

Scrutiny Committee

MEMBERSHIP:-

Councillor GOODYEAR (Chairman) Councillors SHUTTLEWORTH (Deputy Chairman)
Councillors BELSEY, COOKE, Mrs COLES, THOMPSON and UNGAR.

6. Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2011 were submitted and approved and the Chairman was authorised to sign them as a correct record.

7. Declarations of Interest.

None were received.

8. Eastbourne Community Safety Plan.

The committee considered the report of the Senior Head of Community advising members of the success of the Eastbourne Crime Reduction Partnership 2008/2011 (now Eastbourne Community Safety Partnership), the current performance under the new Community Safety Plan, early implications of the County-wide review, including enhanced local arrangements and outlined any issues that would potentially impact future crime and antisocial behaviour performance. The report further detailed the past performance, current Safety Plan performance and resource implications.

Overall crime had substantially reduced since 2005/2006 performance year. Notable reductions had been achieved as a result of the previous co-ordinated plan 2008/2011. Indications were that, in categories measured, crime was continued to reduce under the new plan which was an auspicious start. Details of some of the successes were highlighted in paragraph 2.3 of the report. Members noted that the current Plan, attached at appendix A to the report, had been developed in consultation with key partners including the Police and other members of the Community Safety Partnership.

Members were advised that Central Government cut-backs and the introduction of a Police and Crime Commissioner in May 2012 would potentially adversely impact on Community Safety Partnership funding from the 2013/2014 performance year.

Scrutiny discussed the plan and asked that in future specific figure be included within the report rather than percentages for ease of comparison.

Councillor Ungar highlighted the success of the scheme to install fire alarms in homes by the Fire Brigade.

NOTED.

9. Corporate Performance Outturns 2010/11.

Members considered the report of the Strategic Performance Manager updating the members of the Council's performance against Corporate Plan Priority indicators and action targets for 2011/12.

Members noted that the 2010/15 Corporate Plan was refreshed for 2011 and set out a series of key actions and indicators to deliver and measure progress against key priorities.

Members noted that information contained within the performance reports was collected and managed using the Covalent performance management system. Further detail behind the report and evidence providing a full and robust audit trail for the performance information presented was available to view within the online system. Two Member training sessions dedicated to accessing and using Covalent had been scheduled for 31 October 2011 and 7 February 2012, however, Members were invited to contact the Strategic Performance Team at any time to arrange individual training support on using the system if required.

The committee discussed the performance outturns, in particular numbers of patrons at the Bandstand, the progress of the Loyalty Card scheme, Solarbourne and the measurement of electricity generated and methods for monitoring the scheme, and particular aspects of age restriction policies held by the charity 'Refuge'.

NOTED.

10. Waste Contract – Procurement.

The committee considered the report of the Senior Head of Development and Environment informing and consulting Scrutiny of the specification, inter authority agreement and cost sharing agreement in the procurement of the Joint Waste Contract.

Members were advised that across East Sussex there were a number of waste contracts approaching renewal at about the same time. Eastbourne's contract for the collection of waste and street cleaning was the first for renewal on 1 April 2013. There were similar contracts in Hastings and Rother although these were due to expire at slightly later dates than Eastbourne. Wealden District Council currently provided its waste collection with an in house team but would like to procure a private sector company to carry out the service. Consequently the four authorities had been working in partnership to explore the potential of joint procurement. Early work had shown there were economies of scale that provided the potential for efficiencies and cost avoidance with a large contract. To this end the

authorities had been putting in place the governance and administrating systems to manage a single contract across all four local authority areas.

The stage now reached was a critical point where key documents were being prepared and would form part of the tendering exercise. These documents were:-

- Draft Specification
- Cost Sharing Agreement, and
- Inter-authority Agreement

Each of the documents had been before the new Joint Waste Committee on 17 August and had been agreed in principle as drafts to be progressed to each authority's Scrutiny Committees. The report outlined the draft specification, cost sharing agreements and inter-authority agreement and tender process.

Neil Foley, Financial Development Manager, East Sussex County Council attended the meeting and presented a model for a potential cost sharing scheme that could be applied to an inter-authority agreement. Members noted that actual figures would depend on the accuracy of the financial data supplied by each authority, the weighting impact of the dwellings and sparsity information and any additional requests for specialist services by each authority. Authorities would be consulted at every stage of the process to ensure cross-party agreement.

Len Attrill, WYG, attended the meeting and advised members on the development of the specification of a proposed contract following consultation with all potential contractors to see what was available and what each authority may want. Mr Attrill described the competitive dialogue stage, and the Descriptive Document and Pre Qualification Questionnaire stages. Members noted that the length of any inter-authority contract should be considered and that other issues may arise as the process evolved. All aspects of collection would be considered and included amongst other areas; suitability, affordability, recycling options and frequency of collections.

Members discussed the various waste contract procurement documents including frequency of collections, comparisons between the costs of the current contract and any future joint contract, short listing of contractors and achievable levels of recyclables.

The purpose of this report was to seek comments from Scrutiny Members on these documents. Members were asked to submit and questions relating to the Waste Contract documents and in particular paragraph 2.8 of the main report, to the Scrutiny Co-ordinator by no later than 21 September 2011.

Any comments would be taken into account before the documents were considered by the Joint Waste Committee on 21 October 2011 for further consideration with final approval on 9 November for inclusion in the Tender documentation.

NOTED.

11. Scrutiny Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11.

The committee considered the report of the Scrutiny Co-ordinator regarding the activities of the Scrutiny Committee during 2010-2011.

NOTED.

The meeting closed at 7.40p.m.

**Councillor Goodyear
Chairman**