

**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL  
NOTES OF A MEETING OF SAFER, CLEANER, GREENER SCRUTINY PANEL  
HELD ON TUESDAY, 7 OCTOBER 2014  
IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1, CIVIC OFFICES, HIGH STREET, EPPING  
AT 7.30 - 8.57 PM**

**Members Present:** Mrs J Lea (Chairman), Mrs H Brady (Vice-Chairman), K Angold-Stephens, K Chana, R Jennings, S Neville, Mrs M Sartin, B Surtees and Mrs E Webster (Vice Chairman of Council)

**Other members present:** W Breare-Hall, A Mitchell MBE and G Waller

**Apologies for Absence:** Mrs R Gadsby, Ms Y Knight and L Mead

**Officers Present** K Durrani (Assistant Director (Technical Services)), L Swan (Assistant Director (Private Sector Housing & Communities Support)) and A Hendry (Democratic Services Officer)

**11. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (COUNCIL MINUTE 39 - 23.7.02)**

It was reported that Councillor K Angold-Stephens was substituting for Councillor L Mead.

**12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**13. NOTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The notes of the 15 July 2014 meeting were agreed as a correct record.

**14. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND WORK PROGRAMME**

**Terms of Reference**

Their Terms of Reference were noted.

**Work Programme**

It was noted that items 6 and 7 of the work programme were no longer valid as they had both now changed partly because the climate local agreement had never been signed up to by the Council. These should now be replaced by a new item with the Panel receiving updates from the Green Corporate Working Party. This was agreed by the Panel.

**15. NOTES OF THE IAA MEMBER MEETING ON 18 SEPTEMBER**

The Panel noted that the notes of the recent IAA member meeting were unavailable in time for this meeting.

**16. NOTES OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PARTNERSHIP BOARD**

The Panel noted the notes of the Waste Management Partnership Board meeting for 15 August 2014.

The following questions were raised by Panel members:

Councillor Sartin wanted to know if BIFFA would still pick up the costs for contamination. She was told that they would reflect what we did with SITA. In the new contract that figure was reflected in the overall price to BIFFA, who were trying to keep to our 0% target.

Councillor Surtees noted that the workforce had concerns about TUPE. He was told that there was a recent meeting with regional managers, who were also conducting one-to-ones with all staff. They wished to keep the existing staff as they had the local knowledge.

Councillor Waller commented that from March a wider range of materials were to be recycled. Residents were to be informed by a press campaign. Councillor Breare-Hall added that leaflets about contamination were to go to all households in the District. A 10% contamination rate was the average. Councillor Angold-Stephens noted that a 5% rate had been promised. Some districts had as much as a 35% rate.

Councillor Neville noted that we co-mingle waste and some councils sort them later. What steps are we taking to ensure that the recyclates are of good quality. Mr Durrani replied that the EU had suggested that materials should be separated, but government guidance said this should be done only if practicable. Only one of the top thirty council collect separate materials. Nationally, people like co-mingling; our solution works well for us. But this solution is now being questioned across the country; if it was found to be better then we should collect separately. All districts in Essex are currently doing their own assessment.

Councillor Brady wanted to know what was happening about grass cuttings from country side houses. She was told that the council did not require residents to put their grass cuttings into our green bins, they could compost them themselves.

#### **17. PROGRESS AGAINST CLIMATE LOCAL AGREEMENT**

The Panel noted that the Climate Local Agreement and the Climate Reduction Strategy would in future be replaced by updates on the Green Corporate Working Party.

#### **18. NOTES OF BOBBINGWORTH LIAISON GROUP**

The Panel noted that the notes of the liaison group was not currently available. Councillor Breare-Hall reported that the last meeting had been held on site and that there were no problems to report.

#### **19. RECYCLING IN FLATS AND MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY DWELLINGS**

Mr Durrani gave a short verbal report on the current state of recycling in flat blocks in the District. There were a total of 7,400 flats in the District and some of these were not able to have suitable containers put in to collect the recycling. 80% of flats that were suitable for having recycling containers have now got them and officers were exploring ways to put some containers in the other 20% of flats. They were also looking at ways to put in food recycling but there had been problems with

contamination. Recycling bins were being redesigned along with new literature and leaflets to educate the residents in the flat blocks. He would give more detailed statistics at a future meeting.

Councillor Lea asked if new planning applications would look to put in recycling areas in new flat blocks. Councillor Surtees asked if it would be appropriate to have a standard for recycling in new flat blocks as a lot of flats have problems as they do not have areas for recycling bin storage. Mr Durrani replied that some work had been done on this. Leaflets have been produced to be handed out with planning applications, giving appropriate advice to people applying for flat blocks. Councillor Surtees asked if this could go on the i-plan site to give applicants information on this.

Councillor Neville asked how many flat blocks did not have facilities for recycling and how did we help residents recycle. Mr Durrani replied that they had covered 80% of the appropriate flat blocks and were now down to the harder 20%. Some places just do not have the space and would need a more novel solution; and in other places we have to overcome resident's objection.

Councillor Brady asked if there were any plans for separate high street recycling bins. She was told that officers were currently considering options at present; it was also a funding issue.

