



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT SCRUTINY
COMMISSION

Held: WEDNESDAY, 5 OCTOBER 2016 at 5:30 pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Cutkelvin (Chair)

Councillor Dr Chowdhury	Councillor Halford
Councillor Fonseca	Councillor Hunter

In Attendance

Councillor Clarke, Assistant City Mayor - Energy & Sustainability
Councillor Master, Assistant City Mayor - Neighbourhood Services
Councillor Sood, Assistant City Mayor - Communities & Equalities
Councillor Waddington, Assistant City Mayor - Jobs & Skills

Also present

Councillor Chaplin – Member for Stoneygate Ward

* * * * *

29. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Aldred and Councillor Gugnani.

30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Fonseca declared an Other Disclosable Interest in agenda item 10, "Citizens Advice Leicestershire City Advice Services Contract Performance 2015-16", in that he had previously worked for three months as a volunteer with the Citizens Advice service.

Councillor Dr Chowdhury also declared an Other Disclosable Interest in agenda item 10, "Citizens Advice Leicestershire City Advice Services Contract Performance 2015-16", in that he worked in a voluntary organisation that provided welfare advice.

In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, these interests were not considered so significant that they were likely to prejudice the Councillors' judgement of the public interest. They were not therefore required to withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the relevant item.

31. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Commission received the minutes of its meeting held on 24 August 2016.

With regard to the eleventh paragraph of minute 25, "Social Welfare Advice Procurement Options Paper 2017/22", Members noted that, in order to establish comparable rates for the contracts identified for possible inclusion in the scope of the new contract, they had been calculated as the value of the contract divided by the number of customers seen. It therefore was suggested that the minute be amended to reflect this.

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Services and Community Involvement Scrutiny commission held on 24 August 2016 be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the first sentence of the eleventh paragraph of minute 25, "Social Welfare Advice Procurement Options Paper 2017/22", being amended as follows (new wording in italics):

"The Commission expressed some concern that the contracts identified for possible inclusion in the scope of the new contract had significantly different *rates costs per customer.*"

32. PROGRESS ON ACTIONS AGREED AT THE LAST MEETING

At the invitation of the Chair, the Director of Finance advised the Commission that consultation on proposals for a revised Council Tax Reduction Scheme had closed and the results were being analysed. Members would be advised as soon as possible whether a Special Meeting of the Commission was needed to enable them to consider the outcome of the consultation before they were reported to the Executive. (Minute 21, "Chair's Announcements", referred.)

Members noted that it was likely that procurement options for Social Welfare Advice now would be considered by the Executive in February 2017, (not early October 2016 as originally anticipated). (Minute 25, "Social Welfare Advice Procurement Options Paper 2017/22", referred.)

The Chair also advised the Commission that it had been confirmed that the Council bought both halal and non-halal meat. Where halal meat was being served, the food choices were clearly labelled. An item on food regulation would be considered by the Commission in April 2017, so instead of a separate item being included in the work programme on halal and non-halal meat, it would be included in the food regulation report.

33. PETITIONS

The Monitoring Officer reported that no petitions had been received.

34. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND STATEMENTS OF CASE

The Monitoring Officer reported that no questions, representations or statements of case had been received.

35. CONSIDERATION OF CHARGING FOR BULKY WASTE COLLECTIONS

The Director of Neighbourhood and Environmental Services submitted a report asking the Commission for its views regarding the potential to charge for bulky waste collections, it being noted that a six-week consultation on the options set out in the report was scheduled to start on Friday 7 October 2016.

The Director of Neighbourhood and Environmental Services reminded Members that the City Council currently was one of the few local authorities that did not charge for the collection of bulky waste. While mindful of the potential implications of introducing charges for this service, especially with regard to fly-tipping, the Council needed to consider all options for creating income while safeguarding services.

Councillor Clarke, (Assistant City Mayor for Energy and Sustainability), reiterated that the current financial situation created a need to consider all aspects of services to identify savings. Concerns about increased fly-tipping were important, especially in areas that already had problems with this. However, although some areas had seen an increase in fly-tipping when charges for bulky waste collections were introduced, others had seen a reduction, while in other areas there was no noticeable change.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor Chaplin, one of the Members representing Stoneygate Ward, addressed the Commission. She noted that the report submitted identified Stoneygate as currently having the highest level of fly-tipping in the city. The Council's difficult financial situation was acknowledged, but to introduce charges for the collection of bulky waste could make the fly-tipping situation worse. For example, mattresses had been seen stacked outside a house, piles of furniture had been left on street corners and some residents had had other people's rubbish dumped on their property. If people reporting these things had to pay to have the items removed, they

would stop reporting them.

