

Public Document Pack

Mid Devon District Council

Environment Policy Development Group

Tuesday, 16 May 2017 at 2.00 pm
Exe Room, Phoenix House, Tiverton

Next ordinary meeting
Tuesday, 11 July 2017 at 2.00 pm

Those attending are advised that this meeting will be recorded

Membership

Cllr R F Radford
Cllr D R Coren
Cllr Mrs C P Daw
Cllr R Evans
Cllr Mrs E J Slade
Cllr J D Squire
Cllr R Wright
Cllr J L Smith
Cllr F W Letch

A G E N D A

Members are reminded of the need to make declarations of interest prior to any discussion which may take place

- 1 **Election of Chairman (Chairman of the Council, in the Chair)**

 To elect a Chairman for the municipal year 2017/18.
- 2 **Election of Vice Chairman**

 To elect a Vice Chairman for the municipal year.
- 3 **Apologies and substitute Members**

 To receive any apologies for absence and notices of appointment of substitute Members (if any).
- 4 **Public Question Time**

 To receive any questions relating to items on the Agenda from members of the public and replies thereto.
 Note: A maximum of 30 minutes is allowed for this item.

5 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting** (*Pages 5 - 12*)

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting.

6 **Chairman's Announcements**

To receive any announcements that the Chairman may wish to make.

7 **Litter and Dog Bin Policy** (*Pages 13 - 16*)

Following discussion at the last meeting the Group to review the Litter and Dog Bin Policy.

8 **Performance and Risk** (*Pages 17 - 24*)

To provide Members with an update on performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for 2016-17 as well as providing an update on the key business risks.

9 **Identification of Items for Future Meetings**

Note: This item is limited to 10 minutes. There should be no discussion on the items raised.

10 Year Management Plans for Open Spaces
Cemetery Works
Grass Cutting update
Performance and Risk
Community Engagement Project
Financial Monitoring
Waste and Recycling regular Update

Stephen Walford
Chief Executive
Thursday 4 May 2017

Anyone wishing to film part or all of the proceedings may do so unless the press and public are excluded for that part of the meeting or there is good reason not to do so, as directed by the Chairman. Any filming must be done as unobtrusively as possible from a single fixed position without the use of any additional lighting; focusing only on those actively participating in the meeting and having regard also to the wishes of any member of the public present who may not wish to be filmed. As a matter of courtesy, anyone wishing to film proceedings is asked to advise the Chairman or the Member Services Officer in attendance so that all those present may be made aware that is happening.

Members of the public may also use other forms of social media to report on proceedings at this meeting.

Members of the public are welcome to attend the meeting and listen to discussion. Lift access the first floor of the building is available from the main ground floor entrance. Toilet facilities, with wheelchair access, are also available. There is time set aside at the beginning of the meeting to allow the public to ask questions.

An induction loop operates to enhance sound for anyone wearing a hearing aid or using a transmitter. If you require any further information, or

If you would like a copy of the Agenda in another format (for example in large print) please contact Julia Stuckey on:

Tel: 01884 234209

E-Mail: jstuckey@middevon.gov.uk

Public Wi-Fi is available in all meeting rooms.

This page is intentionally left blank

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a **MEETING** of the **ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP**
held on 7 March 2017 at 2.00 pm

Present

Councillors R F Radford (Chairman)
D R Coren, Mrs C P Daw, R Evans,
F W Letch, Mrs E J Slade, J D Squire and
R Wright

Apologies

Councillor(s) J L Smith

Also Present

Councillor(s) K Busch

Also Present

Officer(s): Andrew Jarrett (Director of Finance, Assets and Resources), Andrew Pritchard (Director of Operations), Simon Johnson (Legal Services Manager), Stuart Noyce (Waste and Transport Manager), Suzanne Kingdom (Auditor), Lorraine Durrant (Waste and Recycling Officer), Jan Norman (Environment and Enforcement Manager) and Julia Stuckey (Member Services Officer)

53 **APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Cllr J L Smith.

