Public Document Pack



Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board

Tuesday, 23 January 2007 6.30 p.m. Council Chamber, Runcorn Town Hall

Chief Executive

Daw, D. W. C.

Councillor Shaun Osborne (Chairman)	Labour
Councillor John Stockton (Vice- Chairman)	Labour
Councillor Susan Edge	Labour
Councillor Martha Lloyd Jones	Labour
Councillor Keith Morley	Labour
Councillor Ernest Ratcliffe	Liberal Democrat
Councillor Linda Redhead	Liberal Democrat
Councillor Colin Rowan	Conservative
Councillor Geoffrey Swift	Conservative
Councillor Dave Thompson	Labour
Councillor Pamela Wallace	Labour

Please contact Michelle Simpson on 0151 424 2061 Ext. 1126 or e-mail michelle.simpson@halton.gov.uk for further information. The next meeting of the Committee is on Tuesday, 20 March 2007

ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH IN THE PRESENCE OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Part I

lte	tem No.	
1.	MINUTES	
2.	DECLARATION OF INTEREST (INCLUDING PARTY WHIP DECLARATIONS)	
	Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any personal or personal and prejudicial interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda, no later than when that item is reached and (subject to certain exceptions in the Code of Conduct for Members) to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on the item.	
3.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	1 - 2
4.	EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES	3 - 5
5.	DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY ISSUES	
	(A) MEGADRIVE - PRESENTATION Presentation from the Road Safety Officer Lisa Scott.	6
	(B) FIRE SAFETY - PRESENTATION Presentation from Fire Safety Officer Alan Briggs entitled "Fire Safety – The Way Ahead", outlining the new and improved Community focus provided by Cheshire Fire & Rescue Service in Halton for 2007/08, in conjunction with many partners.	
	(C) JOINT MERSEYSIDE WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - PRESENTATION	7 - 9
	(D) DRUG ACTION AND ALCOHOL TEAM - PRESENTATION	10
	 (E) SMOKE FREE PREMISES LEGISLATION (F) SECTION 57 OF THE CLEAN NEIGHBOURHOODS AND ENVIRONMENT ACT 2005 DOG CONTROL ORDERS 	11 - 14 15 - 19
	(G) RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR SAFE HEADSTONES	20 - 24
6.	ITEMS FOR INFORMATION	J
	(A) NOTES OF WORKING PARTY MEETINGS	25 - 34

In accordance with the Health and Safety at Work Act the Council is required to notify those attending meetings of the fire evacuation procedures. A copy has previously been circulated to Members and instructions are located in all rooms within the Civic block.

REPORT TO: Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board

DATE: 23 January 2007

REPORTING OFFICER: Chief Executive

SUBJECT: Public Question Time

WARD(s): Borough-wide

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To consider any questions submitted by the Public in accordance with Standing Order 33 (5).
- 1.2 Details of any questions received will be circulated at the meeting.

2.0 **RECOMMENDED:** That any questions received be dealt with.

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1 Standing Order 34(11) states that Public Questions shall be dealt with as follows: -
 - A total of 30 minutes will be allocated for members of the public who are residents of the Borough, to ask questions at meetings of the Policy and Performance Boards.
 - (ii) Members of the public can ask questions on any matter relating to the agenda.
 - (iii) Members of the public can ask questions. Written notice of questions must be submitted by 4.00 pm on the day prior to the meeting. At any meeting no person/organisation may submit more than one question.
 - (iv) One supplementary question (relating to the original question) may be asked by the questioner which may or may not be answered at the meeting.
 - (v) The Chair or proper officer may reject a question if it:-
 - Is not about a matter for which the local authority has a responsibility or which affects the Borough;
 - Is defamatory, frivolous, offensive, abusive or racist;
 - Is substantially the same as a question which has been put at a meeting of the Council in the past six months; or
 - Requires the disclosure of confidential or exempt information.

- (vii) The Chairperson will ask for people to indicate that they wish to ask a question.
- (viii) **PLEASE NOTE** that the maximum amount of time each questioner will be allowed is 3 minutes.
- (ix) If you do not receive a response at the meeting, a Council Officer will ask for your name and address and make sure that you receive a written response.

Please bear in mind that public question time lasts for a maximum of 30 minutes. To help in making the most of this opportunity to speak: -

- Please keep questions as concise as possible.
- Please do not repeat or make statements on earlier questions as this reduces the time available for other issues to be raised.
- Please note that public question time is not intended for debate issues raised will be responded to either at the meeting or in writing at a later date.

4.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

None.

5.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

None.

6.0 RISK ANALYSIS

None.

7.0 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

None.

6.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

There are no background papers under the meaning of the Act.

REPORT TO: Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board

DATE: 23 January 2007

REPORTING OFFICER: Chief Executive

SUBJECT: Executive Board Minutes

WARD(s): Boroughwide

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The Minutes relating to the Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board which have been considered by the Executive Board and Executive Board Sub since the last meeting are attached at Appendix 1 for information.
- 1.2 The Minutes are submitted to inform the Policy and Performance Board of decisions taken in their area.

2.0 **RECOMMENDATION:** That the Minutes be noted.

3.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

None.

5.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

None.

6.0 **RISK ANALYSIS**

None.

7.0 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

None.

8.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

There are no background papers under the meaning of the Act.

APPENDIX 1

Extract of Executive Board Sub Committee Minutes Relevant to the Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board

EXECUTIVE BOARD SUB-COMMITTEE 7th DECEMBER 2006

EBS56 VICTORIA PARK RESTORATION, REPORT ON PATH SURFACING TENDERS

The Board considered a report which outlined the results of the tender for the supply and laying of specialist resin-bound gravel surfaces to Victoria Park's main paths.

Two tenders had been received, however, one tender arrived late and was therefore disqualified. The remaining valid tender from E.B.L. Group in the sum of £97,471.44 was within budget for this element of work and a contract for the work had been entered into in accordance with Standing Orders relating to procurement clause 3.1.

