



*Castle House
Great North Road
Newark
NG24 1BY*

Tel: 01636 650000

www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk

Friday, 7 October 2022

Chairman: Councillor R White
Vice-Chairman: Councillor Mrs P Rainbow

Members of the Committee:

Councillor L Brailsford
Councillor L Brazier
Councillor Mrs B Brooks
Councillor S Carlton
Councillor M Cope
Councillor D Cumberlidge
Councillor Mrs L Dales
Councillor P Harris
Councillor S Haynes
Councillor Mrs L Hurst
Councillor J Kellas
Councillor N Mison
Councillor M Pringle

Substitute Members:

Councillor M Brock
Councillor Mrs R Crowe
Councillor L Goff
Councillor T Wildgust
Councillor Mrs Y Woodhead

MEETING: Policy & Performance Improvement Committee

DATE: Monday, 17 October 2022 at 6.00 pm

**VENUE: Civic Suite, Castle House, Great North Road, Newark
NG24 1BY**

You are hereby requested to attend the above Meeting to be held at the time/place and on the date mentioned above for the purpose of transacting the business on the Agenda as overleaf.

If you have any queries please contact Helen Brandham on helen.brandham@newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk.

AGENDA

Page Nos.

1. Apologies for Absence
 2. Declaration of Interest by Members and Officers
 3. Notification to those present that the meeting will be recorded and streamed online
 4. Minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2022 4 - 12
- Reports and Presentations**
5. Kerbside Glass Collection: Options Appraisal 13 - 26
- Topic Suggestions Received**
6. Review of the Town Centres Strategy 27 - 28
 7. Reviewing our Customer Communication 29 - 31

NEWARK AND SHERWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of **Policy & Performance Improvement Committee** held in the Civic Suite, Castle House, Great North Road, Newark NG24 1BY on Monday, 26 September 2022 at 6.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillor R White (Chairman)
Councillor Mrs P Rainbow (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor L Brailsford, Councillor L Brazier, Councillor Mrs B Brooks, Councillor S Carlton, Councillor M Cope, Councillor D Cumberlidge, Councillor P Harris, Councillor S Haynes, Councillor J Kellas, Councillor N Mison, Councillor Mrs R Crowe and Councillor Mrs Y Woodhead

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Mrs L Dales (Committee Member), Councillor Mrs L Hurst (Committee Member) and Councillor M Pringle (Committee Member)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor L Goff

16 DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no declarations of interest.

17 NOTIFICATION TO THOSE PRESENT THAT THE MEETING WILL BE RECORDED AND STREAMED ONLINE

The Chairman advised that the proceedings were being recorded by the Council and that the meeting was being livestreamed and broadcast from the Civic Site, Castle House.

18 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13 JUNE 2022

Minute No. 9 – Community Plan Performance for Quarter 4 – 2021/2022

It was noted that the referred to attachment to the minutes in relation to responses to questions asked by Members had been omitted from the Minutes.

AGREED that, subject to the omission of the aforementioned attachment, the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2022 were a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

19 RESIDENT SURVEY OUTCOMES

The Committee considered the report and presentation delivered jointly by the Transformation & Service Improvement Manager and the Transformation Service Improvement Officers, which sought to update Members on the findings from the 2022 Residents' Survey undertaken between May and July 2022 using three elements: an open survey that could be completed by any district resident over 16; a representative sample gathered to sense check the open survey; and a series of focus groups held to gather the views of underrepresented groups.

The presentation provided Members with some of the changes that had occurred since the last Residents' Survey was undertaken in 2018 together with details as to who had completed the open survey. Each slide of the presentation provided an analysis of the responses received to the questions asked with the final slide summarising what was important to residents with a suggestion of where the Council should focus resources.

In considering the presentation Members welcomed the positive results and comments received. In noting the diversity within the area and wards which the Council covered, a Member requested that she would wish to be provided with a further breakdown of the data gathered.

Members noted the comments received in relation to glass recycling with a Member stating that it should be progressed further as the response had been that the public wanted this service to be provided.

In summing up, the Chairman welcomed the positive comments received in relation to the cleanliness within the district. She noted that anti-social behaviour remained an issue, adding that this was being considered by the ASB Working Group, established by the Committee at their previous meeting. In relation to kerbside glass recycling, she confirmed that a meeting of the Committee had been arranged for 17 October 2022 to look specifically at that issue with onward recommendations to the Cabinet meeting in November 2022. She also advised that information in relation to the Newark Town Fund would be presented to a future meeting of the Committee and also requested that an update on the Sherwood Levelling Up funding be brought to a future meeting once a decision had been made on the bid. It was also noted that consideration would be given to a Customer Strategy Working Group, looking to improve the customer experience, at the next meeting.

AGREED (unanimously) that:

- a) the above comments on the findings of the 2022 Residents' Survey be noted; and
- b) the findings of the Residents' Survey be used to shape the 2023/2027 Community Plan, to be developed by Officers and Members in early 2023.

20 BASSETLAW AND NEWARK & SHERWOOD COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS & PERFORMANCE UPDATE AND REVIEW OF PRIORITIES

The Committee considered the report presented by the Business Manager – Public Protection which sought to provide Members with an update on the work undertaken by the Bassetlaw and Newark & Sherwood Community Safety Partnership (BNSCSP). Information as to the current performance was also reported together with an explanation as to the choice of priorities for the current year.

The report set out that the establishment of a Community Safety Partnership (CSP) was a statutory requirement and the responsible authorities that formed that partnership. Further details specific to the BNSCSP were provided and how it operated in practice. Paragraph 2.5 listed the priorities for 2022/2023 together with the rationale for each one.

In considering the report Members queried how the list of priorities were reached and whether anything more local or specific could be added. The Business Manager advised that they were broad-based throughout the district but that meetings were held every 3 months to look at the Police statistics as to emerging crime and their priorities. It was at this point that more local priorities would be considered. In response to whether Members could feed into those priorities, the Business Manager advised that it was the intention going forward to bring the draft priorities to Committee near year end to ask the Committee for their recommendations for inclusion of items on the priority list.

