

# TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL



## EXECUTIVE SERVICES

---

### Chief Executive

Julie Beilby BSc (Hons) MBA

Gibson Building  
Gibson Drive  
Kings Hill, West Malling  
Kent ME19 4LZ  
West Malling (01732) 844522

---

**NB - This agenda contains proposals, recommendations and options. These do not represent Council policy or decisions until they have received proper consideration through the full decision making process.**

Contact: Committee Services  
[committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk](mailto:committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk)

12 February 2016

To: MEMBERS OF THE HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENT SERVICES  
ADVISORY BOARD  
(Copies to all Members of the Council)

Dear Sir/Madam

Your attendance is requested at a meeting of the Housing and Environment Services Advisory Board to be held in the Civic Suite, Gibson Building, Kings Hill, West Malling on Monday, 22nd February, 2016 commencing at 7.30 pm

Yours faithfully

JULIE BEILBY

Chief Executive

## A G E N D A

### PART 1 - PUBLIC

- |    |                          |       |
|----|--------------------------|-------|
| 1. | Apologies for absence    | 5 - 6 |
| 2. | Declarations of interest | 7 - 8 |

3. Minutes 9 - 12

To confirm as a correct record the Notes of the meeting of the Housing and Environment Services Advisory Board held on 9 November 2015

**Matters for recommendation to the Cabinet**

4. Bulky Household Waste and Fridge/Freezer Collection Charges 13 - 18  
5. Local Air Quality Regime Consultation 19 - 26

**Matters submitted for Information**

6. Housing Service Update 27 - 52  
7. Waste and Street Scene Services Update 53 - 64  
8. Urgent Items 65 - 66

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

**Matters for consideration in Private**

9. Exclusion of Press and Public 67 - 68

The Chairman to move that the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting during consideration of any items the publication of which would disclose exempt information.

**PART 2 - PRIVATE**

10. Urgent Items 69 - 70

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

## **MEMBERSHIP**

Cllr M O Davis (Chairman)  
Cllr Ms J A Atkinson (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr M A C Balfour  
Cllr V M C Branson  
Cllr D J Cure  
Cllr R W Dalton  
Cllr Mrs S M Hall  
Cllr S M Hammond  
Cllr D Keeley

Cllr D Markham  
Cllr Mrs A S Oakley  
Cllr L J O'Toole  
Cllr S C Perry  
Cllr M R Rhodes  
Cllr T B Shaw  
Cllr Ms S V Spence

This page is intentionally left blank

Apologies for absence

This page is intentionally left blank

Declarations of interest

This page is intentionally left blank



## TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENT SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

Monday, 9th November, 2015

**Present:** Cllr M O Davis (Chairman), Cllr Ms J A Atkinson (Vice-Chairman), Cllr V M C Branson, Cllr D J Cure, Cllr R W Dalton, Cllr S M Hammond, Cllr D Keeley, Cllr L J O'Toole, Cllr S C Perry, Cllr M R Rhodes, Cllr T B Shaw and Cllr Ms S V Spence

Councillors Mrs J A Anderson, O C Baldock, M C Base, Mrs P A Bates, P F Bolt, N J Heslop and B J Luker were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No 15.21.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D Markham and Mrs A S Oakley

#### PART 1 - PUBLIC

##### **HE 15/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made in accordance with the Code of Conduct.

##### **HE 15/18 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the notes of the meeting of the Housing and Environment Services Advisory Board held on 20 July 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

##### **HE 15/19 PRESENTATION: KENT RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP**

Mr Paul Vanston, Partnership Manager for the Kent Resource Partnership (KRP), gave a detailed presentation on the role of the KRP and provided an update on recycling and waste management projects within Kent (excluding Medway).

#### MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CABINET

##### **HE 15/20 REVIEW OF HOUSING, ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND WASTE AND STREET SCENE SERVICES FEES AND CHARGES**

The joint report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services, the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health and the Director of Finance and Transformation set out details of the proposed fees and charges for the provision of services in respect of condemned food certificates, exported food certificates, contaminated land, private water supplies, houses in multiple occupation, caravan site licensing, pest control, stray dog redemption fees, household bulky

refuse collection and “missed” refuse collection. The Advisory Board was advised that the proposed charge for an Exported Food Certificate was based on ‘cost recovery’ and noted that this reflected the Council’s priority for supporting local business development. Members supported the proposal of introducing a new charge for fridge and freezer collection and noted that a further, detailed, report would be submitted to the next meeting of the Advisory Board.

**RECOMMENDED:** That Cabinet

- (1) approve the scale of charges for mandatory HMO licensing, caravan site licensing, condemned food certificates, exported food certificates, contaminated land monitoring, sampling private water supplies, stray dog redemption fees, household bulky refuse collection and “Missed” refuse collection charges with effect from 1 April 2016, as detailed in the report to the Advisory Board; and
- (2) approve the introduction of a new charge for fridge and freezer collections and a report on the proposed charges be submitted to the next meeting of the Housing and Environment Services Advisory Board.

\* **Referred to Cabinet**

#### **HE 15/21 RECYCLING SITE COLLECTION VEHICLES**

Decision Notice D150085MEM

The report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services provided details of the Council’s current arrangements for collecting glass and cans at recycling sites and outlined a proposal to extend the life of the existing collection vehicles, operated in partnership with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council under a contract with Veolia which was due to expire in February 2019.

**RECOMMENDED:** That the life of the Council’s two recycling vehicles be extended to the end of the existing Waste Services contract in February 2019.

#### **HE 15/22 UPDATE ON THE WORK OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TEAMS**

Decision Notice D150086MEM

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health provided an update on the work undertaken by the Environmental Protection Team and the Food and Safety Team. Particular reference was made to the development of the Kent and Medway Health and Safety Memorandum of Understanding – Flexible Warranting Scheme

which would enable the appointment and indemnity of suitably qualified Inspectors to undertake work across local authorities within Kent. An update was also provided on progress with the Retrofitting Project to reduce emissions from buses being undertaken in partnership with Maidstone Borough Council, Kent County Council and Arriva Buses.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the Kent and Medway Health and Safety Memorandum of Understanding in respect of the Flexible Warranting Scheme be signed by the Borough Council; and
- (2) in the event of the project group deeming it feasible, the continuation of the Retrofitting Project be supported.

**HE 15/23 SYRIAN REFUGEES**

Decision Notice D150087MEM

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health provided an update on the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme, a managed migration scheme run by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and outlined current national and local government initiatives to accommodate refugees fleeing Syria. The report outlined how the Borough Council, working with partners, could assist in the resettlement of Syrians from the refugee camps over a five year period.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the Borough Council's formal participation in the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme be agreed; and
- (2) the Home Office be advised that the Borough Council hopes to offer to resettle 10 Syrian refugee households over the next 5 years.

**HE 15/24 LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE PRIVATE RENTED SECTOR  
FROM 1 OCTOBER 2015**

Decision Notice D150088MEM

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health provided an update on legislative changes in the Private Rented Sector introduced by the Deregulation Act 2015 and the Smoke and Carbon Monoxide Alarm (England) Regulations 2015.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) delegated Authority be granted to the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health to implement and enforce the requirements of the Smoke and Carbon Monoxide Alarm (England) Regulations 2015; and
- (2) the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health be authorised to publish a statement of principles on the Council's website defining how a penalty charge for a breach of the Smoke and Carbon Monoxide Alarm (England) Regulations 2015 is determined and to determine the amount of penalty charge to be applied.

**MATTERS SUBMITTED FOR INFORMATION**

**HE 15/25 HOUSING SERVICE UPDATE**

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health provided an update on key issues relating to the Housing Service and made particular reference to proposals contained in the Housing and Planning Bill 2015 and the Welfare Reform and Work Bill 2015 and the delivery of Affordable Housing across the Borough.

**HE 15/26 KENT RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP - UPDATE**

Further to the presentation provided by the Kent Resource Partnership Manager, the report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services provided information and updates on the project work being undertaken within the Borough.

**MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION IN PRIVATE**

**HE 15/27 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no items considered in private.

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

## TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### HOUSING and ENVIRONMENT SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

22 February 2016

#### Report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services

#### Part 1- Public

#### Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet - Key Decision

### 1 BULKY HOUSEHOLD WASTE AND FRIDGES/FREEZERS COLLECTION CHARGES

#### Summary

This report provides details of our current arrangements for collecting fridges/freezers. It also reviews concessions for fridges/freezers and bulky household waste collections and in line with other authorities proposes introducing charges.

#### 1.1 Background

1.1.1 At the last meeting of this Advisory Board Members approved the annual fees and charges for a number of Waste and Street Scene services. While this included approval to introduce a charge for fridges/freezers collections, it was acknowledged that there were a number of operational and contractual implications regarding the collection arrangements.

1.1.2 As such, Officers were asked to review these arrangements with Veolia and report back to the next meeting of this Advisory Board with a detailed proposal and costings for implementation from 1 April 2016.

#### 1.2 Current Position

1.2.2 At present the council collects fridges and freezers free of charge from residents on request, as part of a separate collection service that operates alongside the bulky household waste collection service.

