

3 June 2016

WHITTLE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 13 JUNE 2016

A meeting of the Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be held at 5.30pm on Monday 13 June 2016 in Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Rugby.

Councillor Howard Roberts
Chair of Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

A G E N D A

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Minutes

To confirm the minutes of the meetings held on 14 March and 19 May 2016.

2. Apologies

To receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

3. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations of:

(a) non-pecuniary interests as defined by the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors;

(b) pecuniary interests as defined by the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors;

(c) notice under Section 106 Local Government Finance Act 1992 – non-payment of Community Charge or Council Tax.

Note: Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their non-pecuniary interests at the commencement of the meeting (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a pecuniary interest, the Member must withdraw from the room unless one of the exceptions applies.

Membership of Warwickshire County Council or any Parish Council is classed as a non-pecuniary interest under the Code of Conduct. A Member does not need to declare this interest unless the Member chooses to speak on a matter relating to their membership. If the Member does not wish to speak on the matter, the Member may still vote on the matter without making a declaration.

4. Leader and Executive Director: discussion of performance and future strategy in relation to the Executive Director's area of focus.
5. Matters arising from Finance and Performance Report to the Committee on 14 March 2016.
6. Scrutiny Review of Dog Control Orders and Public Spaces Protection Orders.
7. Mental Health Services for Young People.
8. Committee Work Programme.

Any additional papers for this meeting can be accessed via the website.

Membership of the Committee:

Councillors H Roberts (Chair), Allen, Birkett, Brown, Douglas, Gillias, Keeling, Pacey-Day and Ms Watson-Merret

If you have any general queries with regard to this agenda please contact Linn Ashmore, Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer (01788 533522 or e-mail linn.ashmore@rugby.gov.uk). Any specific queries concerning reports should be directed to the listed contact officer.

If you wish to attend the meeting and have any special requirements for access please contact the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer named above.

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

<i>Name of Meeting</i>	Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee
<i>Date of Meeting</i>	13 June 2016
<i>Report Title</i>	Leader and Executive Director
<i>Ward Relevance</i>	None
<i>Contact Officer</i>	Paul Ansell, Tel: 01788 533591
<i>Summary</i>	The Leader of the Council and the Executive Director have been invited to meet with the Committee to discuss performance and future strategy.
<i>Financial Implications</i>	There are no financial implications relating to this report.
<i>Risk Management Implications</i>	There are no risk management implications arising from this report.
<i>Environmental Implications</i>	There are no environmental implications arising from this report.
<i>Legal Implications</i>	There are no legal implications arising from this report.
<i>Equality and Diversity</i>	No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.

Public Report to Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

13 June 2016

Leader and Executive Director

Summary

The Leader of the Council and the Executive Director have been invited to meet with the Committee to discuss performance and future strategy.

1. BACKGROUND

When the Whittle and Brooke overview and Scrutiny committees were created, it was decided that the Leader would be invited to attend a meeting of each scrutiny committee along with one of the Executive Directors. The focus of discussion at each meeting would be aligned with the remit of the respective Executive Director.

2. DISCUSSION FOCUS

The discussion with the Leader and Adam Norburn at the Brooke Committee on 18 January focused on:

- the revised Corporate Strategy – including the process through which it is being developed, and the evidence base and any analysis of the council's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats that will inform the new Strategy
- the impact of the latest local government finance settlement on the council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.

To avoid duplication, it would be desirable for the discussion at this meeting not to dwell on these.

At the time of the January Brooke OSC meeting, responsibility for particular portfolio areas was divided between the two Executive Directors and that meeting dealt with the areas for which Adam Norburn was responsible. Under the recent management changes, this division no longer exists. However, this meeting will still deal with the areas that were not Adam's responsibility in January and were therefore excluded from discussion at that time. Broadly, these are:

Growth and Investment, including

- Development strategy
- Development and enforcement

- Building Control
- Economic development
- Housing strategy
- Art Gallery and Museum
- Sport & recreation
- Benn Hall and Old Tool Shed Café

Environment and Public Realm, including

- Works Services Unit
- Parks and open spaces
- Arboriculture
- Bereavement Services (crematorium and cemeteries)
- Public health regulatory services
- Community safety
- Health and safety and resilience

Communities and Homes (part)

- Operational housing
- Housing options

3. TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

The following issues for discussion have been suggested:

- The Executive's vision for the expanded Rugby and how we are going to achieve it.
- Green policies
 - Air pollution
 - Traffic
 - Long-term strategy for recycling
- Future of The Retreat and The Lawn
- Developing relationships with other councils
- What is the Council doing to encourage individuals, builders and developers to get empty properties back on the market? Can we be confident that we are defining "empty properties" correctly and that we know the real number?

Other topics may be raised at the meeting.

Name of Meeting: Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of Meeting: 13 June 2016

Subject Matter: Leader and Executive Director

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

There are no background papers relating to this item.

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

<i>Name of Meeting</i>	Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee
<i>Date of Meeting</i>	13 June 2016
<i>Report Title</i>	Matters arising from Finance and Performance Report to the Committee on 14 March 2016
<i>Ward Relevance</i>	None
<i>Contact Officer</i>	Paul Ansell, Tel: 01788 533591
<i>Summary</i>	<p>This report provides a consolidated response to matters raised at the last Whittle O&S Committee meeting during consideration of the Quarter 3 Finance and Performance report.</p> <p>Members are asked to consider whether they wish to make any recommendations for changes to Finance and Performance reporting in the light of the responses on fly tipping, street cleansing, recycling and community safety, balancing any resource implications against the benefits that would result.</p>
<i>Financial Implications</i>	There are no financial implications relating to this report.
<i>Risk Management Implications</i>	There are no risk management implications arising from this report.
<i>Environmental Implications</i>	There are no environmental implications arising from this report.
<i>Legal Implications</i>	There are no legal implications arising from this report.
<i>Equality and Diversity</i>	No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.

Public Report to Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

13 June 2016

**Matters arising from Finance and Performance Report to the
Committee on 14 March 2016**

Summary

This report provides a consolidated response to matters raised at the last Whittle O&S Committee meeting during consideration of the Quarter 3 Finance and Performance report.

Members are asked to consider whether they wish to make any recommendations for changes to Finance and Performance reporting in the light of the responses on fly tipping, street cleansing, recycling and community safety, balancing any resource implications against the benefits that would result.

1. BACKGROUND

On 14 March, the committee asked for a further report on matters arising from consideration of the Quarter 3 Finance and Performance report. These matters related to:

- fly tipping
- street cleansing
- recycling
- community safety
- the cost of town centre WiFi

In relation to the first four of these, this paper discusses the following:

- What indicators for these could be provided
- How useful they would be (i.e. what would they really tell us about performance)
- Whether we have the resources to collect and report the data (and, even if we do, would it be a good use of resources to do so?)
- If we cannot support an RPMS indicator for all of these, how else could scrutiny committees be informed of performance?

2. FLY TIPPING

The Head of Environment and Public Realm reports that there is no statutory definition of fly tipping. However, it is regarded as the illegal deposit of waste on

either public or private land contrary to Section 33(1)(a) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The types of waste fly tipped range from 'black bag' waste to large deposits of materials such as industrial waste, tyres, construction material and liquid waste. It can range in scale from a carrier bag to lorry loads of material.

The council has until recently been required to log data into a national database called Flycapture operated by the Environment Agency for the UK Government. This has now been incorporated in the WasteDataFlow website which serves as the data collection system for the current Defra Municipal Waste Management Survey.