RESOLVED: That in accordance with Standing Orders relating to Procurement Clause 3.2, the Committee note the report for information only, the tender was awarded to E.B.L. Group Limited.

EBS57 EXTENSION OF EXISTING SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT WITH MERSEYSIDE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY SERVICE FOR THE PROVISION OF TECHNICAL ENVIRONMENTAL ADVICE.

The Sub-Committee considered a request for a time extension to a service level agreement between Halton Borough Council and Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council, acting on behalf of Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service (MEAS), for the provision of technical environmental advice in connection with planning matters.

The existing legal agreement for the provision of these services was signed on 9^{th} June 2005 and covered a two-year period from 1^{st} April 2004 to 31^{st} March 2006. The new draft legal agreement would extend this time period for a further two years to 31^{st} March 2008, at an annual cost of £15,000 in financial year 2006/07 and £15,450 in 2007/08.

It had become apparent from previous working with MEAS that they offered good value for money when compared against the charges made by consultants for equivalent services. MEAS were able to draw upon existing local knowledge and technical expertise. Additionally, they also provided advice, on occasion, on behalf of six local authorities, which enabled the cost to be shared between the six rather than borne by an individual authority.

RESOLVED: That the Service Level Agreement between Halton Borough Council and the Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service be extended for two years to cover the period to end of March 2008, at an annual cost of £15,000 in 2006/07 and £15,450 in 2007/08.

Agenda Item 5a

REPORT: Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board

DATE: 23 January 2007

REPORTING OFFICER: Strategic Director Environment

- SUBJECT:Road Safety Education, Training and Publicity
Recent Events and Future Funding Arrangements
- WARDS: Boroughwide

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To provide a verbal presentation on recent and successful road safety education events.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the presentation be received.

REPORT TO:	Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board
DATE:	23 January 2007
REPORTING OFFICER:	Strategic Director - Environment
SUBJECT:	Joint Merseyside Waste Development Plan Document – Presentation by Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service.
WARDS:	Borough Wide

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform to those on the Safer Halton board of the up coming issues and options consultation stage for the Joint Merseyside Waste Development Plan Document. This report simply provides platform for a presentation by the Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service who will further introduce the topic.

2.0 **RECOMMENDATION**:

- (1) The presentation be received;
- (2) Members of the PPB comment and question the Advisory Service as a result of the presentation and put forward any recommendations arising from the debate.

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1 In 2004 the government introduced the new Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. This Act placed a statutory duty on all local planning authorities to produce Local Development Frameworks (LDF's) as part of an open and more transparent way of plan making. LDF's consist of a number of tiers of planning documents from the strategic level Core Strategy, Development Plan Documents (DPD's) which allocate land for uses such as housing and employment and Supplementary Planning Documents which provide additional detailed planning guidance to policies within DPD's and the Core Strategy.
- 3.2 One element of the LDF which may not have been specifically identified in the past, is the Joint Merseyside Waste Development Plan Document.
- *3.3* In Merseyside agreement has been reached to implement the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) through the Merseyside Waste Partnership whilst the relevant waste planning authorities have formally embarked on the process of preparing a joint statutory planning framework, the Waste DPD.

- 3.4 The Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service supported by consultants has been charged with the task of developing the Waste DPD on behalf of the five Merseyside Districts and Halton. This work is progressing in close co-operation with the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority's own Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.
- 3.5 The Waste DPD is aiming to provide a statutory policy framework within which planning decisions can be taken by each of the Merseyside Districts for waste management proposals for all waste streams. In taking a long-term approach the Waste DPD will have substantial benefits for the private sector in reducing planning risk and uncertainty. It will facilitate the delivery of sustainable waste management across Merseyside thereby helping to reduce the financial costs and penalties of non-compliance with European and Government targets. It will also ensure that waste facilities are located in the most appropriate places by taking full account of the social, human, environmental and economic constraints during the plan preparation process. The Waste DPD deals with all waste streams within Merseyside. All these waste streams require facilities for treatment, storage, transfer, bulking and final disposal. Current estimates of Merseyside's waste are as follows:
 - Municipal solid waste 18.5%.
 - Commercial and Industrial waste 29.9%.
 - Construction, demolition and excavation waste 48.2%.
 - Hazardous waste 3.4%.
 - Agricultural waste as yet unquantified.
 - Radioactive waste <0.1%.
 - Other waste streams as yet unquantified.
- 3.6 The Waste DPD will be a joint statutory development plan document of the five Merseyside Waste Planning Authorities namely Knowsley, Liverpool, Sefton, St. Helens and Wirral and also Halton. It will set the planning framework and site-specific allocations for waste management facilities for the next 10 to 15 years from adoption in 2010 to 2020 or 2025.

4.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The new Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act is very demanding in terms of consultation and public participation and requires substantial investment in early stakeholder engagement.
- **4.2** During its production there will be extensive consultation throughout the individual district councils, in accordance with the Statements of Community Involvement, and the Merseyside people and other relevant interested parties (stakeholders). This will ensure that the outcome of the Waste DPD is endorsed by the public and the Councils.

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Document	Place of Inspection	Contact Officer
The Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004	DCLG Website / Environmental Health & Planning Department	Perran Baragwanath
Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Communities	DCLG Website / Environmental Health & Planning Department	Perran Baragwanath
Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management	DCLG Website / Environmental Health & Planning Department	Perran Baragwanath
Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks (and companion guide)	DCLG Website / Environmental Health & Planning Department	Perran Baragwanath

Agenda Item 5d

REPORT TO:	Safer Halton PPB
DATE:	23 rd January 2007
REPORTING OFFICER:	Strategic Director – Health & Community
SUBJECT:	Drug Action and Alcohol Team - presentation

WARD(S) Borough-wide

1.0 **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 To introduce a presentation of the Drug Action and Alcohol Team (DAAT) which outlines their work and their current issues.