Councillor Chaplin explained that Stoneygate Ward contained large numbers of properties that were rented and houses in multiple occupation. When people moved from these, they often left behind items, which the landlord became responsible for disposing of, but instead of using the bulky waste collection service, the items often were fly-tipped. The more items were abandoned in this way, the more it encouraged others to do the same. As well as being unsightly, the accumulated rubbish also created potential health hazards.

Council Chaplin further explained that a lot of time had been spent trying to tackle fly-tipping in Stoneygate Ward. Fly-tipping was a problem across the city, but the situation in Stoneygate Ward was such that officers already were unable to deal effectively with the volume being created. Introducing the charges proposed would make the situation worse.

The following points were then made during discussion on this report:

- Landlords in areas such as Stoneygate Ward, which had a high density of residents and/or students, with a high turnover, could have many bulky items to dispose of;
- The charges recommended in the report had been calculated following extensive research in to charges made by other councils. Approximately 89% of councils charged for this service, with the average charge being £20;
- Any charge made for this service would be received by the Council, not the contractor who removed the waste, (currently Biffa);
- It was estimated that savings of approximately £150,000 per annum could be achieved through the introduction of these charges. This was based on a projected reduction of 75% in the current number of collections made. It was possible that further savings could be achieved if the contractor was able to reduce the number of vehicles used as a result of a drop in demand for the service, but this would need to be negotiated with the contractor;
- The bulky waste collection service currently cost approximately £350,000 per annum to provide;
- The Council currently needed to find savings of £150 million, so the savings achievable through the introduction of charges for bulky waste collections were a very small part of this. It therefore was questioned whether the potential problems created by introducing these charges outweighed the benefits;
- The introduction of concessionary charges, (for example, for the low waged or the elderly), had not been considered at present, as to do so would reduce the level of saving achievable. It also could be resource-intensive to administer;

- Although the Council held information such as the number of people receiving housing benefit, strict data protection rules governed the purposes for which this information could be used. Residents therefore could be asked to self-declare and/or prove their entitlement to concessionary charges, although currently it was not possible to do this on-line, so they would have to visit Council offices for their entitlement to be checked. Checking personal data was not part of the current contract held with Biffa for the collection of bulky waste;
- Some authorities, such as Nottingham City Council, who did not charge people on benefits or low incomes for some services, took self-declarations of eligibility on trust, but the challenges this presented were acknowledged;
- In some areas there were large numbers of people who would not be able to afford to pay these charges, but could be ineligible for concessionary rates. This could lead to a surge in fly-tipping in areas that currently were not identified as problem areas;
- Housing services had an arrangement for bulky waste on some estates to be collected by Council-operated cleansing vehicles, rather than those operated by Biffa;
- The introduction of any charges for this service would need to be accompanied by an appropriate communications plan, to ensure that residents were aware of how to access the service;
- The Waste Standards Authority had identified Leicester as being very similar to a London borough in terms of waste management, so this Council's service had been bench-marked against equivalent London boroughs, as well as neighbouring authorities. However, the expectations of residents in a London borough could be very different to those of residents in Leicester, so Members expressed some caution about the appropriateness of this comparison;
- Increasing levels of fly-tipping had led to the City Wardens being asked to target the worst ten streets in the city to try to reduce the amount being fly-tipped. This had resulted in the volume plateauing and had increased awareness of the problem. However, the procedures that needed to be followed to achieve such improvements could make this very resource-intensive;
- Residents in accommodation such as flats could leave bulky waste items in shared areas of flats without requesting collection if deterred by the charge and residents in terraced streets could resort to leaving the items on the highway. There also could be further examples of people dumping items on other people's property. These issues did not appear to have been explored in the report;
- Although it could be possible to divert some bulky waste items to the local furniture bank scheme, it also could lead to the scheme receiving a lot of

calls about items it was unable to use. This had been highlighted as a risk, so conversations with the furniture bank and waste management officers about how to avoid it happening were ongoing;

- One possible negative result of the introduction of charges could be an increase in the “backyard burning” of items;
- Information was awaited on the impact of the recent introduction of charges by Leicestershire County Council for the disposal of certain types of waste at the recycling centres it operated. However, anecdotal evidence suggested that there had been an increase in fly-tipping in areas of the city adjoining the county area; and
- This was a very visible service and was important to residents. Although there was no wish to sensationalise the possible impact of introducing charges, care needed to be taken to ensure that concerns were addressed.

