

**NOTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP  
TUESDAY 26 JANUARY 2016**

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road,  
West Bridgford

**PRESENT:**

Councillors T Combellack (Chairman), B Buschman, L B Cooper, J Donoghue,  
M J Edwards, A L R A Pell and R G Upton

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

M Lockley                      Acting Programme Director, Economic Development and  
Devolution, Nottinghamshire County Council

**OFFICERS PRESENT:**

D Banks	Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods
D Burch	Waste and Fleet Operations Manager
C Evans	Economic Growth Manager
A Goodman	Constitutional Services Officer
A Poole	Constitutional Services Team Leader
C Saxton	Corporate Projects Officer

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

Councillor R A Inglis

**13. Declarations of Interest**

There were none declared.

**14. Notes of the Previous Meeting**

The notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 20 October 2015 were accepted as  
a true record.

Asylum and Immigration – In response to questions on the Syrian situation, the  
Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods explained that officers would brief the  
Portfolio Holder and updates would be provided through the Councillors’  
weekly newsletter “Members’ Matters”.

**Action                      the Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods to provide  
Members with updates on the Syrian Refugee situation via  
“Members’ Matters”**

## 15. **Update on the delivery of Rural Broadband in Rushcliffe**

Mr Lockley, Acting Programme Director, Economic Development and Devolution, from Nottinghamshire County Council gave a presentation to the Group on the current situation in respect of Fibre Broadband Delivery in Rushcliffe. He informed Members that Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire (BBfN) was a £31 million partnership between the County Council and a range of funding partners. Mr Lockley explained that the programme was funded by £7.85 Million from Central Government, £ 2.76 million from the European Regional Development Fund, £2.63 Million from D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership, £12 million from BT infrastructure and normal business costs, and 2.75 million from Nottinghamshire County Council and £1.15 million jointly from the district councils and Nottingham City Council. Rushcliffe Borough Council had contributed £245,000 to the programme and the remainder of the funding would be realised from a share of the profits from better than expected take up of the scheme.

The programme built on from the commercial roll out of fibre based broadband in 2012 which had provided superfast access to 86% of properties in Nottinghamshire, 73% in Rushcliffe. As a result of the Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire programme, over 95% of properties across the county would gain superfast access by March 2016. Nationally all the contracts had been awarded to BT on a framework basis which was tightly governed. BT had designed a network to maximise coverage and reach as many SMEs as possible, especially in rural areas where costs were greater and there was less coverage. Nottinghamshire County Council's role in the programme was to project manage the rollout, contract management with supplier and to achieve value for money ensuring the maximum number of properties was reached.

Mr Lockley explained that there were two ways to connect homes and businesses to the Fibre Optic Broadband network. The "FTTC" method entailed using fibre optic cables from the telephone exchange to the cabinet and then copper cables to the premises. This was the most cost effective method and delivered speeds of up to 80 Mbps. The "FTTP" method was the fastest connection and involved connecting premises directly to the exchange with fibre optic cables, delivering speeds of up to 330 Mbps. However this approach was much more expensive and was only used in parts of the County where FTTC was not viable. Fibre Optic Deployment was a lengthy process that required significant survey work and the installation of a power source, meaning that it could take up to four months before any construction could commence.

Mr Lockley updated the Group on the progress of Contract 1, the first stage of the Better Broadband programme, which was due to be completed by March 2016. Overall within Nottinghamshire the scheme had exceeded targets on its main priorities by achieving 95% coverage, 6,300 SMEs enabled and a take of rate of over 20%. Over 200 miles of fibre cables had been deployed and 400 cabinets had been installed connecting over 61,500 homes and businesses. In Rushcliffe, the original target to increase superfast coverage from 73% to 92.4% and to connect an additional 9,500 properties had also been exceeded. By March 2016 there would have been an increase in superfast broadband coverage of 27% to 92.4% and over 12,040 premises would have been connected. A total of 65 cabinets across the Borough were now live and the

remaining few in East Bridgford, West Bridgford, Plumtree and Granby were on schedule to be connected by March.