2.0 **RECOMMENDATION: That:**

- i) The presentation be received
- ii) Members of the PPB comment and question the DAAT Co-ordinator as a result of the presentation and put forward any recommendations arsing from the debtate.

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1 The Board has received regular presentations relevant to areas of their remit.
- 3.2 The accepted definition of a 'DAAT' covers the areas of drug use, alcohol harm and domestic violence. The presentation will outline Halton's approach to these issues.

4.0 **POLICY FINANCIAL AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 None as a consequence of this report. A number of strategies have previously been approved.

5.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

5.1 None relevant to this report

Document	Place of Inspection	Contact Officer

REPORT TO:	Safer Halton Policy & Performance Board
DATE:	23 January 2006
REPORTING OFFICER:	Strategic Director Environment
SUBJECT:	Smoke free premises legislation
WARDS:	Boroughwide

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report is brought to the board to inform them on the current position relating to the introduction of the smokefree legislation in England.

2.0 **RECOMMENDATION:** That

- (1) the board note and consider the report; and
- (2) that the Environmental Health and Risk Assessment Working Party continue to meet to undertake an overview of the legislation as national guidance is made available and report back to the board as appropriate.

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Background

- 3.1 Smoking rates in England have fallen from 28 per cent in 1998 to 24 percent in 2005—meaning around 1.6 million fewer smokers at 2005 population levels. The Department of Health has a target to reduce smoking rates further to 21 per cent or less by 2010, and to reduce smoking amongst routine and manual groups to 26 per cent or less over the same time period (from the 2005 level of 31 per cent). The Government aims to achieve reductions in smoking prevalence through an integrated combination of policies that will help the 70 per cent of smokers who say they want to quit to be successful.
- 3.2 The medical and scientific evidence of the risks to health from exposure to secondhand smoke is well established and documented. The Government's independent Scientific Committee on Tobacco and Health (SCOTH) has confirmed that secondhand smoke is a substantial public health hazard, and recommended restrictions on smoking in public places and workplaces to protect non-smokers.
- 3.3 The Choosing Health Making Healthier Choices Easier White Paper set out the Government's proposed action on secondhand smoke. In February 2006 MPs in the House of Commons voted to modify proposals set out in the Government's White Paper so that smoking will be banned in all enclosed public spaces.
- 3.4 The Government therefore introduced smoke-free legislation in the Health Act 2006 with the aim of:
 - reducing the risks to health from exposure to secondhand smoke;

- recognising a person's right to be protected from harm and to enjoy smokefree air;
- increasing the benefits of smoke-free enclosed public places and workplaces for people trying to give up smoking so that they can succeed in an environment where social pressures to smoke are reduced; and
- saving thousands of lives over the next decade by reducing both exposure to hazardous secondhand smoke and overall smoking rates.

The legislation

3.5 In June 2006 the Health Act 2006 with its smokefree provisions received Royal Assent. The Health Act 2006 provides regulation-making powers this will enable the government to introduce details provisions by way of regulations.

All enclosed public places and workplaces will become smokefree from 1st July 2007. The implementation of the smoke-free elements of the Health Act 2006 will mean that virtually all enclosed public places and workplaces will become smoke-free environments. This will include offices, factories, shops, pubs, bars, restaurants, membership clubs, public transport and work vehicles that are used by more than one person. The legislation will make it an offence for those who control or manage smoke-free premises to fail to stop people smoking on them. Exemptions currently under consultation include some hotel/guest bedrooms and designated rooms in care homes, hospices, long stay mental health units and adult prisons. Private homes that are not used as workplaces will not be covered by the law. Signage will be required for smokefree premises and vehicles in prominent positions.

3.6 Smoke-free legislation is not a "smoking ban". The Government respects individual autonomy, including a person's right to choose whether to smoke. The legislation will protect others from exposure to harmful secondhand smoke.

Local authorities are identified as being best placed to enforce smoke-free legislation, and the government expects that in most local authorities, environmental health sections would primarily undertake the work. At present Health and safety executive (HSE) share health &Safety enforcement with LA's in eg they regulate large factories, crown buildings and LA buildings. However, the HSE have stated that they will not enforce the smoking legislation. If the Government upholds this then Environmental Health may be in the position of regulating legal council premises.

- 3.7 A three-month consultation on the draft regulations ran from July to October 2006. Around 550 responses were received, many of them very detailed, from a range of stakeholders. The Department of Health has made a number of changes to draft regulations based on consultation responses.
- 3.8 The Department of Health has published two sets of regulations, which set out some of the detail of the Health Act 2006. These sets of regulations cover:
 - Definition of 'enclosed' and 'substantially enclosed' premises
 - Enforcement authorities
 - Signage

- 3.9 Three further sets of regulations will be published in the New Year containing: exemptions and vehicles; penalties and discounted amounts; and offences in vehicles and the format for fixed penalty notices. The last two sets of regulations will be subject to Parliamentary debate. The Smoke-free (Premises and Enforcement) Regulations have been made in advance of other regulations to give businesses and local authorities as much certainty as possible over how businesses will be able to comply with smoke-free legislation.
- 3.10 In the Smoke-free (Premises and Enforcement) Regulations premises will be considered to be enclosed if they have a ceiling or roof and, except for doors, windows or passageways, are wholly enclosed, whether on a permanent or temporary basis. Premises are substantially enclosed if they have a ceiling or roof, but there are permanent openings in the walls that are less than half of the total areas of walls, including other structures that serve the purpose of walls and constitute the perimeter of premises. When determining the area of an opening, no account can be taken of openings in which doors, windows or other fittings that can be open or shut. This is known as the 50% rule. A roof includes any fixed or movable structures, such as canvas awnings. Tents, marguees or similar will also be classified as enclosed premises if they fall within the definition. Further guidance will be produced for local authorities, business and other enforcement authorities. Premises and vehicles that are to be smokefree under the law will be required to have no-smoking signs in place at each entrance, displayed in a prominent position.