Members suggested that the Executive could be asked to consider delaying the consultation on the proposals to introduce charges for bulky waste collections until evidence has been received of the impact of the charges introduced by Leicestershire County Council. However, Councillor Clarke expressed some concern that it would not be possible to achieve the looked for savings if this happened.

RECOMMENDED:

- 1) That the Executive be asked to consider delaying the consultation on proposals to introduce charges for bulky waste collections until evidence has been received of the impact of the charges introduced by Leicestershire County Council for the disposal of certain types of waste at its household waste recycling centres, with particular attention paid to city wards that are on the boundary with the county;
- 2) That, before the consultation referred to under recommendation 1) above is undertaken, the Director of Neighbourhoods and Environmental Services be asked to provide the Executive with more detailed information on weaknesses in the current bulky waste collection service, such as difficulties encountered by residents in flats, terraced houses and on estates;
- 3) That the Executive be asked to include formal engagement with partner agencies in the consultation process referred to under recommendation 1) above, this to include, but not exclusively, the City Warden service, City Council officers responsible for collecting waste from housing estates, Biffa (as the contractor) and the Leicestershire and Rutland Reuse Network;

- 4) That the Executive be asked to give consideration during the consultation referred to under recommendation 1) above to options for providing free and/or reduced charge bulky waste for residents such as the elderly or those on benefits, and to make appropriate recommendations for delivering such a scheme, including whether residents should “self-declare” their status and what, if any, evidence should be provided by those residents of their status;
- 5) That when options for the future delivery of the bulky waste collection service are submitted to the Executive, improved information be included on the potential environmental and social impact of an increase in “backyard burning” of waste materials; and
- 6) That the Director of Neighbourhoods and Environmental Services be asked to consider how:
 - a) residents in houses of multiple occupation and transient residents such as students can be better educated about waste collection, including household waste collection and what items can be recycled; and
 - b) landlords can be encouraged to take more responsibility for waste left by their tenants.

36. CONSIDERATION OF CHARGING FOR DIY WASTE AT HOUSEHOLD WASTE RECYCLING CENTRES

The Director of Neighbourhood and Environmental Services submitted a report seeking the Commission’s views on the potential to charge for DIY waste deposited at the city’s two Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs).

The Service Development Manager (Waste Management) reminded the Commission that the Council operated two HWRCs, one at Freemans Common and one at Gypsum Close. These Centres were not required to accept non-household waste, but the Council chose to do so.

Household waste was defined by regulation. As such, DIY waste was classified as commercial / industrial waste. This led to problems with builders using the HWRCs illegally, although regular visitors to the sites were monitored.

The Council’s financial position was such that savings needed to be made in order to safeguard services. It was estimated that a saving of £77,000 could be achieved if a charge of £3 per bag of DIY waste was made. Consultation on these proposals would run concurrently with the consultation on the proposed

introduction of charges for bulky waste collections, (see minute 35, “Consideration of Charging for Bulky Waste Collections”, above).

Members noted that, if charges were introduced for the disposal of DIY waste, the HWRCs would continue to receive items such as large pieces of furniture free of charge.

Councillor Clarke, (Assistant City Mayor for Energy and Sustainability), explained that:

- DIY waste referred to the type of waste a builder would be expected to produce when undertaking work on a domestic property, (for example, plasterboard, wood or kitchen units);
- Asbestos would not be included in the charges proposed for DIY waste, to continue to encourage the safe disposal of this material; and
- There was anecdotal evidence that waste materials which Leicestershire County Council now charged to dispose of were being diverted to city HWRCs.

