

- 67.1 That the progress against the overall 2015/16 savings target be noted;
- 67.2 That the development of a fully costed business case to consider the principle of changing the vehicle configuration in the Tranche 1 and Tranche 2 areas be approved.

Reason for Decisions

68. That the Joint Committee along with the Management Board monitors the Partnership's performance against budget and scrutinises actions taken to manage within budget on behalf of partner Councils.

Scheme of Delegation and 2016 Schedule of Meetings

69.1 The Joint Committee considered a report by the Clerk to the Dorset Waste Partnership recommending the DWP scheme of delegation and schedule of meetings to the Joint Committee for approval. The report also presented the Scheme of Delegation for People Management Matters that had recently been approved by Dorset County Council following previously expressed concerns about the number of decisions to be made by the Director. Dorset County Council had subsequently conducted a review and adopted a revised scheme that allowed decisions to be taken by officers unless the general principles could not be met.

69.2 It was confirmed that in the absence of a DWP Director, general DWP delegations would sit with the Environment and Economy Director and that any issues relating to the proposed scheme of delegation were to be addressed as part of the governance workshop.

69.3 Some revised wording of the recommendation was suggested in order to reflect that the scheme of delegation for people management had already been approved by Dorset County Council.

Resolved

- 70.1 That the proposed Scheme of Delegation in appendix 1 be adopted;
- 70.2 That the adoption and implementation of the Scheme of Delegation for People Management by Dorset County Council be noted;
- 70.3 That the proposed schedule of meetings be approved.

Reason for Decisions

71. To support the delivery of effective public services through the Dorset Waste Partnership.

 **Monitoring the Implementation of the Action Plan**

72.1 The Joint Committee considered a report by the Finance and Commercial Manager for the Dorset Waste Partnership setting out progress with the action plan approved by the Joint Committee on 11 March 2015.

72.2 Of the 37 actions contained in the plan, all but 4 had been completed and the South West Audit Partnership (SWAP) had been tasked with ensuring that the processes arising from these actions were embedded in the organisation. Members were informed that future reports would therefore only include progress with the 4 remaining items. A Governance Workshop conducted by the Centre for Public Scrutiny was taking place on 22 September 2015 at 9.30am at East Dorset District Council with regard to one of the outstanding items.

72.3 The Joint Committee wished to be reassured that proper monitoring would continue in relation to the completed actions. It was confirmed that SWAP were scheduling a programme of work that would revisit elements of the action plan to ensure actions were embedded and having an ongoing positive impact. SWAP reports would be available to the Joint Committee and it was also agreed that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman would no longer be required to attend Management Board meetings in this regard.

Noted**Alternative Collection Model and Potential for Outsourcing Waste Services**

73.1 The Committee considered a report by the Chairman of the DWP Management Board following a recommendation from the consultants WYG of the financial benefit from including glass in co-mingled recycling, particularly from restricted access properties. In addition it was recommended that market testing of waste collection should not take place prior to 2017 to allow the delivery points for residual waste to be resolved through contract renewals.

73.2 The full WYG report which was listed as an exempt background report had been circulated to the Joint Committee the previous week. Since its conclusions would have a significant impact on the Recycle for Dorset Scheme, it was considered that the report required further discussion. It was suggested that an informal briefing was arranged at the end of October or early November 2015 on the WYG report and also the Strategic Waste Facility in Bournemouth inviting representatives from WYG and Bournemouth Borough Council.

73.3 Members expressed disappointment that the report did not reflect the full extent of information contained in the WYG report. In addition, the statistics and assumptions made in the report were based upon local authorities that had not performed as well as the DWP. It was also noted that a potential saving of £100k in relation to absence management and savings arising from route optimisation had not been included in the report recommendations. In response, it was clarified that these aspects had been included in the savings plan discussed previously.

73.4 Members questioned the impact on the 2016-17 budget and it was confirmed that some elements of the WYG report had already been included in the savings plan and that other elements would not require a final decision at the October budget meeting, apart from that required in relation to street cleansing vehicles.

73.5 The Joint Committee concluded that the item be deferred for more detailed consideration at the meeting on 14 December 2015 in order that members could evaluate the content of the WYG report and that an informal briefing session be arranged during the interim period.