3.11 **Essential factors for consideration**

- a) Enforcement policy, protocols in the light of national guidance
- b) The impact upon other regulatory functions for example licensing, litter and planning.
- c) Effective advise and support for businesses and how it will be delivered
- d) The resource implications and any potential need to bid for additional funding
- e) Effective communication and media strategies keeping businesses the public at large informed establishments halton council employees informed and responding to media interest prior and post the implementation date.

Environmental Health and Risk Assessment Working Party

3.12 The chair has agreed that the Environmental Health and Risk Assessment Working Party set up by the board to consider such issues should take on an overview and a scrutiny examination of this issue. The panel has met to be briefed on the background and the government's intentions. With the arrival of the detailed legislatiion and the promise of detailed guidance to follow this group will be able meet again to fulfill this role.

4.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Effective and proportionate regulation is a best value consideration (BVPI-166). There is already an environmental health enforcement policy, which will need to be reviewed to reflect anticipated guidance and best practice on smokefree regulation.

5.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Under smoke-free legislation, enforcement authorities will be first-tier local authorities i.e. .a unitary authority; a district council in so far as it is not a unitary authority; a London borough council, or a port health authority. The regulations will impose a new burden on enforcement authorities. In the first instance it is accepted by government that enforcement cannot be readily accommodated from existing resources. Recognising this burden, the Department of Health will be funding local authorities to support the implementation of smoke-free legislation. The Department is currently finalising the funding package for 2007/08. Ongoing enforcement requirements will be assessed to inform funding for local authorities in future years.
- 5.2 There may be unintended consequences of action, including costs to local authorities in cleaning up or providing disposal facilities for cigarette butts in outdoor public places. It has also been suggested that there might be some increase in anti-social behavior from smokers drinking on the streets rather than in licensed premises.

6.0 RISK ANALYSIS

- 6.1 This is an opportunity to contribute to one of the Council's five strategic priorities for the borough of improving health standards by working with partners and local people to create a healthier community.
- 6.2 The main risk is that comprehensive smoke-free legislation may not reflect public opinion completely, and may therefore be controversial and difficult to enforce. It carries a risk of alienating sections of the community.
- 6.3 Similarly failure to communicate effectively with stakeholders from the outset could make enforcement far more resource intensive and costly than it needs to be.
- 6.4 A failure to account for the potential unintended consequences

7.0 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

7.1 The environmental and regulatory services department in exercising its regulatory services aim to be consistent and even handed in all regards and as such the service does not apply differently to any particular group. Even though the services are not intended to have either a positive or negative impact but as a service dealing directly with the whole cross section of the community in a regulatory capacity there is always scope for a group or individuals to perceive to be affected differently.

7.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

There are no background papers within the meaning of the Act General background information can be found on the <u>www.smokefreeengland.co.uk</u> web site

Agenda Item 5f

REPORT TO:	Safer Halton Policy & Performance Board
DATE:	23 January 2006
REPORTING OFFICER:	Strategic Director Environment
SUBJECT:	Section 57 of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 dog control orders
WARDS:	Boroughwide

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 brought in new powers for local authorities to deal with dog-related issues. These powers enable local authorities to deal with the minority of irresponsible dog owners and will replace existing legislation if adopted
- 1.3 The powers are adoptive and this report is brought to the board at the request of the chair to allow the board to consider the merits and implications of adopting these powers and where in the borough would be appropriate to apply them.

2.0 **RECOMMENDATION:** That

- (1) the Board note and consider the report; and
- (2) the Board undertakes an overview examination of the merits and implications for the Council of adopting these new powers with a view to making recommendations.

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1 The Act presents an opportunity to provide a range of controls that could improve the effectiveness of environmental enforcement. The controls relating to dogs are important because in addition to the risks of environmental damage and public nuisance, there are significant public health risks associated with dog fouling for example through Toxocara Canis infection that can cause illness in humans including the risk of damage to eye-sight. These risks have to be balanced against the rights of dog owners and the benefits that can arise from responsible dog ownership.
- 3.2 From 6 April 2006, a Dog Control Order can be made under Section 57 of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 in respect of:
 - Any land which is open to the air, and
 - To which the public have access (with or without payment).
- 3.3 Land is "open to the air" if it is open to the air on at least one side. It, therefore applies to any covered place with a significant permanent opening on at least one side, such as a bus shelter or garage forecourt that remains open to the air at all times. This is the same as the position under the provisions on litter.

- 3.4 Local authorities that designated any of their land under the Dogs (Fouling of Land) 1996 before 6 April 2006 can continue to enforce the 1996 Act indefinitely, or until a Dog Control Order is made in respect of the same land. For example, if a District council designated the whole District under the 1996 Act, but then made a dog control order in respect of its parks, this means the 1996 legislation would no longer have effect in the parks but would continue to have effect throughout the rest of the District.
- 3.5 The Dog Control Orders (Prescribed Offences and Penalties etc) Regulations provide for 5 offences, which may be prescribed in a dog control order
 - a) failing to remove dog faeces; dog
 - b) not keeping a dog on a lead;
 - c) not putting, and keeping, a dog on a lead when directed to do so by an authorised officer;
 - d) permitting a dog to enter land from which dogs are excluded;
 - e) taking more than a specified number of dogs onto land.
- 3.6 The penalty for committing an offence contained in a Dog Control Order is a maximum fine on level 3 of the standard scale (currently £1,000). Alternatively, the opportunity to pay a fixed penalty may be offered in place of prosecution.
- 3.7 It is a requirement, where a Dog Control Order is made, that signs should be placed summarising the Order on land to which the new order applies, thereby informing the public that the land is subject to an order.
- 3.8 The Dog Control Orders (Procedures) Regulations 2006 require that, before it can make a Dog Control Order, an authority must consult any other primary or secondary authority within the area in which the order is being made. In England, parish councils constitute secondary authorities.
- 3.9 Authorities must also publish a notice describing the proposed order in a local newspaper circulating in the same area as the land to which the order would apply, and invite representations on the proposal. The notice must:
 - a) identify the land to which the Order will apply and, (if this is the case),state that it is open access land under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000
 - b) summarise the order ;
 - c) if the order will refer to a map, say where the map can be inspected. This must be at an address in the authority's area, be free of charge and at all reasonable hours during the consultation period;
 - d) give the address to which, and the date by which, representations must be sent to the authority. The final date for representations must be at least 28 days after the publication of the notice.
- 3.10 At the end of the consultation period, the authority must consider any representations that have been made. If it then decides to proceed with the order, it must decide when the order will come into force. This must be at least 14 days from the date upon which it was made.
- 3.11 Once an order has been made, the authority must, at least 7 days before it comes into force, publish a notice in a local newspaper circulating in the same area as the land to which the order applies stating;

