



**GREAT YARMOUTH**  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

# Environment Committee

**Date:** Monday, 12 September 2016  
**Time:** 18:30  
**Venue:** Council Chamber  
**Address:** Town Hall, Hall Plain, Great Yarmouth, NR30 2QF

## AGENDA

Open to Public and Press

### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

### 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

You have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in a matter to be discussed if it relates to something on your Register of Interests form. You must declare the interest and leave the room while the matter is dealt with.

You have a Personal Interest in a matter to be discussed if it affects

- your well being or financial position
- that of your family or close friends
- that of a club or society in which you have a management role
- that of another public body of which you are a member to a greater extent than others in your ward.

You must declare a personal interest but can speak and vote on the matter.

Whenever you declare an interest you must say why the interest arises, so that it can be included in the minutes.

- 3**     **MINUTES**     **3 - 8**
- To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on the 20 July 2016.
- 4**     **MATTERS ARISING**
- To consider any matters arising from the above minutes.
- 5**     **DOG CONTROLS**     **9 - 27**
- Report attached.
- 6**     **QUARTER 1 PERFORMANCE REPORT**     **28 - 32**
- Report attached.
- 7**     **GARDEN WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE**     **33 - 41**
- Report attached.
- 8**     **MAINTENANCE OF A12 ROUNDABOUTS**     **42 - 43**
- Report attached.
- 9**     **EXTRA WORKS UPDATE**
- An update will be given at the meeting.
- 10**    **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- To consider any other business as may be determined by the Chairman of the meeting as being of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration.

# Environment Committee

## Minutes

Wednesday, 20 July 2016 at 18:30

PRESENT :

Councillor Smith (in the Chair); Councillors Annison, Bensly, Borg, Hanton, Pratt, Walch, Weymouth and Wright.

Councillor Borg attended as substitute for Councillor Fairhead

Councillor Hammond attended as substitute for Councillor Hacon

Councillor K Grey attended as substitute for Councillor Jones

Jane Beck (Director of Customer Services), Glenn Buck (Group Manager - Environmental Services), David Addy (Environmental Health Officer), and Sammy Wintle (Member Services Officer).

### **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fairhead, Hacon and Jones.

### **2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest declared at the meeting.

### **3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 8 June 2016 were confirmed.

### **4 MATTERS ARISING**

A Member referred to the use of wording in relation to Members questions and asked if Councillors names could be stated instead of "A Member ", the Chairman advised that the wording referred to was the standard format for minutes.

A Member advised that in relation to item 4, a rota in relation to road sweeping was yet to be received, the Director of Customer Services stated that an email had been circulated which contained details of types of road which were swept by GYBS although pointed out that it would be extremely difficult for exact roads to be highlighted due to the vast numbers.

A Member pointed out that also in relation to item 4, weeds at the Beaconsfield play area and stated that the length of the weeds were making the play area unsafe for children, the Group Manager, (Environmental Services) advised that this matter would be looked in to.

### **5 AIR QUALITY STATUS REPORT**

The Environmental Health Officer, provided Members with a brief overview of his report which set out to inform Members of the Great Yarmouth 2016 Annual Air Quality Status.

The Environmental Health Officer reported that Great Yarmouth Borough Council must annually report on the status of the air quality within the Borough, as required by Part IV of the Environment Act 1995. He advised that overall the Air Quality Annual Status Report has not revealed any exceedance of air quality standards and has not predicted any likely exceedance over the next 12 months.

A Member asked in relation to Table A2 within the report, why there was a variation of heights used to measure, it was advised that heights were dependant on a number of factors. Ideally they would be at average person height between 1.5 – 1.8 metres and would need to take into account situations where for example there is residential accommodation above shops so these would be higher. There is also the constant battle against vandalism of the tubes and so some are located to be just out of reach. The diffusion tubes that are used are only accurate enough to provide a broad indicator of air quality and to highlight areas for more detailed work if breaches of standards are identified.

A Member asked in relation to the Monitoring Sites in particular Site DT4 within the Environmental Health Officers report , why there had been a significant drop seen in February 2015, the Group Manager (Environmental Services) advised the measurements were used to give an indication of the levels and that many factors could impact on the concentration levels including traffic flows and meteorological conditions.

Concern was raised in relation to the height that levels are measured at the Bridge Road Site due to the location of a nursery near by, it was felt that the measurements needed to be taken at a level suitable to take in account the nursery. The Group Manager (Environmental Services) clarified to Members as to where the site was located and advised that a site located nearer to the nursery could be looked into. It was agreed that the Group Manager (Environmental Services) source a suitable location.

RESOLVED :

(1) That the Committee note the Air Quality Annual Status Report and its content.

(2) That the Group Manager (Environmental Services) source a suitable location for a Nitrogen Dioxide testing facility near to the nursery located at Bridge Road.

## **6 UPDATE OF GYBS SERVICES**

(a) Ghost Bid

The Director of Customer Services gave a brief overview of the Great Yarmouth Borough Services Ghost Bid, she advised that an opportunity had arisen for the Joint Venture to be subject to a ghost bidding process in partnership with North Norfolk and Broadland District Councils. The proposed Ghost BID would enable the Borough Council to assess whether the Joint Venture presents the best value for money delivery of the services in the best way for the Borough.

A Member asked how much the ghost bidding process would cost, and it was advised that the bidding process would be found from within existing budgets and was likely to cost £3,000 to £4,000.

A Member asked what would happen if once the ghost bid was complete it was proven that the Joint Venture did not represent best value. The Director of Customer Services advised that a number of options would be considered.

A Member asked whether the costs involved with the Joint Venture were regularly reviewed. The Director of Customer Services advised that a breakdown of costs are discussed at Liaison Board meetings.

RESOLVED :

That the Committee note the information held within the Great Yarmouth Borough Services, Ghost Bid Report.

(b) Quality Audit of GYB Services

The Group Manager (Environmental Services) provided Members with a brief overview of the contents in relation to the Quality Audit of GYB Services report which set out to advise Members of the Auditing process which included two different but related processes, a visual survey and a audit of GYBS systems that are in place as part of the grounds maintenance and street cleansing functions.

- Visual Survey

The visual survey was undertaken over a period of two weeks in early July by the Environmental Ranger. The survey looked at high profile areas of the Great Yarmouth and Gorleston Seafronts and took in a random selection of other main roads and residential streets. Some of the areas targeted were those where complaints had been received from both elected Members and members of the public.

The survey looked at four areas of street scene :-

- Litter
- Grass Cutting
- Detritus in street gullies
- Weed Growth

- Paper Audit

The Paper Audit of GYBS procedural arrangements together with relevant paperwork was undertaken on the 14 July 2016. The audit looked at the procedures in place relevant to the staff delivering the service, the quality procedures in house at GYBS and the relationship to Norse quality processes.

- Area Visit

A spot check of areas tended to back up the views of the Environment Rangers visual survey. Both the seafront areas were considered to be very good from both grounds maintenance and cleansing point of views. Gorleston was also considered good with noted recovery of the grass verges following

the spraying incident earlier in the year.

A walk around the streets between Camperdown and Devonshire Road found litter and detritus at a level that required cleansing and this was picked up by the GYBS personnel accompanying the inspection. The Cliff Park area to the rear of Gorleston Seafront was found to be in general good condition.

The Group Manager (Environmental Services) advised that an audit of GYB Services will be completed on a regular basis.

A Member raised concern in relation to the grass cutting and mechanical sweepers. The Chairman advised that these issues had also been raised at the meeting of the GYBS Liaison Board.

A Member asked in relation to an area on Gorleston Cliff top that was overrun with weeds. The Group Manager (Environmental Services) advised that this matter would be looked into.

