



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL
HELD ON 9th FEBRUARY 2012**

PRESENT: Councillor J Oates (Chair), Councillors S Claymore, D Cook, R Cook, C Cooke, S Doyle, J Faulkner, J Garner, M Greatorex, A James, A Lees, A Lunn, R McDermid, K Norchi, M Oates, N Oates, S People, G Pinner, R Pritchard, S Pritchard, E Rowe and P Seekings

The following officers were present: Anthony E Goodwin (Chief Executive), Jane Hackett (Solicitor to the Council and Monitoring Officer) and Mary Gallagher (Legal and Democratic Services Manager)

56 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors T Clements, L Bates, B Beale, D Foster, K Gant, M Gant and M Thurgood

57 TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2012 were approved and signed as a correct record.

(Moved by Councillor R Cook and Councillor D Cook)

58 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest.

59 TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR, LEADER, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

None

60 QUESTION TIME:

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL NO.1
Under Procedure Rule No 11, Councillor C Cooke asked the Portfolio Holder for Environment & Waste Management, the following question:-

"It has been reported that Communities Secretary Eric Pickles has introduced a £250 million grant scheme for the return of weekly black bin collections. Will the portfolio holder assure me that this scheme will be considered as soon as possible for Tamworth's needs and a report giving comparative facts, costs and details be produced and made available for all councillors to comment on before any final decision is taken by the executive"

The Portfolio Holder for Environment & Waste Management gave the following reply:-

1. This grant scheme is a competitive process that any authority has to bid for, and, as such a successful bid is not guaranteed. Each bid will be scored by the task group set up for this grant, and a successful bid will reflect environmental benefits (improved recycling rates, reduced waste to landfill, CO2 emissions), innovation (being customer focussed, less bins for the customer, more effective or joined up procurement), cost effectiveness, and feasibility of delivery.
2. As you may be aware to implement any changes to our collection methodology we would need to do so in agreement with our joint administrative arrangement partner (Lichfield District Council), and the changes would have to be in the best interest of the joint service overall.
3. Since its commencement in July 2010 both authorities have benefited from an good increase in recycling rate (over 4% for Tamworth), and a large reduction in the weight of residual waste taken to landfill (in Tamworth's case a reduction of nearly 50kg's per household). Carbon emissions have also reduced as a result of route optimisation.
4. An initial overview of a revised weekly residual service has indicated (approximately) **an additional £1.2 million pounds** would be added to the waste collection budget per annum, which, if a bid were to be successful, could be funded over a 3 year period, this would directly impact upon the councils medium term financial forecast in year 4 onwards. Given the overall current budget for the shared service is approximately £3.4 million it does not demonstrate value for money by adding considerably to collection costs for no realistic benefits. A key requirement of the bid would be to demonstrate the service enhancements are sustainable after the grant ceases (for a total of 5 years), and given the recent austerity measures suffered by both authorities it is unlikely any service alteration that introduces additional cost would be sustainable.
5. There are also environmental impact on any service changes which need to be considered,
 1. The carbon footprint of the collection service would increase due to twice as many residual waste miles being completed (more collection activity will produce more emissions.)
 2. The efficiency of collections would reduce as it is probable vehicles would not be used to their maximum potential.
 3. It is likely the weight of residual waste would increase by approximately 6000 tonnes, and the weight of recycling could drop potentially up to 8%,

which in turn would reduce income from recycling credits, thus putting further financial pressures on the service

Finally with customer satisfaction at high levels with nearly 90% of residents being satisfied or greater with the service (taken from Tamworth's citizen survey in June 2011 and a similar survey completed in Lichfield in November) there is no indication of dissatisfaction with the current service.

Given the obvious large financial impact, and no environmental or economic business case to support a review of the collection service I do not intend to progress this matter further.

However if Members wish for further details on the above I will arrange for them to be sent to all Members if so required.

Supplementary Question

"I didn't ask for the report here and now but as you have given it anyway I should thank you. But would the portfolio holder like to agree and perhaps comment on the fact that central government tries to effectively determine and change local policies on such things by first bribing us one way and then the other with a system of grants and penalties?"

The Portfolio Holder for Environment & Waste Management gave the following reply:

No

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL NO.2

Under Procedure Rule No 11, Councillor C Cooke asked the Chair of Community & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee, the following question:-

"Will Cllr Gant confirm that the Scrutiny Committee set up to consider the issue of fluoridation of Tamworth's water supplies will produce a report of its findings with any recommendations which will then be sent back to this Council to consider, as described in part 4 of the Constitution, Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule no. 10 (Agenda Items)? "

The Chair of Community & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee gave the following reply:-

Rule Number 10 to which you refer has, as suspected, been quoted only in part. In order to understand the rule it requires to be read in its entirety and not paraphrased to suit the questioner. The Rule as a whole reads:-

"Any member of an overview and scrutiny committee or sub-committee shall be entitled to give notice to the Chief Executive that s/he wishes an item relevant to the functions of the committee to be included on the agenda for the next available meeting of the committee. On receipt of such a request the Chief Executive will ensure that it is included on the next available agenda. The overview and scrutiny

committees and sub-committees shall also respond, as soon as their work programme permits, to requests from the Council and if it considers it appropriate the executive to review particular areas of Council activity. Where they do so, the overview and scrutiny committee or sub-committees shall report their findings and any recommendations back to the executive and/or Council. The Council and/or the executive shall consider the report of the overview and scrutiny committee or sub-committee within one month of receiving it.”

There is no requirement to produce a report merely a requirement on a “request from the Council.... to review particular areas of Council activity....and to report their findings back to the Council.”

At its meeting on 12 July 2011 the Council accepted the “fluoride petition and referred the issue of fluoridation to the Community and Wellbeing or other appropriate scrutiny Committee for scrutiny as requested by the petitioners.”

That being said in terms of Article 6 there will be an annual report to Council on the Committees workings.

Supplementary Question

“I don't understand your answer. Are you saying that that there is something in what you have read out to say that the fluoridation committee will not produce a report and will not report back to the Council?”

(Your answer being that a report would be produced and returned to Council but it may not be in a written form - an answer that I accepted, thank you).

61 TAMWORTH CORE STRATEGY/LOCAL PLAN

The Report of the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development and Enterprise seeking approval to publish the Pre-submission Publication Draft Core Strategy; incorporating amendments agreed by Cabinet, in accordance with Regulations 27 & 28 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(Amendment) Regulations 2008, and seeking authorisation for officers to make minor changes to the Publication Draft Core Strategy and carry out any necessary further consultations with key stakeholders, prior to submitting it to the Government for Public Examination, in order to ensure a sound Core Strategy was considered.

RESOLVED:

That:

- 1 The Core Strategy be approved by Council for Pre-Submission Publication and following consultation on soundness for submission to the Secretary of State, in accordance with Regulations 27 & 28 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 (subject to recommendation (1a)
 - (a) Subject to no fundamental objections to the soundness of the Core Strategy being made during the Pre-Submission Publication Stage, the Core Strategy is approved for Submission, and;

- 2 Authority is delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning and Development Plan Manager, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development & Enterprise, to make any typographical and formatting (including the insertion of photographs) amendments to the Core Strategy prior to the Submission.

(Moved by Councillor S Claymore and seconded by Councillor J Faulkner)

Cllr C Cooke abstained

The Mayor

This page is intentionally left blank