Members welcomed the flexible and agile approach to the priority setting and queried whether any comments on social media were taken into consideration. The Business Manager advised that the statistical data used to set the priorities was generated by the Police but added that Council Officers were able to gather local intelligence and that such information would be considered in the local priority setting process.

In noting that a performance report based on all crime together with a smaller report based on antisocial behaviour were produced monthly, Members queried whether this was used to detect patterns in crime. The Business Manager advised that Officers were beginning to look at crime patterns and also to monitor any chronological patterns.

AGREED (unanimously) that:

- a) the CSP performance and priorities be noted;
- b) the priorities proposed for 2022/2023 be endorsed

Councillor P. Harris left the meeting at 7pm – part way through the above item and therefore did not participate in the unanimous vote.

21 ASB PRESENTATION BY T/INSPECTOR MATTHEW WARD

The Committee received a presentation on Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) by Temporary Inspector, Matthew Ward. He advised that he undertook the setting of his policing agenda on a 3 monthly basis. ASB had been on that agenda for 6 months and would remain on there for the following 3 month period.

Overall, for the past financial year, ASB had seen a decrease of 4% but there had been an increase in the last month of 6%, noting that this correlated with school holidays. The main 3 areas of concern were: off-road biking; swimming in open water; and neighbour disputes. Of the 21 wards within T/Insp. Ward's area, 11 had seen a reduction in ASB, 3 had remained static; and 7 had seen an increase. He noted that there was a known risk that if a specific area was targeted, it could result in the ASB moving to another area.

Swimming in Open Water: in order to address this, the Police were looking into setting up a multi-agency group with consideration being given to the use of dispersal orders.

Off-Road Biking: this was most prevalent in the Magnus and Devon Wards. Evidence and the reporting of incidents were required in order for a funding bid to be made to tackle the issue. Comments on social media were not sufficient to support the funding bid the police require official reports.

Patrols were undertaken weekly in 3 key areas. The location for the patrols was based on incident reporting and risk. Police Officers could also provide intelligence they had gathered about whether something may happen in a specific area.

School Engagement: this was a long-term initiative and offered to primary schools. Currently these were carried out annually, but the Police would be willing to increase their visits noting that the Police's Early Intervention Officers targeted secondary schools. Officers would be maintaining a high-profile presence during the Halloween and Bonfire Night periods as these typically saw an increase in ASB.

In considering the presentation, Members noted that the public often failed to report incidents as the perception was that no action would be taken by the Police and that improvement to communication channels needed to be progressed. T/Insp. Ward noted the comments and advised that there was a push to improve communications.

A Member queried how the issue of speeding might be considered as a priority for inclusion on the 3 monthly policing agenda. T/Insp. Ward advised that priorities were set by statistical information but that anecdotal information could also be considered, which would be the case for speeding. He commented that it was very much a community feeling and would probably be localised.

T/Insp. Ward was asked as to how dispersal orders were managed and monitored so as to ensure that problems were not merely moved to a different location. In response he advised that Newark Town Centre, Balderton and Fernwood all had such an order and that for him to authorise any he would require evidence that ASB was happening at that time. Beat Officers were able to feed into the process, advising where the persons involved had relocated to. He added that when ASB Contracts were issued, work was undertaken with schools and social workers in an attempt to change the behaviour of those involved. However, he noted that this was not a 'quick fix' and could take several years.

Members noted that regular conversations with residents within their wards about their feelings of safety and what reassurances could be given to them about policing in their area. T/Insp. Ward advised that some activity was not visible for operational reasons. He advised that if a resident had any specific concerns to contact his Officers who would be able to speak to him directly.

A Member raised the issue of an increase in his ward of the theft of catalytic converters but despite the incident being reported, the Police did not attend. T/Insp. Ward acknowledged the issue and advised that the reporting of crimes was triaged in the control room. He added that if the person who had reported the crime was unhappy with the result, they should complain as this may help, in part, to changing the way that crime reporting was dealt with.

In relation to county line drug issues, T/Insp. Ward noted that the increase was due to the Police identifying the issues more easily and not because the number of incidents had increased. He added that it was not a significantly bad situation.

Again in relation to the reporting of crime, a Member noted that when using the 101 telephone reporting service, Option 7 was that in relation to crimes committed by which time many callers had rung off. T/Insp. Ward suggested that during the ASB WGs visit to the control room at Police HQ, the issue be raised, noting that there needed to be a push to alternative options for reporting.

AGREED (unanimously) that T/Insp. Ward be thanked for his presentation and attendance at the Policy & Performance Improvement Committee.

22 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE Q1

The Committee considered the report presented by the Business Manager – Financial Services which sought to update Members with the forecast outturn position for the 2022/2023 financial year for the Council's General Fund and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue and capital budgets. The report also provided Members with information as to the performance against the approved estimates of revenue expenditure and income and on major variances from planned budget performance, in accordance with the Council's Constitution.

Details of the General Fund Revenue Projected Outturn for 2022/23 were provided, showing a projected unfavourable variance together with an unfavourable variance for the General Fund Revenue Outturn for 2022/23 as at 30 June 2022. Further detail of the projected unfavourable variance against revised budgets for the HRA Outturn for 2022/23 were also provided alongside the overview of projected Capital Outturn for 2022/23.

In response to the reason as to why there had been a reduction in income from rents due to the average period of time that dwellings remained vacant, the Business Manager advised that he would provide Members with a written response.

AGREED (unanimously) that:

- a) the General Fund projected unfavourable outturn variance of £0.947m on services be noted;
- b) the Housing Revenue Account projected unfavourable outturn variance of £0.444m on services be noted; and

the capital outturn position of £89.994m be noted.

23 COMMUNITY PLAN PERFORMANCE Q1

The Committee considered the report presented by the Transformation & Service Improvement Officer which sought to present to Members the Quarter 1 Community Plan Performance Report (April – June 2022). Members were asked to review the Community Plan Performance Report attached as Appendix 1.

The report set out that performance reporting, going forward, would now be used as a tool for change with the information contained having been sourced by analysing data and progress against key activities, as well as district statistics, customer feedback and workforce information.