54 **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Mr B Warren, Chairman of Willand Parish Council stated that this question relates to item 8 (Street Cleansing review) on your agenda but of necessity consists of a number of elements as it is dealing with a complex document. It is appreciated that in some areas generalised comments have been made but my questions relate to that which happens in or affects Willand.

Will Members please note that in relation to paragraph 6.2 and recommendation 7 that Willand Parish Council employ a part time litter picker who does the whole of the village, including MDDC and DCC areas and verges? This costs the Parish in excess of £300 per month. MDDC do currently empty bins and remove bags of litter left at agreed spots by the litter picker. This activity is a saving for MDDC and gives a better service than that currently given or planned by MDDC. We do not get any hand sweeping other than when the operator of the small sweeper does around the centre island.

In relation to 6.3 and recommendation 8 one has to ask what is the purpose of this Group discussing this when according to an entry on Twitter and the Crediton Gazette the Council Leader is pictured depositing litter in a bin and reporting that the decision had already been made.

In paragraph 10.2 it refers to each new bin installed being a financial commitment for the District Council.

- (a) What is the figure placed on the supply and fitting of a new litter bin?
- (b) What is the cost placed on the supply and fitting of a new dog bin?
- (c) What figure is placed on the commitment of emptying if the Parish Council supply and fit the new or replacement bin?
- (d) If bins are located where a Parish Council through local knowledge and consultation know they are needed and most effective what criteria is used for the District Council to decide that a bin is at an unsuitable location for collection?

Paragraph 10.6 refers to maps and consultations. In February 2016, in spite of there being no policy, certain officers refused to empty two new bins supplied by the Parish. This issue was resolved by Mr Noyce and Willand Parish Council sent in two schedules as to where all the bins in Willand were situated as the result of two Parish Councillors surveying the village. When the consultation was carried out in September 2016 a map was supplied with the letter and questionnaire showing the bins in Willand. It was inaccurate and did not reflect the information provided earlier in the year. It even fails to record a number of litter bins placed in MDDC managed play areas. The impression given in the report is that Parishes were at fault for not responding. Will officers please accept that in relation to Willand the fault would appear to lie within systems or procedures at MDDC?

Paragraph 13 refers to service recharges to other departments. Why is it necessary to incur administrative charges by paying staff to move money around within MDDC?

Paragraph 14.15 is misleading in that the wrong impression is given, certainly as far as the Willand response is concerned. Our concern was that our 9 fenced play areas for small children have litter bins in them and we were concerned/opposed to dog mess being put into these bins as dogs are banned but some could be accessed by leaning over the fence. Small children are encouraged and do use the litter bins and so could have their hands contaminated by dog mess. Will more thought be given to this point before deciding policy please?

Mr K Grantham from Willand Parish Council said that these questions related to Item 8 on the Agenda and in particular Appendix 'D'.

In the third paragraph of 1.1 it states that new bins will only be located in areas where it can be demonstrated that there is a genuine need for one. If the Parish Council has decided that there is a need as the result of local observation and reports from the 'litter picker' who will have visited the site at least once per week:

- What other surveys or consultations will take place before MDDC make the decision?
- Are parishes to be discriminated against for having better standards of cleanliness than MDDC who have shown in a number of areas that their standards have been reduced to save money?

Requests for new or replacement bins have to be made to MDDC who will take 3 months to survey the need.

- Who will do this?
- What will it cost?
- Who will be expected to pay?

Currently Council Tax Payers pay DCC regarding waste disposal, MDDC charge for collection and because their service does not come up to expectations the Parish employ a litter picker who is likely to have his work increased if bins are removed. We have been unable to get any enforcement visits as the officers seem to be concentrated on the towns and car parking where income can be more easily generated.

Who will be making the decisions at MDDC and what right of appeal or redress will Town or Parish Councils have and to whom?