A Member raised concern in regards to the removal of bags of street sweepings left beside the bins by the street sweepers in Church Road. The member stated that bags had been left here uncollected for a number of days and were becoming split and attracting other rubbish. It was advised that the matter would be fed back to GYB Services as a matter of urgency.

The Director of Customer Services referred to an email that had been received from Simon Mutton, GYB Services the email gave detail of the deployment of additional Services within the Borough to deal with issues that had been raised. The Chairman suggested that this matter be reviewed in four weeks. A Member asked if a press statement would be released to advise the information given by GYB Services to residents within the Borough. The Chairman advised that a Press notice was to be arranged.

A Member asked in relation to the clearing of drains, and was advised that drains were the responsibility of Norfolk County Council.

The Chairman advised that the County Council had agreed to an extra £20,000 to be spent on extra verge cutting on roads across the County. Concern was raised in relation to land ownership between Norfolk County Council and Great Yarmouth Council.

A Member asked in relation to the grass cutting on roundabouts. It was pointed out that Highways England had started cutting the grass although this was to a very basic standard, and would only be cut 3 times a year.

**RESOLVED :**

That the Committee agree that a further update be submitted to the next meeting to discuss.

## **7 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

The Committee agreed the next meeting would be held on the 12 September 2016 at 6:30pm.

## **8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Chairman advised that the monthly meeting discussed at the last meeting between Graham Jermyn of GYB Services, Councillors Pratt, Hacon and himself would form a Sub-Committee of the GYB Liaison Board. He advised that the Director of Customer Services, the Group Manager (Environmental Services), Simon Mutton and Nicola Holden of GYB Services would also be members of the Sub-Committee.

The meeting ended at: 19:45



Subject: Dog Controls

Report to: Environment Committee 12<sup>th</sup> September 2016

Report by: Jane Beck Director of Customer Services  
Paul Shucksmith Senior Environmental Ranger

#### **SUBJECT MATTER/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**This report provides the Committee with details about a review carried out of dog control measures within the Borough with a view to consolidating existing Byelaws and Designation Orders along with any new requirements under a single Public Space Protection Order (PSPO).**

**The Report recommends that the Committee;**

- 1. Agree to the consolidation of dog control legislation within the Borough into a new PSPO as detailed in this report.**
- 2. Agree to the methodology of the public consultation as detailed in the report.**
- 3. Agree that following the public consultation the final draft version of the PSPO comes back to Committee for ratification**
- 4. Agree that for the present time the Council will not pursue the issue around DNA testing on dog faeces.**

#### **1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND**

Officers from Environmental Services have undertaken a review of dog control measures across the Borough with a view to update Byelaws and controls, many of which were created in the 1980's. The new controls will be regulated under the recently introduced Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. Initial consultation has been carried out internally with Officers, Management and Councillors and externally with Parish Councils and a number of landowners as to what control measures are felt are required on publically accessible land across the Borough. These proposals have been collated into a draft Public Space Protection Order. As part of the legal process to implement a PSPO, public consultation must be carried out to provide the opportunity for comment and views on the proposals.

Furthermore, Officers recently attended a workshop at Barking and Dagenham Council who have carried out a trial of using DNA sampling to help address the issue of dog fouling. For such a scheme to work effectively control measures would need to be introduced requiring all dog owners to have their dogs DNA swabbed so that any uncollected dog foul could be DNA tested and cross matched. Information on the trial is provided as part of this report.

## 2. THE REVIEW

### Review Background

To promote responsible dog ownership and address the issue of dog control Great Yarmouth Borough is currently covered by a variety of Byelaws and Designation Orders relating to dog fouling, sites where dogs are banned from and where dogs should be kept leashed. The last review took place in 1996 and most of the Byelaws pre-date this time. As a result there is publically accessible land and recreational areas which do not currently have any control measures in place but would benefit from having them introduced together with other sites which have control measures which are no longer appropriate or needed. A review has now been carried out to look at what control measures are needed and to update these to a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

### PSPO'S

PSPO's are designed to replace and streamline a range of powers such as Byelaws and Orders which have historically been available to local authorities to deal with anti-social behavior including dog control.

The test for the local authority to make a PSPO is that it must be satisfied on reasonable grounds that two conditions are met:-

- Activities carried out in the public place are having, have had or will have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, and
- Activities are or are likely to be persistent, unreasonable and justify the restrictions imposed by the Order

Penalties for a breach of a PSPO is a fine of up to £1,000 upon prosecution or, as an option, a Fixed Penalty Notice can be offered – for Great Yarmouth this is currently set as £80 or reduced to £60 if paid within ten days.

### Internal and Parish Consultations

Officers in conjunction with relevant Departments have reviewed existing control measures and looked at what new measures are felt required. GYBC proposals provide coverage on playsites, cemeteries and the two main tourist beaches at Gorleston and Great Yarmouth. Parish Councils were provided the opportunity to propose any measures they feel are

required on land within their area. In response ten Parishes made a total of 22 proposals covering a range of land including playing fields, heritage sites and burial grounds. Some Parish proposals covered land under private ownership to which the public have access and consent was required from the landowner as part of the proposal process.

During the review we also received two proposals, one from English Heritage and one from a local farmer, for control measures on private land to which the public have access.

Both GYBC and Parish proposals were provided to Departmental Managers, Senior Management Team and Members for comment and the opportunity to add any further proposals. One response was received which was a further proposal.

### 3. DRAFT ORDER AND PROPOSALS

The following are the main control measures proposed under the draft PSPO which is attached as **Appendix 1:-**

- **Failing to Remove Dog Faeces** - An offence is committed where the person responsible for a dog fails to clear up forthwith after a dog has fouled on public land and private land to which the public have access. This is proposed to be a Boroughwide requirement.
- **Dogs on Lead Request** - Enables authorised officers to require that a dog is immediately leashed. This is designed to be used where a dog is causing a nuisance or a hazard to itself or other people. This is proposed to have Boroughwide coverage.
- **Dogs on Lead Requirement** - Makes it a requirement that when using a location with such an Order on that all dogs must be kept leashed. Locations proposed to be covered by such a requirement are covered in Schedule 1 to the PSPO, see **Appendix 2** attached.
- **Dog Bans** - Bans dogs from entering a site covered by such an Order. Locations proposed to be covered by such a requirement are covered in Schedule 2 to the PSPO, see **Appendix 3** attached.

The Borough Council has sought to instigate a dog ban on all fenced playsites it either owns or manages. A small number of fenced sites within communal housing areas will not be able to be covered by a ban due to the sites providing a thoroughfare to properties. For these sites a dogs on leash requirement has been sought instead. Additionally, a number of open playarea sites will not be covered by any requirement as they have no obvious boundary which will make enforcement difficult and open to challenge.

- To aid Members please see **Appendix 4** which, whilst not forming part of the actual PSPO, does provide information on amendments to existing controls and the proposals for sites not previously covered.

#### 4. **PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Following agreement of the draft PSPO it will go out to public consultation for a period of four (4) weeks. The proposals will be advertised in the press and highlighted on the Council's web page. The public will have the opportunity to comment on the proposals through a survey available online, at the main Council receptions or if requested by post. The questions within the survey are attached in **Appendix 5** and will seek to determine public feeling about the proposals plus give the opportunity for comment.

The consultation will also be sent to partners, organisations and bodies such as the Police, RSPCA and neighbouring authorities identified with having an interest in dog control.

#### 5. **IMPLEMENTATION**

Following public consultation any comments or views will be considered and the PSPO will be finalised. This will be returned to Environment Committee for agreement and then onto Council. Once agreed the authority will then proceed with the making of an Order with a view to it coming into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017. Once an Order has been made any interested person may challenge the Order within six weeks via the High Court. PSPO's last for three years after which time they must be reviewed and renewed if still required. During this time they can still be cancelled, varied or altered, however there is a prescribed route that must be followed to do this.