- a) that the order has been made; and
- b) where the order may be inspected and copies obtained
- 3.12 Where practicable a copy of the notice must also be published on the authority's web site. Also, where the order affects open access land, the authority should send a copy of the notice to the access authority, the local access forum and the Countryside Agency.
- 3.13 Finally, if an authority decides significantly to amend its proposal after considering representations, it must start the procedure again, publishing a new notice describing the amended proposal.
- 3.14 Essential factors for consideration coming out of guidance are:
 - 3.14.1 It is important for any authority considering a Dog Control Order to be able to show that this is a necessary and proportionate response to problems caused by the activities of dogs and those in charge of them.
 - 3.14.2 The authority also needs to balance the interests of those in charge of dogs against the interests of those affected by the activities of dogs, bearing in mind the need for people, in particular children, to have access to dog-free areas and areas where dogs are kept under strict control, and the need for those in charge of dogs to have access to areas where they can exercise their dogs without undue restrictions.
 - 3.14.3 Authorities should consider how easy a Dog Control Order would be to enforce, since failure properly to enforce could undermine the effect of an order. This is particularly the case for orders that exclude dogs completely from areas of land
 - 3.14.4 Although ignorance, or lack of facilities to remove faeces, will not be a defence, the Regulation 3(4)(a) of the Dog Control Orders (Procedures) Regulations states that, where practicable, signs must be put up in conspicuous positions on or near the land in respect of which it applies summarising the Order. Methods the Board may wish to consider and recommend include: installing high visibility temporary signs put up on highways, approaches to schools, near parks during periods of enforcement and replacement of current permanent signage.
 - 3.14.5 The nature, content and extent of the required consultation exercise.
 - 3.14.6 The need for community engagement and targeted education and publicity programmes to complement any enforcement regime

4.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Effective and proportionate regulation is a best value consideration (BVPI-166). There is already an environmental health enforcement policy, which includes the control of dogs.

5.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Enforcement can be accommodated from existing resources.
- 5.2 There will be an additional cost for the consultation procedure.
- 5.3 There will be a considerable financial cost of updating and replacing all existing signage. For a blanket boroughwide application of orders the cost of replacing existing signs as well as installing some additional ones together with an effective publicity campaign could be in the region of £8.000-£10.000.
- 5.4 If dog exclusion areas are to be created in recreation areas there will be a new financial cost of fencing, gating and maintaining these. The cost can only be estimated when the overview is complete and the extent of these areas agreed.

6.0 RISK ANALYSIS

- 6.1 This is an opportunity to clarify and consolidate into a single unified enforcement power the various regulatory powers around responsible dog ownership.
- 6.2 It carries a risk of alienating sections of the community particularly dog owners if not sensitively applied.

7.0 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

7.1 The environmental and regulatory services department in exercising its regulatory services aim to be consistent and even handed in all regards and as such the service does not apply differently to any particular group. Even though the services are not intended to have either a positive or negative impact but as a service dealing directly with the whole cross section of the community in a regulatory capacity there is always scope for a group or individuals to perceive to be affected differently.

8.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Document	Place of Inspection	Contact Officer
Clean Neighbourhoods Guidance on the Environmental Protection Act1990, Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 and Related Legislation. Published by the Department for Environment and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)	Environmental Health Division Rutland House Halton Lea, Runcorn WA7 2GW (Further information can be found on the DEFRA website <u>www.defra.gov.uk</u>	Mrs W.K. Salisbury Environmental Protection Manager

REPORT TO:	Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board
DATE:	23 January 2007
REPORTING OFFICER:	Strategic Director, Health and Community
SUBJECT:	Risk Management Strategy for safe headstones
WARDS:	Boroughwide

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To seek Members' support for the revised Risk Management Strategy for Safe Headstones.

2.0 **RECOMMENDATION:** That

- (1) the report be noted; and
- (2) the Operational Director for Health & Partnerships be requested to agree the revised Risk Management Strategy for safe headstones in consultation with the Executive Board Member for Environment, Leisure and Sport.

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1 Many members will be aware that the Council has had a headstone safety strategy for approximately six years. For the last few years there have been only minor changes to this strategy, but a significant change is now necessary for a number of reasons including:
 - The reluctance of many owners to have unsafe headstone memorials refitted to the latest standards
 - The findings of a recent Ombudsman report, which was critical of the approaches to this problem taken by of a number of council's up and down the country (though it should be stressed, not Halton)
 - The identification of a relatively cheap, effective and unobtrusive method of temporarily making headstones safe
 - The allocation of capital monies to fund a major project to temporarily make-safe a large number of headstones in the Council's three cemeteries
- 3.2 A copy of the revised Risk Management Strategy for safe headstones is attached as Appendix 1 to this Agenda Item. The amendments to the wording of the document are highlighted in both red font and italics (so they should be discernable even if reproduced on a mono printer).

