

11 November 2021

Advisory Committees can meet virtually with appropriate Councillors attending via remote video link. Public access is available via a live stream video through the [Mid Sussex District Council's YouTube channel](#).

Dear Councillor,

A meeting of **SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR COMMUNITY, CUSTOMER SERVICES AND SERVICE DELIVERY** will be held **VIA REMOTE VIDEO LINK** on **WEDNESDAY, 17TH NOVEMBER, 2021 at 6.00 pm** when your attendance is requested.

Yours sincerely,  
KATHRYN HALL  
Chief Executive

#### **A G E N D A**

#### **Pages**

- |    |   |                |
|----|---|----------------|
| 1. | Roll Call and Virtual Meeting Explanation.  |                |
| 2. | To note Substitutes in Accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4 - Substitutes at Meetings of Committees etc.                      |                |
| 3. | To receive apologies for absence.   |                |
| 4. | To receive Declaration of Interests from Members in respect of any matter on the Agenda.  |                |
| 5. | To confirm the Minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 24 March and 6 October 2021.                                      | <b>3 - 10</b>  |
| 6. | To consider any items that the Chairman agrees to take as urgent business.  |                |
| 7. | Draft Terms of Reference for forthcoming Community Governance Reviews of Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common and Worth Parish Council. | <b>11 - 24</b> |
| 8. | Food Waste Collection.  | <b>25 - 32</b> |

*Working together for a better Mid Sussex*



9. Scrutiny Committee Community, Customer Services and Service Delivery Work Programme 2021/22. **33 - 34**

10. Questions pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 10.2 due notice of which has been given.

To: **Members of Scrutiny Committee for Community, Customer Services and Service Delivery:** Councillors A Boutrup (Chair), Anthea Lea (Vice-Chair), L Bennett, R Cartwright, P Chapman, R Clarke, B Dempsey, J Edwards, S Ellis, T Hussain, J Mockford, M Pulfer, S Smith, A Sparasci and D Sweatman

**Minutes of a meeting of Scrutiny Committee for Community,  
Customer Services and Service Delivery  
held on Wednesday, 24th March, 2021  
from 5.00 - 5.40 pm**

**Present:** A Boutrup (Chair)  
Anthea Lea (Vice-Chair)

L Bennett	J Henwood	S Hatton
P Chapman	T Hussain	J Knight
R Clarke	M Pulfer	L Stockwell
S Ellis	S Smith	
I Gibson	A Sparasci	

**Absent:** Councillors B Dempsey, J Mockford and D Sweatman

**Also Present:** Councillors J Belsey, R de Mierre, J Llewellyn-Burke,  
A MacNaughton and N Webster

**1 ROLL CALL AND VIRTUAL MEETING EXPLANATION.**

The Vice-Chairman carried out a roll call to establish attendance at the meeting. The Solicitor to the Council provided information on the format of the virtual meeting.

**2 TO NOTE SUBSTITUTES IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE  
RULE 4 - SUBSTITUTES AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES ETC.**

Cllr Hatton substituted on behalf of Cllr Dempsey. Cllr Stockwell substituted on behalf of Cllr Mockford. Cllr Knight substituted on behalf of Cllr D Sweatman.

**3 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies were received from Councillors Dempsey, Mockford and Sweatman.

**4 TO RECEIVE DECLARATION OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS IN RESPECT OF  
ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA.**

The Chairman declared an interest in Item 7, paragraph 50c, as she is Treasurer of Bolnore Village Community Partnership.

**5 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON  
3 FEBRUARY 2021.**

The Chairman updated Members on actions from the previous meeting regarding planning visits and the air quality app, which she confirmed was already on the Council website. The action regarding compliments was being considered for the Complaints report. The minutes of the meeting held on 3rd February 2021 were agreed as a correct record and electronically signed by the Chairman.

**6 TO CONSIDER ANY ITEMS THAT THE CHAIRMAN AGREES TO TAKE AS URGENT BUSINESS.**

The Chairman had no urgent business.

**7 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY PROGRESS REPORT 2020.**

Neal Barton, Policy & Performance Manager, introduced the Equality and Diversity Progress report. He reminded Members that the Committee had discussed a new Diversity and Equality Scheme prior to its adoption by the Council in July 2020. He noted that the Council's Equality and Diversity work as well as covering the protected characteristics looks at disadvantage from people's level of skills, income and by virtue of where they live. It also covers work to support the Armed Forces community. The 2020 report has a focus on the Council's work during the Covid-19 pandemic to support protected groups.

While highlighting the work of the voluntary sector in tackling problems arising from pandemic, the Policy & Performance Manager added that the Wellbeing Team had moved to a virtual programme, mainly contacting people by phone. Several other events had also been adapted such as Silver Sunday and the virtual Play Days at Home. Video content is available online for the public to access. He emphasised new work to support communities, including the Covid Recovery Fund, with £147,000 of funding allocated in the first round.

Members discussed the importance of partnership working. In response to a query, the Policy & Performance Manager confirmed that the Community Champions Network would continue, working with Citizens Advice, to support BAME communities. He also acknowledged a Members request for other groups to include in the report (such as prisoners and the homeless) noting that these groups were already covered by separate strategies adopted by the Council. Collaborative working with other councils was discussed and it was confirmed that there is regular contact with the Towns and Parish Councils and work will continue to ensure coordinated approaches to available grant funding in the future.