In considering the report a Member raised a query in relation to fly-tipping and how this was being dealt with. The Transformation & Service Improvement Officer advised that Officers from Environmental Services were carrying out checks on incidents reports more quickly than in the past with details being kept of the type of waste being tipped, together with the location of the land and what its use was. He advised he would supply a written response as to whether it was commercial or residential waste.

In noting the drop of 5.3% of tenants surveyed as to whether they were satisfied or very satisfied with repairs to tenants' homes, the Director – Housing, Health & Wellbeing advised that this was being kept under close review. She added that a new contractor had been engaged and that a 10-month rolling programme of works was now operational which should secure improved access to properties. A survey of tenants was to be undertaken, asking why they did not wish to allow access to their properties and it was anticipated that access to carry out repairs would improve by October 2022. She also advised that a new way of reminding tenants of the contractor's visit had been implemented. It was agreed that an update report on this would be presented to the next meeting of the committee.

AGREED (unanimously) that the Community Plan Performance Report for Quarter 1, 2022/2023 be noted.

24 STAR SURVEY

The Committee considered the report and presentation delivered by the Director – Housing, Health & Wellbeing which sought to provide Members with the results of the Survey of Tenants & Residents (STAR) for 2021/2022. It was reported that the aim of the survey was to establish the satisfaction levels of Council tenants on a range of measures relating to their Council home, tenancy, communal services and neighbourhoods.

It was reported that the results of the STAR had been considered by SLT, the Portfolio Holder for Homes & Health and the Tenant Engagement Board, who had recommended that the Repairs & Maintenance Service be an area of focus and to identify areas of service development and modernisation.

The report provided Members with the background as to the collection and collation of data in relation to Tenant Satisfaction Measures and how these were used and aligned to the STAR. Paragraph 3 of the report set out the key highlights of the STAR report with further details being provided in relation to: repairs; ASB; lettings; complaints and queries; neighbourhood; home; empowerment; and value for money.

In considering the presentation Members commented that the outcome of the survey had, on the whole, been positive. They queried whether contactors were routinely showing their ID when entering tenants' houses, adding that it should be standard

practice. The Director confirmed that this had been raised with the contractors. In relation to necessary gas safety checks, she added that all tenants had been written to advising of a change in contractor and that all checks would be booked in advance with the tenants notified of the date and time.

AGREED (unanimously) that:

- a) the overall positive levels in satisfaction for housing services be noted;
- b) the full STAR Report attached at Appendix 1 be noted;
- c) the feedback from the Tenant Engagement Board to consider the Repairs & Maintenance Service as an area of focus for the Directorate in 2023/2024 be noted; and

the changes from 2023 onwards with the introduction of the Tenant Satisfaction Measures that, in part, replicate the current arrangements for STAR be noted.

25 TENANT ENGAGEMENT BOARD

The Committee considered the verbal update from Councillor Penny Rainbow, the Vice-Chairman of the Committee and a Member of the Tenant Engagement Board.

She advised that the first meeting of the Board had taken place on 25 August 2022 where principles and standard agenda items were agreed, these being performance and complaints. In relation to performance this would focus on gas servicing and how this could be improved with a view to getting early access to properties to carry out the works. The STAR results were also considered and it was agreed that the repairs service would be reviewed. The Housing Ombudsman Self-Assessment for Effective Complaint Handling and associated action plan was also considered and how the role of the Ombudsman might be better promoted together with how a tenant might make a complaint about housing services. It was agreed that information be provided on the recorded message that tenants heard when they telephoned the service. It was noted that tenant satisfaction measures were being introduced with further updates to come. The Consultation & Engagement Strategy and associated action plan were endorsed, approved and recommended to Cabinet.

26 UPDATE ON ASB WORKING GROUP

The Committee considered the verbal update of Councillor Ronnie White, the Chairman of the Committee and the Chairman of the ASB Working Group.

She advised that the group had met on three occasions with the fourth one scheduled the following day. They had received and discussed a broad overview of ASB, where the hotspots were in the district and what tools were available to the Council to assist in tackling the issue. They had visited the CCTV Control Room at the Nottinghamshire Police HQ and also had a more in-depth discussion in relation to ASB itself and statistical information.

Councillor White advised that there were clear themes emerging from the group:

- i. How the work of the Community Protection Officers could be maximised to have a positive impact on ASB throughout the district.
- ii. How to pursue a collaborative and partnership focussed approach to reduce ASB where possible.
- iii. Exploration of whether it is possible to optimise the use of current CCTV further.
- iv. Tackling ASB with education.
- v. Trying to improve the rate of reporting incidents by promoting the issue and how it might be made easier.

It was further noted that: a visit to the Control Room at Nottinghamshire Police HQ had been arranged; that the Community Safety Charter was to be considered by the group; review the issue of ASB in housing stock; how to progress working in partnership with schools; and engagement with the relevant Portfolio Holders.

27 UPDATE ON DIGITAL TOOLS WORKING GROUP

The Committee considered the verbal report of Councillor Simon Haynes, the Chairman of the Digital Tools Working Group.

He advised that two meetings of the group had been held. They had looked at the current equipment being used; whether additional training was required to enable better and more efficient utilisation of equipment; better use of available software e.g. Microsoft Teams.

Councillor Haynes provided information as to the hardware available currently to Members these being: iPads which were considered not fit for purpose in terms of Member requirements; a Microsoft device (similar to an iPad) being trialled by Councillor Linda Dales with positive feedback; and a Dell Laptop. He also advised that there were two other options which were for Members to: either bring their own device, currently being trialled by Councillor Skinner; or to utilise their mobile phones which Councillor Haynes stated he would be trialling.

It was noted that any recommendations agreed by the group would be presented to the Committee for consideration. They would then be forwarded to the Portfolio Holder for Organisational Development for onward recommendation to Cabinet noting that any changes to Members' devices would be actioned after the May 2023 elections.

Councillor Haynes advised Members that he would welcome any comments which the group could then consider and that the next meeting was scheduled for the following day.

28 MINUTES OF CABINET MEETING HELD ON 12 JULY 2022

NOTED the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 12 July 2022.