- 3.3 The main changes to this strategy document can be summarised as follows:
 - Section 1 The inclusion of an additional requirement to contact grave-deed owners wherever possible to advise of the condition of a specific headstone and any action taken or about to be taken to combat the danger
 - Section 2 Sees the inclusion of the terms high, medium and low risk, as appropriate, for each category of headstone and the inclusion of the provision to temporarily make headstones safe, for Category 1a and Category 1 headstones. Additionally, a new category of headstone has been created for those headstones temporarily made-safe.
 - Section 3 The reference to the re-cementing of joints has been removed, as this is no longer recognised as an appropriate solution to the problem.
 - Section 4 Again, the reference to re-cementing has been deleted (as above).
 - Section 7 There is a new section 7 which indicates that due to their small size, headstones of 610 mm (2 ft) in height or smaller are considered to be outside the scope of this strategy.
- 3.4 The Head of Risk and Emergency Planning has been consulted with regard to the above revisions.
- 3.9 Note that the second recommendation in this agenda item is based on the delegated authority agreed by the Executive Board Sub Committee on 4 February 2003.

4.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The Risk Management Strategy for safe headstones forms the basis of the Council's policy for managing the safety of headstones in the Council's cemeteries.

5.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no additional financial implications flowing from this report. Existing financial implications are addressed via capital monies. It is anticipated that this new strategy will enable the Council to address, as far as is possible for any Burial Authority, the problems associated with unsafe memorial headstones in cemeteries.

6.0 RISK ANALYSIS

6.1 There is always a risk that some grave owners will not appreciate the Council's intervention, but this risk is minimal as the method adopted for temporarily making headstones safe is the most unobtrusive method available. There would be a far greater and more serious health and safety risk without a safe headstone strategy.

7.0 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

7.1 There are no equality or diversity issues flowing from this report.

8.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

8.1 There are no background papers under the meaning of the Act.

Health and Safety

Risk Management Strategy for Safe headstones

1. Public Information

The strategy for advising the public about the ongoing work being undertaken and the results of this work should include:

- a) Displaying notices on notice boards advising of the strategy, the potential dangers posed by headstones and the action the public should take if they have concerns about a particular headstone
- b) Displaying warning notices around the cemetery, as appropriate
- c) Including a headstone safety leaflet with every new grave-deed issued and supplying the leaflet for issue by funeral directors to their clients who use Halton's cemeteries
- d) Publicising headstone safety issues as appropriate via press releases and at "open days" etc.
- e) Whenever possible, contacting the grave-deed owner to advise of the condition of a specific headstone and any action taken or about to be taken to combat the danger

2. Halton Borough Council's strategy for safe headstones

Category 1a – If a headstone is found to be very unstable (*high risk*), *it should* be made temporarily safe when discovered (and so become a Category 4), but if this is not possible it should be laid-down flat when discovered.

Category 1 – If a headstone is found to be unstable and requires remedial work, but is not in imminent danger of collapse (medium risk), whenever possible it should be made temporarily safe (and so become a Category 4). This action should be taken as soon as practicable, but certainly within 3 months. If it is not possible to make such a headstone temporarily safe, a warning sticker should be placed on the headstone inviting the visitor to consult cemetery management in order to resolve the situation.

Category 2 – If a headstone is not unstable, but has cracked joints etc. with the potential to become unstable *(medium risk)*, it shall be re-inspected within 1 year.

Category 3 – If a headstone is not unstable and is in good condition *(low risk),* it shall be re-inspected within 5 years.

Category 4 – Headstones that have been made temporarily safe (low risk). A sample of 100 headstones made temporarily safe during the first-wave of the making-safe exercise (November 06 to March 07) will be retested annually. As soon as one such headstone fails this test, all such "first-wave" headstones will be re-inspected (and this failure shall inform the re-inspection period for all other headstones temporarily made safe). Otherwise, all such headstones shall fall to be re-inspected within 5 years.

Health and Safety

Risk Management Strategy for Safe headstones

3. Specification for individuals or companies erecting new, or repairing unsafe memorials

A specification for erecting headstones should be given to all stonemasons who are authorised to work in the Council's cemeteries. A tender document should also be prepared in order that the Council, should it decide, might organise the repair of an unsafe headstone. (Note: the re-cementing of failed cement joints is accepted by the Council as one method of repairing an unsafe headstone).

4. The responsibilities for the relative/visitor to the headstone.

It is proposed that a warning sign will indicate that there is a problem with a memorial and the relative/visitor will be given a twelve-month period for the headstone to be repaired in accordance with the approved national standard *(or re-cemented as per the note above)*. If the headstone is not repaired within this period, the Council will organise its laying-flat, or its repair, as appropriate.

5. Assistance to Relatives/Visitors

An approved list of contractors will be provided, together with details of the current national standard and specifications, which would be required, should the relatives/visitors wish to repair the problem themselves.

6. Headstones above 2 metres in height

It is proposed that a structural engineer should be employed to test the safety of these headstones. The results from the findings will be dealt with under the process outlined earlier.

7. Headstones of 610 mm (2 ft) in height, or smaller

Due to their small size and following a risk assessment, small headstones are considered to be outside the scope of this risk management strategy and the Council's memorial inspection procedure.

REPORT TO:	Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board
DATE:	23 January 2007
REPORTING OFFICER:	Strategic Director, Health and Community
SUBJECT:	Notes of Working Party meetings
WARDS:	Boroughwide

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To inform members of topics and issues discussed at meetings of Working Parties set up by the Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board.

2.0 **RECOMMENDATION:** That the report be noted.

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1 The Bereavement Services Working Party met on 7 December 2006 and notes of that meeting are attached as Appendix 1.
- 3.2 Where notes have not been produced for meetings help close to, or after the deadline for agenda items for the Board, members may be requested to receive oral reports of Working Party meetings, when the Policy and Performance Board considers this agenda item.

4.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no new policy implications as a result of this report.

5.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no other implications flowing from this report.