Resolved

74.1 That consideration of the report be deferred until the meeting on 14 December 2015.

74.2 That an informal briefing session be arranged during the interim period.

Reason for Decisions

75. In order that the Joint Committee would be able to evaluate the content of the full WYG report.

Charging for non-Household Waste at Household Recycling Centres (HRCs)

76. The Joint Committee considered a report by the Head of Strategy for the Dorset Waste Partnership which presented options for charging for non-household waste at HRCs by comparing with neighbouring authorities who currently made a charge for this service.

Resolved

77.1 That the charging regimes for non-household waste at Household Recycling Centres in neighbouring authorities be noted;

77.2 That the agreement to the introduction of charges for non-household materials at HRCs in principle be reconfirmed;

77.3 That the adoption of a default charging mechanism similar to that used by The Borough of Poole be agreed, accepting that it may change in the light of the results of the HRC management tender process; and

77.4 That the charges be introduced at the earliest opportunity.

Reason for Decisions

78. To continue to provide a good HRC service in Dorset whilst reducing cost, taking into account the results of the public consultation and the needs for the DWP to make revenue savings and to facilitate the re-tendering of the contract to manage Dorset HRCs.

Review of payment of recycling and reuse credits

79. The Joint Committee considered a report by the Head of Strategy for the Dorset Waste Partnership outlining options following a consultation with affected stakeholders as agreed by the Joint Committee at its meeting on 15 June 2015.

Resolved

80. That option one to discontinue recycling credits and continue with reuse credits be agreed, to take effect from 1 January 2016.

Reason for Decision

81. To review budgetary commitments and identify savings opportunities as required by the Joint Committee and to inform the Committee of the potential impacts of withdrawing payments.

Household Waste Collection – Fixed Penalty Charge

82.1 The Joint Committee considered a report by the Head of Strategy for the Dorset Waste Partnership outlining recent legislation that required waste collection authorities to specify a fixed penalty charge for failure to comply with household waste collection requirements. Members acknowledged and agreed the current approach to use penalty charges as a last resort only and to focus on explanation and education as more appropriate approaches.

Resolved

83. That a charge level of £75 for fixed penalty notices made under The Household Waste (Fixed Penalty and Penalty Charge) Regulations 2015 be agreed.

Reason for Decision

84. It was a legal requirement to specify a charge under the Regulations. The recommended charge was the same as that set under the previous legislation.

Performance Indicator Monitoring – First Quarter (2015/16)

85.1 The Joint Committee considered a report by the Head of Strategy for the Dorset Waste Partnership which set out the DWP waste related performance in the first quarter of 2015/16 which demonstrated a positive picture of the continuing effectiveness of Recycle for Dorset and a substantial decrease in the amount of municipal waste to landfill since 2011/12.

85.2 The Chairman highlighted the success of the Recycle for Dorset Scheme which had resulted in a saving of £2.65m per annum in landfill tax and he thanked the officers involved in this achievement.

85.3 There was some concern expressed regarding the request for relaxation of service standards in relation to the target for missed collections from 1 to 3 days. Officers explained that the 3 day target had proved workable during roll-out of the Recycle for Dorset scheme as well as previous systems of waste collection and advised that there was a real cost in meeting missed collections, particularly in rural locations. Food and residual waste was always prioritised and DWP operatives would always endeavour to collect missed bins on the same day or following day. A one day target was more frequently unachievable and had resulted in increased customer contact and greater numbers of dissatisfied customers.

85.4 Following some debate, an amendment to recommendation (ii) was proposed to replace the words “within 3 working days” with “no more than 3 working days”, and this was supported by the Joint Committee.

85.5 A member referred to the number of missed collections highlighted in the report that had demonstrated a significant issue at the Crookhill Depot. Further to a change in management, there were clear signs of improvement which demonstrated that the situation was being rectified.

Resolved

86.1 That the first quarter performance of the DWP against the agreed performance indicator targets be noted;

86.2 That the Recycle for Dorset Service Policy regarding missed collections be amended. The DWP will return to collect a genuinely missed bin no more than three days following notification rather than one.

Reason for Decisions

87. To inform the Joint Committee of the DWP performance against the performance indicator targets and to provide a realistic service standard for missed collections.

Dorset Waste Partnership Corporate Risk Register

88. The Joint Committee considered a report by the Head of Strategy for the Dorset Waste Partnership which included the current corporate risk register of the DWP. Improvements to systems, processes and controls had improved the risk profile since the Joint Committee meeting on 15 June 2015.

Noted

Questions from Councillors of Partner Councils

89. No questions were asked by members under Host Authority Standing Order 20(2).