29 CABINET FORWARD PLAN - SEPTEMBER TO DECEMBER 2022

NOTED the Forward Plan of the Cabinet for the period September to December 2022.

30 ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

NOTED the items for the future meetings on 17 October and 28 November 2022.

Meeting closed at 8.11 pm.

Chairman



Report to: Policy & Performance Improvement Committee Meeting 17.10.22

Director Lead: Matthew Finch, Director of Communities and Environment

Lead Officer: Andrew Kirk, Environmental Services Business Manager

Report Summary	
Report Title	<i>Kerbside Glass Collection: Options Appraisal</i>
Purpose of Report	<i>To present PPIC with the different options for, and implications of, implementing a kerbside glass collection, and for PPIC to consider and endorse the officer recommendations.</i>
Recommendations	<p><i>The Policy, Performance and Improvement Committee recommend to Cabinet that if a kerbside glass collection service is to be introduced that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) an eight weekly collection frequency is adopted;</i> <i>b) a 140 litre bin is used in the collection methodology;</i> <i>c) The Council does not provide the service in the ROB area as it may have a detrimental impact upon the objects of a long-established charity, but;</i> <i>d) The Council works alongside ROB to try to improve knowledge of the ROB service, its take up in the communities it serves and the furtherance of its charitable objects;</i> <i>e) Revenue and capital costs identified with the proposed methodology are recommended to Cabinet for inclusion the budget for 23/24, however;</i> <i>f) Before a final decision is undertaken, may members of PPIC wish to recommend to the Cabinet that consideration is given to a period of public consultation on the recommended service option given the significant capital and revenue costs involved and the need to effectively interface with ROB and the communities it serves, and;</i> <i>g) Furthermore, that a market research company is commissioned to undertake a consultation exercise at a maximum cost of £15,000 funded from existing budgets.</i>

<p>Reason for Recommendation</p>	<p><i>An 8 weekly collection cycle is more cost effective and can be scaled up if required. Therefore, the officer recommendation is a 140L bin on an 8 weekly collection.</i></p> <p><i>This would mean significant operational changes for NSDC and thus costs. However, it is a resident priority as demonstrated by recent resident surveys, and, based on the National Waste Strategy we can expect that the introduction of kerbside glass will become a statutory requirement in the future. If we already have a service, this can be shaped to be compliant to the nuances of any legislation.</i></p>
---	---

1.0 Background

- 1.1** Residents have repeatedly expressed their frustration at the lack of kerbside glass collection in Newark and Sherwood. The results of the Council’s Residents’ Survey, both in 2018 and 2022, show that waste and recycling collections are cited as one of the most important services to residents in the district. In 2018 there were over 820 comments that stressed the importance of kerbside collections, a significant amount of which expressed a desire for a kerbside glass collection. Similarly, the 2022 findings show that recycling continues to be an issue of high importance for residents, and that it is important or very important to 83% of residents to live in a sustainable and environmentally aware way, and again 270 respondents commented to specifically request the introduction of kerbside glass recycling.
- 1.2** Residents also referenced recycling of food and garden waste however glass was the most requested kerbside service. This is likely because it is collected and recycled in at least half of the district’s households, but also because of its potential in reducing the district’s carbon footprint. As glass is one of the few materials which is 100% recyclable with no loss in quality during the recycling process, every tonne of recycled glass that is melted saves approximately 670kg of carbon dioxide.
- 1.3** On 26th September 2022, the Policy and Performance Improvement Committee received a presentation that highlighted the results of the Residents’ Survey. Following that, and having listened to the feedback of our residents, officers were tasked with investigating the options that are available to the council to be able to deliver a kerbside glass recycling service. With that in mind, this report has been developed to outline options for implementation of a kerbside glass service with the aim of establishing which is the most effective and cost-efficient option.
- 1.4** Given the scale of the costs involved in launching a kerbside glass collection and the nature of the proposed offer, further consultation may need to take place with residents and partners to confirm that the method of delivery is acceptable to the public. Additionally given the volatile economic climate we are currently

experiencing, additional work will need to be done to finalise costs before the launch of the project as well as develop an implementation timeline.

2.0 The Current Service

- 2.1** There are currently ‘bottle banks’ at 49 bring sites in the district and it is estimated that they capture over 50% of the glass waste produced by residents in the district. Currently, approximately 2,175 tonnes of glass are collected from within the district per annum. 1,666 tonnes come from bring banks and 510 tonnes are collected by R.O.B.
- 2.2** R.O.B (Recycling Ollerton and Boughton) provide a service covering from approximately 10,000 properties in the district, however they have no interest in expanding their services district wide. R.O.B is a charity which provides work-based training placements to adults with learning difficulties. Providing the collection is one of their placement experiences and they mitigate some of the costs associated with their charity with the glass recycling income. Should the council choose to implement a glass collection, it will need to consider whether to operate in this area.
- 2.3** Officers have met with ROB management about the introduction of a kerbside glass collection service. There is no doubt that should the Council choose to enter the Communities serviced by ROB, then the future of the charity would become uncertain as one-third of their annual income is as a result of selling on the glass which is collected. However, whilst ROB covers around 10,000 properties, the current penetration rate is about 40% and the Council should be mindful of providing a service which isn’t equitable across the district – no matter how valid the rationale. ROB would be keen to work with the Council to improve that penetration rate to closer to 80%, which is similar to the rates achieved by Councils locally. Over time, there has been churn in residents moving in and out of properties so there is perhaps not the awareness of the service that there should be. This is something the Council could help ROB with. Additionally, ROB would also look to concentrate its offer on the communities it currently covers, move some collections from half day to full day and consider mixed collection of glass, rather than single sort. This would be offset by the additional income and recycling credits the increased volume of glass would generate. ROB would not wish to move away from recycling as a means of providing work-based opportunities for the young adults they support as, they say, there are benefits to the visibility of the service in the community.