Following on from Contract 1, Rushcliffe would receive a further 3.6% uplift in coverage through the Contract 2 rollout, increasing superfast coverage to 96% by June 2017. This would enable 1,500 more homes and businesses to gain superfast access and would conclude the project. This would leave 4%, approximately 2,000 premises, with no access to superfast broadband at speeds of 24Mbps or more. Some of these properties would have access to fibre broadband which could provide a speed uplift, however this would still be below the minimum speed to be considered superfast. Nottinghamshire County Council was looking at all possible funding and technical solutions to increase coverage to as many unserved properties as possible over the coming years. The Government, through their delivery arm Broadband Delivery UK, was currently piloting a number of different projects with different suppliers, to identify the most efficient way of providing coverage to the most hard to reach parts of the UK.

Members were informed that Rushcliffe could benefit from Contractual Gainshare, a profit share scheme with BT, which enabled the profits from a higher than 20% take up level to be re-invested. This additional revenue and any underspend from Contract 1 could be used to further enhance the coverage in the least cost effective areas.

In relation to “not spots”, the areas that would not be able to receive superfast broadband, Mr Lockley explained that some premises may be able to benefit from the “Better Broadband For All” scheme. This was a new initiative that allowed individuals to claim a subsidy of up to £350 towards installing satellite broadband and rental costs. There were around 480 premises in Rushcliffe that were eligible for the vouchers, as they currently received sub-2Mbps speeds and officers were keen to promote the scheme.

In response to questions on how the subsidy would be advertised, Mr Lockley confirmed that the scheme had only been launched that week and officers were still considering the best method of communication. Members felt that a mailshot should be sent to all the eligible premises and that the relevant parish councils should be informed. In respect of the remainder of the 2,000 premises that were not eligible for the satellite scheme, Mr Lockley explained that although they were attached to a cabinet, as they were sited over one and a half miles from it, they would not benefit from an uplift in speed. He confirmed that officers would update parish councils and Ward Members in relation to the “not spot” areas and those premises eligible for the satellite scheme. The Government was continually piloting new schemes and if in the future, further funding became available, there could be solutions for the more remote villages. A larger copy of the map detailing the coverage areas, contained in the presentation, was available on the website and would be circulated to members of the Group

**Action            the Economic Growth Manager to provide Members with a larger copy of the map detailing the coverage areas**

In relation to new housing, Mr Lockley confirmed that superfast broadband for the Hollygate Lane development was not part of this programme and was

being provided by BT. Other large scale projects including Sharphill would be provided by the developers, however there could be issues in respect of smaller developments and this was being considered in more detail by the Council.

In response to questions on BT's monopoly on this broadband programme, Mr Lockley explained that this was as a result of the withdrawal of Fijitsu and that Openreach had the monopoly on the infrastructure.

It was AGREED that the Community Development Group endorse the presentation from Nottinghamshire County Council Officers on the rollout of fibre broadband in the Borough and note the issues raised in relation to 'not spots'.

## 16. **Review of Waste Strategy**

The Waste and Fleet Operations Manager outlined the key issues for the new draft Rushcliffe Waste Strategy 2016 -2020 and the future plans for how the Council would continue to manage its waste in line with the waste hierarchy. He informed Members that the Strategy replaced the first version produced in 2009 and sought to:

- Raise awareness among Members, officers, partners and the public about the waste management challenges facing the Borough and the Council's actions in response.
- Position the Council as forward-looking in regard to how it continues to focus on waste reduction and recycling whilst recognising the difficulties in providing additional waste services due to technical and financial restrictions
- Establish a strategy for working with a range of partners to improve waste and recycling services, maintaining existing recycling rates and focusing resources on projects that make a practical difference.
- Continue to deliver cost effective and efficient refuse and recycling services which help resident's to manage their waste

The Waste and Fleet Operations Manager informed the Group that Rushcliffe had an enviable record in regards to waste and recycling. The recycling2go service was awarded Beacon Status in 2007 and had been one of the top performers in the national recycling and composting league tables for many years. The Council remained the top recycling authority in Nottinghamshire with recycling and composting rates consistently around 50%. However, it was recognised that to continue to raise recycling rates would take significant financial and technical investment in the future.