1.2.3 The contract, which is operated by Veolia, initially allowed for the separate collection of fridges/freezers with the removal of Chlorofluorocarbons (CFC's) and separate disposal arrangements. In discussions with Kent County Council as the Waste Disposal Authority, the disposal arrangements have been improved and simplified and although they still require separate treatment at the transfer station, it is now possible to collect and these items with other bulky waste service requests.

1.2.4 As Bulky items (which can include fridge/freezers) are a “prescribed household waste” councils are allowed to make “reasonable” charges for the recovery of their collection costs. This council introduced charges for other bulky household waste collections a number of years ago, but to date fridges/freezers have not been included and have been collected free of charge.

### 1.3 Concessions

1.3.1 Members may be aware that when charges were introduced for bulky household waste collections, it was also agreed that those residents in receipt of a means tested benefit would be entitled to one free collection request every three months.

1.3.2 Having reviewed these arrangements and in keeping with other local neighbouring authorities it is now proposed to introduce a modest charge for concessions for these service requests. For illustration, a table showing the current charges for bulky household waste collection (including arrangements for fridge/freezers) is at Annex 1.

1.3.3 It is proposed to charge £10.00 per service request (whether as a single fridge/freezer or as part of a bulky household waste request of up to six items).

### 1.4 Proposed Arrangements

1.4.1 As there were a number of contractual and operational implications associated with changing collection arrangements, a review was carried out in consultation with Veolia who have confirmed their agreement.

1.4.2 I am pleased to report that Veolia have taken a pragmatic approach and reviewed their own charges in line with more efficient collection of items. It is acknowledged that with the introduction of a charge that numbers of service requests may drop and this will impact on their own income. However, there are a number of other areas where operational efficiencies may be applied and we have agreed to assist in working with them where practicable.

1.4.3 In addition to the **£50.00 charge for bulky household waste collection** (up to six items) which has already been approved, it is proposed that the following charges be introduced with effect from 1 April 2016:

- Bulky household waste **concession charge** of £10.00 per service request (where eligible for concession an entitlement of one booking per quarter at this discounted rate).
- Bulky household waste including a fridge/freezer as one of the items, **full charge** of £50.00 per service request.
- Bulky household waste including a fridge/freezer as one of the items, **concession charge** of £10.00 per service request (where eligible for concession an entitlement of one booking per quarter at this discounted rate).

- Fridge/Freezer only **full charge** of £25.00 per service request
- Fridge/Freezer only **concession charge** of £10.00 per service request (where eligible for concession an entitlement of one booking per quarter at this discounted rate).

1.4.4 As a result of introducing these charges it is anticipated that the total number of service requests will reduce, as some residents will find other methods of disposing of unwanted items, including:

- use of commercial companies “take back” service when buying an appliance
- taking items to their nearest household waste recycling centre
- taking items to the Saturday Bulky Waste Vehicle service
- increased use of charity schemes (the Council includes details of relevant charity schemes on its website)

1.4.5 Although fly tipping remains a very real problem and undoubtedly some residents may dump unwanted items, this is likely to be a very small number of offenders. Fly tipping in general will continue to be monitored closely and kept under review. It is worth noting that when charges were first introduced a few years ago, this did not lead to a significant increase in fly tipping.

## 1.5 Legal Implications

1.5.1 The Council is legally entitled to set fees which allow for recovery of its reasonable collection costs in providing this service.

## 1.6 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

1.6.1 At present, although we charge for bulky household waste collections to those that are not in receipt of Council Tax Support, the majority of service requests (approximately 58%) are from those residents that currently receive a free service. As such, there is an overall cost in providing the present service.

1.6.2 However, when introducing the proposed charges, the overall savings are estimated to be around £40,000 per annum. This is made up of both the additional income from each service request and the reduction in expenditure as the total number of requests is likely fall, leading to lower contract costs.

1.6.3 Although we have accurate data regarding the present numbers of service requests, it should be emphasised that future projections are estimated, as there is no accurate way of projecting the actual number of service requests that will be received once charges are introduced.

## 1.7 Risk Assessment

- 1.7.1 A decision is required now on the proposed fee structure for these activities to ensure that the Council has timely and up-to-date arrangements in place to administer service requests when received.

## 1.8 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.9 The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

## 1.10 Policy Considerations

1.10.1 Asset Management

1.10.2 Procurement

## 1.11 Recommendations

**It is RECOMMENDED to CABINET** that charges outlined in para 1.4.3 of this report be introduced with effect from 1 April 2016 and that future charges and service requests be kept under review.

The Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services confirms that the proposals contained in the recommendation(s), if approved, will fall within the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

Background papers:

contact: Dennis Gardner

Nil

Robert Styles

Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services



**Bulky Household Waste & Fridge/Freezer Collection Services – Local Authority Charges**  
**(Current 2015/16)**

<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>Bulky Household Waste Collection Charge</b>	<b>Concession</b>	<b>Fridge/Freezer Collection Charge</b>	<b>Concession</b>
Tonbridge & Malling	1 to 6 items £48.20	Free of Charge if in receipt of Council Tax Support	Free of Charge to All	Free of Charge to All
Tunbridge Wells	£30.00 per item	1 item FOC per month	£30.00 per item	1 Item FOC per month
Maidstone	1 to 4 items £23.00 5 to 8 items £33.00	None None	Included as 1 Item	None
Sevenoaks	1 item £17.00 2 items £28.00 3 to 4 items £38.00 5 to 10 items £50.00	None None None None	£17.00 per item	None

This page is intentionally left blank

## TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### HOUSING and ENVIRONMENT SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

22 February 2016

#### Report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health

#### Part 1- Public

**Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet - Non-Key Decision (Decision may be taken by the Cabinet Member)**

### **1 LOCAL AIR QUALITY REGIME CONSULTATION**

#### **Summary**

**This report summarises a response to the last part of a three stage consultation by DEFRA on the review of the Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) regime.**

#### **1.1 Background**

1.1.1 As I reported to previous Board meetings in May 2014 and March 2015, DEFRA instigated a three stage consultation process on a review of the LAQM regime which started in autumn 2013.

1.1.2 The review was originally undertaken in part to address proposals under the Government's Red Tape Challenge to reduce burdens on businesses and local authorities and in part to ensure that the LAQM system is targeted at helping local authorities to take action on the ground to address local and national air quality issues.

#### **1.2 Consultation Proposals**

1.2.1 The third consultation document invites views on Government measures to improve LAQM delivery in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The measures have been developed to include the input DEFRA received following the 2014 LAQM consultation.

1.2.2 The consultation document includes the following proposed seven changes to the LAQM framework:

- i. The production of an Annual Status Report (ASR) including a public facing executive summary – to streamline the Local Authority (LA) reporting burden and make better use of resources.
- ii. Option for fast-tracking Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) declaration – to cut down delays on declaring AQMA and implementing subsequent actions.

- iii. Action Plan Template – under the streamlining objective - a template for Action Plans to help reduce the burden on LAs in filling out information and ensure greater consistency across LAs but with flexibility for additional sections, if required.
  - iv. Removal of LA requirement to report on 4 pollutants which are now under control: Benzene, 1.3 Butadiene, Carbon monoxide and Lead.
  - v. PM<sub>2.5</sub> role for local authorities – to improve public health.
  - vi. Clarification of roles and responsibilities – to improve accountability and responsibility for air quality control within local government.
  - vii. Updating/improving policy and technical guidance (2009) – to update or remove out of date policies.
- 1.2.3 The consultation then poses nine questions about the seven proposals to which DEFRA are seeking a response.
- 1.2.4 The nine questions posed by DEFRA and our responses are detailed in **[Annex 1]**.
- 1.2.5 An Impact Assessment (IA) was also published with the Consultation document stating that the objective and intended effect is to transform local air quality management so that local authorities focus more on actions to improve air quality problems and to achieve better public health and environmental outcomes. This entails, amongst other things, clarifying roles and responsibilities for action; aligning new public health outcomes by encouraging LAs to reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations, reducing reporting burdens and providing local authorities with access to evidence on best practice measures to improve air quality.

### **1.3 Legal Implications**

- 1.3.1 The removal of the four pollutants will have no legal implications for TMBC.
- 1.3.2 The proposals do not impose additional statutory duties on local authorities to achieve an objective for PM<sub>2.5</sub>

### **1.4 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

- 1.4.1 There are currently no financial implications on responding to the consultation.

### **1.5 Risk Assessment**

- 1.5.1 There are ambiguities in the proposed revised Technical Guidance (TG16) which will require clarification as highlighted in our consultation response.

## 1.6 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.6.1 The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

## 1.7 Recommendations

- 1.7.1 Members are asked to **ENDORSE** the comments officers have submitted to DEFRA in response to the third stage consultation on the LAQM regime.

The Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health confirms that the proposals contained in the recommendation(s), if approved, will fall within the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Jacqui Rands  
Jane Heeley  
Mary-Anne Norton

Steve Humphrey

Director of Planning Housing and Environmental Health

This page is intentionally left blank

The nine questions posed by DEFRA in the most recent LAQM consultation are:

**Question 1:**

**Does the Annual Status Report (ASR) template strike the right balance between streamlining and robustness of evidence? What else would you like to see covered or removed for the ASR template?**

Officers feel that the information required for the ASR indicates it will become equivalent to an annual Updating and Screening Assessment (USA) – currently only required every 3 years. It is felt the ASR has the potential to become a massive unwieldy document with extensive Appendices (almost doubling (or more) the size of the document itself).