3.0 Wider Considerations

- 3.1** Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC) acts as the Waste Collection Authority (WCA) for the District. Nottinghamshire County Council is the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) and have a contract with Veolia that determines what can and cannot be collected in the district’s domestic recycling (silver bin). Glass is not currently listed as an accepted material under this contract. This means

we cannot recycle glass via Veolia by adding it to the silver bin. As it stands the WDA (NCC) pay NSDC 'recycling credits' for providing bring sites that accept glass. Therefore, in order to implement a kerbside glass service, the Council would need to have a separate collection method.

3.2 The National Waste Strategy (NWS) was released by Central Government in 2018 with the aim of standardising kerbside waste collections across England, however the details of these proposals are still being awaited. There is a possibility that this strategy will dictate how waste streams are collected and, if this is done, there is also the potential that central government might fund Council's moving to the agreed collection methodologies. Funding would be provided via 'Extended Producer Responsibility'. In theory this scheme will result in packaging producers paying for the collection and disposal of their products, with this money then being diverted to local authorities. Producers who place non-recyclable packaging on the market will face higher charges.

3.3 Another element to consider is that the introduction of a kerbside glass service could positively impact our other services. Firstly, it is estimated that glass accounts for up to 8% of the entire waste stream. At the moment, some residents are putting glass in their residual bins. The introduction of this service would likely reduce this meaning less waste going to incineration. Secondly, the council currently achieve a recycling rate of 36%. If a kerbside glass collection was implemented the recycling rate would likely show a small increase (unlikely to be more than 2-3%). This is based on the assumption that glass currently put in the general waste stream and glass currently taken to bring sites would be captured by the kerbside collection diverting glass from the residual stream.

4.0 Options Considered – type of collection

4.1 Type of Collection: Option 1 Single 140L wheeled bin

Benefits

- Standard Refuse freighters (with slight modifications) can be used. These vehicles are far cheaper to purchase and enable rounds to be completed in a shorter timescale.
- There would not be any additional manual handling issues for collection operatives.
- An additional bin presents options for the future should the waste strategy be implemented in full as the bin could still be used for separate glass collection, or switched to another function, for example a glass and plastic mix.
- A bin means that customers have a higher capacity.

Challenges

- Collection in this manner can be noisy which presents additional health and safety concerns and may result in an increase in complaints from residents on collection days.
- Residents will need to have storage capacity for the additional bin. Furthermore, it will need to be judged whether households are automatically enrolled in the scheme, and have to opt out if they do not wish to have an additional bin or cannot store the bin (e.g. a town centre flat).
- If the resident cannot have a bin, consideration needs to be given to an alternative method e.g. keeping some bring sites.
- It should also be noted that implementing a glass collection will increase running costs as the collection hopper of the freighters will need to be refurbished more frequently.

Financial Impact

There are 45,150 households in the district (excluding the ROB area) with domestic bins. These figures are assuming every one of those households would need a bin and includes containers for housing of multiple occupation (flats) and bring banks.

Cost for Bin Purchase and Delivery (based on 45,150 homes)		
	Cost per container inc delivery	Total Cost
Bin Cost 140L	£23.65	£1,170,800
Bin Cost 240L	£28.50	£1,392,800

Prices quoted are current market prices and represent worst case scenario. Figures include trade type bins for House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) and flats.

If a kerbside glass collection is chosen to be implemented, then operationally a 140L bin would be the preferred container. The green and silver bins currently in use throughout the district are 240L containers. It is not expected that residents will be able to fill a container this size regularly before their next collection. A 140L bin will be easier for residents to store, cheaper for the council to supply and is less likely to be rejected by the vehicle lift due to weight than a 240L bin.

4.2 Type of Collection: 40L box container

Use of a 40L box has been considered, but has been deemed unsuitable for the following reasons:

- Boxes require bespoke vehicles to carry out the collection.
- Additional vehicles and crews would be required due to the slower method of collection.

- When compared to the bin there is less capacity meaning that collections are likely to be required more frequently.
- Boxes pose a **significant manual handling risk** to staff as they are heavy and will have to be lifted off the floor.
- Boxes are easily lost or stolen and can blow away in high winds or fill with rainwater.

Financial Impact

This is based on 45,150 households and includes an amount for containers for housing of multiple occupation (flats) and bring banks.

Cost for Box Purchase and Delivery (based on 45,150 homes)		
	Cost per box inc delivery	Total Cost
40L Boxes	£7	£411,050

Prices quoted are current market prices and represent worst case scenario. Figures include trade type bins for HMOs and Flats.

5.0 Options Considered – frequency of collection

5.1 The other element to considering these options is the frequency of collections. Please note that all the calculations below have been made with the assumption that collections will run at their current speed. But please note that if a collection is implemented using a box, then it is likely that the below costs would increase as the working time is longer.

5.2 4 Weekly Collection

If a four weekly collection was to be delivered, the district council would require 3 additional vehicles (2 main and a spare) and additional crew to cover absences.

The costs of implementing a four weekly collection (including estimated income) would be:

Frequency	Yr 1 Capital Costs (Vehicles, bins, transfer station)	Revenue Yr 1	Revenue Yr 2	Capital Yr 3 (Vehicle part replacement)	Revenue Yr 3	Revenue Yr 4	Capital Yr 5 (Vehicle Replacement & Transfer Station)
4 weekly (exc ROB area)	£1,955,500	£324,100	£478,700	£73,000	£485,900	£503,600	£873,200
4 weekly (inc ROB area)	£2,423,900	£437,200	£640,200	£109,500	£650,100	£675,900	£1,147,900

Staffing costs include the current assumed the latest forecast for 2022/23 pay award

5.3 8 Weekly Collection (Preferred Option)

If an eight weekly collection was to be delivered, the district council would require 2 additional vehicles (1 main and a spare) and additional crew to cover absences.

The costs of implementing an eight weekly collection (including estimated income) would be:

Frequency	Yr 1 Capital Costs (Vehicles, bins, transfer station)	Revenue Yr 1	Revenue Yr 2	Capital Yr 3 (Vehicle part replacement)	Revenue Yr 3	Revenue Yr 4	Capital Yr 5 (Vehicle Replacement & Transfer Station)
8 weekly (exc ROB area)	£1,740,200	£140,700	£247,100	£36,500	£251,300	£260,800	£598,400
8 weekly (inc ROB area)	£2,138,109	£257,800	£412,400	£73,000	£419,400	£437,100	£873,200

Staffing costs include the current assumed the latest forecast for 2022/23 pay award

An eight weekly collection model would be the preferred choice operationally. It has the lowest running costs of all the options presented and if a 140L bin is chosen as the preferred container then this should mean that customers have sufficient capacity to have less frequent collections. Several other local authorities including Mansfield DC have recently implemented a kerbside glass collection and have chosen this approach.