The following comments were made in discussion on this report:

- If charges for the disposal of DIY waste were not introduced, monitoring of HWRCs would have to be improved, to ensure that builders were not using them to illegally dispose of building waste;
- It appeared that residents were being penalised by the proposed introduction of these charges due to problems in identifying people disposing of trade waste illegally at HWRCs;
- A range of surveillance techniques were used to identify people fly-tipping building waste;
- The introduction of any charges for the disposal of DIY waste at HWRCs would need to be accompanied by an appropriate communications plan, to ensure that residents were aware of how to access the service;
- Hard-bonded asbestos currently was accepted free of charge at Freemans Common HWRC. It needed to be double-bagged and was collected in a separate skip on the site. Residents therefore needed to check before arriving at the HWRC that space was available in the skip; and
- It was anticipated that the amount of DIY waste disposed of at the HWRCs would reduce by approximately 75% if charges for its disposal were introduced. This was based on research undertaken with local authorities that had introduced charges for the disposal of this waste. Therefore, if the reduction was not as large as this, more income would be generated and more savings made.

Members suggested that the Executive could be asked to consider delaying the consultation on the proposals to introduce charges for the disposal of DIY waste at HWRCs until evidence has been received of the impact of the charges introduced by Leicestershire County Council for the disposal of various types of waste. Councillor Clarke expressed some concern that it would not be possible to achieve the looked for savings if this happened. However, it could be possible to consider extending the consultation period, to give more time for the required evidence to be received.

RECOMMENDED:

- 1) That the Executive be asked to consider delaying the consultation on proposals to introduce charges for the disposal of DIY waste at household waste recycling sites until evidence has been received of the impact of the charges introduced by Leicestershire County Council for the disposal of certain types of waste at its household waste recycling centres, with particular attention paid to city wards that are on the boundary with the county;
- 2) That, before the consultation referred to under recommendation 1) above is undertaken, the Director of Neighbourhoods and Environmental Services be asked to provide the Executive with more detailed information on weaknesses in the current DIY waste disposal service, such as fly-tipping and abuse of the system by professional builders;
- 3) That the Executive be asked to include formal engagement with partner agencies in the consultation process referred to under recommendation 1) above, this to include, but not exclusively, the City Warden service, City Council officers responsible for collecting waste from housing estates and Biffa (as the contractor);
- 4) That the Executive be asked to give consideration during the consultation referred to under recommendation 1) above to options for providing free and/or reduced charge disposal of DIY waste at household waste recycling sites for residents such as, but not exclusively, the elderly or those on benefits, and to make appropriate recommendations for delivering such a scheme, including whether residents should “self-declare” their status and what, if any, evidence should be provided by those residents of their status; and
- 5) That, when options for charges for the disposal of DIY waste at household waste recycling sites are submitted to the Executive, improved information be included on the potential environmental and social impact of an

increase in “backyard burning” of waste materials.

37. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting adjourned at 7.12 pm and reconvened at 7.19 pm.

Councillor Master left the meeting during the adjournment.

38. WELFARE REFORM

The Director of Finance submitted a report providing the Commission with an update on the effect of welfare reform in Leicester during 2015/16 and highlighting the expected impact of changes to be introduced by April 2017.

The Service Improvement Manager (Revenues and Customer Support) introduced the report, reminding Members of the welfare reforms introduced since 2013 and those still to come.

One change with continued impact was that relating to under occupancy of a property, (the “bedroom tax”). This measure aimed to encourage people to move to smaller properties, but although the number of people on the housing register had now increased to 7,000, there was a shortage of Council-managed properties. The Council had a legal duty to protect certain people, such as those with disabilities who, due to their needs, were unable to move, despite under-occupying a property, (for example, by supporting them through discretionary payments).

With effect from 7 November 2016, the benefit income cap would decrease to £20,000 per year for families. Existing capped households would be re-capped and it was anticipated that approximately 700 additional families would be capped in early 2017. In total, the amount of benefits received by these families would reduce by approximately £1 million, so the Council could not provide additional support for all of them.

Other changes included:

- Universal credit was being introduced gradually. Just over 4,000 people currently were affected by this in the city, but this number would increase;
- Various smaller cuts had been made to benefits over the last few years. For example, Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit now could only be backdated for one month, allowances for dependent children had reduced and would continue to do so, people registering new claims for Tax Credit could only claim for up to two children, and the period of temporary absence from home for which benefits could be paid had been reduced from 13 weeks abroad to four;

- It had been announced in 2015 that claimants under 22 years of age no longer would automatically receive Housing Benefit. The draft legislation giving effect to this had not been seen yet, so it currently was not known what exceptions could be made;
- Assistance that could be provided for new claimants with social sector housing rent would be capped; and
- Continuing reassessment for disability benefit of people with chronic conditions would cease.