The template doesn't seem to include a section to keep an eye on/monitor for significant changes on road networks or the 'creeping background' scenario.

**Question 2:**

**Does the ASR executive summary provide sufficient information in a format to keep the public informed of air quality progress and issues within a local authority area? What else would you like to see covered or removed?**

Officers believe the idea for a new public facing element of the ASR to be very good, especially the 'how you can help' element. Care needs to be exercised that the section doesn't become too wordy or long to ensure the public's interest is not lost.

**Question 3:**

**Do you support the idea of fast-track AQMAs declaration?**

No.

Officers think that the proposed idea of fast track AQMA declaration conflicts with the current regime.

The proposed approach is based on the concept that it is expected that many local authorities will be able to determine a suitable AQMA boundary with "reasonable certainty" based on their previous experience, if they already have declared other AQMAs, even without any detailed modelling. This favours the administrative route of declaring AQMAs rather than evidenced based declarations, which is the route that TMBC follows.

With the new focus on administrative style declarations, officers fear an incompatibility emerging with the Planning system and AQMAs declared by other LAs.

Officers feel that in reality realignment will invariably require some form of modelling assessment. This is in fact acknowledged throughout the proposed technical guidance (TG16) which also states the need for a LA to submit supporting information in its next ASR (England).

**Question 4:**

**Do you support the introduction of an AQAP template? If yes, what else would you like added or removed?**

Officers like the idea of the introduction of an AQAP (Air Quality Action Plan) template, if it is optional.

The proposed template doesn't allow for in-depth focus on addressing issues within the AQMAs i.e. acknowledging their individual characteristics that may require more targeted actions.

The proposed template has several sections before the actual actions are detailed. It is feared that the public/readers may lose interest before they reach details of the Council's actions and see what is actually being done to address the problem.

**Question 5:**

**Is the guidance clear that LAs are not required to review and assess these four pollutants unless they are aware of any potential new issues in their locality?**

Yes.

**Question 6:**

**Do the revised policy and technical guidance documents provide local authorities with a framework to help them to address PM2.5 pollution in their local area?**

The revised documents state that the role for LA's to address PM2.5 pollution is 'voluntary'; however in many places it shifts the onus of responsibility for PM2.5 from DEFRA to the LA regardless of a lack of statutory status.

Whilst we will continue to pursue action to reduce air pollution (which incorporates PM2.5) the new shift of responsibility also highlights monitoring. Again it is acknowledged that this is voluntary, but the guidance appears to be written to imply that lack of PM2.5 monitoring will always be seen as LAs avoiding their public health responsibilities by not doing so. Officers would argue that resources focused upon tackling air pollution through actions would be of much greater advantage than simply monitoring levels. The resource implications for undertaking PM2.5 monitoring are large and technically problematic. However it is acknowledged that the impact LA's actions will have upon tackling PM2.5 will always require substantial resource for limited emissions reduction, due to the sources of the pollutant.



**Question 7:**

**Does the updated Policy Guidance achieve its aim of clarifying the roles and responsibilities of District and County Councils?**

The updated Policy Guidance clarifies the roles and responsibilities of the District Councils (DCs) and County Councils (CCs), however it does not address the fundamental issue that the role of the CC can still be described as 'voluntary'.

The statutory AQ duty placed on a CC has moved from that they 'may make recommendations to a district council with respect to the carrying out...' to the 'Secretary of State expects CCs to actively engage' at all stages of Review and Assessment and Action Planning'.

Any responsible CC officer would engage with an LA under this duty to co-operate. However, the way it currently stands, this appears to be an optional duty and likely only to be facilitated through cooperative individuals.

The new guidance puts forward the option for CCs to charge DCs for the provision of information but hopes that no charges will be made under the 'spirit of cooperation and working together'. In our situation, to date, no monies have been paid by either the DC or the CC for the provision of information but, with both tiers facing financial cutbacks, that situation may have to change if the new provision is retained. Officers feel that as there are obligations for both tiers in respect of air quality, would it not be prudent to exclude the provision in the interest of securing air quality improvements.

**Question 8:**

**Do you have any further comments about the revisions to the technical or policy guidance that have not been covered elsewhere in this consultation?**

Officers made 48 further technical comments about the revisions to the guidance documents.

**Question 9:**

**Do you have any further information/views on costs and benefits related to the proposals in this consultation?**

Yes.

As stated in our response to Question 1, the information required for the ASR is very similar to that currently required by the USA, thus indicating that the reporting regime is moving towards the equivalent of an annual USA. The cost of producing an annual ASR/USA will have greater cost implications for LAs than the current regime, not only in money, but also time. Although the requirement to produce a Detailed Assessment (DA), prior to declaring an AQMA, has been removed, the modelling requirements have not, which have a cost implication. It was hoped that this review would reduce the reporting burden, not apparently increase it.

The proposed requirement for LAs to consult on their ASRs will also impact adversely on officer time and is likely to delay submission of reports to DEFRA. Time spent on consulting will mean less time to be spent on developing and implementing actions to improve the local AQ.

If authorities choose to charge for the provision of AQ information, this will be an additional financial burden on the production of the ASR.

The addition of PM2.5 monitoring is not something LAs will be able to easily afford, if at all. As stated in question 9, although monitoring is said to be voluntary, this does not appear to fit with the implied shift of responsibility for PM2.5 from DEFRA to the LA (regardless of a lack of statutory status) contained within the new documents.

## TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### HOUSING and ENVIRONMENT SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

22 February 2016

#### Report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health

#### Part 1- Public

#### Matters for Information

#### 1 HOUSING SERVICES UPDATE

##### Summary

**This report updates Members on key issues across the Housing Service.**

#### 1.1 Housing Strategy and Enabling Update

##### 1.1.1 Housing Association Liaison Panel

1.1.2 Members will be aware that the Council regularly holds meetings of the Housing Associations Liaison Panel with selected Registered Provider Preferred Partners. This round of the Panel is being held between January and February with Circle Housing Russet, West Kent Housing Association, Moat, Hyde Housing, Town & Country Housing Group, Golding Homes and Sanctuary Housing.

1.1.3 The meetings are occurring against a context of widespread current and emerging housing, planning, and welfare reforms impacting both on the housing associations, the Council and more importantly our residents. Members of the Liaison Panel are taking the opportunity to discuss a wide ranging agenda with each partner, in relation to their own existing presence and future aspirations in the borough. This included affordability issues, organisational structure, opportunities for future investment in Tonbridge and Malling, along with traditional housing management matters such as the approach to tackling antisocial behaviour.

1.1.4 All of the housing associations we met with are looking to make substantial operational efficiencies in light of recent changes in the sector such as the one per cent rent reduction announced in the Budget. This includes following a channel shift agenda towards digitalisation, where tenants can increasingly access a wider range of services from their landlord through the internet and by using their smart phones. This would naturally include safeguards to ensure more vulnerable tenants or those unable to use the technology required would not be disadvantaged.

1.1.5 With the scale of the funding reductions and the degree of financial pressure being felt by our Registered Provider Partners, many unfortunately described a

likely future that saw a reduction in their organisations capacity to deliver some of the “softer services” historically seen. In the drive to optimise operational efficiencies many saw a need to reimagine the recent specialist housing officer positions into more generic roles. Some housing associations were exploring housing officers that were responsible for a particular patch or area (possibly on rotation), whilst others saw a flexible approach where officers with wider a skill base could visit particular stock on demand.

- 1.1.6 The Panels are revealing some key trends in relation to the development of new homes. Although the housing associations continue to actively seek opportunities for providing new affordable housing in the borough, this has become ever more challenging. The reduction in capital funding overall, with the remaining focus only on Shared Ownership, means a likely significant reduction in the provision of Social Rent and Affordable Rent in the future. Some housing associations see delivery for outright sale as a means to cross subsidise the provision of more units for rent, and form part of a broader offer to meet housing need.
- 1.1.7 One of the main topics discussed was the issue regarding affordability and rent levels of new affordable housing. Members will be aware that the Affordable Rent tenure is causing significant concern within the borough, particularly when implemented at the full 80 per cent of market rents. Discussions at the panel enhanced our Registered Provider partners understanding of the strategic pressures affordability of accommodation presented to the Council and the need to safeguard where possible negative impacts against the most vulnerable households (including economically active households on low income) that could lead to unsustainable tenancies.
- 1.1.8 The Council continues to express a desire to work closely with each of our partners through the ongoing changes, as this will be critical to being able to robustly perform the Council’s statutory functions as well as deliver our strategic priorities.

## **1.2 Kent County Council Consultation on Commissioned Services For Supported Accommodation and Floating Support For Young People**

- 1.2.1 Kent County Council (KCC) is consulting key partners including the Council regarding changes to how supported accommodation and floating support for young people are provided in the future. It is important to note that although the level of available funding for these services is not predicted to be reduced, the level of demand is increasing in ways that require commissioning decisions to be reviewed, which is driving the consultation process.
- 1.2.2 Many of the services under review are not delivered directly by KCC, and instead are funded (partly by unring fenced funding received for the supporting people programme) and commissioned by the County and then provided through other organisations. The current contracts for a number of these services are coming to an end, which has provided the opportunity to KCC to review how accommodation

and support services are provided for young people. These changes relate to how those services are provided, where they are provided; and who is eligible to access the services.