Willand Parish Council have leased two play areas and an area of public green open space and are offering to take on a third. This was done to save them from closure and/or to improve their maintenance to make them more useable. This saves MDDC money.

- Are we to now be charged for emptying dog and litter bins on these areas?
- Do we have to obtain approval from MDDC to replace a damaged or unserviceable bin on these sites?
- Does this policy mean that the earlier agreements with the Estates Department to have the bins emptied by MDDC will cease to have effect thereby putting more cost onto the Parish?
- If arbitrary charges are to be made what will they cost and what will be the additional administrative costs?

Will Members please take time to really question the detail of the proposed policy as at present it looks more dictatorial rather than meaningful consultation with Town and Parish Councils?

The Chairman informed Cllrs Warren and Grantham that their questions would be answered at the agenda item.

55 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the last meeting were approved as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

56 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed Andrew Pritchard, who had just joined the authority as Director of Operations, to the meeting.

The Chairman also welcomed Mr V Alison and Mr J Cochran who were visiting the authority to undertake a peer review.

57 PERFORMANCE AND RISK

The Committee had before it and **NOTED** a report * from the Director of Corporate Affairs and Business Transformation providing Members with an update regarding

performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for 2016-17 as well as providing an update on the key business risks.

The Audit Officer outlined the contents of the report.

Discussion took place regarding:

- The number of garden waste permits that had been purchased and what potential action could be taken to increase take up.
- A flyer regarding garden waste which was being sent out with Council Tax bills;
- The possibility that further permits would be purchased when the gardening season started;
- The number of missed collections and some changes to staffing which may have contributed to a minor increase in numbers during December and January.

Note: - Report * previously circulated and attached to Minutes.

58 **FINANCIAL MONITORING (00:23:00)**

The Group had before it and **NOTED** a report * from the Director of Finance, Assets & Resources presenting a financial update in respect of the income and expenditure so far in the year.

The Director explained that this was a generic report that was seen by all Policy Development Groups and the Cabinet. He informed the Group that little had changed with regard to areas that were within its remit since his last report and that the predicted overspend for the year was currently £64k, this was approximately 0.75% of the overall budget.

An overspend of £136k was due to the relocation of the waste and recycling depots and talks were now taking place to allocate some of that land as a waste transfer station which would generate some income.

Discussion took place regarding the Capital Programme and the need to ensure that schemes were moved forward or that other projects were brought forward to replace them and shared savings for waste with Devon County Council.

Note: - Report * previously circulated and attached to Minutes.

59 **WASTE UPDATE**

The Waste and Transport Manager updated the Group regarding waste and recycling following the changes that had been implemented 18 months previously.

The Officer explained that the overall recycling rate had increased from 44% (2006/7) to 50.8 (2015/16) and at the end of quarter 3 for 2016/17 was at 53.7%. The dry

recycling rate had increased from 17.77% (2006/7) to 21.93% at the end of quarter 3 in 2016/17.

In the previous year Mid Devon had shown the biggest increase in recycling rates within the Devon authorities and total waste arising's had reduced from 989kg per household in 2006/7 to 796kg per household (estimated end of 2016/17).

The officer informed the Group that the cost of the service per household had decreased from £60.56 (2014/15) to £50.35 (2017/18, estimated).

The officer outlined the waste and recycling collections provided in other Devon authorities and explained that services were moving to an aligned scheme which would help with any future working together.

Discussion took place regarding the limiting of residual waste and the officer informed the Group that this was an area of work that would be looked at in the coming year.

60 **STREET CLEANSING REVIEW (00:48:30)**

The Group had before it a report * from the Waste & Transport Manager providing Members with an update on the Street Cleansing Service Review undertaken in 2016 and proposed actions from that review. The Waste and Transport Manager explained that the review had been undertaken as a desktop exercise.

The officer explained that the recommendations within the review included the appointment of an extra litter picking team, which was highlighted within the Corporate Plan, and that he intended to report back to the Group in 12 months time with further options to move the service forward.