6.0 RISK ANALYSIS

6.1 There are no risks associated with this report.

7.0 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

7.1 There are no Equality and Diversity issues associated with this report.

8.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

8.1 There are no background papers under the meaning of the Act.

Appendix 1

Bereavement Working Party 7th December, 2006 at 5.00 p.m. Conference Room No. 1, Municipal Building, Kingsway, Widnes

NOTES

Present: Cllr. K. Morley (Chair), Cllr J. Swift, Cllr. L. Redhead, Cllr. M. Lloyd-Jones, Mrs. M. Carter, Mrs. D. Philbin, Mr. G. Cookson, Rev. R. Jones, Rev. P. Beetham, Rev. D. Gait, Rev. M. Greenstreet, Rev. M. Eaton, Rev. V. Schofield, Mrs. C. Smith, Mr. K. Austin, Mr. P. Lowry (F Dooley Funeral Service), Mr. A. Molyneux (Co-Operative Funeral Services/S Rigby Funeral Service) Mr. P. Harris (Davis McMullan Funeral Service)

1. Apologies for Absence

Mr. J. Downes, Mr. D. Carter (Halton Memorial Services), Rev. J. Leffler, Rev. P. Skirrow, Deacon M Wynn, Reverend Father Kelly, Rev. Father Redmond, Rev. Fr. Fox, Mr. M. Findlow (Findlows Funeral Services)

2. Minutes of Last Year's Christmas Meeting

The Minutes of last year's Christmas meeting was agreed as a true record.

3. Matters Arising from last year's Christmas meeting held on 7th December 2005 (which would not be covered elsewhere on this Agenda)

Rev. Gait asked whether any progress had been made with the Braille sign for outside the Crematorium Chapel. MC informed the Group that to date, no further progress had been made. Rev. Gait is to make further enquiries on our behalf.

4. Christmas and New Year working arrangements for Halton's three cemeteries and Widnes Crematorium

MC informed the Group of this year's Christmas and New Year working arrangements which are as follows :-

Closed for funerals on Monday, 25th December 2006, 26th December 2006 and Monday, 1st January, 2007.

Wednesday, 27th December 2006/Tuesday, 2nd January 2007 First available burial time 1.00 p.m. (1 interment) or 2.00 p.m. (2/3 interments. Normal service at Widnes Crematorium

<u>Thursday, 28th December/Friday, 29th December 2006</u> Normal working arrangements Saturday morning burials for 9th/16th December will be offered subject to the availability of staff. No cremation/burial services will be available on Saturday, 23rd December, 2006.

5. General feedback from/to clergy and funeral directors Oversized graves and charges

This issue was a concern for all funeral directors in attendance. MC reported to the Group that in the current year to date, out of 236 burials which have taken place only 13 incurred the extra charge due to large coffin sizes being brought for burial.

A discussion on this issue followed, and there was a general consensus of opinion that the extra charge be added for coffins over 30" wide. Cllr. Morley agreed to discuss this matter with the next relevant meeting of the Council before the new charges for 2007/2008 were set.

PH commented that when a Runcorn resident is cremated at Walton Lea Crematorium and the family wish to have the person's remains interred in Runcorn Cemetery, they are charged £150.00 as opposed to £75.00 had the cremation took place at Widnes Crematorium.

A discussion on this subject took place and MC advised the Group that most authorities have the same charging scheme when the Borough's cremation facilities are not used.

Burial times

AM informed the Group that burial times at Warrington and St. Helens Cemeteries were available from 10.00 a.m. on Monday mornings and asked if this facility could be made available at Halton's three cemeteries.

GC informed the Group of possible problems that could occur if this was introduced at Halton, and it was agreed that MC speak with the relevant Authorities to discuss their present working arrangements which enabled them to carry out such early funerals on a Monday.

Extra charges for cremation services after 2.30 p.m.

The funeral directors asked that the additional charge for cremation services after 2.30 p.m. be included in next year's cremation charge. MC informed the Group that this charge was necessary due to the overtime payments being paid to crematorium staff to complete the cremation process by the end of the working day.

Due to the small numbers of cremation services being held at Widnes Crematorium it was felt that this extra charge was necessary to offset the costs of late services. However, Cllr. Morley agreed to review all cremation charges but emphasised that the service needs to run efficiently. It was agreed that amendments to the Crematorium working arrangements could work quite well and some funeral directors felt that this would not cause too many problems in making funeral arrangements.

New Cremation Forms B and C

MC informed the Group that it was now a new requirement locally (although many other authorities in the Country were already adopting this) for all doctors who complete cremation forms B & C to add their GMC registration number to the form. A letter has been sent to all surgeries, hospitals and funeral directors informing them of this requirement, and the funeral directors expressed some concern that forms would be returned if the GMC number was omitted. MC informed the Group that problems would only be encountered in the interim and that all parties would work together to ensure its smooth introduction.

Time for future meetings of the Group

MC informed the Group that a request had been received from a member of the clergy to re-arrange the time of future meetings of the Group. However, everyone present favoured the current arrangements and it was agreed that future meetings would be held at the normal time of 5.00 p.m.

Completion of burial and cremation paperwork

MC informed the Group that incomplete paperwork for burial and cremation services were being received from funeral directors and asked that paperwork is checked prior to submission. It was agreed that the situation be monitored and a letter sent out to funeral directors who regularly submit incomplete forms.

Late arrival of funeral services

MC asked funeral directors to telephone Bereavement Services Office to inform them of late arriving funeral services. DP agreed to issue all funeral directors with the Department's mobile telephone numbers for use when the Cemetery land-line is engaged. All parties agreed to co-operate.

MC informed the Group that since the introduction of the hourly time slots at the Crematorium, some funeral directors were not arriving at the Crematorium at their agreed time and were sometimes arriving 20 minutes late. The agreed hourly appointments were introduced to prevent following funerals having to queue when a previous service overrun a little, and not for funerals to continually arrive late.

It was agreed that the situation be monitored and letters sent to funeral directors who regularly do not keep to their agreed appointment time without prior notification of their late arrival.