An 8 weekly collection could also serve as a pilot, ready to respond to changes resulting from the waste strategy and being relatively easy to scale to more frequent collections if there is a demand to do so. This may allow us to claim additional expenditure back from central government if the option arises.

6.0 Options for Recycling the Glass

As glass recycling is not part of the contract with Veolia, the Council has some flexibility over how the glass is brought together and then sold for recycling. Due to space constraints at the depot the option for collecting and storing the waste by expanding existing waste bays is not feasible. However, there are a number of potential routes to recycling the glass;

- a) A transfer point could be created at the rear of the Council's lorry park. This would involve initial set up and running costs. This would also result in the loss of several parking spaces. However, its location means it is less likely to generate noise issues. Thought needs to be given to any recharge from the corporate property team to cover this.

- b) The glass could be deposited at an external transfer station. This will save on any expansion costs but may add additional travel time and will diminish any potential income from the glass. Furthermore, it could even incorporate a gate fee which would cost the council additional revenue, so therefore all prices associated with this are not obtainable at this time.

Option A would incur both capital and revenue costs. A walled area (alfabloc) will need to be created to store the glass and fencing will have to be erected. The site will also need a tele-handler (a multi-purpose machines that can lift, move and place materials) which can be purchased or hired long term.

The costs involved in creating and running our own transfer station have been included in the cost tables shown in 5.2 and 5.3.

However, it is important to note, that the income received in the different situations is different (less income from outsourcing). The preferred option operationally is to have our own transfer station and further viability would need to be undertaken to establish which suit was best suited.

7.0 Income from Glass Recycling

7.1 *Material Income*

The costs of running a collection service are extensive but some income is achievable from the sale of glass for recycling and recycling credits (at this present time). As mentioned earlier, glass is one of the few materials which is 100% recyclable with no loss in quality during the recycling process and therefore we will be able to sell on any glass collected. The income that we will be able to achieve will be dependent on two factors.

1. How well the scheme is participated in by residents as this will directly impact the volume of glass we are able to collect.
2. The value of the glass, which is determined by market forces.
3. Continuation of recycling credits.

The table below estimates the income from glass collection;

	Total Tonnes per year	Additional Income for sale of glass		
		Income @ £19 per tonne	Income @ £25 per tonne	Income @ £35 per tonne
80% Capture	2,439	£46,340	£61,000	£85,400
66% Capture	2,012	£38,200	£50,300	£70,420

Given uptake at other Local Authorities and the strong appetite from residents for a kerbside glass collection it is reasonable to expect a good uptake of the scheme. Currently the price of glass is averaging between £19 and £25 per

tonne (One other Local Authority has recently signed a contract for £35 per tonne it remains to be seen if we could achieve the same income rate). The market price for glass has been steadily rising over the last 18-24 months with an average return in 2020 being around £8 per tonne (based on figures from letsrecycle.com) but it is worth noting that should the NWS dictate that glass is collected by all local authorities then the supply of glass will increase, and the price of glass will fall. If the price of glass goes below £0 then the council will have to pay for its disposal.

7.2 *Recycling Credits*

Recycling credits are paid to the district by Nottinghamshire County council for any items which are recycled outside of the County's contract. The figure given is calculated annually by passing on the savings made by diverting materials away from residual disposal streams. The service currently receives £110,000 per year, based on £66.13 per tonne set by Government, for the glass captured by our bring sites. Should glass be collected kerbside, we would expect an additional £22,900 to £51,100 depending on 66%/80% capture.

It is important to note that the figures quoted in the tables contained within paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 are net figures which include both the sales income and recycling credit payments

8.0 Next Steps

- 8.1** This report will recommend that should a decision be made to implement a kerbside glass collection then further investigatory work, including detailed finances, should be undertaken as there are price increases on a regular basis in the current climate.
- 8.2** With current supplier lead times it is likely that there could be many months of preparation to implement the service including activities like;
- Recruitment of additional staff,
 - Purchase of vehicle/s, bins and containers, (vehicles are currently at 12 months lead times in some areas),
 - Delivery planning e.g. design routes,
 - Set-up of new processes e.g. missed bin/box form, and
 - Communications to customer including collection calendars.
- 8.3** As mentioned in point 1.4, further consultation should take place with residents and partners to confirm that the method of delivery is acceptable to the public. It would be likely that this will take the form of a specific survey about glass collection as well a potential focus group. An approximate estimate for a market research company to carry this out would be around £15,000.

9.0 Implications

Financial Implications (FIN22-23/8815)

Expenditure

- 9.1** The table below summarises the additional costs for implementing the Kerbside Glass Recycling scheme based on the recommended 8 weekly collection.
- 9.2** The estimated costs for Capital expenditure in year 1 are based on today's prices plus an assumed 5%. All capital purchases thereafter also include an annual 5% uplift. The Glass Collection Vehicles have been assumed to last 5 years, with a small part replacement in year 2 (covered by an annual R&R budget) and a large part replacement in year 3 (through the Capital Programme), before a full replacement in year 5.
- 9.3** It has been assumed that the transfer station will initially be installed in the Lorry Park taking up 3 spaces. The loss of income has been based on 3 spaces at £16.25 (the net fee) per space for 209 days due to Monday – Thursday being the busiest days. These assumptions have been agreed with the Parking Services Manager.
- 9.4** Should the Lorry Park be relocated in the future, the glass recycling transfer station could stay in situ for a period until works start on the Lorry Park site. After which it would need to be moved to the preferred site. Year 5 has been estimated for the requirement to move or rebuild the transfer station. Plans are also underway to consider the long-term development of Brunel Drive and Farrar Close given the future need to electrify the fleet and to accommodate the requirements of the NWS.
- 9.5** The used Tele Handler is expected to last 7 years, with a part replacement in year 5 covered with an annual R&R budget included in the running costs with fuel and maintenance.
- 9.6** Glass Collection Vehicle Running Costs include R&R, tyres, fuel and maintenance.
- 9.7** The crew salary estimate is based on the assumed pay award for 2022/23 as per the MTFP.
- 9.8** The Refuse Collection budget currently contains an amount for bin replacement, it has been assumed that this should increase by £30,000 per year to account for the 140l bin replacements that the team will need to arrange on top of current replacements.