The data submitted by ourselves and others is often flawed and not always comparable due to the constraints of the database and interpretations made to compile returns.

In our case we do not always record every incident of fly tipping as our operatives will remove it if they see it before reports are made and these proactive clearances do not get recorded. Our service standard is to seek to remove fly tipping within 24 hours of being advised of an incident. Large loads or problem wastes will take longer as they require specialist equipment.

WasteDataFlow also records the amount of follow up enforcement action taken. Unfortunately, because of the way that the database is set up, we are often unable to link the two elements with the existing data systems we have. A copy from WasteDataFlow is provided for easy reference at Appendix 1. This does not give a simple single piece of data to track.

The warden services are a useful response service to initiate investigations of fly tipping incidents and, together with other parts of the Regulatory Services team, deliver a wide range of sanctions against offenders ranging from fixed penalty fines, civil sanctions and cost recovery to criminal proceedings. These investigations can be protracted and time consuming.

Community engagement exercises to improve local neighbourhoods can increase the reporting of fly tipping incidents. We also undertake some multi-agency proactive operations with the police and other agencies aimed at disrupting illegal activities including waste offences.

The number of fly tipping incidents may be interesting but does not really give any help in fighting the problem and the same may be said of the recording of data on enforcement actions or interventions.

3. STREET CLEANSING

The Head of Environment and Public Realm reports that we do not measure litter and detritus and as such have no way of providing objective data on this. Whilst there is an approved code of practice for grading different types of land according to the amount of defacement by litter, it can only ever be a snapshot in time.

This used to be done when we had to report a national indicator on it (NI 195). Compiling the data for this indicator was onerous and demanding on resources and

the removal of this reporting requirement allowed a reduction and redeployment of resources.

The only data that we would now be able to provide would be the number of contacts into the council reporting issues and incidents of litter, graffiti etc. However this is not a measure of performance and as such has little practical value.

We could report on the number of fixed penalty tickets that have been issued each month for littering and similar offences, but these do not necessarily cover the full extent of enforcement or education activities to reduce and manage litter. Again, this data is part of the information recorded within WasteDataFlow. Similarly we might be able to report on the number of organized litter picks in local communities. Neither of these indicates the level of cleanliness of the borough.

4. RECYCLING AND WASTE

There are already a number of indicators related to waste and recycling. Due to delays in obtaining the data to complete these indicators they have little practical benefit in improving services and they are really just a historical record of trend information.

As with fly tipping, we are required to submit reports to WasteDataFlow which in turn produces statistics for Government for a number of Best Value Performance Indicators and National Indicators. These reports are attached at Appendix 2 as an illustration of the detail of information that they contain. When considering data requirements for members and officers it is important to note that most of the indicators tell us little or nothing when looked at individually. It is impossible to condense them into just a few indicators that provide a true and comprehensible picture of overall performance. The RPMS therefore just contains indicators on cumulative tonnage (LI077) and percentage (LI091) of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting of household waste.

We have a range of operational data regarding actions taken to address contamination. However these tend to be lists of properties where various thresholds of intervention have been undertaken; for example the properties where bins have been rejected or removed. The value of such data to the committee as a means of measuring performance is questionable.

We may split the services into three separate segments:

4.1. Organic Recycling (food and garden waste – the green bin)

Predominantly this is garden waste, which the council has no obligation to collect from households and the council could charge for this element of the service. Predominantly this material is composed of water and as such is a very expensive discretionary service provided for residents' convenience. The negative environmental impact of collection and treatment significantly outweighs the environmental benefits of recycling this material. However the weight of this material boosts recycling tonnages and perhaps distorts the reality.

Food waste must be collected free of charge but it makes up a small fraction of the green bin contents. This could be collected in the black bin and sent for disposal.

Weight data for this stream is affected by the moisture content of the garden waste and the growing conditions, principally of grass. This will have the greatest impact on the apparent performance for this waste stream. No other data sources exist or are of benefit to monitoring performance.

4.2. Dry recycling (the blue-lidded bin)

Given the current state of the world commodity market, the recycling industry is in a depressed and volatile condition. The current lack of demand for raw materials, the relatively low price of oil and overproduction of other materials in the world market have a significant impact on the domestic recycling market. As demand for recyclable materials is very low, there is therefore an expectation of increased quality from those who are buying the materials.

This distortion has impacts on the performance locally of our recycling services. We have a concern about levels of contamination in the blue lidded bins. However this is difficult to monitor reliably and consistently for reporting purposes.

We have two sources of information available:

We have information from the recycling facility regarding the percentage of waste from test loads. This is interesting and is linked to the basket value for our input materials. However, these test loads are taken on one or two days a month, and each test will relate to different collection rounds. We know that the quality of materials will vary at different areas of the town/borough due to the socio-economic make-up of the population, density of population and stability of the residential population. Whilst this data set may be a useful source of trend data, it is too disparate to be a useful or reliable indicator of actual performance across the whole service.

The other data source is the actual crews. They should record bins that are not collected due to obvious and gross contamination. Although obviously this is not a reliable measure as we still have “hidden” contamination as explained above that gets through to the plant. This would also fail to report on the properties where the service has been withdrawn due to persistent abuse of the collection services.

It has in the past been suggested that the cost of recycling would be an interesting indicator. There are some concerns with that approach, as much of that data would be commercially confidential. The service costs are reported in the quarterly finance data anyway.

4.3. The black bin (residual waste)

This is perhaps the most consistent and reliable stream of the three. Ideally we would wish to see a reduction in waste production. We do eventually get information from Warwickshire County Council regarding the amount of household waste we take to landfill or energy from waste plants. This data is reported regularly to the Warwickshire Waste Partnership.

The Waste Partnership also commissions and receives a number of other pieces of data such as compositional analysis. An example of the data that the Waste Partnership produces is attached at Appendix 3.

5. CONCLUSION ON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR FLY TIPPING, STREET CLEANSING AND RECYCLING AND WASTE

The Head of Environment and Public Realm has described how the routine collection and reporting of data for a range of performance indicators has been discontinued because it is demanding on resources, it was difficult in some cases to perform accurately, it did not helpfully inform service improvement and it distracted employees from the core task of providing the service.

The reinstatement of indicators, or the creation of new indicators, would have a resource implication, which would be likely to require Cabinet approval and could have a detrimental effect on service delivery.

However, it would not be unrealistic to examine each of these topics at scrutiny committee meetings occasionally – say, annually – to take stock of performance.

6. COMMUNITY SAFETY PERFORMANCE DATA

It was agreed that officers would raise the issue of the reporting of community safety performance data with the Head of Environment and Public Realm to see how robust the Community Safety Partnership's management systems were, and to explore ways of measuring performance and making the data available for scrutiny.

This matter had been discussed in connection with the proposal to remove the reporting from quarterly reports to Cabinet of LI105 (Percentage of personal anti-social behaviour cases where the victim's vulnerability score is reduced).

It was noted that this information was reported to the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Board and that the Head of Environment and Public Realm had requested its removal from the quarterly Cabinet finance and performance report. A member questioned why reporting to the CSP Board precluded its inclusion in the Cabinet report.

Whilst inclusion in the Cabinet Finance and Performance report is not actually precluded, performance reports to Cabinet generally seek to inform members about the performance of this Council whereas, in matters of community safety, it is a whole partnership of a wide variety of organisations that are involved.

