

MINUTES of the meeting of the Cleaner, Greener and Safer Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 10th October 2011 at 7.00pm.

Present: Councillors James Halden (Chair), Pauline Tolson, Steve Liddiard and Mike Stone (left at 8.03pm).

Apologies: Councillor Claire Baldwin

In attendance: Councillor Lynn Worrall – Portfolio Holder for Communities, Culture and Leisure
Councillor Val Morris- Cook – Portfolio holder for Street Services
L. Magill – Head of Public Protection
A. Murphy- Head of Environment
J. Gilford – Waste and Recycling Manager
Chief Inspector R. Baxter – Essex Police
M. Boulter – Principal Democratic Services Officer

6. MINUTES

The minutes of the Cleaner, Greener and Safer Overview and Scrutiny meeting held on 14th July 2011 were approved as a correct record.

The Chair used this item to add that he was working with the chairs of Children's and Health overview and scrutiny on violence against women and girls issues and that representatives from relevant organisations would be invited to this meeting when these issues were discussed.

The chair also added that he and the vice-chair had met with officers to discuss the CCTV car and a briefing note would be circulated to the committee in due course.

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

a) Interests

No interests were declared.

b) Whipping

No interests were declared.

8. MULTI-SKILLED CLEANING AND GREENING TEAM PILOT

The Chair stated that he was pleased with the work the working group had undertaken, which had included site visits and meeting with frontline staff. It was felt that the recommendations would create stronger interactions between community needs and the cleaning rotas, as well as add more flexibility to the system. It was recognised that East Tilbury had a good street cleansing service and the working group had identified very little problem areas. It was confirmed that the ward councillors for East Tilbury did not attend all the meetings.

The Portfolio holder welcomed the report and noted the recommendations, although she stated that cost and man management implications made the recommendations impractical. The Portfolio holder felt that Members should not get involved in the operational management of the service and should instead be more community led. It was suggested that the current rotas could be maintained with any extra available time being used for Member requests. The Portfolio holder also questioned whether East Tilbury was the correct area for a pilot seeing as the working group had discovered it was serviced well and the ward Members had not shown a high level of engagement.

The Chair responded to the portfolio holder stating that East Tilbury had been chosen for a logistical reason as it provided a mix of different street environments and felt that the recommendations demonstrated that the service would not be Member led, rather Member consulted. The Chair added that he was happy to take the report to Cabinet as it was because it represented their true findings and he welcomed working with Cabinet following their meeting to ensure the pilot was implemented.

It was clarified at the end of the discussion that the street cleaning service did respond to individual requests from Members as their capacity allowed and they had the flexibility to clean and remove rubbish wherever they saw it on their routes.

RESOLVED:

- i) East Tilbury be designated as the pilot area and that a pilot run for a period of six months from Mid May to November 2012.**
- ii) That three front line workers from the Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing teams be designated as exclusively East Tilbury workers and are provided with any further training required to enable them to cover all grounds maintenance and street cleansing work anticipated to occur in that area.**
- iii) During the period of the pilot, it is recommended that current pre-planned maps, routes and schedules of work are**

supplemented for worker initiative and ward member direction.

- iv) To support the pilot, it is recommended that one of the front line workers is supplied with a council Blackberry. This will be used to provide daily updates of activities to ward members and identify projects planned for the following days.**
- v) The ward member would be designated as a primary point of contact for service consultation in addition to a Senior Officer from Street Services (such as the Street Services Manager) would be designated as the sole officer to manage the pilot scheme in consultation with ward members.**
- vi) The senior officer in charge should compile a data base to be updated every three weeks where comments of ward members, forum representatives and residents can compliment the NI 195 indicator and be used to influence the service.**
- vii) A new incentive scheme to be implemented to reward examples of excellence in terms of service engagement for front line works involved in the pilot.**
- viii) That the working group meet during the pilot to review progress and outcomes to support reporting at the end of the pilot and advise on the current status.**
- ix) That the committee offer their sincere thanks for the work carried out by the Street Services team.**

9. WASTE AND RECYCLING PROGRESS REPORT

The Portfolio Holder introduced the report highlighting the progress and achievements of the service. These included an increased rate of recycling to 48%, the introduction of food waste collections and the Council now owning and maintaining its own fleet of vehicles and providing collection services directly to residents. The Council was also working with more schools and had aspirations to work with supermarkets in using biodegradable bags in the future.

Future waste contracts were discussed and the portfolio holder clarified that it was wise for the Council to enter no more than a seven year contract with companies rather than a longer twenty five year contract due to the current adverse economic climate.

