

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
NOTES OF A MEETING OF SAFER, CLEANER, GREENER SCRUTINY STANDING
PANEL
HELD ON TUESDAY, 2 APRIL 2013
IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1, CIVIC OFFICES, HIGH STREET, EPPING
AT 7.30 - 8.55 PM

Members Present:	Mrs J Lea (Chairman), Mrs M Sartin (Chairman of the Council) (Vice-Chairman), Mrs H Brady, Mrs T Cochrane, L Girling, G Mohindra, Mrs P Smith and P Spencer
Other members present:	G Waller
Apologies for Absence:	K Avey, Ms Y Knight and S Murray
Officers Present	J Gilbert (Director of Environment and Street Scene), J Nolan (Assistant Director (Environment & Neighbourhoods)), C Wiggins (Safer Communities Manager), J Harding (Partnership Analyst) and A Hendry (Democratic Services Officer)

45. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (COUNCIL MINUTE 39 - 23.7.02)

The Panel noted there were no substitute members.

46. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

47. NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The notes of the 12 February 2013 meeting were agreed as a correct record.

48. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND WORK PROGRAMME

Terms of Reference

1. The Panel considered their Terms of Reference (ToR) on the Safer Cleaner Greener initiative development programme (ToR item 1, i, ii & iii) and if they were broad enough to cover the Environmental Agency brief. It was agreed that officers would review them.

2. The Panel would also like the minutes of the Police and Crime Panel to be added to their Terms of Reference. Officers agreed that they should be added to the ToR and the main O&S Committee would be asked to agree this at their next meeting.

Work Programme

1. They noted that item 21 on their work programme, review of waste contract ahead of procurement, was a duplication of what the Portfolio Holder Advisory Group

did. As such, it was proposed that this be deleted from their work programmes as a duplication of work. This was agreed by the Panel.

2. It was noted that a meeting with the Fire and Rescue Services was still to be arranged when possible.

49. REVIEW OF EA FLOOD MANAGEMENT OF RIVER RODING

The Panel noted the written update on the River Roding Flood Management Strategy. The strategy was not yet in place and therefore the full implications were not yet known.

It was noted that the Environmental Agency (EA) had formally signed off on the proposals for withdrawing maintenance, constructing a large flood storage area at Shonks Mill and managing surface water in Redbridge.

The EA was also drafting a 'post adoption statement' which would explain the processes to put their proposals in place. This would give the Council a better indication of the timescales involved.

The Panel noted that the EA must follow a formal protocol when it withdraws maintenance and undertake a six month 'communication period'. As the EA had not yet commenced this period it would be that any maintenance withdrawal was at least two and a half years away.

When a 'post adoption statement' was released by the EA and more details were known, a further update would be presented.

50. CSP STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT REPORT AND REVIEW OF CSP SCRUTINY MEETINGS

The Panel took agenda items 7 (Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment) and item 8 (Review of Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny) together as they were interlinked.

The Strategic Assessment was produced by the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) every year, setting out the priorities for the forthcoming year.

The Partnerships key priorities for 2013/14 were:

- (1) Domestic Abuse;
- (2) Theft from Motor Vehicles;
- (3) Anti-Social Behaviour; and
- (4) Burglary Dwellings (including attempts).

The Partnership Plan included their key priorities and how they were going to achieve them.

It was noted that for future years it was the officers intention to join these two reports together into one report.

Councillor Spencer asked about the Strategic Intelligence Assessment. It mentioned both Buckhurst Hill and Buckhurst Hill West, why was that. He was told that it depended on how the database was searched, the areas were defined by the Police System.

Councillor Girling asked what the PCC budget allocation for this year would be for the CSP. He was told that we would get the same as last year. We also had to bid for this £21,800 and appear to have been successful. We would also be bidding for extra funds later on in the year. It should be noted that we have got all the money that we had bid for and that not all authorities achieved that.

Councillor Smith said it was helpful to hear that funding was in place. She would like to know how strong the membership of the Community Safety Partnership was and would it be at risk if it could not fulfil all its obligations. She was told that the key part of the partnership was between the Council and the police force. The Fire Brigade had moved further away from the partnership, the probation and public health authorities attend some meetings but other services did not. They have been reminded that they need to turn up at the partnership meetings as they were needed to make the partnership stronger. Councillor Waller agreed it would be helpful for the Panel to convey their concerns about this. Councillor Lea asked that the officers relay the Panel's concerns about attendance at the Partnership meetings.