Moreover, reporting of performance data to the CSP Board is no longer carried out routinely. It used to be the practice for the most recent data from the Warwickshire Observatory to be submitted to each Board meeting. However, the data was not compiled by the CSP and was found to be unreliable and difficult to interpret. This was also the experience of the Council's former Crime and Disorder Committee, which received the same data. These reports are now discontinued.

CSP data relates to the Partnership's priorities and these change from year to year. It is therefore not possible to establish year-on-year trends.

Also monthly or quarterly crime and disorder data provides insufficient evidence on which to draw conclusions about performance. For example, household burglary figures might rise steeply in a particular month or quarter in which cross-border offenders target Rugby but they might be quite stable, or reduce, in subsequent months. It would be quite wrong to take remedial action on the basis of short-term data and without the knowledge of police intelligence, which clearly would have to remain confidential.

The established practice is for the Community Safety Partnership Manager to make an annual report to a scrutiny committee, thereby satisfying the council's statutory requirement to have a committee that scrutinises the work of the CSP once a year. The Head of Environment and Public Realm suggests that this will continue to provide Scrutiny with accurate and meaningful data over a reasonable timescale. However, if there are particular matters of community concern, these can still be put into the committee work programme for special attention.

7. TOWN CENTRE WI-FI

Members questioned the amount of increased capital costs arising from the implementation of town centre Wi-Fi.

The Head of Growth and Investment reports that the £150,000 capital budget for town centre improvements was set by resolution at the 2015 Annual Council to provide "smart bins" and Wi-Fi in the town centre. At the time of setting this budget, detailed costings and specifications had not been available. The new bins in the town centre cost approximately £100,000 leaving a relatively small proportion to deliver Wi-Fi in time for the Rugby World Cup. The Wi-Fi system could have been provided within budget but the ongoing revenue costs would have been higher. The increased capital investment at this stage has therefore ensured better medium term value for money for the council.

Name of Meeting: Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of Meeting: 13 June 2016

Subject Matter: Matters arising from Finance and Performance Report to the Committee on 14 March 2016

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

There are no background papers relating to this item.

Authority	Rugby Borough Council
Period	Jan 16 - Mar 16

Incidents			
Total number of incidents this period	250		
Number of incidents by land type			
Highway	82	Agriculture	2
Footpath / Bridleway	65	Private Residence	4
Back Alley	8	Commercial / Industrial	0
Railway	0	Water course / bank	3
Council Land	86	Other (unidentified)	0
Sum of incidents by land type	250		
Number of incidents by primary waste type			
Animal Carcass	1	Construction / demolition / excavation	16
Green	6	Black bags - commercial	2
Vehicle Parts	1	Black bags - household	15
White goods	39	Chemical drums, oil, fuel	0
Other electrical	1	Other household waste	138
Tyres	11	Other commercial waste	16
Asbestos	3	Other (unidentified)	1
Clinical	0		
Sum of incidents by primary waste type	250		
Number of incidents by size and estimated clearance and disposal cost			
	Incidents	At (£) each	Total (£)
Single black bag	0	7	0
Other single item	28	29	812
Car boot load or less	9	29	261
Small van load	110	56	6,160
Transit van load	74	115	8,510
Tipper lorry load	22		7,700
Significant / multiple loads	7		2,520
Sum of incidents by cost	250		
			Estimated Total Cost (£) 25,963

Actions Taken			
Number and estimated cost of actions taken this period			
	Incidents	At (£) each	Total (£)
Investigation	14	33	462
Warning letter	1	33	33
Statutory notice	0	33	0
Fixed penalty notice	1	33	33
Duty of care inspection	0	33	0
Stop and search	0	324	0
Vehicles seized	0	33	0
Formal Caution	0	33	0
Prosecution	0		0
Injunction	0		0
			Estimated Total Cost (£) 528
Number of prosecution outcomes			
Absolute/conditional discharge	0	Custodial sentence	0
Community service	0	Cases Lost	0
Fine	0	Other (successful)	0
Paid fixed penalty notice	0		
Number of fines by level (excluding costs and Fixed Penalty Notices)			
£0 to £50	0	£51 to £200	1
£201 to £500	0	£501 to £1,000	0
£1,001 to £5,000	0	£5,001 to £20,000	0
£20,001 to £50,000	0	over £50,001	0
		Total fines this period	0



NATIONAL INDICATORS & Metrics - Rugby Borough Council

THIS INFORMATION IS PROVIDED FOR GUIDANCE ONLY – VALIDATION OF THE QUARTER MAY LEAD TO INFORMATION HAVING TO BE CHANGED.

Calculation Details for National Indicators (NI191 & NI192) are available from their individual detail tabs

NI and Comparator BVPI guidance can be found on the WDF website here: <http://www.wastedataflow.org/html/datasets.aspx#NI>

NB for 2014/15 please disregard the values for quarters where Qu100 hasn't been used. For these values please download the PI report for that quarter from the data authorisation page. Annual values will only be generated where Qu100 has been used for all quarters.

NI191: Residual Household Waste per Household (Provisional)

	Q1 2015/16	Q2 2015/16	Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Total For 2015/16
HH waste not sent for recycling, reuse or composting	5,486.88	5,577.09	5,764.28	-	16,828.25
Number of households	44,810.00	44,810.00	44,130.00	-	-
Residual HH Waste	122.45	124.46	130.62	-	-

From Detail Tab
CVAR
Kg / Household

NI192: Percentage HH waste sent for Reuse, Recycling or Composting (Provisional)

	Q1 2015/16	Q2 2015/16	Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Total For 2015/16
HH waste sent for recycling, reuse or composting	6,224.69	5,588.43	4,515.27	-	16,328.39
Total HH Waste Collected	11,711.57	11,165.52	10,279.55	-	33,156.64
Reuse, Recycling and	53.1%	50.1%	43.9%	-	49.2%

From Detail Tab
CVAR
per cent

Percentage of household waste arisings which have been sent for recycling - (BVPI82a Comparator) (Provisional)

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total For
	2015/16	2015/16	2015/16	2015/16	2015/16
Household dry recycling	2,189.47	2,065.50	2,102.87	-	6,357.84
Total HH Waste Collected	11,711.57	11,165.52	10,279.55	-	33,156.64
Dry recycling rate	18.69%	18.50%	20.46%	-	19.18%

*From Detail Tab
CVAR*

Percentage of household waste sent for composting or anaerobic digestion - (BYP182b Comparator) (Provisional)

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total For
	2015/16	2015/16	2015/16	2015/16	2015/16
Household Composting	4,030.88	3,518.48	2,408.76	-	9,958.12
Total HH Waste Collected	11,711.57	11,165.52	10,279.55	-	33,156.64
Composting rate	34.42%	31.51%	23.43%	-	30.03%

*From Detail Tab
CVAR*

N.B. The sum of the rates of BYPI comparator 82a and 82b will not match the rate of NI192 in situations where reuse is present

84a – Household Waste Collection (kilograms per head)

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total For
	2014/15	2015/16	2015/16	2015/16	2015/16
Waste Collected	43,665.17	11,706.27	11,157.56	10,274.90	-
Population	102,500	102,500	102,500	102,500	-
Waste Collection Per Head	426.0	114.2	108.9	100.2	-
					323.30

*tonnes
heads
Kg / head*

84b – Household Waste Collection % Change on Previous Year

	Total For	%Change
	2015/16	
Waste Collected	43,665.17	0.00%
Population	102,500	0.00%
Waste Collection Per Head	426.00	-

86 – Cost of household waste collection per household (WCA/UAs only)

	2014/15	Total For 2015/16
Cost of Waste Collection Households	#N/A	#N/A
Cost Per Household	0.00	£ / household

N.B. BVPI 86 uses cost data from Question 31, within the annual question group. Completion of this group of questions is now optional and so if not submitted, BVPI 86 will not be calculated.