#### 6. **DNA TESTING**

Following interest from Members in the scheme Officers attended a workshop at Barking and Dagenham Council who have carried out a trial of using DNA sampling to address the issue of dog fouling. Please see the attached **Appendix 6** for information on the workshop.

#### 7. **ENFORCEMENT**

Current Byelaws around dog control are generally enforced by the Environmental Ranger team. It is recognised that the new proposals will expand the areas for control and place a strain around both enforcement and proactive work, particularly on large open sites. As part of the consultation exercise with Parishes it was asked how the Parish could help with enforcement of the measures they wished to propose. One Parish has a paid dog warden, a number of Parishes have voluntary dog wardens who have had training from the Environmental Rangers and others have said they will collate information about issues via Parish Councillors to pass on to the Rangers. As part of the general enforcement of PSPO's across the Borough (including the Alcohol PSPO introduced last year and the Car Enthusiasts PSPO that is currently out for consultation), all Council officers undertaking

enforcement roles are duly authorised. The issue around resources for enforcement is one that will need to be closely monitored.

## 8. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Where a control measure is in place adequate signage highlighting the requirement must be present. £20,000 has already been allowed in this year's budget to cover the cost of new signage for the sites. To reduce overall costs signage provision for the Drinking PSPO has been delayed so that both controls measures can be included on the one sign.

## 9. EQUALITY ISSUES

Exemptions have been considered in making the draft PSPO for those people with disabilities who make use of trained assistance dogs. Guidance would suggest that anyone using any type of assistance dog is not subject to a Banning Order in respect of their assistance dog and are also exempt from any requirement to pick up under the Dog Fouling Order. Additionally, PSPO's should not restrict the normal activities of working dogs and we would not seek to enforce in such cases.

## 10. RECOMMENDATIONS

Committee are asked to consider the individual site proposals contained within the draft PSPO taking into account whether they feel they are appropriate and enforceable, and are recommended to;

- a) Agree to the consolidation of dog control legislation within the Borough into a new PSPO as detailed in this report.
- b) Agree to the methodology of the public consultation as detailed in the report.
- c) Agree that following the public consultation the final draft version of the PSPO comes back to Committee for ratification
- d) Agree that for the present time the Council will not pursue the issue around DNA testing on dog faeces

| Area for consideration                       | Comment |
|--|---------|
| Monitoring Officer Consultation:             | None    |
| Section 151 Officer Consultation:            | None    |
| Existing Council Policies:                   | None    |
| Financial Implications:                      | Yes     |
| Legal Implications (including human rights): | Yes     |
| Risk Implications:                           | None    |
| Equality Issues/EQIA                         | Yes     |

|                      |      |
|----------------------|------|
| assessment:          |      |
| Crime & Disorder:    | Yes  |
| Every Child Matters: | None |



## **The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014**

### **The Public Spaces Protection Order (Great Yarmouth Borough Council) ????**

Great Yarmouth Borough Council (in this order called “the Authority”) hereby makes the following Order:

This Order comes into force on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017 for a period of 3 years.

#### **Offences**

##### **1. Fouling-failure to remove dog faeces**

If within the administrative area of the Authority a dog defecates at any time on land to which the public or any section of the public has access, on payment or otherwise, as of right or by virtue of express or implied permission and a person who is in charge of the dog at the time fails to remove the faeces from the land forthwith, that person shall be guilty of an offence unless

(a) he has reasonable excuse for failing to do so;

or

(b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

##### **2. Dogs on Leads by Order**

A person in charge of a dog shall be guilty of an offence if, at any time, within the administrative area of the Authority he does not comply with a direction given to him by an authorised officer of the authority to put and keep the dog on a lead unless

(a) he has reasonable excuse for failing to do so;

or

(b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

An authorised officer may only give a direction under this order if such restraint is reasonably necessary to prevent a nuisance or behaviour by the dog that is likely

to cause annoyance or disturbance to any other person, or to a bird or another animal.

### **3. Leads Requirements**

A person in charge of a dog shall be guilty of an offence if, at any time, (during the period specified in the schedule if stated), on land detailed in Schedule 1 below he does not keep the dog on a lead unless

- (a) he has reasonable excuse for failing to do so;
- or
- (b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

### **4. Exclusion-Dog Ban**

A person in charge of a dog shall be guilty of an offence if, at any time, (during the period specified in the schedule if stated), he takes the dog onto, or permits the dog to enter or to remain on, any land detailed in Schedule 2 below unless

- (a) he has reasonable excuse for failing to do so;
- or
- (b) the owner, occupier or other person or authority having control of the land has consented (generally or specifically) to his failing to do so.

### **5. Exemptions**

Nothing in part 1 or part 4 of this order shall apply to a person who –

(a) is registered as a blind person in a register compiled under section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948; or

(b) is deaf, in respect of a dog trained by Hearing Dogs for Deaf People (registered charity number 293358) and upon which he relies for assistance; or

(c) has a disability which affects his mobility, manual dexterity, physical coordination or ability to lift, carry or otherwise move everyday objects, in respect of a dog trained by a prescribed charity and upon which he relies for assistance.

For the purpose of this order –

A person who habitually has a dog in his possession shall be taken to be in charge of the dog at any time unless at that time some other person is in charge of the dog;

Placing the faeces in a receptacle on the land which is provided for the purpose,



or for the disposal of waste, shall be sufficient removal from the land;

- Being unaware of the defecation (whether by reason of not being in the vicinity or otherwise), or not having a device for or other suitable means of removing the faeces shall not be a reasonable excuse for failing to remove the faeces
- “an authorised officer of the Authority” means an employee, partnership agency or contractor of Great Yarmouth Borough Council who is authorised in writing by Great Yarmouth Borough Council for the purposes of giving directions under the Order.
- Each of the following is a "prescribed charity" -
  - \_ Dogs for the Disabled (registered charity number 700454)
  - \_ Support Dogs Limited (registered charity number 1088281)
  - \_ Canine Partners for Independence (registered charity number (803680)
  - \_ Dog A.I.D (Registered Charity Number 1124533)
  - \_ Medical Detection Dogs (Registered Charity 1124533)

## **6. Penalty**

A person who is guilty of an offence under this order shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale

## APPENDIX 2

# THE PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER (GREAT YARMOUTH BOROUGH COUNCIL) ?????

## SCHEDULE 1

### LAND TO WHICH THE DOGS ON LEAD REQUIREMENT SHALL APPLY

- Promenade adjacent to the beach between Wellington Pier and Britannia Pier, Great Yarmouth - To operate from Good Friday or 1<sup>st</sup> April (which ever falls first) to 30<sup>th</sup> September each year
- Great Yarmouth (New) Cemetery North, Kitchener Road, Great Yarmouth
- Great Yarmouth (Old) Cemetery South, Kitchener Road, Great Yarmouth
- Great Yarmouth (Caister) Cemetery, Ormesby Road, Caister on Sea
- Promenade adjacent to the beach between the breakwater and Ravine, Gorleston - To operate from Good Friday or 1<sup>st</sup> April (which ever falls first) to 30<sup>th</sup> September each year Elder Green Playarea, Elder Green, Gorleston
- Hertford Way Playarea, Hertford Way, Gorleston
- Pine Green Playarea, Pine Green, Gorleston
- Clarendon Close (North) Playarea, Clarendon Close, Great Yarmouth
- Clarendon Close (South) Playarea, Clarendon Close, Great Yarmouth
- Dorset Close Playarea, Dorset Close, Great Yarmouth
- Howard Street South Playarea, Howard Street South, Great Yarmouth
- King Street Multi Use Games Area (MUGA), King Street, Great Yarmouth
- Sidney Close Playarea, Sidney Close, Great Yarmouth
- Green Lane Playing Field, Green Lane, Bradwell
- Generation Wood, Mill Lane, Bradwell
- Roman Fort, Butt Lane, Burgh Castle
- River Way, Belton
- Special Protection Area covering the beach from Salisbury Road, North Denes, Great Yarmouth to Tan Lane, Caister-on-Sea
- St Margaret's Burial Ground and Churchyard, Yarmouth Road, Ormesby St Margaret
- Allotments, Black Street/Low Road, Winterton-on-Sea
- Recreation Ground, Somerton Road, Winterton-on-Sea
- Land adjacent to Village Hall (south), King Street, Winterton-on-Sea
- Caister Roman Fort, Norwich Road, Caister-on-Sea