The officer explained that there were no performance indicators for street cleansing but that benchmarking had been undertaken along with consultation with Town and Parish Councils. This report was a starting point for a service that had not had any major work undertaken for several years.

Discussion took place regarding:

- The bench marking data provided and the difficulty in comparing costs due to different authorities using differing accounting methods;
- The different levels of cleansing provided to towns and parishes;
- The additional litter picking 'blitz' team and the works that it was envisaged would be allocated to them;
- The recommendation that 'any bin will do' and the fact that this would not be appropriate in play areas;
- The 'any bin will do' campaign could free up bins to be placed in areas identified as being in need.

It was **AGREED** that the Litter and Dog Bin Policy be brought to the next meeting of the Group for further review.

It was **AGREED** that the questions asked by Willand Parish Council at public question time would be responded to in writing.

It was **RECOMMENDED** that the Cabinet approve the recommendations below, with the additional wording 'where appropriate' to be added to recommendation v) regarding dog bins.

- a) Categorise land according to EPA.
- b) Measure current productivity of service.
- c) Cost option for output frequency rather than input.
- d) Cost different frequencies options(less and more) for the mechanical street sweeping service.
- e) Check schedules against adopted highways maps and address any anomalies.
- f) Reroute schedules into zones so all mechanical sweepers work in the same area at the same time.
- g) Map and review Parish Sweeper routes and evaluate efficiency.
- h) An additional two person parish sweeper team is introduced at cost of £54,500 p.a.
- i) Risk-assess all high speed roads that are litter picked.
- j) Litter picking of the two high speed road verges is reinstated and undertaken twice per year and layby every two months.
- k) A Review of weekend sweeping is undertaken and costed.
- l) Benchmark the cost effectiveness of town council work/grants and review the routes to ensure that is not duplicating work done by the District Council's cleansing service.
- m) If these working arrangement are to continue, provide a service level agreement for three years from April 2018.
- n) If these working arrangements are to continue, inform Town Clerks of future training so their operatives may attend also.
- o) Re-introduction of using NI195 criteria to assess street cleanliness by District Officers once a quarter.
- p) New transfer station to include a skip for road sweepings so they can be composted.
- q) Purchase three split recycling litter bins one for each town centre to assess their success.
- r) Continue to encourage voluntary groups and investigate whether litter picking groups would be happy to litter pick where advised by Parish/Town/District Councils.
- s) Adopt New dog and litter bin policy (Appendix D).
- t) Review all existing bin locations and conduct a condition survey.
- u) Pressure wash clean all bins once a year.
- v) Introduce "Any bin will do!" stickers on litter bins.
- w) Street Cleaners to report any bins that are frequently filled with household waste, for District Officers to investigate.
- x) Regular contact with estates to effective joint working.
- y) District Officers and Town Councils to meet once a month to discuss issues.
- z) That MDDC sign the Memorandum of Understanding with Highways England.
- aa) Create an "online look up" for street sweeping schedules.

(Proposed by Cllr D R Coren and seconded by Cllr B Evans)

Note: - Report * previously circulated and attached to Minutes.

61 **STREET SCENE ENFORCEMENT POLICY (01:16:11)**

The Group had before it a report * from the Waste & Transport Manager providing a review of the Street Scene Enforcement Service that had been undertaken over the last twelve months. The report outlined the findings of the review and gave Members an opportunity to comment on proposed new ways of working and agree the priorities of the service going forward.

The Waste and Transport Manager explained that the District Officer role had not been changed for a number of years and that as part of the review he had taken the opportunity to look at how the service was delivered. Shift patterns had been changed to a four day working week which allowed for longer days, less time spent travelling and some flexibility outside of normal working hours. This had allowed for some time to be identified for undertaking discretionary work and the officer asked that Members review the proposed allocation of work on page 77 of the report.

Discussion took place regarding the allocation of these hours and it was **AGREED** that the condition survey of litter/dog bins could be undertaken by the waste operative emptying them, freeing up 10% of officer time which would be added to dog fouling patrols, which would then total 30% of officer time.