In response to a question officers clarified that around 50% of residual household waste was treated to make energy. Currently Thurrock used a treatment plant in north Kent, although the Council benefitted from

having a number of plants near them. There was a possibility that a plant would be built in or near Thurrock on the north side of the Thames.

It was stated that bring sites were reducing from forty to approximately ten. This reflected the better 3 bin collection system and variety of material that could be collected as kerbside recyclable material. Therefore, there was less need for bring sites.

Officers confirmed that they were making money from the collection of trade waste and would achieve the £5000 target for this year. Next year they hoped to make a further £10,000 from this scheme. It was added that the Council was also looking to charge public buildings for collecting waste as in many cases the waste was created through commercial activities, such as hiring the building for private functions.

RESOLVED: That:

- i) The information set out in 3.1 of the report is noted.**
- ii) The recommendations set out in 3.3 of the report are approved.**

10. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP PERFORMANCE REPORT 10/11

The duties of the Committee in scrutinising the community safety partnership were outlined and the headline statistics were confirmed as follows:

- There was a 5% overall reduction in crime last year.
- Burglary, criminal damage and anti-social behaviour all reduced
- Violent crime increased
- Domestic abuse reporting increased, which was a positive step to tackling this crime
- There was an increase of reporting on hate crimes related to sexuality and disability.

The Partnership undertook partner walk around days where feedback from residents was that anti-social behaviour was still a key concern for the community.

The Committee was reminded of the Partnership's five priorities that were written in the report but added that the current economic climate meant it would be more of a challenge to maintain the reduction of crime.

There was a brief debate on road safety where some Members expressed their doubts about the seriousness of the reported accidents and the response by relevant organisations in then installing road traffic

measures on those roads to reduce perceived danger. It was explained that the definition of killed or seriously injured was a national definition and the decision to install speed bumps or other road safety features was a decision of the Highways Agency or the Council's Transport team and not that of the police or the partnership.

The portfolio holder concluded the item by stating that she was working to get clarity from the Police with regards to a hate crime officer in the structure.

RESOLVED that the report is noted.

11. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP – IMPROVING VALUE FOR MONEY

The partnership had already self-assessed itself on value for money but requested that Members become involved for additional scrutiny.

RESOLVED: That

- i) A task and finish group with the Head of Public Protection and Thurrock Community Safety Partnership Manager assist Thurrock Community Safety Partnership with improving Value for Money.**
- ii) The group be composed of four Members with two nominated from both the Conservative and Labour parties respectively.**
- iii) The group prepare a briefing note to report back to the Committee and the Thurrock Community Safety Partnership Board.**

12. PUBLIC PROTECTION ENFORCEMENT POLICY

The Council was required to have this policy. There had only been minor changes which included integrating the health and safety aspect which had previously been separate and clarifying some changes around licensing..

Officers stated that the policy was flexible to accommodate minor changes if Members wished to add anything following the introduction of the CCTV car. However, any significant changes would require the policy to go through the committee system again for approval and the enforcement tools available were already covered in the document.

Following debate it was clarified that fixed penalty notices were still being issued for a range of offences. Penalty Charge Notices which are issued for parking, were still being issued but this was by the transportation team not Public Protection.

RESOLVED that the policy be recommended to Cabinet for approval.

13. POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS (PCSOs)

The Chair stated that he, the vice-chair and the portfolio holder had agreed to meet and discuss issues surrounding PCSOs in greater detail and that the outcome of this debate would be appended to the budget considerations in November.

The Committee debated what they wished to spend the funding on. Through the debate it was explained that the Council part funded fourteen PCSOs. Those fourteen PCSOs were considered additional resources to the standard police numbers assigned to the Thurrock area. The representative from the police stated that Essex Police wished to continue the match funding of the PCSOs as at the time of the meeting.

The Committee recognised that replacing PCSOs and community protection officers (CPOs) had different roles and were not interchangeable. PCSOs offer community visibility and reassurance, whereas Community Protection Officers are enforcement officers.

RESOLVED that a small group of Members from the Committee work with the portfolio holder for Communities, Culture and Leisure on options related to the PCSO funding and report back to the Committee in November.

14. WORK PROGRAMME

RESOLVED that:

- i) The CCTV item for December is removed.**
- ii) The Community Safety Strategy for December is deferred indefinitely.**

The meeting finished at 8.29pm.

Approved as a true and correct record

CHAIRMAN

DATE

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Matthew Boulter, telephone (01375) 652082,
or alternatively e-mail mboulter@thurrock.gov.uk**

Draft