Discussion was held on the allocation of Covid grants, and the Business Unit Leader for Community Services, Policy, and Performance noted that a number of grants are aimed at young people, including Buddy Benches, sports facilities and online education, as well as initiatives underway prior to the pandemic. A Member queried the geographical split of the figures on NEETs in the area and emphasised the growing gap between generations. The Policy & Performance Manager agreed to provide a written response with more information.

A Member queried work on safeguarding and thanked the Council for the training on this matter provided to Councillors. The Business Unit Leader noted that safeguarding training is available online (Level 1 and Level 2), with further details to be shared with Members via MIS shortly.

Another Member requested more focus on the figures for Armed Forces in the Council's staff monitoring. The Policy & Performance Manager noted that the HR Department were working on including referencing to the Armed Forces in the recruitment process and he will ascertain if these figures can be included in future reports.

The current pressure on leisure centres was also discussed and the committee's suggestions for longer opening hours and support for less privileged groups to access the facilities will be passed back to the Leisure Team.

The Cabinet Member for Community reassured the Member with concerns on supporting ex-Armed Forces personnel and said that finding additional ways to support them was a priority. He informed Members that there are several different training courses available.

Regarding ex-prisoners, he highlighted the importance of providing community support to them to break the cycle of returning to crime. He additionally mentioned the increase in hate crime and domestic violence. He also reminded Members of the government's Job Retention Scheme and the need to support people if they lose their jobs when the Scheme ends. He concluded by thanking the Committee Members for their diligence in considering this report.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendation contained in the report. This was approved with 15 votes in favour.

## **RESOLVED**

The Scrutiny Committee endorsed the Council's approach to meeting its duties under the Equality Act, as evidenced by the Equality and Diversity Progress Report 2020 included at Appendix 1.

## **8 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.2 DUE NOTICE OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN.**

No.

The meeting finished at 5.40 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Minutes of a meeting of Scrutiny Committee for Community,  
Customer Services and Service Delivery  
held on Wednesday, 6th October, 2021  
from 5.00 - 5.34 pm**

**Present:** A Boutrup (Chair)  
Anthea Lea (Vice-Chair)

L Bennett  
R Cartwright  
P Chapman  
J Edwards

S Ellis  
J Mockford  
M Pulfer  
S Smith

A Sparasci  
D Sweatman

**Absent:** Councillors R Clarke, B Dempsey and T Hussain.

**Also Present:** Councillor R Bates.

**1 ROLL CALL AND VIRTUAL MEETING EXPLANATION**

The Vice-Chairman carried out a roll call to establish attendance at the meeting. The Solicitor to the Council provided information on the format of the virtual meeting.

**2 TO NOTE SUBSTITUTES IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE  
RULE 4 -SUBSTITUTES AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES ETC.**

Cllr Hatton substituted on behalf of Cllr Dempsey.

**3 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies were received from Councillors Clarke and Dempsey.

**4 TO RECEIVE DECLARATION OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS IN RESPECT OF  
ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA.**

Cllr Sweatman declared a personal interest in Item 7: Mid Sussex Partnership Annual Report as he sits on the Mid Sussex Partnership Board where he represents the Mid Sussex Association of Town Councils.

**5 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON  
28 APRIL 2021.**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 April 2021 were agreed as a correct record and electronically signed by the Chairman.

**6 TO CONSIDER ANY ITEMS THAT THE CHAIRMAN AGREES TO TAKE AS  
URGENT BUSINESS.**

The Chairman had no urgent business.

## **7 MID SUSSEX PARTNERSHIP ANNUAL REPORT.**

Neal Barton, Policy, Performance & Partnerships Manager, introduced the annual report on the work of the Mid Sussex Partnership (MSP), the Council's main strategic partnership involving key public sector partners that is chaired by the Leader of the Council. He provided Members with information on the work undertaken under the umbrella of the MSP in 2020/21 and the programme for the year ahead. He drew attention to the Strategic Intelligence Assessment 2021 (SIA) which noted that Mid Sussex is the joint safest district in West Sussex alongside Horsham and that crime has reduced by 4% compared with the previous year. Future work of the partnership included consultations for further Public Space Protection Orders in other parts of the District and the roll out of the Safe Places Pilot following its success in East Grinstead.

The Chairman thanked the officers for the report and believed that it would be useful for all Members to have sight of the Strategic Intelligence Assessment 2021 via the Member Information Service.

A Member found the SIA to be helpful. She noted that Mid Sussex is the least deprived area in Sussex however made the point that there are pockets of deprivation in these communities. She expressed worry that access to national funding streams is perhaps easier when an area is recognised as one of deprivation but much harder when the area as a whole is known as one of the least deprived therefore making it harder for some communities in those areas to access support. The Member felt pleased about the new CCTV cameras and asked for some feedback from the headquarters in Lewes about what they are seeing. The Member noted the recent Sarah Everard case and the issues that may be faced by women walking alone through the many pathways in the district's parks and open spaces, some of which are not lit well. She asked whether areas could be subtly lit to make them safer. The Member expressed thanks that the other towns have come forward to implement the Safe Place project and asked all members to keep highlighting the places so that residents always know where they are just in case they need them.

The Policy, Performance and Partnerships Manager asked that when residents report instances of concern they state where and when it has taken place as, due to the number of cameras in operation at Lewes, they often have to look back at previous footage to ascertain a pattern of concern.