91a – Kerbside collection of recyclables (one recyclable) WCA/UAs only

(Note that the annual figure for this BVPI is based on Quarter 4's figure only.)

	2014/15	Q1 2015/16	Q2 2015/16	Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Total For 2015/16
Number of Households	43,850	-	-	-	-	-
Households in Authority Area	-	-	-	-	-	-
Percentage Served	-	-	-	-	-	-

91b – Kerbside collection of recyclables (two recyclables) WCA/UAs only

(Note that the annual figure for this BVPI is based on Quarter 4's figure only.)

	2014/15	Q1 2015/16	Q2 2015/16	Q3 2015/16	Q4 2015/16	Total For 2015/16
Number of Households	43,850	-	-	-	-	-
Households in Authority Area	-	-	-	-	-	-
Percentage Served	-	-	-	-	-	-

From April 2011, data on the number of households served by a kerbside collection of x number of recyclables (question 7) is only reported in Qtr. 4 (Jan – March). This means that data for BVPI 91a and BVPI 91b will only be available in Qtr. 4 (Jan – March) for each year.

NI191 – Residual Household Waste per Household

Numerator : HH waste not sent for recycling, reuse or composting

	England NI 191 numerator - hh waste sent for recycling, composting or reuse C403	England NI 191 denominator - HH Total hh waste collected C404	England NI 191 numerator - HH waste not sent for recycling, reuse or composting C401
Q1	6,224.69	11,711.57	5,486.88
Q2	5,588.43	11,165.52	5,577.09
Q3	4,515.27	10,279.55	5,764.28
Q4	-	-	-
Total	16,328.39	33,156.64	16,828.25

From NI192 Detail *C-Var Driven*
Calculated here

Denominator : Number of households

	England NI 191 denominator - Number of households C208	England NI 191 denominator - Number of households C402
Q1	44,810	44,810
Q2	44,810	44,810
Q3	44,130	44,130
Q4	-	-
Annual figure	-	-

C-Var Driven *C-Var Driven*

Qrt 4's value is used for the annual NI 191 Calculation

See NI192 Details tab for definitions of C403 and C404

C208 is generated from the Dwelling stock figure upload

NI191 numerator (C401) = C404 - C403

NI191 Denominator (C402) = C208

NI192 – Percentage HH waste sent for Reuse, Recycling or Composting

Numerator : HH waste sent for recycling, reuse or composting

	England NI 192 numerator - hh waste sent for recycling, composting or reuse C403
Q1	6,224.69
Q2	5,588.43
Q3	4,515.27
Q4	-
Total	16,328.39

From Data Table

Denominator : Total HH Waste Collected

	Q23 HH Residual Waste C17	Q10, 12, 16, 17, 33, 34 Collected For Recycling (excl rubble) plus Q18 HH C21	Q10, 12, 16, 17, 33, 34 Collected for Reuse (excl Rubble) C504	Q23 Asbestos waste separately collected C604	England NI 192 denominator - Total hh waste collected C404
Q1	5,598.04	6,108.23	4.34	0.96	11,711.57
Q2	5,587.73	5,569.83	4.45	3.51	11,165.52
Q3	5,949.02	4,325.88	3.47	1.18	10,279.55
Q4	-	-	-	-	-
Total	17,134.79	16,003.94	12.26	5.65	33,156.64

C-Var Driven C-Var Driven C-Var Driven C-Var Driven C-Var Driven

NI192 numerator = See Data Table

This represents C403. See below for further

component breakdown

This represents C404

N.B. The proportions shown here are rounded to nearest whole number. A

NI192 Denominator = C504 + C21 + C17 + C604

Household Ratios

Proportion Residual Recycling Due To HHld Sources = C17 / (C17 + C18)

	Q23 HH Residual Waste C17	Q23 NH Residual Waste C18	Proportion
Q1	5,598.04	834.47	87.0%
Q2	5,587.73	833.65	87.0%
Q3	5,949.02	829.54	87.8%
Q4	-	-	-

C-Var Driven C-Var Driven

Proportion MRF Recycling Due To HHld Sources = C8 / (C8 + C10)

	Q11 Co-Mingled Collected C8	Q11 Co-Mingled Collected C10	Proportion
Q1	2,239.13	119.73	94.9%
Q2	2,179.78	180.22	92.4%
Q3	2,232.46	136.28	94.2%
Q4	-	-	-

C-Var Driven C-Var Driven

Proportion of Recycling Due To HHld Sources = C21 / (C21 + C4 + C25)

	Collected For Recycling (excl green, other compost, rubble) C4	Q10, 12, 16, 17, 33, 34 Collected For Recycling (excl rubble) plus Q18 HH C21	Q11 Green and other Compostable Collected For Recycling C25	Proportion
Q1	119.73	6,108.23	-	98.1%
Q2	180.22	5,569.83	-	96.9%
Q3	136.28	4,325.88	-	96.9%
Q4	-	-	-	-

C-Var Driven C-Var Driven C-Var Driven

Proportion of Reuse Due To HHld Sources = C504 / (C504 + C88 + C92)

	For Reuse (excluding green, other compost & rubble) C88	Q11 Green and Other Compostable Collected For Reuse C92	Q10, 12, 16, 17, 33, 34 Collected for Reuse (excl Rubble) C504	Proportion
Q1	-	-	4.34	100.0%
Q2	-	-	4.45	100.0%
Q3	-	-	3.47	100.0%
Q4	-	-	-	-

C-Var Driven C-Var Driven C-Var Driven

Item 7

Warwickshire Waste Partnership

17th June 2015

Waste Composition Analysis

Recommendation

The Waste Partnership is asked to note the overview of the recent kerbside waste composition analysis.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Warwickshire County Council commissioned a waste composition analysis to take place during a three week period in February/March 2015 (spring 2015) on behalf of the Partnership.
- 1.2 The analysis replicated the waste composition surveys undertaken in October/November 2012, February/March 2013 and February/March 2014 in order to provide comparable results.
- 1.3 The same households were surveyed during each waste analysis. The households were selected using Mosaic demographic profiles; so that results from each survey could be weighted to give the annual picture of the residual waste being collected within individual Waste Collection Authority's (WCAs), as well as across the County.
- 1.4 The latest survey, focused on the weight and composition of
 - kerbside residual waste containers
 - kerbside organic/green recycling containers
- 1.5 The data was split into primary categories and sub categories which are shown in **Appendix 1**.
- 1.6 The key aim of the waste composition analysis is to provide information which could be used by the Partnership when planning future services and campaigns etc.

2.0 Residual Kerbside Analysis

- 2.1 Where recorded, an average of 82% of households presented residual waste bins at the kerbside for collection (79% in 2014).

2.2 In terms of kerbside residual waste generation only, households were setting out an average of 5.94 kg/hh/wk for direct collection. This figure has decreased compared with the previous results which showed an average of 7.51kg/hh/wk in 2014.