Councillor Waddington, (Assistant City Mayor for Jobs and Skills), reiterated that these changes were affecting residents that the Council would want to protect. However, although the Council could provide some support, it did not have the resources to help all those affected. In addition, it was recognised that people with children and those with disabilities could find it difficult to find work, despite government policy being to reduce benefits to encourage them in to work.

During discussion on this item, it was noted that:

- Anyone receiving Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) with their benefits would not be affected by the benefits cap. However, they would only receive ESA if they claimed it;
- Anecdotal evidence suggested that rent arrears could accumulate when people moved on to Universal Credit. If people moved from Jobseekers' Allowance on to Universal Credit they could request a hardship advance of their benefit, which could then be repaid over a 6 – 12 month period. Over 20 people had applied for an advance to date and more applications were anticipated as more people received Universal Credit;
- A leaflet had been produced advising people on how to apply for assistance when facing financial hardship. In addition, posters at the Jobcentre Plus provided information on assistance available from local authorities, as these were venues at which applications for benefits could be made;
- Housing Benefit rates for new claimants in social sector accommodation would be limited to the Local Housing Allowance private sector rates for claimants who had lived in their properties for less than two years. Existing claimants would retain their existing limit;
- Entitlement to benefits was partly based on nationality and whether a claimant had a right to reside in this country;
- Jobseekers were not automatically entitled to housing benefit, but needed to meet other criteria, such as whether they had dependents;

- The Council now had no discretion to backdate benefits claims further than one month. It therefore was very important that claimants were aware of this restriction;
- The reduction in the period of temporary absence abroad for which benefits could be paid had been communicated proactively to community groups, schools, council hubs and the local media. There was some concern that people would not report that they had been abroad, but the Council's Audit and Risk Committee had provided useful advice on key community locations for posters around the city, (minute 22, "Housing Benefit Subsidy and Improvement Regime", Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 3 August 2016 referred). The effectiveness of these would be monitored;
- Funding for hardship grants had been provided by the government for two years, but had now ended. The Council therefore needed to consider what crisis support it could provide; and
- Care should be taken to ensure that the opportunities available for the personal development of children in households with decreasing income were monitored, to ensure that they are not disproportionately disadvantaged because of these welfare reforms.

The Commission welcomed the report and the quality of the information contained in it, but asked that more information be included in future reports on what action was being taken to support people and respond to emerging issues.

Members were invited to contact officers about individual claimants' cases outside of the meeting.

AGREED:

- 1) That the Head of Revenues and Customer Support be asked to supply Members with copies of the leaflet produced advising people on how to apply for assistance when facing financial hardship;
- 2) That the Head of Revenues and Customer Support be asked to include information in future reports on what action is being taken to support people and respond to emerging issues
- 3) That the Assistant City Mayor for Children, Young People and Schools be asked to ensure that the opportunities available for the personal development of children in households with decreasing income are monitored, to ensure that these children are not disproportionately disadvantaged because of these welfare reforms; and
- 4) That the Director of Finance be asked to submit a further report in 12 months' time updating the Commission on the effect of welfare reform in Leicester, but that this report be made earlier if

unexpected significant welfare reforms occur before then.

39. CITIZENS ADVICE LEICESTERSHIRE CITY ADVICE SERVICES CONTRACT PERFORMANCE 2015-16

The Director of Finance submitted a report providing an overview of the Social Welfare Law and Advice contract outcomes for the city, highlighting key outcomes and identifying risks and issues arising during 2015/16.

The Head of Revenues and Customer Support introduced the report, explaining that:

- This was a review of Year 3 of the contract, which had been awarded to Citizens' Advice LeicesterShire (CAL);
- CAL had met the targets for Tier 1, 2 and 3 advice;
- CAL had undertaken 500 outreach sessions outside the city centre and 210 home visits. This work was sub-contracted to Age UK;
- Outreach sessions had been quite fractured, (for example, being held for half a day each in various locations). This was confusing for clients, so was being addressed through contract management;
- Clients were not required to divulge demographic data, so the information recorded reflected casework where clients were willing for CAL to collect data;
- The target for customer satisfaction was 85%, but in all elements of the contract surveyed it was at over 90%. The only element not surveyed was outreach provision, but data on customer satisfaction with this would be collected during 2016/17; and
- Risks had been identified as set out in the report and a collaborative approach to addressing them would achieve improvements going forward.