The officer informed the Group that IT systems were being explored to save time and allow for mobile working.

It was **RECOMMENDED** to the Cabinet that Council be asked to review the report and approve the Street Scene Services Enforcement Policy at appendix A.

(Proposed by Cllr B Evans and seconded by Cllr C P Daw)

Note: - Report * previously circulated and attached to Minutes.

62 **CHAIRMANS ANNUAL REPORT**

The Group had before it and **NOTED** a draft report * by the Chairman on the work of the Group since May 2016, a final copy of this report would be submitted to Council on 26 April 2017.

Note: - Report previously circulated and attached to Minutes.

63 **IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING**

Performance and Risk
Financial Monitoring
Litter and Dog Bin Policy

(The meeting ended at 3.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

Litter and Dog Bin Policy

Version: 1.1
Date Reviewed: March 2017
Next Review: March 2020



1.1 Introduction

Mid Devon District Council has no legal duty to provide litter and dog waste bins but it does have a duty to keep Council owned land and public highways clear of litter and refuse as far as practicable.

Bins are provided, maintained, and emptied as the main method of controlling the litter and dog waste problems that many areas experience. There are approximately 394 litter and 300 dog bins in varying condition across the District with a capital cost in the region of £136,000. This is a large number for the size of the district and as funding continues to be reduced from central government a reduction in the number should be considered.

Whilst the Council is committed to providing sufficient bins to help discharge its responsibilities under the Environmental Act 1990, the Council has never had a policy for agreeing bins. It has often allowed town and parish Councils to locate additional bins, if they pay for the new bin installation and then take the on-going cost for the emptying of the bin. Going forward new bins will only be located in areas where it can be demonstrated that there is a genuine need for one. All locations must be approved by MDDC in consultation with local town and parish Council.

This policy helps to support Government advice in developing an integrated strategy to the problem of litter and cleanliness that includes defining standards and working in partnership with local communities.

1.2 Purpose of this Policy

The purpose of this policy is to detail how the Council will deal with:

- Requests for new bins
- Emptying and maintaining existing bins
- Replacing existing bins
- Dual dog and litter bins
- Increase Recycling of Litter

2.0 Requests for New Bins

All requests for new bins must be received in writing from either Town or Parish Councils using the form in Appendix A. The request must demonstrate why there is the need for a bin and include:

- Plan of the location for the bin and nearest alternative
- Type of Bin
- Financial Assistance provided by the local Council
- A risk assessment determining any hazards that the placement of the bin may cause to members of the public or MDDC staff
- Survey of litter/dog mess over a three month period

Bins will only be supplied, installed, maintained or emptied if they are on land for which MDDC has responsibility. This includes streets, parks and green spaces, but doesn't include private land such as schools, canal towpaths or riverbanks. Should a third party request a new or replacement bin on their land MDDC will consider the request, and if approved a bin will be supplied and installed at a cost to the third party. The responsibility of emptying such a bin would remain with MDDC and a charge made for this service in advance.

Where deemed appropriate litter bins with recycling facilities may be installed instead of, or in addition to, standard litter bins.

This policy does not suggest public consultation on the installation of bins in general. However in some circumstances, it is recommended, such as when bins are proposed in close proximity to houses.

As there are on-going human and financial resource implications with the installation of any new bin, due consideration should be given to all requests for bins using the criteria detailed below:

2.1 Site Survey:

A site survey, to include the following criteria:

- Suitability of the location including the need to reduce street clutter, particularly in more sensitive locations such as Conservation Areas and near to listed buildings.
- Scale of the litter/dog waste problem- will it make a real impact on litter or can this be addressed in other ways e.g. by enforcement.
- Number and location of existing bins in the area.
- Accessibility to all including collection vehicle.
- Cost of installation.
- Costs for emptying the bin as some in more remote areas can have disproportionate transport costs.
- The possibility of valid objections from neighbours.