- 1.2.3 For how the service is delivered KCC are considering a “standard offer”, which means that all services would be able to cater for the needs of all young people. The aim would be that access can be prioritised according to need, and that there is more likely to be a suitable service available closer to where young people currently live.
- 1.2.4 For where the service is delivered, KCC are considering either a countywide service or one based on four areas (North, South, East, and West Kent). Currently accommodation based support and floating support services are delivered differently across the County, some areas have a large number of services while other areas do not have any services. If successful this would help young people to continue living locally and to have or retain a “local connection”.
- 1.2.5 For who will be eligible to use these services, three models are suggested. These are to simply retain the status quo, move to prioritise those that KCC have a statutory duty to assist, or make services only available to those to which KCC have a statutory duty. Clearly this final option represents a radical shift in service provision and a position that those not entitled to a statutory duty will receive no support.
- 1.2.6 Whilst we fully acknowledge the need to save money and streamline services we are urging KCC that some of the Options proposed also are at odds with the agreed Kent Young Homeless Persons Protocol, where the needs of the young person are the focus of the process, not the level of resource. Our concern is that some of the future directions would seriously undermine the principles of the joint protocol arrangements to the detriment of homeless young people. There could be a significant increase in rough sleeping for this age group from some of the options presented, with the resultant risks in terms of potential sexual and financial exploitation of these individuals.
- 1.2.7 Our primary observations is that we understand there is to be a further review planned of homeless services that were previously funded by the Supporting People programme in Kent. This review significantly overlaps with arrangements for supported housing for young people, as any young people excluded from specialist projects by new eligibility criteria are likely to end up in services designed for adults that are not suited to their needs, or spend periods of time rough sleeping. We therefore consider that it is essential that these reviews are considered together, so that the broader implications for homelessness services can be considered before any potential new restrictive eligibility criteria are introduced.
- 1.2.8 The Council’s response to KCC’s consultation document describing the local impacts is set out at **[Annex 1]**.

### **1.3 West Kent Housing & Homelessness Strategy**

- 1.3.1 The current five year West Kent Joint Homelessness Strategy 2011-2016 for Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, and Sevenoaks District Council expires this year. The three councils wish to extend the joint strategy for a further five years, and also expand this to develop a joint Housing Strategy covering the same period.
- 1.3.2 Consequently the authorities have jointly commissioned the consultant Susan French to draft this document, which will be set within and reflect the national, regional, sub-regional and local policy contexts and housing markets. The new Strategy will understand and reflect both similarities and differences in approach across the three authorities and the close partnership working that already exists.
- 1.3.3 The new Strategy will be developed in consultation with key stakeholders, partners and service users, and will start in January 2016, with a first draft of the strategy by summer 2016.

### **1.4 Affordable Housing Delivery in the Borough**

- 1.4.1 Officers continue to work proactively with our Registered Provider Partners to ensure a forward supply of affordable homes in the Borough. Set out at **[Annex 2]** is a monitoring spreadsheet showing the completed schemes for the previous and present financial year, along with the development programme by year up to 2017-18.
- 1.4.2 Members will be pleased to hear that since the last meeting of this Board Abbeyfield Kent Society have obtained planning permission for a 100 per cent Affordable Housing redevelopment of their existing scheme at St Martins Square in Larkfield. This features 54 Affordable Rented homes for Extra Care, and 20 Older Persons Shared Ownership properties.
- 1.4.3 Members will note that despite emerging challenges to the provision of affordable housing described above, for the time being the Borough maintains a healthy and diverse programme of affordable housing supply across varied tenures and through different Housing Associations. However, a note of caution is necessary as it is likely that some of these schemes will be subject to change as a result of the aforementioned changes.

### **1.5 Housing Needs Update**

- 1.5.1 The table below gives details of the number of households on the housing register. On average, homeseekers represent 65 per cent of households on the housing register and transferring housing association tenants represent the remaining 35 per cent of the total. Band B now accounts for 53 per cent of registered households, with a further three per cent in Band A, 28 per cent in Band C and 16 per cent in Band D.

Month	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed	Total
April 2015	768	457	99	50	18	1,392
May 2015	781	459	108	53	18	1,419
June 2015	784	464	111	54	16	1,429
July 2015	543	342	78	41	7	1,011
August 2015	529	344	80	42	7	1,002
September 2015	549	359	89	43	7	1,047
October 2015	523	340	89	41	7	1,000
November 2015	525	352	89	41	7	1,014
December 2015	527	342	99	44	7	1,019

1.5.2 The following table shows applicants housed via Kent Homechoice during the last nine months, broken down by bed need. Approximately 66 per cent of all lettings were made to homeseekers during this period.

Month	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed	Total
April 2015	10	10	10	0	1	31
May 2015	12	6	7	2	0	27
June 2015	28	15	9	2	0	54
July 2015	26	19	13	1	0	59
August 2015	24	5	11	0	0	40
September 2015	15	8	13	0	0	36
October 2015	8	11	16	1	0	36
November 2015	16	10	6	1	0	33
December 2015	13	12	4	0	0	29
<b>Total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>351</b>

1.5.3 The table below shows the waiting times of applicants that have been housed via Kent Homechoice during the six month period between 1 July 2015 and 31 December 2015, broken down by size and type of accommodation. Waiting time is impacted to a large degree by the availability of each property type and bidding behaviours, as some applicants are prepared to wait for particular property types or particular location before placing bids:

Property Type	No. of Lets	Shortest Wait	Longest Wait	Average Wait
Sheltered	18	18 days	14 years	19 months
1 bed flat	79	5 weeks	7 years	12 months
2 bed flat	32	6 months	3 years	16 months
2 bed house	28	7 weeks	9 years	25 months
3 bed flat	2	10 weeks	10 weeks	10 weeks
3 bed house	63	5 weeks	7 years	10 months
4 bed house	4	3 months	12 years	5 years

## 1.6 Housing options

1.6.1 The table below illustrates the number of customers approaching the Housing Options team in the past six months. The majority of our customers contact the team for advice to prevent them from losing their current home or are seeking assistance to find alternative accommodation. The average number of households making a homeless application was 12 per month for 2015, compared to seven per month for 2014. The most common reason for homelessness remains the ending of a private sector assured short-hold tenancy.

Month/Year	No. of approaches	Homeless applications	Advice only	Homelessness Prevented	Open
<b>2015</b>					
April	76	18	33	7	13
May	56	10	27	4	12
June	44	5	13	3	22
July	70	13	37	5	8
August	55	8	26	7	6
September	67	6	33	3	21
October	69	15	32	8	4
November	55	7	33	3	7
December	33	7	15	1	5
<b>2016</b>					
January	60	4	28	0	28
<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>82</b>



### 1.6.2 Temporary Accommodation

The following table provides a 'snapshot' number of homeless households living in temporary accommodation at the end of each month. The number remains relatively high reflecting the increased demand for the service. The majority of homeless households require two bedroomed accommodation which is in high demand, meaning that they can be waiting for longer periods to be rehoused.

<b>Date</b>	<b>No. in self-contained temporary accommodation (AST)</b>	<b>No. in self-contained temporary accommodation (nightly paid)</b>	<b>No. in traditional bed &amp; breakfast</b>	<b>Total</b>
30.04.15	3	16	3	22
31.05.15	3	16	3	22
30.06.15	3	13	0	16
31.07.15	3	10	4	17
31.08.15	3	7	3	13
30.09.15	3	12	6	21
31.10.15	3	16	4	23
30.11.15	3	16	4	24
31.12.15	3	16	4	24
28.01.16	3	18	5	26

1.6.3 There are a number of avenues we are pursuing to help reduce the use of and length of stay in temporary accommodation. We are:

- redirecting existing resources to understand the private rented sector in more detail and source properties appropriately;
- working with our Registered Provider Partners, in particular Circle Housing Russet (CHR), to make direct offers of accommodation outside of Choice Based Lettings so that we can move households on to more suitable accommodation in a more timely manner;
- in dialogue with our Registered Provider Partners to reach an agreement for a handful of existing general needs, self-contained properties to be used as emergency accommodation as an alternative to Bed & Breakfast. We have very recently started piloting the use of a general needs property as temporary accommodation within Circle Housing Russet stock.

#### 1.6.4 Rent Deposit Scheme

- 1.6.5 It remains challenging for those on a low income to access the private sector as many private landlords are seeking rent levels considerably higher than the local housing allowance rates, and additionally require tenants to have guarantors who are homeowners and/or have a high income.
- 1.6.6 Whilst numbers of customers accessing the Rent Deposit Scheme remain low, the Housing Options Team are working hard to negotiate with and offer incentives to landlords to work with the Council despite the gap between local housing allowance levels and market rent which remains the biggest obstacle in accessing the private sector.