Members were informed that within a two tier local authority arrangement, waste collection was carried out by the district council, as the designated Waste Collection Authority (WCA), whereas disposal arrangements and costs were the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council as the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA). In 2006 Nottinghamshire County Council awarded a

26 year contract to Veolia Environmental Services Ltd to dispose of the waste. As part of this arrangement the Council was responsible for collecting and delivering waste to contractually designated disposal sites and had limited influence over what was collected and subsequently recycled. Although the Council was keen to see improvements in the range of recycled items collected, such as food and textile recycling, this would require significant changes at the reprocessing plant in Mansfield. This would incur additional costs to both the Council and Nottinghamshire County Council and was unlikely during the current financial climate. Therefore the focus of the new Strategy was how to improve recycling rates and reduce residual waste, whilst continuing to deliver high quality and cost efficient services.

The new Strategy also focused on greater partnership and collaboration work with Nottinghamshire County Council and Veolia Environmental Services. This would enable officers to explore ways to expand of the range of materials collected at the kerbside and to investigate the feasibility of textile and food waste recycling.

The strategy was supported by detailed action plan and would be put out for consultation before being presented to Cabinet on 8 March 2016 for approval. An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken and no major change or adverse impacts had been identified.

Members questioned the year on year increase in the quantity residual waste and the reduction in recyclables collected. The Waste and Fleet Operations Manager explained that this was a national trend and was due to many factors, including the increase in property numbers and changes to consumer buying habits. The inclusion of street sweepings in the figures from 2013/14 had also contributed to the increase in the level of residual waste. It was recognised that some residents were confused about what items could be placed in the blue bin for recycling, which often led to contamination. Officers were working to address this by raising awareness through communication campaigns including the “bin there done that”, “Love food hate waste” and “Recyclenow” promotions. A new campaign that used pictures to depict what items should be placed in each bin was currently being launched and it was hoped that this would be beneficial to residents.

Members raised the issue of contamination due to plastic wrappings on bulk mail being discarded with the paper contents and the need to work with companies to encourage them to use paper instead. The Waste and Fleet Operations Manager explained that although this was outside the Council’s control, he agreed to feedback the Group’s views to the Waste Advisor to further investigate the issue.

**Action            the Waste and Fleet Operations Manager to feedback the Group’s views on the issue of plastic wrapping on bulk mail to the Waste Advisor**

In response to questions, Members were informed that wherever possible the contents of litter bins were sorted by Streetwise and any recyclables were extracted. Litter bins with separate compartments for recyclables had been trialled in West Bridgford, however this had limited success. The key to making the scheme succeed was to educate the public and officers were investigating

ways to achieve this. The Waste and Fleet Operations Manager confirmed that 100% of the recyclables collected were processed at the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) and none were sent to landfill sites. Items of contamination were removed and recycled elsewhere if possible and the Council received regular feedback on the levels. Currently new battery bags were being distributed to households and all batteries that were collected were placed in a cage on the bin lorry to be returned to the Depot for recycling.

The Group highlighted the importance of encouraging primary school children to recycle as they could then educate their families. The Waste and Fleet Operations Manager informed Members that the Council was involved with the "School Waste Action Club" run by Nottinghamshire County Council that worked with schools to promote recycling. Members felt that the YouNG Group should be utilised to promote waste management as this would be an ideal method of communicating with young people.

**Action      the Waste and Fleet Operations Manager to investigate enlisting the YouNG Group to assist with waste management promotions**

Members raised the issue of litter, in particular ribbons of tape, left by contractors that had been working on the trunk roads in the Borough. The Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods informed the Group that he had recently attended a meeting with senior officers from the Highways Authority to address this issue and requested that any instances should be reported via the helpline number.

Members expressed disappointment that the new four year Strategy did not contain any new "headline" items including kerbside glass collections and food waste collections. The Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods explained that Nottinghamshire County Council as the WDA was at the heart of waste disposal and governed what items could be collected based on business case studies of viability. However, officers were in touch with Nottinghamshire County Council to explore the feasibility and business case of food waste collection from the kerbside.

The Waste and Fleet Operations Manager explained that the Council had previously explored the option of kerbside glass collections and established that it was not viable. Currently Rushcliffe was collecting more glass from bring sites than other district councils were from kerbside collections. Due to changes in legislation glass collection would soon be classed as contract waste and as a result, councils providing kerbside collections may wish to switch back to bring sites. Members felt that the practice of "money back on bottles" should be introduced and requested that officers feedback their views to the Joint Waste Management Committee.