If MDDC deems the location to be unsuitable for reasons of safety, such as stopping to empty a bin, proximity to housing or installation difficulties an alternative location may be suggested.

2.2 Alternative Arrangements:

Possible alternatives, including:

- Changing the size/type of existing bins in the area (e.g. dog bin to dual dog and litter bin)
- Moving an existing bin to a different location.

Bins will only be installed on sites which are safe and where there is a genuine need for a bin. We will not install bins on private land or in a location which may encourage the disposal of trade waste. The EPA 1990 makes provision for the collection and disposal of commercial waste, and the Council expects businesses to provide and empty their own bins for the litter they create, including retail premises such as takeaways, kiosks etc.

Once a decision has been made by MDDC regarding the outcome of a request for a bin, that decision will not be reviewed for a minimum of six months.

3.0 Emptying and Maintaining Bins

Only those bins purchased by the MDDC will be maintained and emptied, or those with an agreement with the owner.

Bins will be emptied on such a frequency that will prevent them overflowing. This will be based on their locations and related to the intensity of use. The frequency may also vary according to the time of year and for special events. Monitoring will ensure that these frequencies are sufficient.

All bins will be maintained to a standard that is fit for purpose. When a bin is damaged or stolen it will be replaced only if it meets the criteria above for new bins. Also any bins that have a history of constant vandalism will not be replaced.

Bins that have been supplied, installed and maintained by a Parish Council remain the responsibility of the Parish Council and will not be included in any assessment, replacement, refurbishment and repair process. Should these bins be in need of a replacement a request for a new bin should be submitted.

4.0 Replacing and Removing Existing Bins.

The Council will aim to improve the effectiveness of individual bins through a program of removal and replacement, using larger capacity bins where required or combining separate dog and litter bins into one. We will continually monitor the usage of bins to determine their viability. Bins not being used or being used infrequently may be removed.

Where individual bins are repeatedly targeted with vandalism, a flexible approach to finding a suitable solution should be found. This may include using a different type of bin, moving the bin to a nearby location or removing the bin entirely. When the most appropriate solution is to move or remove the bin, consultation should be carried out with local Council to ensure they support the solution.

If a member of the public, a Parish Council, other interested party or MDDC deems a bin to no longer be needed in a particular location an assessment will be carried out similar assessment as that used for the placement of a new bin will be carried out. If the bin is shown to be in a suitable location it will remain in place. If the assessment shows the bin to be in an unsuitable location an alternative location may be suggested or the bin may be removed entirely following consultation with local people.

5.0 Dual Dog and Litter bins

All dog and litter bins are collected by the same round for each area and the waste is taken to the same disposal point. It therefore serves no purposes to split this waste before collection. Dog owners should be advised that dog waste in bags can be put in any public litter bin, reducing the need for specific dog bins. There are many dog and litter bins in the district which have been located next to each other. A review of bin locations could identify bins which could be removed and a dual purpose bin installed instead.

6.0 Recycling Litter bins

Much of the waste collected in litter bins could be recycled. The Council will consider in high use locations such as town centres the installation of split litter bins (one side recyclables the other for non-recyclables). The recycling of this waste will both benefit the environment but also reduce disposal costs and thus generate an income from both recycling credits and sale of the material.

**ENVIRONMENT PDG
16 MAY 2017:**

AGENDA ITEM:

PERFORMANCE AND RISK REPORT

Cabinet Member Cllr Karl Busch
Responsible Officer Director of Corporate Affairs and Business Transformation, Jill May

Reason for Report: To provide Members with an update on performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for 2016-17 as well as providing an update on the key business risks.

RECOMMENDATION(S): That the PDG reviews the Performance Indicators and Risks that are outlined in this report and feeds back any areas of concern to the Cabinet.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: Corporate Plan priorities and targets are effectively maintained through the use of appropriate performance indicators and regular monitoring.