Emma Sheridan, Business Unit Leader for Community Services, Policy and Performance, acknowledged the existence of pockets of significant deprivation in the district. She confirmed that it could be a challenge to justify funding under, or even meet the basic criteria of, many national funding streams but that wherever possible the Council do make strong bids for funds on the basis of nested deprivation. Being in a deprived area in an otherwise affluent area can sometimes be harder than being in a widely deprived area which is a challenge the Council is conscious of. She also confirmed that she would feed back the comments of the Member to her colleagues in the Leisure & Landscapes team as they are currently looking at the parks master planning and a 'safe by design' concept as well as raising the issue in conversations about the Local Cycling, Walking and Infrastructure Plan.

The Vice-Chairman referred to Paragraph 54, P.12 in which sources of funding is mentioned. She noted that funding has been received from the Home Office and asked whether the funding is safeguarded and is going to be continuing and whether there are any other sources of funding.



The Business Unit Leader for Community Services, Policy and Performance confirmed that the funding derives from the Police and Crime Commissioner's Office which has been secured for the current year and is received on an annual basis. She confirmed that it has been received for a number of years and hasn't received any indication that its ceasing. In respect of other funding, it was confirmed that the Council continues to work as a partnership to bring in external funding where its available and have received funding variously through in-kind support from partners in the voluntary sector and increasingly in partnership with the health authorities.

A Member observed that the Council largely has a coordination role and sometimes a directional role in the Partnership however he noted that there seems to be a lack of success criteria in the work so asked how Partnership knows when it's work has been successful.

The Business Unit Leader for Community Services, Policy and Performance explained that the Partnership assumes responsibility for the projects and each individual project depending on the nature of it will usually have a lead organisation with this sometimes but not always the Council, Police or a voluntary sector organisation. She stated that its difficult in a summary annual report to go into the details of each particular project however she is happy to provide that level of detail at the Member's request and that this is reported regularly to the MSP Board.

A Member referred to the CCTV project on Paragraph 22, P.8 and expressed an interest in attending Lewes to get a better understanding of them. She noted the drug offences on P.22 which has more than doubled and thanked Mid Sussex District Council for the helpful online training provision which modules' covers safeguarding and county lines.

A Member enquired as to the engagement of other schools with the partnership as she noticed Haywards Heath College being part of the partnership and whether the Partnership has received any feedback from schools that are not reciprocating.

The Business Unit Leader for Community Services, Policy and Performance stated that due to the College covering the whole district they have a district wide remit and that there were a wide range of channels for school to engage with an participate in the Partnership. In addition, West Sussex Officers representing Education attend partnership meetings I. She also drew attention to the Sub-Groups and the work they do with schools some of which has not occurred recently due to the pandemic however it is restarting. She added that the Partnership was conscious of not wishing to add to the pressure put on schools to participate in meeting however they do obtain feedback from schools when relevant.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendation contained in the report. This was approved with 13 votes in favour and 1 abstention.

## **RESOLVED**

The Scrutiny Committee noted the work of the Mid Sussex Partnership in 2020/21 and endorsed the proposed continuing emphasis in the year ahead on the response to and recovery from the Covid-19 pandemic.

**8 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR COMMUNITY, CUSTOMER SERVICES AND SERVICE DELIVERY WORK PROGRAMME 2021/22.**

The Chairman introduced the Work Programme and noted that the meeting commenced at 5pm where other Committees have been convening at 6pm. She appreciated that it may be early for some Members and proposed a vote for moving the commencement of the forthcoming meetings to 6pm. This was approved with 8 votes in favour, 2 votes against and 3 abstention.

Tom Clark, Head of Regulatory Services, presented the Work Programme which has scheduled two meetings ahead with the usual reports. He noted that the Chairman has agreed an additional meeting to be held on 17 November 2021 to deal with governance reviews for both Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council and Worth Parish Council.

The Chairman noted that no Member wished to speak so took Members to a vote on the recommendation contained in the report. This was approved unanimously.

**9 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.2 DUE NOTICE OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN.**

None.

The meeting finished at 5.34 pm

Chairman

## **Draft Terms of Reference for forthcoming Community Governance Reviews of Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common and Worth Parish Councils**

REPORT OF: Head of Regulatory Services  
Contact Officer: Terry Stanley, Business Unit Leader - Democratic Services  
Email: [terry.stanley@midsussex.gov.uk](mailto:terry.stanley@midsussex.gov.uk) Tel: 01444 477415  
Wards Affected: Copthorne & Worth and Hurstpierpoint & Downs  
Key Decision: No  
Report to: Scrutiny Committee for Customer Services & Service Delivery  
17 November 2021

---

### **Purpose of Report**

1. To notify the Committee that the Council has been petitioned to conduct Community Governance Reviews relating to the Governance and Electoral arrangements for the following: Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common and Worth Parish Councils.
2. To consult the Committee regarding the content of the Draft Terms of Reference for these two Community Governance Reviews.

### **Recommendations**

3. **The Committee is recommended to:**
    - (i) **Agree each of the draft terms of reference which have been the subject of consultation with both parish councils and the petitioners**
    - (ii) **To note that a further report may be provided to the next committee meeting if further consultation with statutory consultees require that additional amendments be made ahead the Review start dates.**
    - (iii) **And to note that further reports will be provided as this Council's draft and final recommendations are available at later stages of the Reviews.**
- 

### **Background**

4. Both petitions were properly submitted by the requisite number of local registered electors, and each petition has been validated by our Electoral Services team.