## Appendix 3

# THE PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER (GREAT YARMOUTH BOROUGH COUNCIL) ?????

## SCHEDULE 2

### LAND TO WHICH THE DOG EXCLUSION/BAN SHALL APPLY

- All Borough Council owned or managed fenced playareas
- All Borough Council owned or managed fenced fitness areas
- All Borough Council owned or managed fenced skate parks
- All Borough Council owned or managed Multi Use Games Areas (MUGA) with the exception of King Street, Great Yarmouth
- Runham Playarea, Thrigby Road, Runham
- The beach between Wellington Pier and Britannia Pier, Great Yarmouth - To operate from Good Friday or 1<sup>st</sup> April (which ever falls first) to 30<sup>th</sup> September each year
- The beach between the breakwater and Ravine, Gorleston - To operate from Good Friday or 1<sup>st</sup> April (which ever falls first) to 30<sup>th</sup> September each year
- Magdalen Lawn Cemetery, Oriel Avenue, Gorleston
- Gorleston Old Cemetery, Magdalen Way, Gorleston
- Bland Corner, New Road, Belton
- New Road Playing Field, New Road, Belton
- Burgh Castle Playing Field, Church Road, Burgh Castle
- Hemsby Playing Field, Waters Lane, Hemsby
- Hemsby Burial Ground, The Street, Hemsby
- Amenity Area, Pit Road, Hemsby
- St Margaret's Ruins, Coast Road, Hopton-on-Sea
- Martham Playing Field, Rollesby Road/Playing Field Lane, Martham
- Edgar Tenant Recreation Ground, Station Road, Ormesby St Margaret
- Repps Playing Field, High Road/Church Road, Repps with Bastwick
- Allotment Gardens, Low Street/Church Road, Repps with Bastwick
- St Edmunds Church and Parish Graveyard, Church Road, Thurne
- Thurne Playing Field, The Street, Thurne

## Appendix 4

### SITES FOR CONSIDERATION

THE BELOW ARE AREAS OF LAND WHICH CURRENTLY HAVE A BYELAW ON HOWEVER WE HAVE SOUGHT TO AMEND AS PART OF THE REVIEW:-

| TYPE OF CONTROL           | LOCATION   | CHANGE  |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| Dogs On Lead Request      | Boroughwide  | Current byelaws only cover certain open green spaces. Officers wish to have Boroughwide coverage.   |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Promenade adjacent to the beach between Wellington Pier and Britannia Pier, Great Yarmouth | Existing is in force from 1 <sup>st</sup> May to 30th September. To take account of Easter falling early it has been proposed to bring this forward to start on 1 <sup>st</sup> April or Good Friday which ever falls earliest.                           |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Promenade adjacent to the beach between the breakwater and Ravine, Gorleston               | Existing dogs on leash requirement is in force from 1 <sup>st</sup> May to 30th September. To take account of Easter falling early it has been proposed to bring this forward to start on 1 <sup>st</sup> April or Good Friday which ever falls earliest. |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Great Yarmouth (New) Cemetery North, Kitchener Road, Great Yarmouth                        | Site currently has a dog ban, however this has been difficult to enforce due to the site providing a through route for the public. Officers feel a leash requirement would be more appropriate.   |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Great Yarmouth (Old) Cemetery South, Kitchener Road, Great Yarmouth                        | Site currently has dog ban, however this has been difficult to enforce due to the site providing a through route for the public. Officers feel a leash requirement would be more appropriate.   |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Great Yarmouth (Caister) Cemetery, Ormesby Road, Caister-on-Sea                            | Site currently has dog ban, however this has been difficult to enforce due to the site providing a through route for the public. Officers feel a leash requirement would be more appropriate.   |
| Dog Ban                   | The beach between Wellington Pier and Britannia Pier, Great Yarmouth                       | Existing dog ban is in force from 1 <sup>st</sup> May to 30th September. To take account of Easter falling early it has been proposed to bring this forward to start on 1 <sup>st</sup> April or Good Friday which ever falls earliest                    |
| Dog Ban                   | The beach between the breakwater and Ravine, Gorleston                                     | Existing dog ban is in force from 1 <sup>st</sup> May to 30th September. To take account of Easter falling early it has been proposed to bring this forward to start on 1 <sup>st</sup> April or Good Friday which ever falls earliest.                   |

**THE FOLLOWING ARE SITES WHICH CURRENTLY HAVE NO BOROUGH COUNCIL CONTROL MEASURE IN PLACE BUT FOR WHICH WE HAVE RECEIVED A PROPOSAL. THESE WOULD BE NEW SITES:-**

| <b>TYPE OF CONTROL</b>    | <b>LOCATION</b>   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Special Protection Area covering the beach from Salisbury Road, North Denes, Great Yarmouth to Tan Lane, Caister-on-Sea |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Caister Roman Fort, Norwich Road, Caister-on-Sea  |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Land adjacent to Village Hall (south), King Street, Winterton-on-Sea  |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Recreation Ground, Somerton Road, Winterton-on-Sea  |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Allotments, Black Street/Low Road, Winterton-on-Sea   |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | St Margaret's Burial Ground and Churchyard, Yarmouth Road, Ormesby St Margaret  |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | River Way, Belton   |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Roman Fort, Butt Lane, Burgh Castle   |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Generation Wood, Mill Lane, Bradwell  |
| Dogs on Leash Requirement | Green Lane Playing Field, Green Lane, Bradwell  |
| Dog Ban                   | Bland Corner, New Road, Belton  |
| Dog Ban                   | New Road Playing Field, New Road, Belton  |
| Dog Ban                   | Burgh Castle Playing Field, Church Road, Burgh Castle   |
| Dog Ban                   | Hemsby Playing Field, Waters Lane, Hemsby   |
| Dog Ban                   | Hemsby Burial Ground, The Street, Hemsby  |
| Dog Ban                   | Amenity Area, Pit Road, Hemsby  |
| Dog Ban                   | St Margaret's Ruins, Coast Road, Hopton-on Sea  |
| Dog Ban                   | Martham Playing Field, Rollesby Road/Playing Field Lane, Martham  |
| Dog Ban                   | Edgar Tenant Recreation Ground, Station Road, Ormesby St Margaret   |
| Dog Ban                   | Repps Playing Field, High Road/Church Road, Repps with Bastwick   |
| Dog Ban                   | Allotment Gardens, Low Street/Church Road, Repps with Bastwick  |
| Dog Ban                   | St Edmunds Church and Parish Graveyard, Church Road, Thurne   |
| Dog Ban                   | Thurne Playing Field, The Street, Thurne  |

# QUESTIONS FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

## DOG CONTROL – PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER

1. I am completing this survey:-

- As a resident of the Borough of Great Yarmouth
- As a business person
- As a visitor
- Representing a charity or organisation