**Action              the Waste and Fleet Operations Manager to feedback the Groups views on "money back on bottles" to the Joint Waste Management Committee**

In respect of the increasing numbers of flats and communal waste, Members were informed that the Council's Waste Advisor was consulted on all new housing developments. Recycling packs were delivered to all flats and

information stickers were placed on bulk bin containers to assist residents. Officers were working with landlords through forums to educate them, however it was recognised that some student accommodation presented issues.

Members queried why the recyclables were not taken directly to the MRF at Mansfield by the bin lorries. The Waste and Fleet Operations Manager explained that as part of the agreement the district councils took their recyclables to a centre at Colwick where they were transferred in bulk to the MRF, thus saving on fuel.

It was AGREED that the Group endorse the draft Waste Strategy 2016 - 2020 prior to it being presented to Cabinet for approval.

## 17. **Work Programme**

The Group considered the report of the Service Manager – Corporate Governance that set out details of the proposed work programme for the municipal year 2016/17.

The Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods reported that possible items including a review of Community Assets and working with Parish Councils could be added to the programme later in the year, as well as any items referred from Cabinet.

The Group suggested the following items for potential scrutiny:

- Communication between planning and Parish Councils
- Post Office Closures
- Arts in the Borough

The Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods explained that the potential scrutiny of these items would be discussed at the next Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairmen Meeting and if appropriate they would be added to the Group's Work Programme.

In response to the request for a six monthly update in May 2016 on the Refugee situation, the Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods explained that this would be too early as there would be little to report as the Council was working to timescales set by the Home Office. Officers had been undertaking preparatory work in the background and updates on this would be provided via the Members' weekly newsletter "Members' Matters".

The Group AGREED the Work Programme as set out below:

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Item</b>
24 May 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reputation Management</li><li>• Work Programme</li></ul>

Date of Meeting	Item
23 August 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Report</li> <li>Work Programme</li> </ul>
22 November 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work Programme</li> </ul>

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm.

## Action Sheet Community Development Group - Tuesday 26 January 2016

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
14 Notes of the Previous Meeting	Provide Members with updates on the Syrian Refugee situation via "Members' Matters"	Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods
15 Update on the delivery of Rural Broadband in Rushcliffe	Provide Members with a larger copy of the map detailing the coverage areas	Economic Growth Manager
16 Review of Waste Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) feedback the Group's views on the issue of plastic wrapping on bulk mail to the Waste Advisor</li> <li>b) investigate enlisting the YouNG Group to assist with waste management promotions</li> <li>c) feedback the Groups views on "money back on bottles" to the Joint Waste Management Committee</li> </ul>	<p>Waste and Fleet Operations Manager</p> <p>Waste and Fleet Operations Manager</p> <p>Waste and Fleet Operations Manager</p>
17 Work Programme	None	



## Responses

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible	Response
14 Notes of the Previous Meeting	Provide Members with updates on the Syrian Refugee situation via “Members’ Matters”	Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods	Updates have been provided
15 Update on the delivery of Rural Broadband in Rushcliffe	Provide Members with a larger copy of the map detailing the coverage areas	Economic Growth Manager	Link to the map <a href="http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/2504/betterbroadbandrolloutrushcliffe.pdf">http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/2504/betterbroadbandrolloutrushcliffe.pdf</a>
16 Review of Waste Strategy	<p>a) feedback the Group’s views on the issue of plastic wrapping on bulk mail to the Waste Advisor</p> <p>b) investigate enlisting the YouNG Group to assist with waste management promotions</p> <p>c) feedback the Groups views on “money back on bottles” to the Joint Waste Management Committee</p>	<p>Waste and Fleet Operations Manager</p> <p>Waste and Fleet Operations Manager</p> <p>Waste and Fleet Operations Manager</p>	<p>a) Feedback given to Notts Waste Officer Group and Joint Notts Waste Management Committee. However it is recognised that this is a national issue and we locally have little input</p> <p>b) YouNG will be asked to assist in any waste promotional work at summer events (such as Lark in the Park, etc.).</p> <p>c) Feedback given to Notts Waste Officer Group and Joint Notts Waste Management Committee. However it is recognised that this is a national issue and we locally have little input</p>
17 Work Programme	None		