### **Policy Context**

5. The Petitions lodged in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, Section 80, prevail upon Mid Sussex District Council as the Principal Authority, to conduct Community Governance Reviews in each of these areas.

### **Other Options Considered**

6. Having been petitioned by the requisite number of registered local government electors, the Council must exercise this statutory duty. No other options are available.

### **Financial Implications**

7. The costs involved with conducting Community Governance Reviews fall to the Principal Authority and are within existing Democratic Services budgetary provision.

8. Any costs and liabilities arising from separation of an existing parish Council to form a new one could have financial and legal implications for the existing and potentially any new parish council.

### **Risk Management Implications**

9. As the conduct of Community Governance Reviews is a statutory duty for this Authority, the Reviews will be conducted according to government guidance, so the risk level is assessed to be low.

### **Equality and Customer Service Implications**

10. Some local people will have already expressed views about what form of community governance they would like for their areas, and principal councils should tailor their terms of reference to reflect those views on a range of local issues. Ultimately, the recommendations made in a community governance review ought to bring about improved community engagement, better local democracy and result in more effective and convenient delivery of local services. The Reviews incorporate two substantial public consultation periods, so that electors have opportunities to contribute.
11. The Terms of Reference describe how we will publicise and conduct the Reviews. The Review timetable is also included.
12. Within the draft Terms of Reference, we show as tracked changes the suggestions that your officers have already accepted. There is broad consensus that the start of the Reviews should occur after the publication of the Local Government Boundary Commission's Final Recommendations for Mid Sussex District Council, due for publication at the Commission's website on 1 February 2022.

### **Other Material Implications**

13. Whether or not separate or new parishes are resolved because of these Reviews, the Council's Legal Services Division will ultimately be required to make Community Governance Orders, at the conclusion of the review and following adoption in Council.

### **Sustainability Implications**

14. A key aim of any Community Governance Review is to alight upon suitable Governance and Electoral arrangements that are capable of enduring. There is little or no environmental impact.

### **Background Papers**

- [Government & Local Government Boundary Commission Guidance on Community Governance Reviews.](#)
- [LGBCE Draft Recommendations for Mid Sussex District Council.](#)

### **Enc.**

- Draft Terms of Reference for Community Governance Review of Worth Parish Council
- Draft Terms of Reference for Community Governance Review of Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council

# Community Governance Review 2021-22

## Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

### Terms of Reference

#### 1. Introduction

##### 1.1 What is a community governance review?

A community governance review is a review of the whole or part of the Principal Council's area to consider one or more of the following:

- creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes;
- the naming of parishes and the style of new parishes;
- the electoral arrangements for parishes (the ordinary year of election council size; the number of councillors to be elected to council and parish warding); and,
- grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes.

A community governance review is required to consider:

- the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion; and
- the size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish.

If the Council (MSDC) is satisfied that the recommendations from a community governance review would ensure that community governance within the area under review will reflect the identities and interests of the community in that area; and is effective and convenient, the Council (MSDC) makes a community governance order.

##### 1.2 Scope of the review

The review, which is being undertaken in response to a petition received from electors, will consider whether a new parish and parish council should be created for Crawley Down. Guidance for respondents will include a few suggested themes to be covered by qualitative submissions. The proposed themes are listed at Appendix 1.

If a split is resolved, it would result in two newly named Councils:

- Crawley Down Village Council
- Copthorne Parish Council

If a split is not resolved, the name of the existing Worth Parish Council be changed to better reflect the identity of both villages – i.e. Copthorne & Crawley Down Parish Council, or Crawley Down & Copthorne Parish Council.

The review will also consider the electoral arrangements for any new parish council. This includes:

- (a) The name of any new parish
- (b) Ordinary year of election – the year in which ordinary elections will be held
- (c) Council size – the number of councillors to be elected to the parish council(s)
- (d) Parish warding – whether the parish(es) should be divided into wards for the purpose of electing councillors. This includes considering the number and

boundaries of any such wards, the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward and the name of any such ward

Other related matters which may arise during the review in response to representations received will be considered as appropriate.

## 2. Consultation

### 2.1 How the Council proposes to conduct consultations during the Review

Before making any recommendations or publishing final proposals, the Council must consult local government electors for the Worth Parish Council area under review and any other person or body (including a local authority) which appears to the Council to have an interest in the review. The Council will therefore:

- publish a notice and the Terms of Reference (ToR) on the council's website ([www.midsussex.gov.uk](http://www.midsussex.gov.uk)) and arrange for copies to be available for public inspection at Mid Sussex District Council, Oaklands, Oaklands Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1SS during normal office hours;
- send a copy of the notice and the ToR to the Worth Parish Council, Mid Sussex Association of Local Councils, Ward Members, Members of West Sussex County Council whose electoral divisions encompass the area concerned and the MP for the Horsham Parliamentary Constituency
- write to all households in the Worth Parish Council area
- publicise the review and the notice in the council's residents' magazine, and
- send a copy of the notice and the Community Governance Review (CGR) ToR to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and to the relevant officers of West Sussex County Council.

Before making any recommendations, the Council will take account of any representations received. The Council will publish its recommendations as soon as practicable and take such steps as it considers sufficient to ensure that persons who may be interested in the community governance review are informed of the recommendations and the reasons behind them.

The Council will notify each consultee and any other persons or bodies who have made written representations of the outcome of the review.

## 3. Timetable for the community governance review

- 3.1 The Council must complete a community governance review within twelve months from the day on which the Council publishes the terms of reference. A community governance review is concluded on the day on which the Council publishes the recommendations made by the community governance review.