Other (please specify):

2. Please supply your postcode:

3. Are you a dog owner?

- Yes
- No

4. **DOG FOULING**

The Council is proposing the continuation of the existing powers that make it an offence if a person in charge of a dog fails to clean up its faeces. Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- Agree
- Disagree

5. **DOGS ON LEAD BY ORDER**

The Council is proposing a new Boroughwide offence for failing to put a dog on a lead when directed to do so by an authorised officer where the dog is considered to be out of control, causing alarm or distress or to prevent a nuisance. Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- Agree
- Disagree

6. **DOGS ON LEAD REQUIREMENT**

In addition to its own proposals, the Council has received a number of proposals from Parish Councils and other landowners that would require a dog to be leashed when on certain areas of land. This would be in the interest of hygiene, preventing nuisance and respect. Do you agree where it has been proposed dogs should be leashed on the following types of land:-

- **Heritage Sites**

Agree

Disagree

- **Promenades adjacent to the main tourist Beaches at Great Yarmouth and Gorleston**

Agree

Disagree

- **Cemeteries and Churchyards**

Agree

Disagree

- **Special Protection Areas for Nature (Beach at North Denes to Caister)**

Agree

Disagree

- **Recreational Areas**

Agree

Disagree

7. **DOG BAN**

In addition to its own proposals, the Council has received a number of proposals from Parish Councils and other landowners that would ban dogs from certain areas of land. This would be in the interest of hygiene and safety. Do you agree where it has been proposed dogs should be banned from the following types of land:-

- **Fenced Playareas, Fitness Areas, Skate Parks and Multi Use Games Area (MUGA)**

Agree

Disagree

- **Designated areas of the Beach at Gorleston and Great Yarmouth**

Agree

Disagree

- **Cemeteries and Churchyards**

Agree


Disagree

- **Recreational Areas**

[ ] Agree

[ ] Disagree

**8. ANY OTHER COMMENTS**



Please return completed questionnaire by 10 October 2016 to:-

Dog Control Consultation  
Environmental Services  
Town Hall  
Hall Plain  
Great Yarmouth  
NR30 2QF



## OVERVIEW OF DOG DNA WORKSHOP BARKING AND DAGENHAM COUNCIL

### BACKGROUND

- Officers from Environmental Services attended a workshop in June held at Barking and Dagenham Council
- At the workshop were representatives from Barking Council including management, enforcement staff, dog warden and representatives from PooPrints who provide dog DNA testing in the UK
- Barking and Dagenham Council have recently held a trial around using DNA sampling to address the issue of dog fouling
- The trial took place over three months. The dog warden initially recorded the amount of dog fouling in 3 of their main parks. They then monitored the amount of dog fouling present throughout the duration of the trial and claim to have had a reduction of up to 90% in these areas.
- During the trial DNA testing was offered free to dog walkers using the parks and they had a take up of 400 dogs which they state is 25% of the dogs in the area. Dogs which were tested were given a collar tag so officers could see that the dog had been tested.
- DNA is taken from a dog via a swab in the cheek carried out by Council Officers. This swab is then sent away for processing at a fee charged by PooPrints of £30 per dog. Where faeces are found and a cross reference match is required PooPrints charge a fee of £70 for carrying out the service.
- Any dog foul found in the parks was DNA tested and they advertised they would take enforcement action against any positive match.
- The Council now wish to make it compulsory that to walk your dog in their main parks you can only do so if your dog has been DNA tested. They envisage using a Public Space Protection Order to pursue this further.

### Issues Raised

- Whilst the workshop had been put on to demonstrate how DNA testing could be used there are a number of fundamental issues that have yet to be addressed and it would appear that the day was also held to seek ideas from other Councils as to how to resolve these.

- These issues include how does DNA testing fit with current legislation, can DNA testing actually be made compulsory, can you prevent a person from walking a dog if it hasn't been DNA tested and is any of this enforceable. Further questions were also raised around the need for additional staffing to ensure compliance with any DNA registration scheme.
- The Council's Solicitor who gave a presentation does not feel they can justify making it a requirement that any dog walker using their park would have to have their dog DNA registered but are looking to word it that an officer can, at their request, swab a dog being walked in the designated parks. This would suggest that there is uncertainty as to how this sits legally and are going down the route that there would have to be just cause in the first place to swab the dog.
- When questioned as to whether any requirement would apply to visitors and people not living in the area they said they did not think they would be able to enforce against them.
- Information about the trial was not always forthcoming. When questioned as to when the trial took place and did the audit allow for the seasonal trend found with the issue of dog fouling, was the area cleared a week or so prior to the first audit to ensure that what they were recording was new foul and not the accumulation of a number of months they failed to provide any detail.
- No information was provided when questioned about whether the issues of dog fouling increased in other parts of the Borough and the decrease seen in the parks was simply because users went elsewhere.
- The Council has 16,000 properties and estimated that the number of properties with dogs is 10% so have 1600 in the Borough. Without more accurate figures this does bring their 25% take up into question.
- It emerged that the figures of DNA registration included all their stray dogs which according to figures provided would mean that 200 of the 400 dogs tested were actually stray so actual voluntary buy in from the public was minimal.
- A question which repeatedly came up was a request to see the findings of the trial and the business case for pursuing it further. Any information on this was refused with the reason given that their legal team were currently working on bringing in the PSPO and did not feel that it was appropriate to release the information prior to this being introduced.
- Figures they did disclose were that they had tested 40 piles of dog faeces for cross referencing which had come back with one single positive match. No formal action was taken with the reason given that they wanted to educate the person, however it was felt it was more likely because current legislation would not allow it.
- A figure was provided that the estimated total cost of the trial would be somewhere in the region of £70,000.

Whilst in the future there may be scope for DNA to be a tool to address dog fouling, currently there are too many uncertainties around its legality and actually requiring compliance. It also has been shown to come at a significant cost. Barking appears to be proceeding with using it

but it would appear that this will be done in a watered-down way to what they originally envisaged and registration will be voluntary and not compulsory.

Subject: Quarter 1 Performance Report

Report to: Environment Committee – 12 September 2016

Report by: Director of Customer Services

#### **SUBJECT MATTER/RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following gives an update on current performance of Environment Committee measures for the first quarter of 2016/17 (Apr – Jun) where progress is assessed against Targets which are set at the start of the financial year.

Progress against Targets is assessed by RAG (Red/Amber/Green) ratings and is also assessed in terms of Direction of Travel (DoT) through use of arrows.

The summary report, see attached, highlights performance measures that have not achieved the target for this period and measures that do not have a target but are moving in the wrong direction. The report also highlights a number of measures that are showing exceptional performance against targets.

Commentary is provided at the end of the summary report highlighting those measures that outturns are below target or moving in the wrong direction.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The actions are:

- All measures to be monitored during the next quarter

#### **1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND**

In September 2015 the Council agreed 'The Plan' which sets out its strategic vision and priorities for up to 2020. This establishes the framework against which the Council should measure its performance at both officer meetings (through regular management reports) and Member meetings (through performance reports).

This framework was considered as part of a review of the transformation programme, moving this programme into a business strategy, which maximises income streams, whilst at the same time meeting the Council's stated objectives in 'The Plan'.

The business strategy includes a new set of key projects which will be reported separately from the measures to the Policy & Resources committee.

## 2. Performance Measures

### Performance Measures – Highlights

Performance measures cover the full range of services delivered within the area covered by the Environment Committee. The details in the summary report provide quantitative information about the performance of these services and provide useful trend data. A traffic light status easily identifies if improvement is required.