2.3 Organics and Food

Food waste was seen to be the major component of residual waste forming 40.7% (39.6% in 2014) of the total, this equates to 2.42 kg/hh/wk (2.97 kg/hh/wk in 2014).

Up to 40% of this food waste is potentially home compostable (36% in 2014). This equates to 16% of the total residual waste (14% in 2014).

6.5% of all food waste in residual bins was still packaged (7% in 2014).

1.1% of residual waste was found to be garden waste (1.5% in 2014). Around 48% (45% in 2014) of this was soil and turf, with the remainder consisting of compostable garden trimmings.

2.4 Paper

9.3% of the residual waste in 2015 was paper items (9.1% in 2014). 41% of the paper or 0.23 kg/hh/wk was recyclable at the kerbside (48% or 0.33 kg/hh/wk in 2014). This equates to 3.8% of the total residual waste (4.4% in 2014).

2.5 Card and Cardboard

Card and Cardboard made up around 3.7% of collected residual waste (no change from 2014).

74.6% or 0.19 kg/hh/wk of card and cardboard was recyclable at the kerbside (79.5% or 0.22 kg/hh/wk). This equates to 2.8% of the total residual waste (2.9% in 2014).

2.6 Plastic

Plastics formed 13.1% or 0.78 kg/hh/wk of the residual waste (12.4% or 0.93 kg/hh/wk in 2014).

50% of plastic waste was due to plastic films representing 0.39 kg/hh/wk of residual waste. (48% or 0.45 kg/hh/wk in 2014).

67% of the remaining plastics consisted of recyclable bottles, tubs, pots and trays (52% in 2014). This equated to an additional 0.26 kg/hh/wk of recyclable material, forming 4.4% of the residual waste (0.25 kg/hh/wk or 3.4% in 2014).

2.7 Metal

2.8% of residual waste was metallic (1.9% in 2014).

66% of metallic or 0.11 kg/hh/wk was recyclable (79% or 0.11 kg/hh/wk in 2014). This equates to 1.8% of the total residual waste (1.5% in 2014).

2.8 Glass

Around 2.7% of residual waste was seen to be glass (2% in 2014).

82% or 0.13 kg/hh/wk of this glass was recyclable (83% or 0.13 kg/hh/wk in 2014). This equates to 2.2% of the total residual waste (1.7% in 2013).

2.9 Textiles

4.5% of residual waste was due to textiles (6.8% in 2014).

36% or 0.10 kg/hh/wk was seen to consist of re-usable clothing and shoes (67% or 0.34 kg/hh/wk in 2014). This equates to 1.6% of the total residual waste (4.6% in 2014).

2.10 Hazardous or Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE)

Just 1.6% of residual waste was deemed to be either Hazardous or WEEE (2% in 2014).

2.11 Disposable nappies

4.98% consisted of disposable nappies (5.38% in 2014).

2.12 Summary for kerbside residual waste

Overall 58.6% (57.9% in 2014) of collected residual waste could have been recycled at the kerbside – the equivalent of 3.48 kg/hh/wk (4.34 kg/hh/wk in 2014).

The potentially recyclable waste is largely made up of four material types; food waste 70% (68% in 2014), paper 7% (8% in 2014), plastic 5% (6% in 2014) and card/cardboard 5% (no change from 2014).

Residual waste collected from Warwickshire households was deemed to be around 68% biodegradable (66% in 2014).

Collected waste had a packaging content of 16%, or 0.97 kg/hh/wk; some of this is recyclable across the material types as noted above (13.2 % or 0.99 kg.hh.wk in 2014).

3.0 Organic Kerbside Analysis

3.1 Where data was available, 42% of households presented organic recycling bins at the kerbside (36% in 2014).

- 3.2 Households were setting out an average of 2.84 kg/hh/wk of organic recycling at the kerbside (5.23 kg/hh/wk in 2014).
- 3.3 Overall 43.1% (10.9% in 2014) of organic recycling waste collected from all properties was classified as contamination – the equivalent of 1.23 kg/hh/wk (0.57 kg/hh/wk in 2014). The majority of organic waste contamination was due to soil and turf; forming 93% of that presented (66% in 2014).
- 3.4 16% of food waste and 97% of garden waste was correctly captured (recycled) by households (12% of food waste and 99% of garden waste in 2014).
- 3.5 Warwickshire households diverted an average of 18.4% of their waste through these collections (36.6% in 2014).
- 3.6 Warwickshire households are therefore diverting around 1.62 kg/hh/wk of their total waste (8.82 kg/hh/wk) through their kerbside organic recycling collections (4.65kg/hh/wk of total waste (12.74kg/hh/wk) was diverted in 2014).
- 3.7 If all the organics available to current recycling schemes was captured and recycled then a diversion of 46.3% could currently be achieved (this was 60.4% in 2014).
- 3.8 If all food, garden and pet bedding organics recycled in all WCAs were fully captured; a potential diversion of 46.9% is possible (this was 62.2% in 2014).

4.0 Next steps

- 4.1 It is proposed that future communication campaigns target the recyclable material that is currently being disposed of in the residual waste at the kerbside.

Background Papers

None.

	Name	Contact Information
Report Author	Tamalyn Goodwin	tamalyngoodwin@warwickshire.gov.uk
Head of Service	Mark Ryder	markryder@warwickshire.gov.uk
Strategic Director	Monica Fogarty	monicafogarty@warwickshire.gov.uk
Portfolio Holder	Jeff Clarke	jeffclarke@warwickshire.gov.uk

Item 11

Warwickshire Waste Partnership

17th June 2015

Waste Statistics from Quarter 4 and the provisional data for 2014/15

Recommendations

The Waste Partnership is asked to note the provisional data for the 4th quarter (January to March 2015) and the estimated provisional data for the whole year 2014 - 2015.

1.0 Key Issues

1.1 Members of the Warwickshire Waste Partnership are presented with an estimate of waste and recycling figures at Disposal and Collection Authority level.

2.0 Data Overview

2.1 This report contains a mixture of data taken from Waste Data Flow and from Warwickshire County Council in-house records and at the publication of this report are considered **provisional estimates**

2.2 The figures should be treated as provisional, as data may be changed until all authorities data is approved by the EA and DEFRA through the Waste Data Flow System.

Provisional Waste Management Data Quarter 4 2014/15

Figures are taken from Warwickshire County Council in-house records and at the publication of this report are considered provisional estimates.

1. Total Municipal Waste Arising and Disposal Route (Tonnes)

	January	February	March	Q4 Total	Q3 Total
Total Tonnes	20,175	17,724	21,144	59,043	62,550
Landfilled	3,074	2,853	2,649	8,576	8,856
Inert - Landfilled	0	0	0	0	0
Energy from Waste	8,022	6,279	7,615	21,916	21,411
Other Technology*	0	0	0	0	0
In-vessel Composting*	2,358	1,959	3,650	7,967	12,227
Windrow Composting*	181	184	436	801	1,095
Other Composting*	0	0	0	0	0
Recycling (HWRC)	1,982	1,806	2,011	5,799	5,651
Recycling (WCA)	4,192	4,279	4,237	12,708	12,060
Reuse	366	364	546	1,276	1,250

*Other Technology – Refuse Derived Fuel

*Windrow composting – Outdoor composting of green garden waste from HWRCs, NBBC and NWBC

*In Vessel composting – Indoor controlled composting of garden and food waste from RBC, WDC, SDC