Capital Expenditure Financing

- 9.9** It is recommended that the Bin purchase be funded from the Change Management reserve, to reduce the annual impact on the general fund.

9.10 All other capital expenditure will be financed by borrowing and will therefore attract a cost for interest and Minimum Revenue Provision.

Additional Expenditure	Capital Year 1	Revenue Year 1	Revenue Year 2	Capital Year 3	Revenue Year 3	Revenue Year 4	Capital Year 5	Revenue Year 5
Bin Purchase	1,229,300							
x2 Glass Collection Vehicles Purchase	430,500			36,500			549,400	
Transfer Station	38,400						49,000	
Tele Handler	42,000							
x2 Glass Collection Vehicles Running Costs		52,000	53,600		55,200	56,800		58,500
Crew (x2 Drivers x2 Loaders)		121,700	125,500		126,900	133,500		137,500
Transfer Station Site R&R		2,500	2,500		2,500	2,500		2,500
Bin Replacement budget increase		30,000	30,900		31,800	32,800		33,800
Tele Handler Running Costs		7,500	7,500		7,500	7,500		7,500
Loss of Income from Lorry Park		10,200	10,500		10,800	11,100		11,400
Interest on Borrowing		28,900	28,900		28,900	28,900		28,900
Minimum Revenue Provision			99,800		99,800	99,800		99,800
Total	1,740,200	252,800	359,200	36,500	363,400	372,900	598,400	379,900

Income

9.11 The table below summarises the income that could be generated as a result of implementing Kerbside Glass Recycling. This income is not guaranteed and will be unpredictable following the release of the NWS however, this is what is expected based on the information held currently.

9.12 As per paragraph 7.2, the service currently receives recycling credits from Nottinghamshire County Council based on a value set by Government for glass

diverted from landfill. This is expected to increase by £51,100 if 80% of the district (outside the ROB area) participate in the scheme. The table also includes three amounts that could be received from recycling the collected glass.

Additional Income	Revenue Year 1	Revenue Year 2	Revenue Year 3	Revenue Year 4	Revenue Year 5
Additional recycling credits	(51,100)	(51,100)	(51,100)	(51,100)	(51,100)
Income generated from Glass Recycling	(61,000)	(61,000)	(61,000)	(61,000)	(61,000)
Total Income	(112,100)	(112,100)	(112,100)	(112,100)	(112,100)

Net Budget changes

9.13 If the above income is realised, the below shows the net budget requirement for both Capital and Revenue

Net Budget Requirement	Capital Year 1	Revenue Year 1	Revenue Year 2	Capital Year 3	Revenue Year 3	Revenue Year 4	Capital Year 5	Revenue Year 5
Total	1,740,200	140,700	247,100	36,500	251,300	260,800	598,400	267,800

10.0 Equalities Implications

All support provided for other domestic waste and recycling services would apply e.g., assisted collection.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Appendix 1 – glass recycling rates for other councils in Nottinghamshire.

Appendix 2 – recycling figures for other councils in Nottinghamshire.

WCA RECYCLING CREI	Apr	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	
Ashfield DC													
Glass - kerbside	296.10	275.40	287.86	289.92	264.58	249.92	225.86	223.08	258.34	301.42	254.88	250.56	3,177.92
Glass - bring banks	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bassetlaw													
Glass - bring banks	120.18	89.35	83.52	104.97	94.86	124.40	59.29	96.65	106.95	114.93	88.28	92.62	1,176.00
Broxtowe BC													
Glass - kerbside	199.20	170.11	224.44	141.50	56.62	198.46	170.27	172.98	179.31	255.76	142.10	171.64	2,082.39
Glass - bring banks	45.45	28.95	29.30	40.47	17.84	14.33	20.06	18.36	23.85	18.56	23.91	36.44	317.51
Gedling BC													
Glass - kerbside	274.36	250.5	280.34	269.70	234.82	221.58	201.60	216.74	246.92	301.06	207.84	237.40	2,942.86
Glass - bring banks	16.39	13.06	14.51	16.16	4.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.16	0.00	0.00	80.83
Mansfield DC													
Glass - kerbside	0.00	389.26	194.40	223.72	166.92	188.30	166.42	167.11	165.04	222.98	252.44	165.94	2,302.53
Glass - bring banks	57.49	39.05	44.12	37.261	17.85	18.85	0.00	11.31	23.71	0.00	8.80	0.00	258.44
Newark & Sherwood DC													
Glass - bring banks	156.42	148.22	138.65	179.73	133.83	120.98	138.199	112.64	149.81	148.13	118.35	121.73	1,666.70
Glass - kerbside (R.O.B)													510.90
Rushcliffe BC													
Glass - bring banks	311.75	285.55	255.20	299.87	228.04	254.66	227.67	257.86	256.25	284.22	226.18	224.81	3,112.06

2022/23 Recycling rates

Local Authority	Recycling Rate
Ashfield District Council	58.7%
Bassetlaw District Council	26.4%
Broxtowe Borough Council	35.7%
Gedling Borough Council	33.1%
Mansfield District Council	32.1%
Newark & Sherwood District Council	36.0%
Rushcliffe Borough Council	48.0%

Topic Request Form

Available on Mod.Gov or by contacting the Democratic Services lead for PPI. To be considered at the next PPI Committee the form must be submitted 20 working days before the next meeting.