### **1.7 Private Sector Housing Update**

- 1.7.1 Extending mandatory licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and related reforms
- 1.7.2 In November 2015 Government published a technical discussion document for local authorities and others to comment on the planned changes to HMO licensing legislation due in 2016. It is planning to extend the scope of mandatory licensing of HMOs, introduce national minimum room sizes and simplify the process for applying for a HMO or other residential property licence.
- 1.7.3 Currently mandatory licensing applies to HMOs comprising non self-contained accommodation of three or more storeys occupied by five or more people, who do not form a single household. This definition is to be extended to include single and two storey HMOs, and poorly converted blocks of flats. This will have a significant impact on the number of licensable HMOs in Tonbridge and Malling, an estimated additional 25 HMOs, compared to the 12 currently licensed, as predominantly much of our HMO accommodation is two storey. The Council can charge a fee for administering licence applications to recover its costs. To avoid the need to licence, landlords may choose to change the traditional shared house type HMO occupied by single persons to a house for one family. This may have the effect of reducing the availability of affordable accommodation for single persons in the borough.
- 1.7.4 The Government is looking to introduce national minimum room sizes for HMOs rather than local authorities setting their own standards as is currently the case. This will enable consistency across local authorities.
- 1.7.5 Government is looking to simplify the licensing application process particularly where landlords are making multiple applications, so they will only be required to enter their details once. This will make it less time consuming for landlords but the same may not be true for local authorities processing the applications.

## **1.8 Right to Rent**

1.8.1 From 1 February 2016 private landlords including those subletting or taking in lodgers, will need to make right to rent checks. This will mean checking tenants have the right to be in the UK. This will include

- seeing the tenant's documents that allow them to live in the UK;
- checking the documents with the tenant present; and
- copying the documents and keeping on file for the full term of the tenancy and for a year after, including recording the date of the check.

1.8.2 It is the responsibility of the landlord to do the check but this can be assigned to an agent as long as this is in writing. Enforcement will be by the Home Office local Immigration Compliance and Enforcement (ICE) teams. Landlords who don't make the checks could be issued a civil penalty fine of up to £3,000 per tenant if they rent out a property to someone who's in the UK illegally.

1.8.3 The local ICE teams are working with local authorities across Kent to share data and promote the new requirements to landlords through for example social media and landlord forums. Further information about the right to rent checks can be found at [www.gov.uk/righttocheck](http://www.gov.uk/righttocheck).

## **1.9 Legal Implications**

1.9.1 None arising from this report.

## **1.10 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

1.10.1 None arising from this report.

## **1.11 Risk Assessment**

1.11.1 None arising from this report.

Background papers:

contact: Satnam Kaur

Nil

Steve Humphrey  
Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health

This page is intentionally left blank

**Proposed Changes to Kent's Supported Accommodation and  
Floating Support Services  
Consultation Questionnaire**

We are committed to keeping you involved and are keen to listen to your views.

Please let us know what you think by visiting [www.kent.gov.uk/supportedaccommodation](http://www.kent.gov.uk/supportedaccommodation) and completing the online consultation questionnaire.

Alternatively, complete the consultation questionnaire below and send it back to us using the address below:

- Email – 16-25accommodation@kent.gov.uk
- Post – Kent County Council, Commissioning Unit, Room 2.11, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone, Kent, ME14 1XQ (or phone us for a freepost envelope on 03000 414181)

Please submit your questionnaire by 8<sup>th</sup> February 2016.

**Question 1.**

**Are you completing this questionnaire on behalf of:**

*Please select **one** option.*

- a.
- b. **An organisation** → Please go to question 1b

Please tell us the name of your organisation:

Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council

### Question 1a.

Which of the following best describes you? (Please tick all that apply)

- I am a young person who currently uses these services
- I am a young person who may use these services in the future
- I am a Family member, neighbour or friend of a young person who uses these services
- I am Foster Carer
- I am a Professional e.g. Advocate, Social Worker, Support Worker
- I am a Supported Lodgings Host
- I am a Landlord
- I am a Private Housing Landlord.
- I run a Bed and Breakfast
- I run a Training Flat
- I provide support services to people in their home e.g. Floating Support
- Other please specify

### Question 1b.

Which of the following best describes your organisation? (Please tick all that apply)

- Independent Fostering Agency
- Supported Lodgings Co-ordinator/ Provider
- Housing Related Support Accommodation Provider e.g. Young People at Risk Service
- Teenage Parent Service Provider
- Independent Accommodation Provider
- Children's Residential Home
- Local Authority/ Housing Authority
- Housing Association
- A Hostel
- A Foyer
- Secure Accommodation Provider
- A Refuge
- Training Flat Provider
- Support services in someone's home e.g. Floating Support
- Other please specify

## Question 2:

We are considering prioritising young people who are entitled to a statutory duty or who may need some support to prevent them coming into Care (Option 2)

*This would mean that more young people who are entitled to a statutory duty (Children in Care including Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children, Care Leavers and 16 and 17 year olds at risk of homelessness) will be supported and fewer young people over 18, who are not entitled to a statutory duty will be supported.*

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with this prioritisation?**

(Please tick one option)

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree                   | → Please go to question 3  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agree                            | → Please go to question 3  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree       | → Please go to question 2a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree                         | → Please go to question 2a |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree     | → Please go to question 2a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know                       | → Please go to question 2a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do not wish to comment on this | → Please go to question 3  |

## Question 2a:

**Could you tell us why you say that?**

**Strategic Housing Authorities have statutory duties to those beyond those covered by the remit of this consultation process. Young people who the local authority (but not the county) might have a duty to would not be able to access appropriate accommodation as before, e.g. teenage parents, without a substitute system or safety net being in place. **This approach would also be at odds with the agreed Kent Young Homeless Persons Protocol, where the needs of the young person are the focus of the process.****

**This proposal would mean there would may not be any appropriate accommodation available for those young people that neither KCC or the LA have a statutory duty to but who are still vulnerable due to homelessness.**

**The proposal could lead to an over concentration of specific client groups in one place, in particular the larger current KCC/SP funded accommodation. This may lead to schemes becoming very hard to manage, or challenging in terms of their impact on their existing environments. For example, if young person's schemes have much higher concentrations of 16 & 17 year olds, as opposed to the wider age spread across a more diverse need spectrum that have traditionally been preferred by referral panels in terms of creating manageable environments.**

**The proposed welfare reform changes restricting housing benefit for those under 25 would restrict young people accessing affordable accommodation in the private rented sector and therefore this proposal would mean that young people would not be able to source accommodation of any kind. Potentially this may lead to a rise in homelessness and rough sleeping for this vulnerable group, with the associated danger of sexual or financial exploitation leading to safeguarding issues.**

### Question 3:

We are also considering limiting services to those who are entitled to a statutory duty only (Option 3).

*This would mean that young people over 18, who the council does not have a statutory duty to support, will NOT be supported.*

To what extent do you agree or disagree with only delivering support to Children in Care including *Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children, Care Leavers and 16-17 year olds at risk of homelessness?* (Please tick one option)

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree                   | → Please go to question 4  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agree                            | → Please go to question 4  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree       | → Please go to question 3a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree                         | → Please go to question 3a |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree     | → Please go to question 3a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know                       | → Please go to question 3a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do not wish to comment on this | → Please go to question 4  |

### Question 3a:

Could you tell us why you say that?

Our response to question 2a also applies here, with an increased likelihood of the pitfalls, **including operating against the agreed Kent Young Homeless Persons Protocol**, along with the following points.

This could lead to young people making the conscious decision to enter the care system purely to give themselves housing options.

It is likely there would be a significant impact on local authority housing options teams due to the increase in footfall from young people having limited, if any, housing options and seeking advice, not all of which can be dealt with through mediation.

Further to this young people rough sleeping or sofa surfing may be in danger of sexual or financial exploitation leading to safeguarding issues.

The proposal would create added competition for private rented accommodation between the local authority and the county, and this would lead to fewer properties being available for households accepted as homeless by local authorities. This could potentially drive up rents, which would not be cost effective situation for the county or the local authority.

Such a change also brings with it the potential to halt the delivery of new bespoke supported schemes as Local Authorities struggle to comprehend the degree to which such a new resource would address truly local needs.