Councillor Smith added that it would be better to have the partners input into the new joint report for next year.

Councillor Mohindra noted that the Home Office Community Safety Fund had dropped dramatically over the last five years, from £151,697 in 2008-09 to £10,000 in 2012-13. Were we getting funding from other areas? Caroline Wiggins, the Communities Safety Manager, said that it was getting harder to find funding at present. They were chasing funding but had not been very successful. Mr Gilbert added that they were building strong working relationships with the PCC from where we would get some of our future funding. Councillor Stallan said that the priorities were in line with the other CSPs in the County. Was there funding for the priorities for the coming year? Mrs Wiggins said that they had received money for these priorities and they were safe for this year.

Councillor Girling commented that we have a lot of external stakeholders involved with us; were we steering them to external funding opportunities. He was told that officers were steering them to other organisations and charities. For example the Crucial Crew now get funding from the High Sherriff funds and get Grant Aid from us.

Councillor Girling said that a lot of the completion dates for the initiatives read as ongoing, should there be a final date put in? Mrs Wiggins said that originally the Home Office designed these as three year plans and so would not have a completion date as yet. They did get feed back from them as they went along.

Councillor Spencer asked how many Anti-Social Behaviour investigators did we have and was told that we had two officers in post at present.

Councillor Smith said that the Panel should acknowledge the Safer Communities Team and the work that they do. They are now embarking onto uncharted waters and we should be proud of our team and the work they do. Councillor Waller added one of their success stories was the work that they had done on Anti-Social Behaviour and in terms of value for money they did a fantastic job. Councillor Girling asked if they were going to be promoted in the Forester. Mrs Wiggins said it would be in the Council Bulletin; leaflets were also being prepared.

Jim Nolan, the Assistant Director Environment and Neighbourhoods, referring to agenda item 8, review of Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny meetings, noted

that there were usually two partnership meetings a year, but it proved difficult to get other partners involved and restricted the time available at the remaining meetings for non community safety issues to be considered. Because of this officers were recommending that this was reduced to just one meeting a year and this was to be held at the beginning of the Council year, with hopefully different partners attending. This was agreed by the Panel.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment for 2013/14 be noted;
- (2) That only one Scrutiny Panel meeting to scrutinise the Community Safety Partnership be held per year; and
- (3) That this scrutiny meeting be held on the first meeting of the Panel to enable it to review the Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment and plans for the forthcoming municipal year.

51. HIGHWAY ACCIDENT STATISTICS

Members received a report on Highways Statistics from the County Highways department. As Essex Highways operated on a pan-Essex basis, rather than prioritising one particular district. Their priorities for Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) in Essex were:

- (a) Powered 2 wheeled;
- (b) Young car drivers; and
- (c) Pedestrians

which accounted for 20%, 18% and 15% respectively of the 630 KSI recorded in Essex in 2011.

In respect of this District, there were 83 KSI in 2011, comprised of:

- (a) 17 powered 2 wheeled (20%);
- (b) 10 young car drivers (12%); and
- (c) 15 pedestrians (18%)

Members wondered why the priorities excluded cyclists.

Officers noted that there was not as much data in the report as they would have liked and would hopefully have better statistics in future reports. Councillor Girling noted that they have been asking for this for some time and were disappointed at the level of detail. They would like to see 'hot spot maps' on where the accident happened and what subsequent action had been taken.

Councillor Smith noted that we now have a Highways Panel and that sat behind any requests from Members. She was not sure what was to be done with the information contained in this report. Would it go to the Highways Panel? Mr Gilbert replied that County used the figures, but they were outside the remit of the Highways Panel. However, it was EFDC that needed more detailed information. He could ask County to explain how they do their assessments and maybe ask them here to explain how they work. This was agreed by the Panel.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Highways Accident Statistics provided by Essex Highways be noted; and

2. That the relevant county officers be invited to a Panel meeting to explain how they compile their accident figures.

52. SUSTAINABILITY UPDATES

The Panel received a report updating them on the work of the Environmental co-ordinator. They noted that:

- The Green Corporate Working Party had instigated a review of the Council's commercial waste disposal arrangements and it was found that all waste from the Civic Offices' compactor was sent to landfill;
- A temporary contract had been entered into with SITA for the recycling of the Civic Offices commercial waste;
- A trial for food waste was to begin by the end of March 2013 in certain council offices;
- An initial draft of the corporate carbon reduction strategy was completed some time ago, but this has not been officially adopted as yet because of new requirements for local authorities that may be included; and
- Measuring and reporting the Council's greenhouse gas emissions under the government requirement was ongoing and the deadline for publishing the 2012-2013 report was the end of June 2013.