Dawn Mason, Service Leader at Citizens' Advice LeicesterShire, addressed the commission at the invitation of the Chair, in accordance with Scrutiny Procedure Rule 8(2), (part 4E of the Council's Constitution). Ms Mason noted that:

- Welfare reform had led to an increased number of people approaching CAL for advice;
- In responding to this, CAL also aimed to identify issues associated with enquiries that they could provide advice on, as many client groups were very vulnerable and needed help with basic life administration;
- All people working with clients were volunteers;

- CAL was becoming very successful at getting people in to work using skills learned with the Citizens' Advice Bureau;
- Even if people raised several issues on one visit, this was counted as one contact;
- Councillors could contact CAL about individual cases and CAL would make appointments to see those people;
- Webchat enabled people to click on a link from the CAL website and interact with staff, (who were trained generalists), on issues. Only general advice could be given over the website, so this was Tier 1 advice and as such was only an initial assessment of a person's situation; and
- Leicester appeared to have a higher number of disabled clients than the national average, but this figure was derived from self-classification by clients.

Councillor Waddington, Assistant City Mayor for Skills and Jobs, welcomed the report and the notable number of people helped, the scope of advice offered and the variety of locations used. However, she agreed that more information was needed on outcomes for people who received advice on social welfare matters. She also suggested that improved marketing was needed, to get information on the scope and availability of advice to people who needed it.

Members asked that information be made available on where outreach sessions were held, as they were not always aware of those within their own wards. They also suggested that it would be useful to receive information on how clients and Councillors could access CAL.

It was noted that the Ward names used in the information on contract performance were out of date. However, the updating of Ward data was included on the list of improvements needed, so this would be addressed during the coming year.

The Commission welcomed the range of good practice identified in the report, but questioned whether the translator service included provision for clients to provide their own interpreter. In response, Dawn Mason explained that it was recognised that some people preferred to use their own interpreter. It was important though that such people were impartial, as not being so could influence the way things were interpreted.

Members particularly welcomed the initiative to train people as "problem noticers" and suggested that this could be very useful training for Councillors and front-line staff to receive.

AGREED:

- 1) That the report be received and welcomed;

- 2) That the Head of Revenues and Customer Support be asked to provide information for Councillors on how clients and Councillors could access Citizens' Advice LeicesterShire's advice services, this information to be sent direct to each Councillor and included in the information bulletin issued by Members' Services;
- 3) That Citizens' Advice LeicesterShire be asked to include more information in its next report on outcomes for people who receive advice under its Social Welfare Law and Advice provision contract with this Council;
- 4) That the Head of Revenues and Customer Support be asked to consider how "problem notice" training can be provided for front-line staff and to liaise with the Democratic and Civic Support Manager to determine how provide this training could be provided for Councillors;
- 5) That Citizens' Advice LeicesterShire and the Head of Revenues and Customer Support be asked to regularly assess the locations at which outreach services are provided, particularly with a view to identifying new locations;
- 6) That Citizens' Advice LeicesterShire and the Head of Revenues and Customer Support be asked to provide future contract monitoring reports in the same format as that presented here.

40. SPENDING REVIEWS

The Director of Neighbourhood and Environmental Services gave a verbal update on spending reviews affecting services within his remit, as follows:

- **Neighbourhood Services**
The Transforming Neighbourhood Services review was being delivered. Regular reports were being made to the Commission and this would continue as the review progressed.
- **Regulatory Services**
These services currently were being considered by service analysts, so no decisions had been taken yet. Although these were front-line services, opportunities needed to be identified to restructure spending. Discussions on potential savings would then be held with the Executive.
- **Waste and Cleansing Services**
Waste and Cleansing services were operated under Private Finance Initiative contracts with Biffa. It was felt that opportunities for savings existed with regard to both contracts.
- **Standards and Development**
These were smaller scale services, such as landscape design, allotments

and CCTV operation. Spending in these areas also would be reviewed.

A programme of spending reviews had been considered by the Overview Select Committee, when the need to properly engage with the scrutiny process had been stressed. (Minute 5, "Outturn 2015/16 – Budget Strategy Update", Overview Select Committee meeting of 22 June 2016 referred.)

41. WORK PROGRAMME

The Commission received its work programme, noting that it currently was anticipated that the following reports would be submitted to its next meeting:

- Transforming Neighbourhood Services: North-East Area
- Channel Shift – Update
- Social Welfare Advice Partnership Annual Report
- Update on Spending Reviews

42. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 8.29 pm