*Other composting – Chipboard and wood

2. Percentage of Waste by Disposal Route

	January	February	March	Q4 Total	Q3 Total
% Recycling	30.6%	34.4%	29.5%	31.3%	28.3%
% Composting	12.6%	12.1%	19.3%	14.9%	21.3%
% Reuse	1.8%	2.1%	2.6%	2.2%	2.0%
Total	45.0%	48.6%	51.4%	48.4%	51.6%

% Landfill	15.2%	16.0%	12.6%	14.5%	14.2%
% Energy from Waste and RDF	39.8%	35.4%	36.0%	37.1%	34.2%
Total	55.0%	51.4%	48.6%	51.6%	48.4%

3. Estimated Municipal Waste Performance Q4

	Q4 2013/2014	Q4 2014/2015	Change
Recycling/Reuse Rate	20,638 tonnes	19,783 tonnes	X 855 tonnes down
	34.2%	33.5%	X 0.7% down
Composting Rate	10,083 tonnes	8,768 tonnes	X 1,315 tonnes down
	16.7%	14.9%	X 1.8% down
Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate	30,721 tonnes	28,551 tonnes	X 2,170 tonnes down
	50.9%	48.4%	X 2.5% down
Landfill Rate	10,634 tonnes	8,576 tonnes	☺ 2,058 tonnes down
	17.6%	14.5%	☺ 3.1% down
Energy from Waste	19,002 tonnes	21,916 tonnes	☺ 2,914 tonnes up
	31.5%	37.1%	☺ 5.6% up
Total Municipal Waste	60,357 tonnes	59,043 tonnes	☺ 1,314 tonnes down
			☺ 2.2% down

4. Comparison of Municipal Waste Yearly figures 2013/14 to 2014/15

	2013/14 Year	2014/15 Year	Change
Recycling/Reuse Rate	78,693 tonnes	80,039 tonnes	☺ 1,346 tonnes up
	29.0%	29.5%	☺ 0.5% up
Composting Rate	67,592 tonnes	70,133 tonnes	☺ 2,541 tonnes up
	24.9%	25.8%	☺ 0.9% up
Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate	146,285 tonnes	150,172 tonnes	☺ 3,887 tonnes up
	53.9%	55.3%	☺ 1.4% up
Landfill Rate	67,806 tonnes	37,526 tonnes	☺ 30,280 tonnes down
	25.0%	13.8%	☺ 11.2%
Energy from Waste	56,977 tonnes	84,083 tonnes	☺ 27,106 tonnes up
	21.0%	30.9%	☺ 9.9% up
Total Municipal Waste	271,068 tonnes	271,781 tonnes	X 713 tonnes up
			X 0.3% up

NB. District recycling rates are taken from claimed recycling credits. Last years figures are taken from Waste Data Flow. All other figures are taken from Warwickshire County Council in-house records and at the publication of this report are considered **provisional estimates**.

5. District Provisional Performance – Household waste

Note: Figures are estimated from the Waste Management System and not Waste Data Flow therefore WCA reporting differences will exist.

	North Warwickshire		Nuneaton and Bedworth		Rugby		Stratford		Warwick	
	Year 2013/14	Year 2014/15	Year 2013/14	Year 2014/15	Year 2013/14	Year 2014/15	Year 2013/14	Year 2014/15	Year 2013/14	Year 2014/15
Recycling Rate	4,487 tonnes	5,609 tonnes	10,587 tonnes	9,328 tonnes	9,294 tonnes	9,187 tonnes	13,909 tonnes	13,667 tonnes	13,138 tonnes	11,213 tonnes
	17%	21%	22%	20%	22%	21%	26%	25%	27%	23%
Composting Rate	6,288 tonnes	7,631 tonnes	11,413 tonnes	11,548 tonnes	10,277 tonnes	10,886 tonnes	17,186 tonnes	18,837 tonnes	13,948 tonnes	14,870 tonnes
	23%	29%	23%	25%	25%	25%	33%	35%	28%	30%
Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate	10,775 tonnes	13,240 tonnes	22,000 tonnes	20,876 tonnes	19,571 tonnes	20,073 tonnes	31,095 tonnes	32,504 tonnes	27,086 tonnes	26,083 tonnes
	40%	51%	45%	45%	47%	46%	59%	60%	55%	53%
Residual	16,315 tonnes	12,960 tonnes	26,847 tonnes	25,553 tonnes	22,164 tonnes	23,450 tonnes	21,557 tonnes	21,257 tonnes	22,397 tonnes	23,048 tonnes
	60%	49%	55%	55%	53%	54%	41%	40%	45%	47%
Total	27,030 tonnes	26,200 tonnes	48,847 tonnes	46,429 tonnes	41,735 tonnes	43,523 tonnes	52,652 tonnes	53,761 tonnes	49,483 tonnes	49,131 tonnes

6. Estimated Household Waste Performance Q4

	Q4 2013/2014	Q4 2014/2015	Change
Recycling/Reuse Rate	16,924 tonnes	17,463 tonnes	☺ 539 tonnes up
	30.4%	31.8%	☺ 1.4% up
Composting Rate	10,434 tonnes	8,465 tonnes	X 1,969 tonnes down
	18.8%	15.4%	X 3.4% down
Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate	27,358 tonnes	25,928 tonnes	X 1,430 tonnes down
	49.2%	47.2%	X 2% down
Landfill Rate	9,091 tonnes	7,589 tonnes	☺ 1,502 tonnes down
	16.3%	13.8%	☺ 2.5% down
Energy from Waste	19,191 tonnes	21,429 tonnes	☺ 2,248 tonnes up
	34.5%	39.0%	☺ 4.5% up
Total Household Waste	55,640 tonnes	54,946 tonnes	☺ 594 tonnes down
			☺ 1.1% down

7. Comparison of Estimated Household Waste Yearly figures 2013/14 to 2014/15

	2013/14 Year	2014/15 Year	Change
Recycling/Reuse Rate	69,196 tonnes	71,198 tonnes	☺ 2,002 tonnes up
	26.9%	27.5%	☺ 0.6% up
Composting Rate	67,945 tonnes	69,762 tonnes	☺ 1,817 tonnes up
	26.5%	27.0%	☺ 0.5% up
Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate	137,141 tonnes	140,960 tonnes	☺ 3,819 tonnes up
	53.4%	54.5%	☺ 1.1% up
Landfill Rate	63,859 tonnes	34,245 tonnes	☺ 29,614 tonnes down
	24.9%	13.3%	☺ 11.6% down
Energy from Waste	55,857 tonnes	83,243 tonnes	☺ 27,386 tonnes up
	21.7%	32.2%	☺ 10.5% up
Total Household Waste	256,857 tonnes	258,448 tonnes	X 1,591 tonnes up
			X 0.6% up