Members of the Panel asked that in future a member from the relevant department should be in attendance to answer any questions raised by this type of report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the report of the Environmental Co-ordinator be noted; and
2. That a member of the relevant department should be in attendance for future reports to answer any questions raised.

53. EFDC GREEN CORPORATE WORKING PARTY MINUTES - 3 DECEMBER 2012

The Panel noted the minutes of the EFDC Green Corporate Working Party for 3 December 2012. They again asked that a relevant officer should be in attendance to answer any questions that may arise on green waste.

54. INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENT MEMBER WORKING GROUP MINUTES

The Panel noted the minutes of the Inter Authority Agreement Member Working Group held on 29 November 2012. Members noted that:

- A transfer station was to be constructed in Harlow. This would be important for us and our new waste contract and should generate some cost savings as all our waste would go to the new transfer station and would not have to be taken many miles away to the landfill sites, thus saving on the wear and tear on waste disposal trucks;
- The Commercial Waste Policy update which was pressing for the council to offer a trade waste collection service. This had always been difficult for us to do as we contract out our service and may end up competing against our service providers. We will be talking to our contractors about this when the new contract came into force.

Asked if we would have to pay for the use of the transfer station Mr Gilbert said that we would not. The transfer station would be opened in a year's time.

Councillor Brady asked if the business rates covered waste collection and was told that it did not. At the end of the day it was a commercial decision and at present the waste recycling business was at a low ebb.

55. NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP MINUTES

The Panel noted the minutes of the North Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee for On-Street Parking for 4 October 2012.

Noted that Councillor Waller would be attending another meeting of this parking partnership on 10 April when he would be proposing a further 9 parking schemes. They had also agreed to a CCTV vehicle to tackle problems of parking and safety at various sites, it would prioritise schools. They were presently going through the procurement exercise for the vehicle. He was happy for members to let him know of any problem areas.

Councillor Smith noted that the accounts for 11/12 was approved at the October meeting. Did we still continue to get a good deal out of the partnership. Councillor Waller replied that they had been concerned about North Essex Parking Partnership's (NEPP) performance in terms of the issue of Penalty Charge Notices in Epping Forest as the number had fallen very substantially in recent months. NEPP Civil Enforcement Officers were spending too much of their time travelling to and from their base in Latton Bush, Harlow. An officer group had been set up to advise on the situation, which was now starting to improve. It had not been resources properly from the outset and had failed to generate as much income as anticipated. It was noted that joining NEPP had generated significant savings, so even if we had to contribute to NEPP that financial benefit would still exist.

Councillor Smith asked if we had an officer acting in an advisory role monitoring this work. She was told that we had two officers who did this and looked after our car parks and street furniture.

Councillor Girling asked if there was a summary of the NEPP meeting that could be had with any relevant statistics. He was told that the agenda for the March meetings would have that information in. Mr Gilbert added that we could ask our finance officers to review the income stream that was provided.

56. WASTE MANAGEMENT PARTNERSHIP BOARD MINUTES

The Panel noted the Waste Management Partnership Board Minutes for 5 November 2012, 7 January and 4 March 2013.

57. MINUTES OF THE LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL

The Panel noted the minutes of the ECC/EFDC Local Highways Panel Minutes for 28 January 2013. They noted that there were no time frames for the actions to be carried out in. They were informed that the Highways Panel had just been allocating jobs at their recent meetings. Councillor Girling noted that there would have to be two cost elements in the work to be done. One would be for the feasibility costs and then one for the actual cost of the works.

58. REPORTS TO BE MADE TO THE NEXT MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

It should be reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that the Panel had asked for its Terms of Reference to be altered to enable it to consider the minutes of the Police and Crime Panel.