## Question 4:

**We are considering a standard service offer.**

*This would mean that young people will be able to access the same services. Services would cater for the needs for all young people and there would be no separate targeted services.*

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the creation of a standard accommodation and support offer for all young people who will use these services? (Please tick one option)**

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree                   | → Please go to question 5  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agree                            | → Please go to question 5  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree       | → Please go to question 4a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree                         | → Please go to question 4a |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree     | → Please go to question 4a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know                       | → Please go to question 4a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do not wish to comment on this | → Please go to question 5  |

## Question 4a:

**Could you tell us why you say that?**

**In relation to young people, there is not a 'one size fits all' solution**

**Many young people will have issues that will require specialist support.**

**This proposal could lead to support needs for individual clients being missed.**

**Further to this young people with identified or unidentified support needs could be placed into unsuitable environments, e.g. clash of cultures.**

**There is potential for boroughs with resources and schemes that are not held in other locations to lose the present benefits this brings.**

**The strategic pressures across Kent are also not experienced equally across the 13 local authorities, and a Standard Service Offer may not reflect this diversity. This may apply to new and growing pressures in particular, such as unaccompanied asylum seekers (children) that require access to appropriate services, potentially a lesser issue in the west of the county.**

**This could lead to a reduction in providers who may not consider building new schemes, or existing providers changing current provision in response to the changes.**

### Question 5:

**We are considering joining up services.**

*This would mean creating a service that is able to deliver a full range of stable, safe and well maintained accommodation (including smaller and larger properties) and appropriate personalised support packages (including targeted support as required) to meet the needs of all young people throughout their journey to independence.*

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the joining up of accommodation based and floating support services? (Please tick one option)**

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree        | → Please go to question 6  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agree                            | → Please go to question 6  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree       | → Please go to question 5a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree                         | → Please go to question 5a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree                | → Please go to question 5a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know                       | → Please go to question 5a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do not wish to comment on this | → Please go to question 6  |

### Question 5a:

**Could you tell us why you say that?**

**Whilst this sounds ideal, we would need further detail on this proposal to be able to offer an informed response. For example, the way such an approach or model tackles known and understood problems with sourcing appropriate levels of move-on accommodation?**

### Question 6:

**Kent County Council is considering either a countywide service or 4 area based services.**

*This would mean there were lower overhead and management costs and services would be delivered in a consistent way across the County.*

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with reducing the number of organisations delivering services? (Please tick one option)**

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree                   | → Please go to question 7  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agree                 | → Please go to question 7  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree       | → Please go to question 6a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree                         | → Please go to question 6a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree                | → Please go to question 6a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know                       | → Please go to question 6a |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I do not wish to comment on this | → Please go to question 7  |

### **Question 6a:**

**Could you tell us why you say that?**

**The Council recognise that there is an urgent need to find efficiency savings and streamline the operation of existing services. Subject to the detail a “four area service” that also ensures a level of consistency seems a wise approach. However, it is important to stress that “quality” must remain as a foundation of the decision making that lays ahead.**

### **Question 7:**

**Which of the following do you think would deliver the best outcomes for the young people who use our services? (Please tick one option)**

- Option 1 Current – Services are delivered in various locations across Kent. Some areas have lots of services while other areas do not have any.
- Option 2 – Countywide service(s) (Kent)
- Option 3 – Area based services (North, South, East or West Kent)
- Don't Know/ Not Sure

### **Question 7a:**

**Could you tell us why you say that?**

**Our response is subject to understanding the detail. Potentially we understand that those areas that currently lack of services will benefit with this option, but we would also reiterate our response to the relevant aspect of question 4a.**

**This option is preferable to Option 2 which could ultimately result in the dilution of services.**

**It would seem sensible to align with the existing KCC staffing resources for the Social Care & Early Help Teams.**

**This option would make the best use of local expertise, which is to be embraced.**

**This option would also enable young people to remain within their existing support networks.**

**It is important to understand that “local connection criteria” varies between local authorities, as does the operation of their individual Housing Allocation Schemes. This could create unintended barriers in providing assistance, how will this work? This is a key issue to be understood moving forward.**

## Question 8:

**If you think there is something we haven't asked you, or you would like to make any other comments on our options and proposals for this service, please use the space below to tell us:**

Whilst we fully acknowledge the need to save money and streamline services we would urge you to consider the effects some of the proposals would have on vulnerable young people currently accessing services from other providers in Kent, such as those through direct access.

Most local authority's currently assist young people who are ready to leave supported accommodation by giving priority within their allocation policies as their role as the Strategic Housing Authority. This is to ensure that young people do not remain in supported accommodation when they no longer need the support so that spaces will become available in a timely manner for those who do need the support. This provision is likely to be removed or made redundant as LA's are unable to access the supported accommodation places and to source more accommodation for YP's not owed a statutory duty by KCC. **Some of the Options proposed also are at odds with the agreed Kent Young Homeless Persons Protocol, where the needs of the young person are the focus of the process, not the level of resource. Our concern is that some of the future directions would seriously undermine the principles of the joint protocol arrangements to the detriment of homeless young people.**

Further to this LA's will not be able to assist the young person when they have to leave that accommodation until the legal process has been followed. This could lead to high eviction costs to the provider, for example those who have not been given a priority.

We must reinforce our view that there could be significant increase in rough sleeping for this age group, which is a huge concern locally as well as for Central Government, especially in terms of potential sexual and financial exploitation.

We have not been offered any statistical data to support that Option 1 (to not make changes and keep models as they are) will not work. For example, how many care leavers currently occupy supported accommodation? How many referrals are being made by KCC into this type of accommodation which are not successful because places are being taken by young people owed a statutory duty by KCC?

We also have concerns about how the decisions may be phased in? For example if option 3 is chosen to only assist those owed a statutory duty, will all existing tenants be served with a notice or will it be when a void comes up?

Unfortunately there does exist already a negative perception about immigration in terms of using locally provided and funded resources. We would be concerned about large numbers of UASC children being prioritised as this could be considered discrimination against other priority groups who are just as much in need.

The lack of appropriate supported accommodation for young people could lead to an increase in young people seeking to fit into priority need/statutory categories in order to obtain housing as their options are decreased, and wider costs increasing.

The comments that have been made are based on the limited information given in this consultation. There is nothing to demonstrate how robust these services will be. We need more detail in order to make an informed opinion.

If limiting the number of providers through the tendering process, some existing providers may choose not to move forward and change the use of the accommodation, e.g. to general needs, thus reducing the accommodation available for young people.

We are concerned that these proposals could have detrimental effect on the relationship between LA's and KCC.

It has not been made clear about whether there will be an outreach service (currently floating support). If there is a floating support service, will this only be available to the young people that KCC have a duty to?

These changes are also adding instability to the process of providing new schemes and services, which are already under pressure due to changes in capital funding, the Housing & Planning Bill and Welfare Reform changes. This is despite the recent delay in the 1% rent reduction for such accommodation.

We would conclude our observations by making the following key point. We understand that there is to be a further review planned of homeless services that were previously funded by the Supporting People programme in Kent. This review significantly overlaps with arrangements for supported housing for young people, as any young people excluded from specialist projects by new eligibility criteria are likely to end up in services designed for adults that are not suited to their needs, or spend periods of time rough sleeping. We therefore consider that it is essential that these reviews are considered together, so that the broader implications for homelessness services can be considered before any potential new restrictive eligibility criteria are introduced.

Tonbridge & Malling would urge you not to introduce new eligibility criteria for supported housing projects for young people until this wider review has been completed. I would also ask you to fully involve the counties homelessness services in designing any new criteria, so that we can collectively understand and mitigate the impacts of these changes.

This page is intentionally left blank

## TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL: AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME 2014/15

SCHEME DETAILS		AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS											DELIVERY TIMETABLE		
Address	RSL	Tenure	Flats			M'nette		Houses			B'galow		Total Units	Start on site date	Planned completion date
			1 bed	2 bed	3 Bed	1 bed	2 bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+bed	1 bed			
Isles Quarry	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent		9				4	10	5			28	May-13	Feb-15
		Shared Ownership							2				2		
Cannon Lane	Moat	Affordable Rent	12	13									25	Apr-13	May-14
		Shared Ownership	4	11									15		
Scott Road Scheme	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent						4	2				6	Aug-13	Sep-14
		Shared Ownership		8									8		
Marvillion Court Regeneration	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent		4				1	2				7	Jan-13	Dec-14
		Shared Ownership						1	8				9		
Carnation Close	Circle Housing Russet	Shared Ownership							2				2	Sep-13	Mar-15
		Affordable Rent						2	1				3		
The Mound, Hadlow	Sanctuary	Affordable Rent						2	1				3	Sep-13	Sep-14
<b>TOTALS 14/15</b>			<b>16</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		

## TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL: AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME 2015/16

SCHEME DETAILS		AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS												DELIVERY TIMETABLE	
Address	RSL	Tenure	Flats			M'nette		Houses			B'galow		Total Units	Start on site date	Planned completion date
			1 bed	2 bed	3 Bed	1 bed	2 bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+bed	1 bed			
Twisden Road	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent						5					5	Feb-13	Jul-15
Lavender Road	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent		4									4	Feb-13	Jul-15
Winterfield Phase 1	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent							4	2	4		10	Feb-13	Jul-15
		Shared Ownership						4	2				6		
Winterfield Phase 2	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent	9	8					2	2			21	Feb-13	Jul-15
		Shared Ownership	2	14		1			2				19		
Isles Quarry	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent													
		Shared Ownership		6										May-13	Mar-16
Isles Quarry	Crest Nicholson	Shared Equity		12				6					18	May-13	Mar-16
Shrubshall Meadow, Plaxtol	Moat	Affordable Rent					2	1					3	May-13	May-15
		Shared Ownership						3	1				4		
Sovereign House	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent													
		Shared Ownership	10	16									22	May-13	Sep-15
<b>TOTALS 15/16</b>			<b>21</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>112</b>	



## TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL: AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME 2016/17