Financial Implications: None identified

Legal Implications: None

Risk Assessment: If performance is not monitored we may fail to meet our corporate and local service plan targets or to take appropriate corrective action where necessary. If key business risks are not identified and monitored they cannot be mitigated effectively.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Appendix 1 provides Members with details of performance against the Corporate Plan and local service targets for the 2016-17 financial year.
- 1.2 Appendix 2 shows the section of the Corporate Risk Register which relates to the Environment Portfolio. See 3.0 below.
- 1.3 Appendix 3 shows the profile of all risks for the Environment for this quarter.
- 1.4 All appendices are produced from the corporate Service Performance and Risk management system (SPAR).

2.0 Performance

- 2.1 The **Residual household waste per household (measured in Kilograms) and % of household waste reused, recycled and composted** are both above target and have been all year. March figures are not yet available from Devon County Council. The **Net annual cost of waste service per household** is also above target.

- 2.2 Most of the PIs are above target with only 2 showing below target: **% of missed collections reported (refuse and organic)**; which is only marginally under target, there have been a small increase in missed collections in the ¼ due to some staff changes and route knowledge in the waste service. The performance should improve back to normal shortly. **Number of Households on Chargeable Garden Waste**; sales/renewals have steadily increased since December 2016 and it is hoped that this will continue through the spring. Although the target hasn't been achieved a saving of £500k has been achieved.
- 2.3 There is an annual performance indicator: **to improve energy efficiency and continue to reduce consumption by 0.5% post degree day adjustment** this is below target this year, the degree day allowance is less than the previous year and this is an indication that more people are using the facilities; an overall benefit to the Council.
- 2.4 When benchmarking information is available it is included.

3.0 Risk

- 3.1 The Operational risk assessments are job specific and flow through to safe systems of work.
- 3.2 The Corporate risk register has been reviewed by Management Team (MT) and updated. Risk reports to committees include risks with a total score of 10 or more. (See Appendix 2)

4.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

- 4.1 That the PDG reviews the performance indicators and risks for 2016-17 that are outlined in this report and feeds back any areas of concern to the Cabinet.

Contact for more Information: Catherine Yandle, Internal Audit Team Leader ext. 4975

Circulation of the Report: Management Team and Cabinet Member

Corporate Plan PI Report Environment

Monthly report for 2016-2017
 Arranged by Aims
 Filtered by Aim: Priorities Environment
 For MDDC - Services

Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators:	No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
-------------------------	---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

* Indicates that an entity is linked to the Aim by its parent Service

Corporate Plan PI Report Environment																		
Priorities: Environment																		
Aims: Increase recycling and reduce the amount of waste																		
Performance Indicators																		
Title	Prev Year (Period)	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Actual to Date	Head of Service / Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Residual household waste per household (measured in Kilograms)</u>	329.42 (3/4)	424.08	421.00	0.00	0.00	95.36	0.00	0.00	183.10	211.13	242.85	273.41	305.85	333.88		333.88 (11/12)	Stuart Noyce	(April - March) March figure not yet available. (SK)
<u>% of Household Waste Reuse, Recycled and Composted</u>	50.9% (3/4)	50.6%	52.0%			55.9%			56.2%	55.8%	55.3%	53.7%	53.6%	52.7%		52.7% (11/12)	Stuart Noyce	(March) March figure not yet available. (SK)
<u>Net annual cost of waste service per household</u>	£60.88	£60.88	£58.17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	£56.37	£56.37	Stuart Noyce	(2016 - 2017) Figure based on current outturn and maybe subject to change up until the accounts are finalised. (SK)
<u>Number of Households on Chargeable Garden Waste</u>	7,021	7,021	10,000	0	0	8,431	0	0	8,533	8,615	8,298	8,280	8,327	8,409	8,536	8,536	Stuart Noyce	(March) Some customers have waited until April to renew their permit. Same number of customers as previous year despite delays in renewal. 10,000 target was based on lower price. £500k saving has been achieved. (SN)
<u>% of missed collections reported</u>	0.02%	0.02%	0.03%			0.03%			0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.04%	0.04%	0.04%	0.04%	Stuart Noyce	(March) still slightly above target by