The table below sets out the timetable for the review.

Action	Date	Outline of Action
Start Date	14 February 2022	Council publishes the terms of reference
<b>Public Consultation 1</b>	14 February 2022	Two-month consultation period starting with publication of the Review Terms of Reference.
Public Consultation ends	15 April 2022	All representations are examined & considered
Draft proposals considered by MSDC Scrutiny Committee (Customer Services & Service Delivery)	(TBC) May 2022	Any additional recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee are added to the published draft proposals
Draft proposals published	27 May 2022	Council publishes draft proposals
<b>Public Consultation 2</b>	(TBC) June 2022	Further two-month consultation period.
Public Consultation ends	(TBC) August 2022	All representations are examined & considered
Final recommendations are published <b>[Review ends]</b>	(TBC) September 2022	Results of consultation considered by the relevant Scrutiny Committee (date TBC) who shall consider the extent to which the Council should give effect to the recommendations and make recommendations to Full Council
Final recommendations (as amended, if applicable) are recommended to Full Council for adoption.	(TBC) October 2022	Full Council considers and determines the extent to which the Council shall give effect to the recommendations
Order made	By 25 November 2022	Council publishes Community Governance Order
Order takes effect	May 2023	Next scheduled local government elections

## 4. Background information

4.1 The Local Government Act 1972 provides that any parish council must have at least five councillors. No maximum number is prescribed.

4.2 When considering the number of councillors to be elected for a parish the Council must have regard to the number of local government electors for the parish and any change to that number that is likely to occur within five years of the date on which these terms of reference are published.

4.3 Joint guidance issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in 2010 provides further information on community governance reviews and the factors influencing size and membership of parish councils. On size, the guidance says:

**“154.** In practice, there is a wide variation of council size between parish councils. That variation appears to be influenced by population. Research by the Aston Business School Parish and Town Councils in England (HMSO, 1992), found that the typical parish council representing less than 500 people had between five and eight councillors; those between 501 and 2,500 had six to 12 councillors; and those between 2,501 and 10,000 had nine to 16 councillors. Most parish councils with a population of between 10,001 and 20,000 had between 13 and 27 councillors, while almost all councils representing a population of over 20,000 had between 13 and 31 councillors.

**155.** The LGBCE has no reason to believe that this pattern of council size to population has altered significantly since the research was conducted. Although not an exact match, it broadly reflects the council size range set out in the National Association of Local Councils Circular 1126; the Circular suggested that the minimum number of councillors for any parish should be seven and the maximum 25.

**156.** In considering the issue of council size, the LGBCE is of the view that each area should be considered on its own merits, having regard to its population, geography and the pattern of communities. Nevertheless, having regard to the current powers of parish councils, it should consider the broad pattern of existing council sizes. This pattern appears to have stood the test of time and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to have provided for effective and convenient local government.

**157.** Principal councils should also bear in mind that the conduct of parish council business does not usually require a large body of councillors. In addition, historically many parish councils, particularly smaller ones, have found difficulty in attracting sufficient candidates to stand for election. This has led to uncontested elections and/or a need to co-opt members in order to fill vacancies. However, a parish council’s budget and planned or actual level of service provision may also be important factors in reaching conclusions on council size.”

4.4 The National Association of Local Council’s Circular 1126 recommends:



<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>
Up to 900	7	10,400	17
1,400	8	11,900	18
2,000	9	13,500	19
2,700	10	15,200	20
3,500	11	17,000	21
4,400	12	18,900	22
5,400	13	20,900	23
6,500	14	23,000	24
7,700	15	45,000	25
9,000	16		

4.5 The electoral cycle for parish councils is for elections every four years.

## 5. The Petition

5.1 The Petition is lodged in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, Section 80 and prevails upon Mid Sussex District Council as the Principal Authority, to conduct a Community Governance Review.

5.2 The Petition has been validated as having been duly signed by 493 registered electors of the Crawley Down Electoral ward. This exceeds the 461-signature requirement.

5.3 The Petition calls for consideration of a distinct parish council for Crawley Down and proposes that any new parish council should be named 'Crawley Down Village Council'. The full petition wording will be stated within the Public Notice of Community the Governance Review.

## 6. Making representations

6.1 If you wish to make written representations on the community governance review please send to:

Community Governance Review  
Electoral Services  
Mid Sussex District Council  
Oaklands, Oaklands Road  
Haywards Heath  
West Sussex  
RH16 1SS

Or via e-mail: [elections@midsussex.gov.uk](mailto:elections@midsussex.gov.uk)

6.2 Should you require any further information regarding the review, please contact Terry Stanley, Business Unit Leader – Democratic Services, at the email / postal address above or by phone (01444) 477415.

## APPENDIX 1

Guidance for respondents will include a few suggested themes to be covered in qualitative written submissions. The proposed themes are currently as follows:

1. Do you believe that Crawley Down has a separate community identity?
  - a. Yes / No / Don't Know
  - b. If Yes or No, please give evidence to support your answer
2. Do you believe there should be a separate civil parish council for Crawley Down?
  - a. Yes / No / Don't Know
  - b. If Yes or No, please give evidence to support your answer
3. If a separate civil parish council is formed for Crawley Down, what do you think the impact for the remaining part of Worth Parish might be:
  - a. Good / Bad / Don't Know
  - b. Please fully explain / evidence your answer

**A Community Governance Review is a detailed qualitative review, it is not a poll. Accordingly, any brief communications simply offering support or objection to one proposition or another will be not be considered.**

# Community Governance Review 2021-22

## Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

### Terms of Reference

#### 1. Introduction

##### 1.1 What is a community governance review?

A community governance review is a review of the whole or part of the Principal Council's area to consider one or more of the following:

- creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes;
- the naming of parishes and the style of new parishes;
- the electoral arrangements for parishes (the ordinary year of election council size; the number of councillors to be elected to council and parish warding); and,
- grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes.