SCHEME DETAILS		AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS											DELIVERY TIMETABLE		
Address	RSL	Tenure	Flats			M'nette		Houses			B'galow		Total Units	Start on site date	Planned completion date
			1 bed	2 bed	3 Bed	1 bed	2 bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+bed	1 bed			
Coventry Road	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent							2				2	tbc	Jan-17
Isles Quarry	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent						2	2				4	tbc	Mar-17
		Shared Ownership						1	1				2		
60 Kings Hill Hall	Hyde Housing	Affordable Rent	3	10									13	May-15	Jul-16
		Social Rent		5									5		
		Shared Ownership	2	10	16								28		
Kings Hill F1	Hyde Housing	Affordable Rent							6				6	tbc	Jun-16
		Shared Ownership							2				2		
Bunyards Farm	WKHA	Affordable Rent	2	7					4				13	Dec-14	Nov-16
		Shared Ownership							4				4		
<b>TOTALS 16/17</b>			<b>7</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		

## TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL: AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME 2017 onwards

SCHEME DETAILS		AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS												DELIVERY TIMETABLE	
Address	RSL	Tenure	Flats			M'nette		Houses			B'galow		Total Units	Start on site date	Planned completion date
			1 bed	2 bed	3 Bed	1 bed	2 bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed	1 bed			
Enterprise House	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent	7										7	tbc	tbc
		Shared Ownership	13	24											
Isles Quarry	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent							4				4	tbc	tbc
		Shared Ownership							5				5		
Northwood Road, Tonbridge	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent										2	2	tbc	tbc
		Shared Ownership													
Twyford Road, Tonbridge	Circle Housing Russet	Affordable Rent												tbc	tbc
		Shared Ownership						2							
Leybourne Grange Phase 3	Orbit South	Affordable Rent	4	10									14	tbc	tbc
		Shared Ownership	5	6											
Leybourne Grange Phase 4	Orbit South	Affordable Rent	3	14				3	2				22	tbc	tbc
		Shared Ownership	5	9											
Leybourne Grange Phase 4	Taylor Wimpey	Shared Equity											21	tbc	tbc
Tudely Lane, Tonbridge	AKS	Affordable Rent	16	12									28	tbc	tbc
		Shared Ownership													
St Martins, Larkfield	AKS	Affordable Rent	47	7									54	tbc	tbc
		Shared Ownership	5	15											
Kings Hill	TBC	Social Rent	11	6				7	10	5			39	tbc	tbc
		Affordable Rent	18	10				11	0	0			39		
		Shared Ownership	0	20				0	14	0			34		
Preston Hall	Circle Housing	Affordable Rent		35	1			8	5	2			51	tbc	tbc
		Shared Ownership		12				1	1	2			16		
Priory Works	TBC	Affordable Rent	3	13					17	4			37	tbc	tbc
		Shared Ownership						21					21		
<b>TOTALS 17/18</b>			<b>137</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>478</b>	

Kings Hill Area F1 Shared Ownership 3 bed home with Hyde Housing



Page 5

Mill Hall, Worsford Shared Ownership Homes with Hyde Housing



This page is intentionally left blank

## TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

### HOUSING and ENVIRONMENT SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

22 February 2016

#### Report of the Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services

#### Part 1- Public

#### Matters for Information

#### 1. WASTE & STREET SCENE SERVICES UPDATE

##### Summary

This report provides an update on a number of projects and initiatives within Waste & Street Scene services.

#### 1.1. Christmas Collection Arrangements 2015/16

1.1.1. Details of last year's Christmas arrangements for refuse & recycling collections were reported to the Advisory Board in May 2015. The general approach taken was similar to previous years, with the aim to:

- keep disruption to an absolute minimum;
- provide minimal suspension to green waste collection service, while recognising the need to ensure that no properties go more than 15 days without a black bin collection;
- maintain the green box recycling collections throughout the holiday period; and
- provide notification to all residents in a variety of formats.

1.1.2. This approach was applied again for the 2015/16 Christmas and New Year period and worked very well with only a small number of complaints received from residents. The few complaints received were generally about the suspension of the green waste service for around 10,000 households. The only other issues experienced were due to very windy weather on one day during the issuing of bin hangers, and unusually high demand (compared with previous years) at some recycling bring sites.

1.1.3. Officers are now reviewing options for collection arrangements for the 2016/17 Christmas period and will also be looking at any additional measures that can be taken to help reduce the impact on high use recycling sites. Details will be reported to this Board's next meeting in May.

## 1.2. Easter, May & August Bank Holiday Collection Arrangements 2016

- 1.2.1. As in previous years, there will be no refuse or recycling collections on either Good Friday (25 March) or Easter Monday (28 March). In order to cause least disruption to residents and to avoid any suspension of the regular recycling cycle, we will be operating on the two consecutive Saturdays (26 March and 2 April). The full Easter Bank Holiday collection schedule is set out below, and has been communicated to residents via the calendar delivered to every property in October, as well as being available on our website at [www.tmbc.gov.uk/waste](http://www.tmbc.gov.uk/waste).

Normal Collection due	We will collect
Friday 25 <sup>th</sup> March	Saturday 26 <sup>th</sup> March
Monday 28 <sup>th</sup> March	Tuesday 29 <sup>th</sup> March
Tuesday 29 <sup>th</sup> March	Wednesday 30 <sup>th</sup> March
Wednesday 30 <sup>th</sup> March	Thursday 31 <sup>st</sup> March
Thursday 31 <sup>st</sup> March	Friday 1 <sup>st</sup> April
Friday 1 <sup>st</sup> April	Saturday 2 <sup>nd</sup> April

- 1.2.2. As a result of operating kerbside collections on those two Saturdays, we will be unable to run the normal **Saturday Bulky Household Waste Freighter Service** on 26 March and 2 April. In order that no locations miss their regular visits, we have amended the schedule for March & April accordingly:

MARCH	
Saturday 5 <sup>TH</sup> March	Week 1 locations
Saturday 12 <sup>th</sup> March	Week 2 locations
Saturday 19 <sup>th</sup> March	Week 3 & Week 4 locations
Saturday 26 <sup>th</sup> March	No Service
APRIL	
Saturday 2 <sup>nd</sup> April	No Service
Saturday 9 <sup>th</sup> April	Week 1 locations
Saturday 16 <sup>th</sup> April	Week 2 locations

Saturday 23 <sup>rd</sup> April	Week 3 locations
Saturday 30 <sup>th</sup> April	Week 4 locations

1.2.3. There will be no changes to arrangements and collections will be carried out as normal on **both May** bank holiday weeks and the **August** bank holiday week.

### 1.3. Food Waste – Kitchen Caddies

1.3.1. In order to raise awareness that food waste can be included in the green waste collection service a number of promotional activities were implemented over the last few months. This included:

- Information on the Christmas bin hangers
- Providing free kitchen caddies through Council and Parish Council offices (including an initial supply of paper liners)
- Promotion on staff email signatures
- News Release

1.3.2. During the promotion approximately 500 kitchen caddies were distributed to residents.

### 1.4. “Love Kent – Hate Litter” Roadside Litter Campaign

1.4.1. The Kent Resource Partnership (KRP), consisting of Kent County Council and all twelve Kent district councils, ran the Love Kent, Hate Litter Campaign in both 2014 and 2015. The campaign included a radio campaign on Heart FM with a call to action for local volunteer activity. It was a huge success with Social Media engagement across the county of over 1.5 million people. TMBC ensured a high level of local involvement with more than 100 Love Where You Live events in the borough over the four campaign periods.

1.4.2. The campaign is currently running again between February & March 2016. A list of TMBC “Love Where You Live” events advised so far within the campaign period are at Annex 1.

1.4.3. TMBC are again using mobile roadside litter signage to promote the campaign. The current “Take Your Litter Home” signs are being refreshed with a new message, to tie in with the national “Clean for the Queen” campaign.

## **1.5. Clean For The Queen**

- 1.5.1. Clean for The Queen is a national campaign launched by Country Life magazine in partnership with Keep Britain Tidy to “clear up Britain in time for The Queen’s 90th birthday in 2016”. It aims to “rally an army of volunteers across the country to clean up their local areas and will include a special clean-up weekend on March 4–6. Adrian Evans, who has been appointed as Campaign Director, ran The Queen’s Diamond Jubilee River Pageant in 2012. With the full backing of Keep Britain Tidy, the campaign already has the support of well-known national organisations with a total membership in excess of 1.5 million, as well as individual ambassadors
- 1.5.2. Locally, almost 30 groups have already registered their interest in carrying out a clean-up initiative in their local area. There is likely to be at least one event in almost every parish within the borough, as well as five confirmed in Tonbridge. Due to the number of events being organised, we are encouraging groups to hold them throughout the month of March and beyond. This will not only prolong the initiative and maximise publicity opportunities, but will enable TMBC to provide the necessary support in providing equipment and rubbish collections.