Printed by: Suzanne Kingdom

SPAR.net

Print Date: 28 April 2017 12:10

Corporate Plan PI Report Environment

Priorities: Environment

Aims: Increase recycling and reduce the amount of waste

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year (Period)	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Actual to Date	Head of Service / Manager	Officer Notes
<u>(refuse and organic waste)</u>																		0.01%. This is due to staff changes and route knowledge in service. (SN)
<u>% of Missed Collections logged (recycling)</u>	0.12%	0.12%	0.03%			0.04%			0.04%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	Stuart Noyce	(March) Much improved on previous year after roll out of new scheme. (SN)

Aims: Reduce our carbon footprint

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year (Period)	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Actual to Date	Head of Service / Manager	Officer Notes
<u>To improve energy efficiency and continue to reduce consumption by 0.5% post degree day adjustment</u>	3.4%	3.4%	0.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-2.9%	-2.9%	Andrew Busby	(2016 - 2017) Degree day allowance is less than the previous year and an indication that more people are using the facilities (an overall benefit to the authority). (SK)

Aims: Protect the natural environment

Performance Indicators

Title	Prev Year (Period)	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Apr Act	May Act	Jun Act	Jul Act	Aug Act	Sep Act	Oct Act	Nov Act	Dec Act	Jan Act	Feb Act	Mar Act	Actual to Date	Head of Service / Manager	Officer Notes
<u>Number of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) Issued (Environment)</u>	21	21	n/a	0	0	2	2	2	5	5	5	7	8	9	10	10	Stuart Noyce	

Environment PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 2

Report for 2016-2017
For Environment - Cllr Karl Busch Portfolio
Filtered by Flag: Include: * CRR 5+ / 15+
For MDDC - Services
Filtered by Performance Status: Exclude Risk Status: Low
Not Including Risk Child Projects records or Mitigating Action records

Key to Performance Status:

Risks: No Data (0+) High (15+) Medium (6+) Low (1+)

Environment PDG Risk Management Report - Appendix 2

Risk: H&S RA - Recycling Depot Operatives Risk assessment for role - Highest Risk scored - Vehicle Movements inside Depot

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Street Scene Services

Current Status: Medium (10)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 2 - Low

Head of Service: Stuart Noyce

Review Note: No incidents or further mitigating actions added.

Risk: H&S RA - Refuse Driver/Loader Risk Assessment for Role - Highest risk from role RA. - Risk of RTA from severe weather conditions

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Street Scene Services

Current Status: Medium (10)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 2 - Low

Head of Service: Stuart Noyce

Review Note: Annual review - No incidents or further mitigating actions added.

Risk: H&S RA - Street Cleansing Operative Risk assessment for role - highest risk from role - Risk of RTA from severe weather conditions

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Street Scene Services

Current Status: Medium (10)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 2 - Low

Head of Service: Stuart Noyce

Review Note: Risk with control measures added

This page is intentionally left blank

Risk Matrix Environment Appendix 3

Report
 Filtered by Service: Street Scene Services
 Current settings

Risk Likelihood	5 - Very High	No Risks	No Risks	No Risks	No Risks	No Risks
	4 - High	No Risks	No Risks	No Risks	No Risks	No Risks
	3 - Medium	No Risks	No Risks	1 Risk	No Risks	No Risks
	2 - Low	No Risks	No Risks	No Risks	No Risks	3 Risks
	1 - Very Low	No Risks	No Risks	No Risks	1 Risk	1 Risk
		1 - Very Low	2 - Low	3 - Medium	4 - High	5 - Very High
		Risk Severity				

Printed by: Nicola Chandler	SPAR.net	Print Date: 03 May 2017 15:26
------------------------------------	-----------------	--

This page is intentionally left blank