A community governance review is required to consider:

- the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion; and
- the size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish.

If the Council (MSDC) is satisfied that the recommendations from a community governance review would ensure that community governance within the area under review will reflect the identities and interests of the community in that area; and is effective and convenient, the Council (MSDC) makes a community governance order.

##### 1.2 Scope of the review

The review, which is being undertaken in response to a petition received from electors, will consider whether a new parish and parish council should be created for Sayers Common Guidance for respondents will include a few suggested themes to be covered by qualitative submissions. The proposed themes are listed at Appendix 1.

If a split is resolved, it would result in two newly named Councils:

- Hurstpierpoint Parish Council
- Sayers Common Parish Council

If a split is not resolved, the name of the existing Parish Council would remain unchanged.

The review will also consider the electoral arrangements for any new parish council. This includes:

- (a) The name of any new parish
- (b) Ordinary year of election – the year in which ordinary elections will be held
- (c) Council size – the number of councillors to be elected to the parish council(s)
- (d) Parish warding – whether the parish(es) should be divided into wards for the purpose of electing councillors. This includes considering the number and

boundaries of any such wards, the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward and the name of any such ward

Other related matters which may arise during the review in response to representations received will be considered as appropriate.

## 2. Consultation

### 2.1 How the Council proposes to conduct consultations during the Review

Before making any recommendations or publishing final proposals, the Council must consult local government electors for the Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council area under review and any other person or body (including a local authority) which appears to the Council to have an interest in the review. The Council will therefore:

- publish a notice and the Terms of Reference (ToR) on the council's website ([www.midsussex.gov.uk](http://www.midsussex.gov.uk)) and arrange for copies to be available for public inspection at Mid Sussex District Council, Oaklands, Oaklands Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1SS during normal office hours;
- send a copy of the notice and the ToR to the Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council, Mid Sussex Association of Local Councils, Ward Members, Members of West Sussex County Council whose electoral divisions encompass the area concerned and the MP for the Arundel & South Downs constituency.
- write to all households in the Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common area
- publicise the review and the notice in the council's residents' magazine, and
- send a copy of the notice and the Community Governance Review (CGR) ToR to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and to the relevant officers of West Sussex County Council.

Before making any recommendations, the Council will take account of any representations received. The Council will publish its recommendations as soon as practicable and take such steps as it considers sufficient to ensure that persons who may be interested in the community governance review are informed of the recommendations and the reasons behind them.

The Council will notify each consultee and any other persons or bodies who have made written representations of the outcome of the review.

## 3. Timetable for the community governance review

- 3.1 The Council must complete a community governance review within twelve months from the day on which the Council publishes the terms of reference. A community governance review is concluded on the day on which the Council publishes the recommendations made by the community governance review.

The table below sets out the timetable for the review.

Action	Date	Outline of Action
Start Date	14 February 2022	Council publishes the terms of reference
<b>Public Consultation 1</b>	14 February 2022	Two-month consultation period starting with publication of the Review Terms of Reference.
Public Consultation ends	15 April 2022	All representations are examined & considered
Draft proposals considered by MSDC Scrutiny Committee (Customer Services & Service Delivery)	(TBC) May 2022	Any additional recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee are added to the published draft proposals
Draft proposals published	27 May 2022	Council publishes draft proposals
<b>Public Consultation 2</b>	(TBC) June 2022	Further two-month consultation period.
Public Consultation ends	(TBC) August 2022	All representations are examined & considered
Final recommendations are published <b>[Review ends]</b>	(TBC) September 2022	Results of consultation considered by the relevant Scrutiny Committee (date TBC) who shall consider the extent to which the Council should give effect to the recommendations and make recommendations to Full Council
Final recommendations (as amended, if applicable) are recommended to Full Council for adoption.	(TBC) October 2022	Full Council considers and determines the extent to which the Council shall give effect to the recommendations
Order made	By 25 November 2022	Council publishes Community Governance Order
Order takes effect	May 2023	Next scheduled local government elections

## 4. Background information

4.1 The Local Government Act 1972 provides that any parish council must have at least five councillors. No maximum number is prescribed.

4.2 When considering the number of councillors to be elected for a parish the Council must have regard to the number of local government electors for the parish and any change to that number that is likely to occur within five years of the date on which these terms of reference are published.

4.3 Joint guidance issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in 2010 provides further information on community governance reviews and the factors influencing size and membership of parish councils. On size, the guidance says:

**“154.** In practice, there is a wide variation of council size between parish councils. That variation appears to be influenced by population. Research by the Aston Business School Parish and Town Councils in England (HMSO, 1992), found that the typical parish council representing less than 500 people had between five and eight councillors; those between 501 and 2,500 had six to 12 councillors; and those between 2,501 and 10,000 had nine to 16 councillors. Most parish councils with a population of between 10,001 and 20,000 had between 13 and 27 councillors, while almost all councils representing a population of over 20,000 had between 13 and 31 councillors.