Any other suggestions

AM informed the Group of his concern over the size of cremated remains caskets permitted for the Sanctum 2000 overground vaults, as there had been a few instances where all the cremated remains did not fit into the casket. GC informed the Group that this was a rare occurrence and that the size of casket permitted is determined by the size of the interior of the vault. The current cremulator is now due for replacement and it was hoped that the new machine would reduce the cremated remains more finely which would help to alleviate the current problem.

6. Any other business

Rev Jones made enquiries regarding the portable shelter at the Crematorium. MC informed the Group that there had been problems with it and that it was currently away for repair. It was envisaged that it would be back in operation early February.

Enquiries were made regarding the proposed cemetery extension plans and Cllr Morley advised the Group that work on this was continuing. Further information would be cascaded in due course.

7. Date and time of next meeting

Thursday, 6th December, 2007 4.30 p.m. for 5.00 p.m.-Civic Suite, Runcorn Town Hall.

Minutes of Special Meeting of Anti-Social Behaviour Topic Group

Held on Wednesday 22nd November 2006 at 5pm

Municipal Building CR2

- **Present:** Cllr John Stockton (Chair), Cllr Pamela Wallace, Cllr Colin Rowan, Cllr Geoffrey Swift, Cllr Linda Redhead, Cllr Shaun Osborne, Andy Briggs, Inspector Andy Ross, Alex Villiers, Clare Myring, Steve Eastwood, Andy Williams Howard Cockcroft
- **Apologies:** Cllr Sue Edge, Cllr Marie Wright, Cllr Martha Lloyd-Jones, Cllr Dave Thompson, Gareth Jones, Dwayne Johnson, Chris Frazer, Cllr Margaret Ratcliffe

ltem	Details	Action
1	 The principle of the West Lancs Multi-Agency Problem Solving Team was considered. The meeting felt that the principle was sound, but needed to be made relevant to Halton. The following points were highlighted: - The focus should be on the strategic rather than operational. We all had a collective responsibility to tackle the issue. Initial concentration might be on enforcement, but we should not forget prevention and deterrents. The principle of co-location should be to provide seamless communication. Size of any co-located team needs to be manageable. General feeling that a co-located site should not be a Police Station as some potential clients might be nervous of criminal justice agencies. 	
2	The meeting considered in detail who might be part of co-located team. Partners were identified as either 'core' (i.e. those who would work closely with the core team, but not physically co-located). Link partners should have the opportunity to 'hot desk' from the core teams co-located office, and should establish robust communication links with the core team. The following groupings emerged: - Core: - Community Safety Police Fire YOT Probation Youth Service Co-ordinator Link: - PCT Consumer Affairs Environmental Health DAAT Mental Health Team/Social Care Housing/Homelessness	
3	Potential sites were considered for co-location. Costs were recognised as a factor, particularly ICT costs to move. Agreed to look at the viability of Church Street site.	
4	The meeting agreed that the concept of co-location needed some formal endorsement before individual partners could be approached. Debbie	

	Houghton/Andy Williams were already tasked to produce a paper on the West Lancs model for the next meeting of the Safer Halton Partnership. It was felt that this could provide a basis for a report to the Safer Halton PPB, who could then make proposals to the Executive Board.	
5	Overall management structures remained an outstanding issue. The new Community Safety Co-ordinator would be tasked with considering these. CCTV cameras would be looked at separately as an issue. Cllr Philbin to be included in future mailings.	
6	Date and time of next meeting Wednesday 20 th December at 5.00pm at CR2, Runcorn Town Hall	

Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board

Waste Working Party

Notes of a meeting held on 13th November 2006 at the Halton Stadium, Widnes.

Present: Councillor Thompson, (Chair), Councillor Osborne Councillor Redhead Councillor Stockton J Unsworth – Head of Waste Management

With the approval of the Chair, JU began the meeting by updating Members on the current position in relation to Halton's Strategic Waste Management position and the progress that had been made in the development of partnership arrangements with the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority.

JU reaffirmed the reason behind Halton's decision to withdraw from the Halton and Warrington Partnership and to pursue the option of working with Merseyside. This being as result of Halton's concerns surrounding the ability and capacity of the Halton and Warrington Waste Partnership to procure the required future waste treatment facilities within the tight timescales required. Halton's concerns were heightened by the failure of the 2 authorities to attract a suitable candidate for a Project Director and came at a time when both Merseyside and Cheshire were significantly more advanced in the procurement process than Halton.

JU confirmed that the relevant Officers and Members from Warrington were made aware of Halton's concerns at the meeting of the Halton and Warrington Waste Partnership Board on 12 June 2006, and Halton's decision to pursue a partnership was Merseyside was confirmed at the meeting of the Board on 10th July 2006.

A general discussion then took place on the effect of working with Merseyside. JU outlined the work programme being carried out by Officers to move forward with the Merseyside Partnership which included the updating of Halton's Waste Management Strategy which, in broad terms, mirrored that of Merseyside. JU confirmed that, as had always been the situation, Halton's final waste treatment process will be determined by the waste industry, with the procurement of waste treatment facilities through an output based contract specification.

JU confirmed that the updating of the Council's Strategy could lead to the introduction of alternate weekly collections of residual waste, facilitated by an increased collection of recyclable materials. The introduction of such a scheme would be on a phased basis with areas piloted in 2007. Members of the working party supported the scheme, and agreed to discuss potential areas for the pilot at their next meeting.

To support the Councils waste minimisation programme, the Waste Working Party also supported the introduction of a pilot 'no side waste' scheme and the implementation of enforcement measures where residents fail to comply with the Council's requirements, and where attempts to encourage such compliance had failed. Members agreed that this should be implemented in areas agreed for the pilot alternate weekly collection scheme.

JU advised the Working party that following the study of properties on the Palacefields estate, some properties had been identified as being suitable for wheeled bins and that subject to a bid for funding, wheeled bins would be delivered to these properties at the earliest opportunity.

It was agreed that the next meeting would take place in January and JU to then arrange a calendar of meetings from March 2007 onwards.