8. HWRC Performance

	Burton Farm HWRC	Cherry Orchard HWRC	Hunters Lane HWRC & Transfer	Judkins HWRC	Lower House Farm	Princes Drive HWRC & Transfer	Shipston HWRC	Stockton HWRC	Wellesbourne HWRC	Total
Apr	71.2	71.7	70.8	50.8	73.6	73.8	78.6	68.4	70.4	69.9
May	73.6	72.8	72.6	47.9	71.0	66.5	72.6	70.4	74.7	69.1
Jun	74.5	74.6	75.9	65.2	74.4	64.3	79.7	72.9	76.7	73.1
Jul	74.2	78.8	74.1	62.1	71.8	69.5	79.5	72.3	76.9	73.3
Aug	74.3	72.9	76.6	57.1	74.3	67.9	74.5	75.1	70.4	71.5
Sept	73.2	75.1	73.7	55.4	72.8	70.0	76.4	72.3	77.1	71.8
Oct	76.2	72.0	73.4	54.1	66.0	65.4	70.6	84.8	74.1	67.5
Nov	71.3	69.7	64.7	61.7	85.6	59.4	77.3	63.7	67.0	68.7
Dec	64.7	63.0	62.9	51.9	64.7	60.5	67.7	60.6	68.9	62.0
Jan	65.7	67.6	67.4	53.0	64.8	58.4	77.1	58.4	64.6	62.4
Feb	73.2	71.8	69.6	57.2	69.1	61.0	67.2	57.9	63.8	65.3
Mar	68.2	76.4	71.6	65.6	70.6	61.3	82.9	54.2	72.8	67.7
Overall	71.7	72.2	71.1	56.8	71.6	64.8	75.3	67.6	71.4	69.7

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

<i>Name of Meeting</i>	Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee
<i>Date of Meeting</i>	13 June 2016
<i>Report Title</i>	Scrutiny Review of Dog Control Orders and Public Spaces Protection Orders
<i>Ward Relevance</i>	None
<i>Contact Officer</i>	Paul Ansell, Scrutiny Officer, Tel: 01788 533591
<i>Summary</i>	Members are asked to consider the one-page strategy for a review of dog control orders and public spaces protection orders.
<i>Financial Implications</i>	There is a budget of £500 available in 2015/16 to spend on the delivery of the overview and scrutiny work programme.
<i>Risk Management Implications</i>	There are no risk management implications arising from this report.
<i>Environmental Implications</i>	There are no environmental implications arising from this report.
<i>Legal Implications</i>	There are no legal implications arising from this report.
<i>Equality and Diversity</i>	No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.

Public Report to Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

13 June 2016

**Scrutiny Review of Dog Control Orders and
Public Spaces Protection Orders**

Summary

Members are asked to consider the one-page strategy for a review of dog control orders and public spaces protection orders.

1. BACKGROUND

The work programme report to the 14 March meeting referred to the inclusion of items in the longer-term work programme on public spaces protection orders and the role of wardens and rangers. The issue of wardens and rangers had emerged at the work programme workshop in relation to the enforcement of dog control orders. The issue of dog control orders has now brought this topic to the fore.

2. DOG CONTROL

The Council has four orders dealing with different aspects of dog control. These orders expire in September 2017. The legislation under which the orders were made has been repealed. Dog control will now be carried out by means of public spaces protection orders (PSPOs) made under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014

The Council already has a PSPO for the control of anti-social consumption of intoxicating substances. However, the use of PSPOs for controlling dogs is a new departure which, given the public concern and sensitivities and the relatively short time scale involved, would benefit from work by an O&S task group. Such a task group would encompass the issue of enforcement, thereby dealing with the outstanding matter of clarifying the roles of wardens and rangers. For these reasons, the Chairs and Vice Chairs have placed a task group review on this this topic in this committee's work programme.

A draft one-page strategy is appended for members' consideration.

Name of Meeting: Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of Meeting: 13 June 2016

Subject Matter: Scrutiny Review of Dog Control Orders and Public Spaces Protection Orders

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

Document No.	Date	Description of Document	Officer's Reference	File Reference
1	July 2014	Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014: Reform of anti-social behaviour powers Statutory guidance for frontline professionals	Paul Ansell	

SCRUTINY REVIEW OF DOG CONTROL ORDERS AND PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDERS

DRAFT ONE-PAGE STRATEGY

What is the broad topic area?

How can we encourage a change of behaviour on the part of those dog owners who do not comply with the present dog control orders?

What is the specific topic area?

The creation of public spaces protection orders (PSPOs) to replace the dog control orders when or before they become invalid in September 2017.

The inclusion in the PSPOs of other categories of persistent or continuing behaviour that has a detrimental effect on quality of life.

The enforcement of the new PSPOs, including clarification of the roles of the various wardens and rangers.

What is the ambition of the review?

Creation of an environment for the enjoyment of open spaces by all.

How well does the service perform at the moment?

There is a wide variety of open spaces and these are used in different ways by a range of different people. Consequently, some conflict arises, leading to community tension and complaints. There is limited ability to modify behaviour or enforce change because of limitations in the legislation.

The task group will seek to learn from the experience of the existing PSPO for the control of the anti-social consumption of intoxicating substances in the town centre area.

Who shall we consult about the current service and about how we can improve it?

Parish councils, users of parks such as sports clubs, dog club, model engineers and the general public.

What other help do we need?

Information from other councils, Legal Services.

How long should it take?

Six months maximum.

What will be the outcome?

Establishment of need for regulation to encourage appropriate behaviour in public spaces and to control inappropriate behaviour. Recommendations for implementing and enforcing this.

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

<i>Name of Meeting</i>	Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee
<i>Date of Meeting</i>	13 June 2016
<i>Report Title</i>	Mental Health Services for Young People
<i>Ward Relevance</i>	None
<i>Contact Officer</i>	Paul Ansell, Tel: 01788 533591
<i>Summary</i>	The purpose of this item is to consider the focus of the light touch review of mental health services for young people and to agree its one-page strategy.
<i>Financial Implications</i>	There are no financial implications relating to this report.
<i>Risk Management Implications</i>	There are no risk management implications arising from this report.
<i>Environmental Implications</i>	There are no environmental implications arising from this report.
<i>Legal Implications</i>	There are no legal implications arising from this report.
<i>Equality and Diversity</i>	No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.

Public Report to Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

13 June 2016

Mental Health Services for Young People

Summary

The purpose of this item is to consider the focus of the light touch review of mental health services for young people and to agree its one-page strategy.

1. BACKGROUND

The Overview and Scrutiny Chairs and Vice-Chairs have placed a light-touch review of Mental Health Services for Young People in the current year's committee work programme. Light-touch reviews are reviews that are carried out typically at just one meeting of an O&S committee. A tightly drawn specification is therefore imperative.

This is a particularly challenging requirement in relation to Child and Adult Mental Health Services (CAHMS) because the service has recently begun the process of implementing a major all-encompassing transformation plan for the redesign of CAMHS.

2. CAHMS TRANSFORMATION PLAN

The transformation plan is contained in the December 2015 document [Transforming Children and Young People's Mental Health and Emotional Wellbeing](#). This was published jointly by the three CCGs operating in Warwickshire. [If the link is not accessible to hard-copy readers, the transformation plan may be found on-line by Googling: "democratic warwickshire transforming children and young people's"]

Members are recommended to read this document before deciding which issues of particular local concern in Rugby Borough should be concentrated on.