There are several areas across the Council where performance is below the target level set (RAG rating) or where no target has been set performance is moving in the wrong directions (Direction of Travel). These measures are highlighted in the appropriate service committee section in the report.

The following areas of performance are brought to your attention:

#### Improved performance:

##### 1. Number of 'Report it GY' Apps received (EN01)

Use of the 'Report it GY' launched last year continues to see increase usage this easy to use service reports directly to the staff in the field. We have seen the average number of days to deal with these reports reduce during this quarter and we will continue to monitor to understand if this is a seasonal issue or as part of a wider review that needs to be undertaken as a result of increased reports.

#### Reduced performance:

##### 2. Percentage of contamination of recyclates as a % of all recyclates Sickness absence rates: (EN05)

This current figure for contamination has been determined following an intensive period of sampling between January and March this year and has provided a true base level. The figure agreed with NEWS in 2014 at the setting up of the joint venture for the running of the recyclable contract agreed a maximum level of 10% over which the Council would face excess waste charges. Work continues to educate residents using a variety of methods. High levels of contamination have been recorded across all the Norfolk councils and the Norfolk Waste Partnership is researching new ways to address this.

#### Data Quality note

All data included in this report for the current financial year is provisional unaudited data and is categorised as management information. All current in-year results may therefore be subject to later revision.

## 3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None

#### 4. RISK IMPLICATIONS

The need to reduce the level of contaminated recyclate will be a focus for both Environmental Services and Great Yarmouth Borough Services further information, education and targeted campaigns will be developed in a bid to reduce levels to within recognised limits (10%).

#### 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The actions are:

- All measures to be monitored during the next quarter

#### 6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

**None**

*Areas of consideration: e.g. does this report raise any of the following issues and if so how have these been considered/mitigated against?*






| <b>Area for consideration</b>                | <b>Comment</b> |
|--|----------------|
| Monitoring Officer Consultation:             | N/A            |
| Section 151 Officer Consultation:            | N/A            |
| Existing Council Policies:                   | None           |
| Financial Implications:                      | None           |
| Legal Implications (including human rights): | None           |
| Risk Implications:                           | None           |
| Equality Issues/EQIA assessment:             | N/A            |
| Crime & Disorder:                            | N/A            |
| Every Child Matters:                         | N/A            |

**PERFORMANCE INDICATORS – SUMMARY REPORT QUARTER 1 (Apr – Jun) 2016/17**

**ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE**

| Measure  | Previous Quarter | This Quarter | Target         | Qtr 1 2015/16 | Status | Trend       |           |
|--|------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|--------|-------------|-----------|
|  |                  |              |                |               |        | Last Period | Last Year |
| EN01 - Number of 'Report it GY' Apps received (Quarterly Cumulative)   | 828              | 2,265        | NA             | New indicator |        | ↑           | N/A       |
| EN02 - Average time to respond to report from 'Report it GY' App (Quarterly Cumulative)  | 3.7 days         | 6.9 days     | 5 working days | New indicator |        | ↓           | N/A       |
| EN03 - Number of Street Scene Enforcement actions taken (Quarterly Cumulative)   | 20               | 11           | NA             | 11            |        | ↑           | ↔         |
| EN04 - % of food premises scoring 3 star food hygiene ratings or above (Quarterly Snapshot at last day of month)   | 91.3%            | 92.6%        | 93.5%          | Not available |        | ↑           | N/A       |
| EN05 - % of contamination of recyclates as a % of all recyclates (Quarterly Cumulative)  | 18.3%            | 19.6%        | 12.5%          | New indicator |        | ↓           | N/A       |
| EN06 - Garden waste service:<br>a) Number of households taking up garden waste service.<br>b) % of households with a garden waste bin as a % of all households eligible to receive a garden waste bin<br>c) Total tonnage of garden waste recycled. (Quarterly Cumulative) | 6,388            | 7,406        | 7,500          | 5,477         |        | ↑           | ↑         |
|  | 26.6%            | 30.9%        | 33%            | 22.8%         |        | ↑           | ↑         |
|  | 2,613.66         | 990.62       | NA             | 826.54        |        | N/A         | ↑         |
| EN07 - Total tonnage of waste recycled (Quarterly Cumulative)  | 11,433.10        | 3,189.42     | NA             | 3,042.05      |        | N/A         | ↑         |

| Measure  | Previous Quarter | This Quarter | Target | Qtr 1 2015/16 | Status | Trend       |           |
|--|------------------|--------------|--------|---------------|--------|-------------|-----------|
|  |                  |              |        |               |        | Last Period | Last Year |
| <b>Measures that are not achieving Target:</b>   |                  |              |        |               |        |             |           |
| <p>EN05 - % of contamination of recyclates as a % of all recyclates - This current figure for contamination has been determined following an intensive period of sampling between January and March this year and has provided a true base level. The figure agreed with NEWS in 2014 at the setting up of the joint venture for the running of the recyclable contract agreed a maximum level of 10% over which the Council would face excess waste charges. Work continues to educate residents using a variety of methods. High levels of contamination have been recorded across all the Norfolk councils and the Norfolk Waste Partnership is researching new ways to address this.</p> |                  |              |        |               |        |             |           |
| <b>Measures where no target set and moving in the wrong direction:</b>   |                  |              |        |               |        |             |           |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Key</b>  |  |
| <b>Status</b>   |  |
|    | Current performance has met or exceeded target   |
|    | Current performance is below target but within tolerance   |
|   | Current performance is below target and tolerance  |
| <b>Trend</b>  |  |
|  | Performance for quarter is improving (up) or deteriorating (down) compared to previous quarter.                |
|  | Performance for period (quarter) is improving (up) or deteriorating (down) compared to same quarter last year. |

**Key:**

NA = No target set, contextual information only

N/A = Not available/not applicable



Subject: Garden Waste Collection Service – Annual Renewal of Subscriptions

Report to: Environment Committee 12<sup>th</sup> September 2016

Report by: Glenn Buck – Group Manager Environmental Services

**SUBJECT MATTER/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**This report seeks to advise Committee of the proposed arrangements to improve the system of collection of the annual renewal of resident's subscriptions to the Council's garden waste collection service.**

**The report requests Committee to endorse EMT's recommendation for the release of £17,400 from the Council's Spend to Save budget to enable the purchase of a software system to handle the proposed arrangements.**

**1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND**

As part of its operation to collect domestic solid waste the Council has operated a garden waste collection service for a number of years. The garden waste collection service is an opt in, paid for service. The service has grown over recent years which have made the management of the existing annual process for renewal of subscriptions staff and resource intensive and lead to a process that is overly cumbersome.

This report and appendix highlights those difficulties and recommends the purchase of software which will provide a solution. There is no budget provision for the purchase of the software. An earlier report was considered by EMT who has recommended the initial upfront costs be met from the Council's Spend to Save budget.

**2. THE GARDEN WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE**

The Council has offered an opt in charged for service to collect garden waste since the mid 2000's. With the reduction in landfill space and the fact that garden waste is readily compostable, it is desirable for as much of this to be diverted away from the residual waste stream as possible. For every tonne of material diverted the Council receives recycling credit payment of £56.89 from Norfolk County Council. In 2014, the Borough Council banned garden waste from the residual waste stream and this led to a rapid expansion in the number of customers from less than 4000 to today's position where the number is approaching 8000. The Council also introduced a garden waste bag system for those people with a small garden which has also

proved popular.

The methodology for ensuring that the subscriptions are renewed for the 1<sup>st</sup> April each year is essentially a manual process. This is now very labour and resource intensive, tying up staff in Environmental Services, Finance, Printing, and GYB Services. The situation is not sustainable. Therefore a small working group of Officers was convened to look at the options for introducing a more streamlined and less resource intensive payment methodology.