Councillor Surtees noted that they organised litter picks in towns, could not this be recycled? Mr Durrani said it was possible if it was picked separately.

## **20. NOTES OF LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL**

The Local Highways Panel notes for 28 August 2014 were noted.

Councillor Webster commented that there were some schemes in the pipeline that had not been completed. Local members needed more information about these schemes. Councillor Lea noted that these were being looked at. The schemes mentioned in the minutes were new recommendations that had been agreed.

Councillor Sartin asked if this Panel could be webcast as ordinary members were not allowed to attend. Councillor Waller noted that some local Highway Panels in Essex were open to the public. Under Government regulations passed in 2012, all executive meetings must be open to the public; Local Highways Panel, however, are considered to be advisory rather than decision making forums; the ECC Portfolio Holder has the final word. Councillor Webster added that when they used to be open the public could get very rowdy. She would support them being webcast and so would Councillor Angold-Stephens. Councillor Surtees sounded a note of caution saying that webcasting might raise false expectations.

Councillor Lea noted that the Panel had very limited powers; it was only for particular, limited schemes. They only had a £100,000 budget which was not suitable for wide ranging Highways works.

Councillor Chana noted that one of the difficulties was that the list was never up to date, although it had started improving after Councillor Knapman became Chairman.

## **21. NOTES OF SLM CONTRACT MONITORING BOARD**

The Panel noted the notes of the SLM monitoring board, dated 1 September 2014.

Councillor Webster referred to item 4 of the notes saying she was glad the final income position was more than expected and congratulated all concerned.

## **22. NOTES OF NORTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP 26 JUNE 2014**

The Panel noted the notes of the North Essex Parking Partnership meeting held on 26 June 2014. Councillor Waller noted that the next meeting would be held next week, when they would look at schemes in our area and how to put them into effect. The June meeting had looked at the risk register and the financial position. He noted that we had one camera car with CCTV looking to police the roads outside schools. If members had any particular schools they would like us to look at, please let him know.

Also they had made a small profit on the on street account of £15k for all of Essex, and were looking to get better equipment for wardens and to protect against future deficits.

The Panel noted that the Council had just been informed that they could now start to look at enforcement against parking on green verges and to erect warning signs. But it could only be enforced on an “ornamentally” maintained verge and would have to be looked at on a case by case basis. It is being trialled at Braintree at present.

## **23. UPDATE ON THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY RIVER RODING STRATEGY**

The Panel received a tabled report on the update on the Environment Agency’s River Roding Strategy telling members that the Environment Agency (EA) would be adopting the recommendations of the River Roding Strategy. They would be writing to all properties and landowners within the boundary of the River Roding’s flood plain, advising them of the strategy recommendations and how the implementation would impact on their property. This strategy would benefit 1000 properties in the catchment but unfortunately some properties would remain at high risk or in a few cases have an increased risk of flooding. They would be working with those property owners to offer advice and guidance to ensure they were aware of the risks and the steps they could take to minimise these.

Once the River Roding Strategy was fully implemented it was likely that there would be impacts on the district and resourcing implications for the Council. When these impacts were better understood and if any other significant issues arose as a result of the strategy, a further report would be submitted to this Panel.

Councillor Angold-Stephens noted that we may have to help the EA in some of the funding. Towns and Parishes should be alerted to this.

### **RESOLVED:**

That a further report would be submitted once the strategy was fully implemented and /or the wider implications were known to the Council.

## **24. DEFRA CONSULTATION ON SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS**

The Panel considered an extra item introduced by Mr Durrani on a DEFRA consultation about a revised proposal for delivering sustainable drainage systems (SuDs). This was designed for new developments and to mimic nature in helping to control surface water discharges and reduce overall flood risk. The original proposal

placed the responsibility for approving the SuDs on County as the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) and as the SuDs Approving Body. The latest consultation seeks to remove the responsibility from the LLFA and strengthens existing planning policy which means the duty would fall to the LPA.

Officers consider that this alternative approach should be supported but it is in opposition to the view of County. The Panel was asked to endorse this in principle, subject to there being no cost or any legal liability falling to this Council.

The Panel were happy to agree this response to the consultation.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Panel agreed with the DEFRA consultation premises that the District supports the revised proposal in that the approval of SuDs be streamlined into the planning regime subject to there not being any cost liability or legal liability falling to this Council.

**25. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 2014/15 - QUARTER 1 PERFORMANCE**

The specific Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for the first quarter of the year, appropriate to this Panel were noted. This was the first time these specific indicators had gone to the Panel since being agreed by last year's Overview and Scrutiny Review Task and Finish Panel.

It was noted that at the end of the first quarter (1 April to 30 June 2014), the KPIs performance was as follows:

- (a) 22 (60%) indicators achieved the cumulative third quarter target; and
- (b) 14 (39%) indicators did not achieve the cumulative third quarter target, although 4 (11%) of these KPIs performed within the agreed tolerance for the indicator.

On the whole the Panel were generally satisfied that the indicators were going in the right direction.

The Panel asked that the few specific KPIs for this Panel be printed in colour to make them easier to follow.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Key Performance Indicators within its area of responsibility were noted.

**26. FUTURE MEETINGS**

The future meetings dates for the Panel were noted.