**155.** The LGBCE has no reason to believe that this pattern of council size to population has altered significantly since the research was conducted. Although not an exact match, it broadly reflects the council size range set out in the National Association of Local Councils Circular 1126; the Circular suggested that the minimum number of councillors for any parish should be seven and the maximum 25.

**156.** In considering the issue of council size, the LGBCE is of the view that each area should be considered on its own merits, having regard to its population, geography and the pattern of communities. Nevertheless, having regard to the current powers of parish councils, it should consider the broad pattern of existing council sizes. This pattern appears to have stood the test of time and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to have provided for effective and convenient local government.

**157.** Principal councils should also bear in mind that the conduct of parish council business does not usually require a large body of councillors. In addition, historically many parish councils, particularly smaller ones, have found difficulty in attracting sufficient candidates to stand for election. This has led to uncontested elections and/or a need to co-opt members in order to fill vacancies. However, a parish council's budget and planned or actual level of service provision may also be important factors in reaching conclusions on council size.”

4.4 The National Association of Local Council's Circular 1126 recommends:

<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Electors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>
Up to 900	7	10,400	17
1,400	8	11,900	18
2,000	9	13,500	19
2,700	10	15,200	20
3,500	11	17,000	21
4,400	12	18,900	22
5,400	13	20,900	23
6,500	14	23,000	24
7,700	15	45,000	25
9,000	16		

4.5 The electoral cycle for parish councils is for elections every four years.

## 5. The Petition

5.1 The Petition is lodged in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, Section 80 and prevails upon Mid Sussex District Council as the Principal Authority, to conduct a Community Governance Review.

5.2 The Petition has been validated as having been duly signed by 348 registered electors of the Sayers Common Electoral ward. This exceeds the 250-signature requirement.

5.3 The Petition calls for consideration of a distinct parish council for Sayers Common and proposes that any new parish council should be named 'Sayers Common Parish Council'. The full petition wording will be stated within the Public Notice of Community the Governance Review.

## 6. Making representations

6.1 If you wish to make written representations on the community governance review please send to:

Community Governance Review  
Electoral Services  
Mid Sussex District Council  
Oaklands, Oaklands Road  
Haywards Heath  
West Sussex  
RH16 1SS

Or via e-mail: [elections@midsussex.gov.uk](mailto:elections@midsussex.gov.uk)

6.2 Should you require any further information regarding the review, please contact Terry Stanley, Business Unit Leader – Democratic Services, at the email / postal address above or by phone (01444) 477415.

## APPENDIX 1

Guidance for respondents will include a few suggested themes to be covered in qualitative written submissions. The proposed themes are currently as follows:

1. Do you believe that Sayers Common has a separate community identity?
  - a. Yes / No / Don't Know
  - b. If Yes or No, please give evidence to support your answer
2. Do you believe there should be a separate civil parish council for Sayers Common?
  - a. Yes / No / Don't Know
  - b. If Yes or No, please give evidence to support your answer
3. If a separate civil parish council is formed for Sayers Common, what do you think the impact for the remaining part of Hurstpierpoint Parish might be:
  - a. Good / Bad / Don't Know
  - b. Please fully explain / evidence your answer

**A Community Governance Review is a detailed qualitative review, it is not a poll. Accordingly, any brief communications simply offering support or objection to one proposition or another will be not be considered.**



## FOOD WASTE COLLECTION

REPORT OF: Assistant Chief Executive  
Contact Officer: Rob Anderton, Divisional Leader – Commercial Services and Contracts  
Email: [robert.anderton@midsussex.gov.uk](mailto:robert.anderton@midsussex.gov.uk) Tel: 01444 477374  
Jo Reid, Business Unit Leader- Waste, Landscapes and Leisure  
Email: [jo.reid@midsussex.gov.uk](mailto:jo.reid@midsussex.gov.uk) Tel: 01444 477374  
Wards Affected: All  
Key Decision: No  
Report to: Scrutiny Committee for Community, Customer Service and Service Delivery  
17 November 2021

---

### Purpose of Report

1. To provide an update on the Council's work to introduce a weekly food waste collection service alongside a restructured residual waste collection frequency in Mid Sussex.

### Recommendation

2. Following careful consideration of the complexities and interrelated issues outlined in this report the Scrutiny Committee is asked to provide advice to Cabinet about the proposal to trial a 1-2-3 food waste collection and absorbent hygiene products collections in three areas in Mid Sussex.

### Background

3. On 28 January 2020, this Committee recommended to Cabinet that the Council, in partnership with WSCC, trial a food waste and absorbent hygiene products collection in three areas in Mid Sussex.
4. At its meeting on 10 February 2020 Cabinet agreed with the Committee's recommendation; committing to undertake a food waste and absorbent hygiene products collection trial, alongside a restructured residual waste collection frequency across approximately 3,000 properties in three areas in Mid Sussex, commencing in April 2020.
5. However, following the onset of the Coronavirus pandemic at the end of March 2020, in order to protect core waste services, and to adhere to lockdown and social distancing rules, the trial was postponed.
6. In September 2020, Council approved a Revised Corporate Plan and Budget. The Plan included a decision not to proceed with a food waste and absorbent hygiene product collection trial; and to instead work with Serco to deliver a business case for the future operation of the service with the aim of addressing forthcoming legislative requirements and delivering improved value for money.