The appendix attached to this report details the options available and makes a business case for the recommended option.

### **3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The recommended option to go with the product produced by Bartec carries an upfront financial cost for which there is no budgetary provision. This report seeks to request those year one upfront costs are funded via the Spend to Save budget. Year two (and beyond) costs will be incorporated in future base budgets.

By utilising the recommended option, it is estimated the Council will make annual savings year on year from year 2 onwards of at least £10,484 on associated printing, postage, and full year subscription income (based on 2016 renewal figures). Therefore, taking out the annual maintenance charge for the system, the Council can still expect to make around £5,000 savings overall per year.

### **4. RISK IMPLICATIONS**

The income received from the garden waste collection service (subscription, bin sales and recycling credits) was in total worth £415,000 to the Council in 2015/16 and is a significant income. Removing garden waste from the residual waste stream and into recycling also has benefits for the whole of the Norfolk waste system by reducing landfill and final waste disposal costs that Norfolk County Council pay.

### **5. CONCLUSIONS**

There are significant environmental and financial benefits from expanding the garden waste collection service. To properly manage this at minimal cost to the Council and its operational partner, the purchase of the Bartec system is seen as an essential step.

### **6. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Committee is recommended to note the appended report and to endorse the decision made by EMT that £17,400 be used from the Spend to Save budget for the initial upfront costs to purchase the Bartec system.

## 7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Appended report

*Areas of consideration: e.g. does this report raise any of the following issues and if so how have these been considered/mitigated against?*

| <b>Area for consideration</b>                | <b>Comment</b>   |
|--|--|
| Monitoring Officer Consultation:             | None   |
| Section 151 Officer Consultation:            | None   |
| Existing Council Policies:                   | Current ban on garden waste in the residual waste stream                                 |
| Financial Implications:                      | Yes, upfront costs required for future savings   |
| Legal Implications (including human rights): | None   |
| Risk Implications:                           | Significant income via subscription fees and recycling credits that need to be maximised |
| Equality Issues/EQIA assessment:             | None   |
| Crime & Disorder:                            | None   |
| Every Child Matters:                         | None   |

## **Garden Waste Collection Service (Brown Bins)**

### **Options for the Future – A Business Case**

#### **Introduction**

The Council's garden waste collection service currently has in excess of 7000 customers utilising a brown wheeled bin or degradable sacks. The target for this financial year is to increase the take up of the service to 8000 customers and if possible even higher numbers.

The service provides much needed income to the Council via a number of financial streams;

- Recycling credits paid by the County Council for every tonne of garden waste diverted from the residual waste stream at a rate of £56.89 per tonne.
- One off income from bin sales at a rate of £12.34 per bin. These then remain the property of the resident. Residents can purchase more than one bin.
- Annual subscription to the collection service. Currently a full year costs £40.56. This figure reduces as the year advances to reflect the reduced number of collections being paid for. There are also reduced collection fees for properties with more than one bin

In 2015/16 the garden waste service brought in approximately £275,000 in respect of bin sales and subscriptions and £140,000 in respect of recycling credits on a collection tonnage of nearly 2,500 tonnes. This also had a knock on effect on the overall waste disposal costs for the County by not having to pay landfill charges to dispose of this material.

Issues have arisen over the procedure around the collection of the annual subscriptions which have become more acute as the number of customers has grown. Whilst the Council and its operational partner GYB Services have introduced systems to collect the fees, these have been very resource intensive involving officers from a number of Council service departments to become involved and necessitated the hiring of temporary staff to cope with demand.

#### **Background to the Payments Collection Systems**

##### **Prior to 2016**

Customer invoicing (using the Civica system) has proved to be challenging throughout the operation of the garden waste service being both labour intensive and time dependant as invoicing is completed for commencement in April each year.

As the numbers of subscribers has risen the task became even more resource intensive and is no longer sustainable. In addition it was made clear that fees and charges would only be set at Budget Council in February thus not allowing sufficient time to set up the system for an April 1<sup>st</sup> start date. As a consequence it was agreed to look at commercial software options to improve the back office system.

## **Payment Collection System 2016/17**

The payment system chosen for this current year was the use of a reminder letter requesting payment rather than any account based system. It was thought this could be set up and run fairly quickly after Budget Council set the fees and charges at its February meeting provided certain steps were taken prior to that date. These steps included;

1. Removal of periodic invoice records from the Council's sundry debts system. This involved additional work for the invoices section in December 2015.
2. Obtaining all customer addresses from GYBS Garden Waste spreadsheet to provide data for a mail merge to send a reminder letter to each customer to pay their subscription. This creation of the mail merge was undertaken by Lester Goffin and his team – December 2015 and January 2016.
3. Printing Services printed the addressed letters – March 2016
4. Significant time spent by the web team January – March trying to get the payment connector to work with the payment form and then when this was done picking up a lot of the queries with payments
5. The addressed letters were manually placed in envelopes by GYBS and Environmental Services staff over two days and sent through the post – March 2016

The renewal letter offered a number of payment streams for customers;

- Online via My Account
- Councils normal on line payment portal
- By telephone
- By cheque

This was long winded and resource intensive in both the preparatory work for the option to work and in staff to take telephone payment calls (two additional temporary posts were created within customer services to take the telephone calls). It appears there were two methods of making on line payments which led to confusion for the public with difficulties if the wrong method was chosen. There were further issues in payments being made but no record of them being recorded or passed to GYBS for scheduling resulting in confusion for the collection rounds. The many disgruntled members of the public often being the only way to trace who has and who has not paid.

This method did however see a significant increase in the number of customers paying on line and enabled email details to be taken for large numbers of customers.

This process also will not cater for an annual renewal (anniversary) date and the advantages that will bring in the avoidance of confusion for residents as the current pricing structure reduces during the year together with the increase in income for the Council by ensuring that the full year's subscription is taken every time.

### **The Process at GYB Services**

This process has been mapped and whilst thought of as being very good it takes extra resource at peak times and is managed by way of 15 separate spreadsheets covering each round, new bins and an overview. These will increase as bin take up increases. Each spreadsheet has to be updated and at peak times this year there has been over 1000

requests in the 'waste' in box waiting to be dealt with manually. It is important for GYBS to receive payment information from GYBC in a readily usable format so that payments can be reconciled. There have been issues around the report format not allowing this to happen easily.

At the time of writing (early August) there remains around 300 customers whom it is not certain have paid (the bins have not been collected from these) which does seem a significant number. These have been subject to a reminder letter.

A decision therefore has to be made around the payments collection system for 2017/18.

## **Payment Options for 2017/18 and Beyond**

### **Option 1: Return to Using Civica**

The reasons for the abandonment of this system are still present. The time constraints around using the system have been covered above. This is also compounded by the need to manually re-enter all 7000+ addresses onto the database so that an invoice can be raised to be set against the direct debit (DD). To use a rolling renewal date would also create significant resource issues for the invoicing team in terms of maintenance for unpaid /cancelled DDs and the need to create and maintain product codes. Furthermore, from a digital perspective, Civica Open Revenues does not currently have an automated solution for direct debits within Sundry Debts, for customers to set up payments by DD and then the back office being automatically updated (which it has for Council tax and Business Rates).

For all the above reasons this option has been discounted.

### **Option 2: Using/ Adapting another Existing Council System**

The Capita system can handle DD as a managed service but at a high cost against (relatively) low take up. Otherwise capita will still need a back office system to be able to use Capita DD self-serve module. A recurring payments system will not save on bank transaction charges and there is a cost in purchasing and implementing the module.

None of the Councils other systems are thought to be appropriate or adaptable for this work.

Therefore this option has been discounted.