## **1.6. Littergram**

- 1.6.1. Littergram is a free app solution that allows users to take a picture of litter, flytipping, dirty street signs or overflowing litter bins. GPS then pinpoints the location of the problem and the photo is sent automatically to the relevant local council authority.
- 1.6.2. Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council has become the first council in the UK to adopt a new app, littergram, in a bid to exploit the latest smartphone technologies to help clear the streets and countryside of rubbish.
- 1.6.3. TMBC have worked with littergram to develop the app, which will help the Council to respond even more quickly when rubbish is spotted and reported by app users. As well as pinpointing the exact location of the rubbish and sending a photo, the app also gives the Council the opportunity to reply to the sender to let them know what action is being taken. It also enables us to forward reports to third parties where the responsibility for the issue lies elsewhere, such as potholes and waste on private land.
- 1.6.4. The app was created by Danny Lucas, Chairman of Lucas, a UK specialist fit out and finishing company based in Wrotham. Mr Lucas – a resident of Higham ward - has developed a number of apps to advance his own business and the littergram app was a by-product of one of his Company’s technology developments. As a result of his close work with the Council in developing the app so that it not only benefits residents but also aids the Waste & Street Scene team in being able to respond promptly and take appropriate action, Mr Lucas has been nominated for this year’s Environmental Champions Awards.



## **1.7. Environmental Champions Awards 2016**

- 1.7.1. The Environmental Champions scheme, which was launched in 2009 to encourage more people to make an extra effort to improve the environment, is open to all Tonbridge and Malling residents and anyone can nominate a person or a group to become an Environmental Champion. The awards are part of the Love Where You Live campaign and are kindly sponsored by Veolia, the council's refuse, recycling & street cleansing contractor
- 1.7.2. Over the last 7 years we have recognised groups and individuals for litter picking, supporting local food projects through farmers markets, flood wardens, school and uniform groups Love Where You Live projects, community wildlife gardeners, country park volunteers, volunteer health walk leaders and volunteer Street Monitors, as well as a special Love Where You Live Gold Award for Tonbridge Canoe Club.
- 1.7.3. This year's call for nominations has resulted in 12 winners who will be recognised at a reception at Tonbridge Castle on Friday 26 February 2016. A list of the winners is attached at **Annex 2**.

## **1.8. Kent Resource Partnership (KRP) Communications Group – Waste Resources Action Programme (WRAP) Funding**

- 1.8.1. Members will recall that last year the KRP was successful in bidding for £70,694 of the £350,000 made available by the national Waste Resource Action Programme (WRAP). The aim of the funding was to assist local authorities to increase recycling through communication activities. KRP officers also managed to secure additional funding from external partners, Marks & Spencer and Alupro.
- 1.8.2. The KRP is now implementing a Kent wide recycling campaign from October 2015 to June 2016. The aim is to increase both the capture and quality of dry recycling in the whole county and especially the six target districts. This is to be achieved through a combination of increasing household participation, increasing capture of target materials and reducing contamination (thereby reducing the risk of rejected loads and increasing recycling). A range of core communications activities are being delivered by KRP officers with support from district council representatives via the KRP Recycling Communications Group.
- 1.8.3. The first phase of the campaign was aimed at raising residents' awareness of the various different types of plastics that they can recycle. WRAP's research showed that although most residents were aware that they can recycle plastic bottles such as fizzy drink & sauce bottles, they did not necessarily know that bottles used for bathroom & cleaning products, for example, or food pots, tubs & trays can be recycled. A leaflet was distributed to every household in Kent in early January, which served as a useful reminder to TMBC residents of the wide range of containers that we collect via our network of plastics bring banks.

1.8.4. The second phase of the campaign focuses on metal recycling, specifically raising awareness of what happens to metals once they have been collected. Two leaflets have been developed, based on 2012's national "Metal Matters" campaign and the first was sent out to every Kent household in w/c 1 February, with the second to follow during w/c 29 February.

1.8.5. TMBC has supported both phases through the use of social media, sending out regular messages via Twitter and Facebook throughout each phase of the campaign. The subject of the third phase has yet to be confirmed but is likely to be either paper & card, or food waste. This will depend on the findings of the waste audits being carried within the next month or so, as that will indicate which material has most potential to be diverted from residents' black bin waste.

## **1.9. TMBC Communications Plan**

1.9.1. Last year each district was allocated some funding by the KRP so that they could run tailor-made communications activities that were specific to local needs whilst still supporting Kent-wide and national campaigns. Officers are currently working with a local marketing agency to produce a communications project plan for TMBC residents which will commence in late March/early April 2016. The campaign's main messages will be:

- "Get Back To Basics" – what material goes into which bin; when & where to put your bin; no side waste with black bin; clinical waste & pull outs; etc
- "Your Waste Need Never Go To Waste" – what happens to your rubbish after you put it out; how black bin waste becomes electricity; how green bin waste is composted; where do your paper, metals, plastics & glass go?
- Communications throughout the year will also carry seasonal messages, such as how to get a second green bin or bags for extra garden waste during the Spring; how to manage food waste during Summer; recycling at Christmas; etc

Details of the finalised plan will be reported to the Board in May.

## **1.10. Legal Implications**

1.10.1. The Council has a statutory duty to provide a refuse collection service. The proposed arrangements ensure that the Council complies with that duty.

## **1.11. Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

1.11.1. The costs associated with the collection and contracted services arrangements for Easter and the various promotional initiatives are contained within existing budgets.

**1.12. Risk Assessment**

1.12.1. Careful planning, good communication with residents and coordinated arrangements for the holiday collection period will ensure minimal disruption and effective delivery of these high profile services.

Background papers:

Nil

contacts:

David Campbell-Lenaghan

Lesley Letts

Robert Styles

Director of Street Scene, Leisure and Technical Services

This page is intentionally left blank

## “Clean for the Queen” and “Love Kent” Monthly Activities

1. **Golden Green** - Cllr Howard Rogers (Sat 5 March)
2. **Tonbridge** Farm Sportsground - Cllr Vivian Branson
3. Barden Road Volunteers - **Tonbridge**
4. LitterGram / West Kent College - Student Support Services / IMAGO (West Kent Volunteer Centre) **Tonbridge** Thursday 25 February
5. Cllr Sarah Spence TBC (Tonbridge Litter Catchers TLC / **Angel Community Gardeners** and **Tonbridge Town Team**)
6. McDonalds **Tonbridge** - Surjit Manger
7. **Wouldham** All Saints Primary School - Carl Fitter (Headteacher) & Cllr Roger Dalton
8. **Burham** PC - Cllr Roger Dalton
9. **Kings Hill** Parish Council / SportsPark
10. Mike Whitts (**Wateringbury** PC & Wateringbury Sports and Recreation Club) - Saturday 5 March
11. **Ditton** Lions Cub Scouts - Caroline Crittenden - Wed 2 March (will leave equipment with group to carry out litter pick)
12. TM Youth Forum (Ruth Lowe) TBC **Tonbridge**
13. The Malling School / Street Monitors / Cubs / MVCP - Clare Lake (Friday) and Park (Saturday) David Thornewell **East Malling**
14. **Aylesford** Parish Council - Clerk Neil Harris TBC
15. **Tonbridge** U3A - **East Malling**
16. **Hildenborough** Parish Council (Pam Gow) - inviting groups and 3 schools
17. **Larkfield** Football Club - Adam Handy & John Michel
18. **Larkfield** Angels (19 March 2015)
19. **Borough Green** Baptist Church - Adrian Tribe (Friday 4 March & Sat 5 March)
20. **Ditton** Churchyard - Carol Wellbelove, Alan Warner and Dave Stevens (Sat 12 March 2016)
21. **Platt** Cubs & Scouts
22. **Platt** Womens Institute
23. **Platt** Parish Council (TBC Pat Darby, Chairman)
24. **Plaxtol** WI (Street Monitor Group)
25. **Hadlow** College TBC
26. **Snodland** Goes Cleaner, Holmesdale Technology College and Sustrans (Snodland Station)

**Note:** The above is a list of groups or individuals have registered their support and involvement for these events, although at the time of going to print details are still to be confirmed in some cases.

This page is intentionally left blank

**List of Environmental Champions Award Winners 2016**

1. Danny Lucas – ‘littergram’; technology to make reporting litter simple and fun , Hadlow
2. Dave Stevens, Ditton Churchyard Clean Up volunteer leader, Ditton
3. Alan Hetherington, Tonbridge Racecourse volunteer litter picker, Tonbridge
4. Carl Lewis representing the voluntary TMBC Flood Wardens, Tonbridge
5. Nick Neeld Eccles, Street Monitor, Aylesford
6. Morag Neeld Eccles, Street Monitor, Aylesford
7. Richard Dedman, Chair of Woodland Walk Community Management Group, Tonbridge
8. Rachel Cantwell, Rainbows Volunteer and Street Monitor, Larkfield
9. Mrs Betty Uffindell, Chair of Platt Woods Management Committee, Platt
10. Plaxtol Women Institute, Street Monitors / litter pickers volunteers, Plaxtol
11. Barden Road Litter Pickers, Street Monitor volunteers, Tonbridge

**GOLD AWARDS:**

12. Stuart and Anne Olsson, Larkfield – The Larkfield Voluntary Litter Code and Larkfield Neighbourhood Watch
13. Tommy Hickmot, Exceptional Veolia Operative, Tonbridge

This page is intentionally left blank



# Agenda Item 8

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 9

The Chairman to move that the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting during consideration of any items the publication of which would disclose exempt information.

**ANY REPORTS APPEARING AFTER THIS PAGE CONTAIN EXEMPT  
INFORMATION**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 10

Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent due to special circumstances and of which notice has been given to the Chief Executive.

This page is intentionally left blank