It is important that health scrutiny carried out at district and council level brings to the issues a local perspective that is not present in county-level scrutiny of those issues. Care also needs to be taken not to duplicate scrutiny work that has already been carried out at county level. The Warwickshire Adult Social Care and Health OSC received a CAMHS progress update on 2 December 2015. Quoting directly from this update report, the transformation plan identifies seven key strategic priorities across Coventry and Warwickshire that align with national priorities and reflect the local CAMHS redesign:

- a. **Strengthening mental health support to children and young people in school:** using dedicated resource within school settings to increase awareness and identification of mental health needs and provide support young people at school.
- b. **Reducing waiting times for access to CAMHS services:** Additional investment will meet current and anticipated demand, to reduce waiting times for assessment and follow up appointments.
- c. **Reducing the number of young people awaiting an assessment for ASD:** Recent work to align the diagnostic pathway across Warwickshire will enable investment to meet current and anticipated demand.
- d. **Providing crisis support to young people presenting with self-harm:** building on the Acute Liaison service, children and young people will receive support using a stepped care approach with support provided through community intervention coupled with crisis support.
- e. **Dedicated mental health support for the most vulnerable:** By increasing the linkages between CAMHS professionals and Children's Social Care Teams to assist in the early identification of mental health needs amongst Looked After Children and those on the edge of care.
- f. **Enhancing access to information and communication through technology:** to increase reach and reduce the stigma through mental health promotion and dedicated resource, designed to meet the needs of young people and stakeholders.
- g. **Implementation of a newly developed community based Eating Disorder Service:** across Coventry and Warwickshire, designed to meet the national Access and Waiting Time Standards.

The minute of the County OSC discussion reads as follows:

Members of the Committee made the following points:

- *The time taken for this review to date. It was noted that the implementation date for the revised contract was shown incorrectly in the report and it would be in place for December 2016, not 2017.*
- *There was still much work to be done and members had concerns for those receiving support during the transition. The need for a clear contract between service user and provider was stated.*
- *The impact for school children, where disruptive behaviour occurred in classrooms was stated.*
- *It was felt the Committee should continue to monitor progress, for example on waiting time statistics, the standards being stated in the new contract and performance against those standards.*
- *The number of children currently waiting for support. Councillor Caborn offered to provide a briefing note, both for members of this Committee and the Children and Young People OSC with this information.*
- *There was discussion about the current waiting times for specific services for example for people with autism, or those who were committing self-harm.*
- *The impact of additional funding on reducing waiting times.*

- *Investment and funding were discussed more generally. Some funding was ring fenced, such as that for the community eating disorder service, whereas there was more scope in the use of the majority of the £30m of funding against agreed priorities.*
- *It was clarified that a county-wide collaborative approach involving all local authorities and CCGs was being taken.*

3. TOPICS FOR BOROUGH COUNCIL SCRUTINY

Because of the timescale and size of the transformation plan (and WCC's scrutiny work on it), members may be advised not to launch into an appraisal of the plan. However, it would be of interest to know what form the "collaborative approach involving all local authorities" is taking as far as Rugby Borough Council is concerned. Apart from this, members should perhaps concentrate on a few selected issues that they have identified as matters of local concern.

A particular change that has already occurred is the single point of access system (also referred to as single point of entry) operated by the Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership NHS Trust. Under this, a single team receives each referral (by phone, letter, email or web), puts it through a triage process and then refers it to one of a range of specialist teams for assessment and then, if required, treatment. Most of the outpatient referral appointments are at The Railings, the Trust's Rugby premises. The committee may choose to explore whether this system is working and whether referred patients are getting the treatment that they need.

A further constructive area for discussion may also be whether there are any particular conditions in young people that are becoming more common and creating difficult-to-meet demands on the system. Self-harming among young teenagers is well-publicised but are there others, and is there anything that Rugby Borough Council can contribute?

Members are asked to consider any other areas for consideration in the review.

A draft one-page strategy sheet is appended as the basis for discussion.

Name of Meeting: Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of Meeting: 13 June 2016

Subject Matter: Mental Health Services for Young People

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

Document No.	Date	Description of Document	Officer's Reference	File Reference
	Dec 2015	<u>Transforming Children and Young People's Mental Health and Emotional Wellbeing</u>	Paul Ansell	-
	2 Dec 2015	<u>Warwickshire County Council Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services progress update</u>	Paul Ansell	

LIGHT-TOUCH SCRUTINY REVIEW OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

DRAFT ONE-PAGE STRATEGY

What is the broad topic area?

Mental health services for young people resident in Rugby

What is the specific topic area?

The impact of recent changes in the delivery of mental health services for young Rugby residents with particular reference to:

- Single Point of Entry and the increasing number of referrals
- Redesign of CAMHS (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services) – what form of collaboration with district and borough councils is taking place?
- Whether users feel they are getting what they need
- Are there any particular areas of unmet need in Rugby?

What is the ambition of the review?

To highlight any changes that could be made to improve access to mental health services.

How well does the service perform at the moment?

To be determined during the course of the review discussion.

Who shall we consult about the current service and about how we can improve it?

Patient Groups
Mind

What other help do we need?

Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership Trust and Coventry and Rugby CCG to be invited to the meeting.

How long should it take?

One meeting

What will be the outcome?

A set of recommendations on measures to make improvement to the access to quality mental health service for young people.

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

<i>Name of Meeting</i>	Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee
<i>Date of Meeting</i>	13 June 2016
<i>Report Title</i>	Committee Work Programme
<i>Ward Relevance</i>	None
<i>Contact Officer</i>	Paul Ansell, Scrutiny Officer, Tel: 01788 533591
<i>Summary</i>	This report updates the committee on the progress of task group reviews and lists possible items for future meetings. The content of each committee's work programme is agreed jointly by the Chairs and Vice Chairs, but committee members are invited to suggest items for inclusion.
<i>Financial Implications</i>	There is a budget of £500 available in 2016/17 to spend on the delivery of the overview and scrutiny work programme.
<i>Risk Management Implications</i>	There are no risk management implications arising from this report.
<i>Environmental Implications</i>	There are no environmental implications arising from this report.
<i>Legal Implications</i>	There are no legal implications arising from this report.
<i>Equality and Diversity</i>	No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.

Public Report to Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

13 June 2016

Committee Work Programme

Summary

This report updates the committee on the progress of task group reviews and lists possible items for future meetings. The content of each committee's work programme is agreed jointly by the Chairs and Vice Chairs, but committee members are invited to suggest items for inclusion.

1. PROGRESS OF SCRUTINY REVIEWS

Review of On-Street Car Parking

This review will take the form of a select committee style meeting on 11 July (subject to confirmation of attendance from some key participants), followed by another committee meeting to make recommendations.

SLAs with voluntary sector organisations

Start date not yet agreed. It is suggested that the committee agrees a one-page strategy on 12 September.

2. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The Chairs and Vice-Chairs have so far allocated work to future meetings of the committee as follows.

12 September

Mental Health Services for Young People – as scoped at the present meeting

Finance and Performance Monitoring Quarter 1

7 November and 16 January

Nothing fixed yet

13 March

Finance and Performance Monitoring Quarter 3

This clearly does not represent a full work programme but it is expected that the future programme will become clearer following the Chairs' and Vice-Chairs' planning meeting on 20 July. The following topics have yet to be put into the work programme:

Portfolio holder reports – It is intended that a portfolio holder should report to one of the two committees every two months. The Communities and Homes Portfolio Holder is attending Brooke on 14 July, so it will be Whittle's turn to invite a portfolio holder in September.

Air quality management and monitoring annual update – O&S has been in the habit of receiving an annual report, the last one having been to Customer and Partnerships Committee in June 2016.

Reports on impact of past reviews – These will involve an in-depth examination of the lasting outcomes of O&S reviews and will be in addition to the customary periodic RPMS action plan reports.

Scrutiny review scoping and final reports

Ambulance service - Performance of the ambulance service in the borough to be revisited 12-18 months following the review that took place in March 2015

Name of Meeting: Whittle Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of Meeting: 13 June 2016

Subject Matter: Committee Work Programme

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

There are no background papers relating to this item.