### **Option 3: Use the Same System as for 2016/17 Renewals**

Although bulky and long winded, much of the preparatory work carried out last year does not have to be repeated for next year. The additional costs that might be incurred by utilising the same methodology for an assumed 8000 customers are set out as follows;

#### **Environmental Services;**

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| 8000 envelopes                          | £260   |
| 8000 second class postage               | £4400  |
| 8000 two page renewal letters printed   | £384   |
| Calendar printing costs (15/16 figures) | £1,118 |

Inserting 8000 letters into envelopes manually estimated at 16 hours work (£20 p/h) £320

From 2016, 1650 customers renewing late – loss to Council for the first month alone was calculated to be. £5,570

**Total Cost: £12,058**

These costs will increase proportionally as the numbers subscribing to the service increases.

The total cost above relates to specific budget costs which could be utilised as savings should an alternative method be identified.

#### **Option 4: Using a Bespoke System**

There is a number of software systems on the market designed to assist waste authorities on the management of the domestic solid waste collection. Perhaps the best known is BARTEC but others include Whitespace / AllOnMobile. The BARTEC system was demonstrated last year to the officer group who were impressed by its capabilities and that it can be an asset to the overall management of the Council's waste functions not just around payments and the garden waste collection service.

The software systems were further reviewed in June 2016 by Terence Gray of the Officer group who found that;

- *Having reviewed both BARTEC ([BARTEC-systems.com/index.html](http://BARTEC-systems.com/index.html)) and Whitespace/AllOnMobile ([www.allonmobile.com/#videos](http://www.allonmobile.com/#videos)) waste management solutions, BARTEC's system clearly offers more comprehensive waste management facilities, particularly around in-cab solutions. However, Whitespace/AllOnMobile is closely tied to Civica (see [here](#)).*
- *BARTEC / Goss Self-Service platform would offer better, end-to-end solution (compared to Whitespace), particularly as GYB Services do not utilise Civica back-end systems for waste management.*

Having attended a recent meeting with other local authorities' client waste officers, BARTEC does seem to be the market leader and system of choice of many. A number of Councils have integrated BARTEC with the Capita payments systems which we have at Great Yarmouth and which would be necessary to make the system work.

The Council is due to change its form provider to GOSS this year and they would need to ensure the payment connector is in place for February. GOSS has wide experience of integrating both with BARTEC and Capita. With residents self-serving there will be no need to create a database of accounts or invoicing upfront.

The BARTEC system would enable payments to move to an anniversary system which would reduce administration for reducing payments throughout the year and offer the potential to increase income through no loss of revenue to late renewals.

#### **BARTEC Costs**

Using 2015 figures;

## Appendix

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| Implementation – one off cost                  | £7,600  |
| Training – one off cost                        | £1,300  |
| System Hosting (per year)                      | £3,000  |
| System Support and Maintenance (per year)      | £2,500  |
| Capita Costs (work to payment files) – one off | £3,000  |
| GOSS costs absorbed                            |         |
| Therefore, Year 1 costs                        | £17,400 |
| Year 2 (and beyond) per year                   | £5,500  |

### **Recommendation**

BARTEC has a number of advantages over what the Council currently does. It is not solely a back office payment facilitator but is a complete tool to manage the whole of the Councils solid waste collection service now and in the future. It can be an in cab tool if required and allows for quick assimilation of new properties, changes to routes and can send advisory emails to customers resulting in substantial postage savings.

Year 1 start-up costs are significant and there is currently no budget provision for such. Savings can be identified from within the existing delivery to reduce ongoing annual costs however it is requested that the initial 1<sup>st</sup> year costs be taken from the Spend to Save reserve with £10,484 (approximately 30% of current outgoing letter and postage costs to allow for those residents that will still require a mailing) identified as ongoing annual savings from this change. Taking out the annual maintenance fee for the system, the Council will still save around £5,000 per year from year two.

It is recommended that approval be given for the purchase of the BARTEC system and Year 1 costs are provided from the Council's Spend to Save budget.

**Report Author: Glenn Buck Group Manager Environmental Services**

**Date: 17<sup>th</sup> August 2016.**





Subject: Maintenance of A12 Roundabouts

Report to: EMT 18<sup>th</sup> August 2016  
Environment Committee 12<sup>th</sup> September 2016

Report by: Jane Beck Director of Customer Services

**SUBJECT MATTER:**

**This report seeks to inform members of the current position with the A12 Highway England roundabouts and to consider possible options for their future maintenance provision.**

## **1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The condition of A12 Hopton to Great Yarmouth trunk road roundabouts have been a serious concern for the Authority since raised with Highways England in September 2015. The level of maintenance undertaken by the Contractor is considerably lower than Borough expectations.
- 1.2 The current poor maintenance schedule creates Health and Safety implications resulting from poor visibility and has a detrimental impact on businesses, residents and visitors of the Borough.
- 1.3 Highways England currently maintains the roundabouts at Hopton, Gorleston Beacon Park, Middleton Road, Victoria Road and Harfreys industrial estate. The roundabouts at Gapton Hall industrial estate and Vauxhall roundabout are maintained through the Joint Venture Contract with GYB Services.
- 1.4 Highways England acknowledged in September 2015 that the condition of the roundabouts was poor and agreed a range of works to improve the locations bringing them back up to the Highway England defined standard. This work originally due to be undertaken in November 2015 did not take place until February 2016.
- 1.5 Since the work in February minimal works have been undertaken on the five Highway England roundabouts the result being that again all are in poor condition, confirmation has been received that no further work is anticipated to be undertaken on any of these roundabouts until September/October 2016.

## **2. PROPOSAL FROM HIGHWAY ENGLAND**

- 2.1 Highways England have outlined an option for the Council to take over the management and maintenance of the five roundabouts which would be based on a s.142 license agreement.
- 2.2 The License will wholly permit the Council the plant, retain, maintain and replace trees, shrubs, plants and grass to a good standard but agrees to the Council covering completely of undertaking this work.

- 2.3 The agreement will enable the Council to install sponsorship signage provided it is in line with Highway England guidance on Environmental Sponsorship.
- 2.4 Highway England have identified that plans are in place to improve some of the trunk road roundabouts as part of the Government Roads Investment Strategy, works are due to start in the first period which includes up to 2019 this may result in some licenses being suspended during the period of improvements.

### **3. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

- 3.1 In order to fully evaluate and cost the proposal to enter into a S142 agreement it is necessary to identify the proposed standard. For the purposes of this report it is recommended that the two roundabouts currently maintained by the Joint Venture Company are used as the baseline.
- 3.2 It is suggested that works are undertaken to reduce health and safety issues relating to working on a busy truck road and further evaluation of this will be addressed in the financial costs of any license agreement.
- 3.3 The proposal by Highways England does not currently offer funding toward the costs of maintaining the roundabouts however this will continue to be explored as part of any negotiations.

### **5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 Costs associated with entering into a S142 Agreement as contained with the attached appendix. Options range from maintaining planting through to redesign in order to reduce ongoing costs.
- 5.2 Interest has been shown in relation to sponsorship and it may be possible to mitigate costs through local business sponsorship.
- 5.3 GYTABID wish to consider the option to enhance the entrance gateways, Vauxhall and Hopton roundabouts, to promote the tourism industry.

### **6. RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 There are additional costs in entering into any agreement with Highway England although clearly the overall benefit to the Borough through a much enhanced level of maintenance would benefit businesses, residents and visitors.
- 6.2 Further appraisal will be required should Committee wish to progress this proposal further to ensure current and future risks are mitigated.

### **7. RECOMMENDATION**

- 7.1 To progress negotiations with Highways England toward a S142 Agreement.
- 7.2 To identify options to mitigate additional costs through private sector funding.