Topic Request Form		
Please complete the first section of this form to request that a topic is considered by the Policy and Performance Improvement Committee. Please send the completed form to Helen Brandham		
Section 1: Member Request		
Proposed topic	Review of the Town Centres Strategy	
I would like to understand (key lines of enquiry)	How the Town Centres Strategy has been developed, its KPIs and how these are been achieved and potential KPIs for the next 2 years.	
I think this topic should be considered because	This topic needs consideration as its achievements are unclear; it may be an area of poor performance but its success has the opportunity to improve the quality of life of residents or achieve greater value for money across at least two of the town centres of the District.	
(if applicable) High level evidence supporting the reason for consideration		
Proposed by (name of member)	Peter Harris	Ward: Southwell Party: Lib Dem
Seconded by (name of member)	Malcolm Brock	Ward: Southwell Party: Lib Dem
Date form is submitted	Sept 6 2022	
Section 2: Officer Recommendation		
Officer comment	Officers discussed this request with Councillor Harris to seek further clarity on the direction of a town centre strategy review. He provided helpful guidance outlining that he wanted to know about progress with town centre development (as outlined in the Economic Growth Strategy) in terms of the success of and progress against the outlined priorities, programmes/projects and interventions. The strategy outlines these plans, and an annual update is taken to members updating on progress against the strategy. The last update was in September 2021, and the next update will go to Cabinet in November 2022 . As this information will be available for consideration by all members, in line with Cabinet publish dates, we do not recommend undertaking a review, as this information is in the upcoming reporting plan.	
Officer recommendation	Do not undertake a review	
Officer name	Ella Brady	Role: Transformation and Service Improvement Manager
Date information added	29.09.2022	
Section 3: PPI Chair Recommendation		
PPI Chair comment	Given the information will be presented at the next Cabinet meeting and this is annually reviewed and assessable by	

Topic Request Form

	members, I do not think PPIC will add any value in carrying out an additional review.	
PPI Chair recommendation	Do not undertake a review	
Date information added	06.10.2022	Role: Chairman
Next step	Completed form to be taken to PPI on 17 October 2022	



Report to: Policy & Performance Improvement Committee Meeting, 17 October 2022

Director Lead: Deborah Johnson, Director of Customer Services and Organisational Development

Lead Officer: Ella Brady, Transformation and Service Improvement Manager

Report Summary	
Report Title	Reviewing our Customer Communication
Purpose of Report	To provide members with additional detail on the customer communication topic raised by residents in the 2022 Resident Survey consultation.
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Members set-up a working group to review customer communication experiences and feed these reflections into the development of the Customer Strategy. b) Members add a review of the Communications Strategy to the Committee Work Programme to ensure this strategy appropriately considers/responds to resident feedback.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 It is part of Newark and Sherwood’s vision to be driven by what matters most to its residents, and therefore the Council wants to consider the views and priorities of residents in the development of the next Community Plan (to cover 2023 to 2027). As such, the Council undertook district wide consultation, the 2022 Resident Survey, to inform the development of the plan in 2023. The results of this consultation were presented to Policy and Performance Improvement Committee members on the 26 September 2022.
- 1.2 This consultation was three-pronged with the elements being, an open survey, a representative survey (which was gathered to sense check the open survey), and a series of focus groups.
- 1.3 As part of the open survey, respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with their local area and their experience with the Council. Underneath this question was a comment box requesting specific feedback and areas for improvement. 919 comments were submitted in this box and the comments were analysed and grouped into themes. The largest theme, with 260 comments, was ‘Council Communication’. Members requested further information on this topic with the intension of setting up a working group to look at this issue. This working group would review the customer experience in relation to residents communicating with the Council and tie the findings into the development of a Customer Strategy.
- 1.4 The Customer Strategy is currently in development for decision at Cabinet in 2023. This working group would be an opportunity for customer experience to feed into this strategy to ensure the strategy results in customer led processes, and the setting and embedding of high-quality customer care standards.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 The 'council communication' theme can be further broken down into three elements.

Quantity of, and Approach to, External Communication	Quality of Service Communication	Consultation
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•This communication is to inform residents about the work of the Council•Some survey respondents felt they did not understand the work of the Council and want to know more about its work to achieve greater transparency. Respondents also expressed a wish for this communication to be via a range of media e.g. community notice boards, social media•The approach to developing the Council's external communication will be part of the Communications Strategy currently in development and on the Forward Plan for decision in 2023.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•This communication is related to the Council's response to complaints, and other feedback as well as service requests•Some survey respondents felt that their service requests were not always replied to or the reply took too long. Whilst others felt that some processes were complex and it wasn't clear what would happen next in the process e.g. when to expect a response•Some survey respondents also felt their feedback wasn't acknowledged and their feedback was not taken seriously enough•The approach to developing the Council's communication with residents is within the Customer Strategy on the Forward Plan for decision in 2023.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Some residents don't feel listened to and want to be consulted with more•The principles of consultation and engagement with residents are laid out in the Consultation and Engagement Strategy.•The effectiveness of this strategy will be reviewed by Policy and Performance Improvement Committee after one year of implementation, and this would be an appropriate time to reflect on this feedback.

2.2 Therefore, this report proposes that members add a review of the Communications Strategy (currently in development) to this Committee's Work Programme. To ensure this strategy appropriately considers/responds to resident feedback. It also proposes that members set-up a working group to undertake a review of customer communication to feed this valuable customer experience insight into the development of the Customer Strategy.

2.3 This review of customer communication would cover three key areas. Each area would be reviewed, looking at the current practices and processes, to ensure they are of good quality and fit for purpose when compared to customer experiences and needs. The three areas are;

- To review how customers get in touch, considering method and hours of contact,
- To review how the council handle enquiries, considering tone of staff and style of communication (aiming for clear and proactive communication), and
- To review how the council constantly improves its customer service and learns from customer feedback, considering performance measures and improvement procedures.

3.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations' officers have considered the following implications; Data Protection, Digital and Cyber Security, Equality and Diversity,

Financial, Human Resources, Human Rights, Legal, Safeguarding and Sustainability, and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Resident Survey Outcomes Presentation to the Policy and Performance Improvement Committee on 26 September 2022.

[Code of recommended practice on local authority publicity](#)