7. In October 2020, in anticipation of the Government's Resources and Waste Strategy, West Sussex County Council commissioned a strategic review of its disposal contract with their Mechanical and Biological Treatment Plant (MBT) operators. This work has identified that the physical changes required to the MBT to enable food waste to be separately processed would take around 12 months to implement and that work can only start on this once commitment has been secured from a 'critical mass' of Waste Collection Authorities across the county. WSCC remain keen to trial the introduction of a food waste collection service in Mid Sussex, under the same arrangements outlined to this Committee in January 2020. However, they have indicated that they would not be able to continue to dispose of the food waste from the trial for an 'indefinite' period.
8. In July 2021, the Government carried out a much-delayed second round of consultation on its National Resources and Waste Strategy. This represented a shift in direction which potentially has a significant bearing on this Council's work to date.
9. In the recent budget announcement (October 2021), the Government made £295m of capital funding available 'to allow local authorities in England to prepare to implement free separate food waste collections for all households from 2025.' Whilst this is obviously welcomed, the Government are clearly indicating a move away from their original introduction date of 2023/24.
10. The Council's Corporate Plan priority to deliver a business case for the future operation of the service has been significantly impacted by the aforementioned events and new information.

### **1-2-3 Trial in Mid Sussex**

11. County-wide modelling carried out in 2018/19 indicated that a move to a '1-2-3' waste and recycling collection system across West Sussex could be achieved at no cost across the whole waste system. This work acknowledged that additional costs would fall to collection authorities and savings to the disposal authority, and that an adjustment would therefore be required to share the costs and savings and to ensure no Council was worse off.
12. Based on this information, in February 2020, this Council agreed to work in partnership with WSCC to trial a weekly food waste and absorbent hygiene product collection alongside a restructured residual waste collection frequency (a '1-2-3' service) across approximately 3,000 properties in Mid Sussex.
13. The operational details of this trial, and the principles agreed between this Council and WSCC are set out in the Scrutiny and Cabinet reports of January and February 2020 respectively. Any reinstatement of the trial would be on the same basis as outlined in these reports.

### **Other Trials in West Sussex**

14. During 2021, two other small trials commenced within the County. These are both smaller than the trial proposed in Mid Sussex, and are both time-limited; but will provide valuable learning for the wider WSWP:
  - a. Arun District Council embarked on a 1-2-3 collection trial in May 2021, initially rolling the service out to 1,150 Houses and flats before introducing it to a further 250 properties from Sept 21 (just over 1,400 properties in total). The trial is due to run for 12 months.
  - b. Subsequently, Horsham District Council announced a very small, time-limited trial across approximately 100 properties. This went live on 29 September and is due to run for a period of 12 weeks, before services revert to normal.

## Government Resources and Waste Strategy

15. The Government's Resources and Waste Strategy (originally published in December 2018) outlined the Government's intention to introduce new statutory responsibilities in respect of waste and recycling. An initial consultation was undertaken in 2019, and in July 2021 the Government concluded a much-delayed second round of consultation on a range of specific proposals; some of which represent a major shift in the Government's direction and potentially have a significant bearing on the County and this Council's Waste Service Redesign. These are summarised below:
- A minimum service standard of fortnightly residual waste collections (potentially ruling-out a 1-2-3 collection model).
  - A core set of dry recycling material streams must be collected separately unless it can be demonstrated this is not possible for technical, environmental, or economic reasons (meaning fully commingled collection of dry recycling which this Council currently operates may no longer be permitted).
  - Mandatory weekly food waste collections from all properties by 2023/24.
  - Mandatory free collection of garden waste from all properties (meaning charges would no longer be levied for garden waste collections, resulting in a significant loss of income and a substantial increase in costs) or;
  - Introduction of statutory guidance on 'reasonable charges' for garden waste (meaning the charge levied by this Council would potentially be much reduced, resulting in a significant loss of income).
  - Potentially new funding to be made available directly to waste collection authorities from 2023 via an Extended Producer Responsibility scheme, to cover the net cost of collecting packaging waste.
16. In addition, the Government confirmed its intention to make New Burdens funding available for the introduction of new statutory responsibilities for weekly food waste and fortnightly garden waste collections. The funding will provide capital and revenue related to transitional costs and, in the case of garden waste, the loss of income. It is currently unclear how much, when and to whom this funding will be made available and therefore the Council should not rely on this funding.
17. It would appear the Government supports the collection of food waste and is likely to be mandating this in the near future; however, it is not clear what collection method they will support or potentially mandate for other waste streams. Currently it would appear that they favour a fortnightly residual waste collection service. Based on our modelling work to date, this is the least economic and most inefficient method.
18. WSCC and other WSWP partners provided a [joint response](#) to the Government's consultation, and given the potentially significant implications of the proposals, MSDC also submitted a [separate local response](#).

## West Sussex County Council Disposal Contract Review

19. In October 2020, to support the delivery of a countywide food waste service and in anticipation of the Government's Resources and Waste Strategy, WSCC commenced a strategic review of its disposal contract with their Mechanical and Biological Treatment Plant (MBT) operators Biffa.

20. The introduction of a food waste service would divert waste away from the MBT, unless the plant is modified to take this material in separated form. The current contract requires WSCC to pay financial penalties to Biffa in the event of a reduction in the amount of waste going to the plant; and termination of the contract would also give rise to significant financial penalties. Therefore, to protect the taxpayer, the County is looking to renegotiate its contract with Biffa to convert the MBT to support the disposal of food waste.
21. These negotiations have been lengthy, and the situation remains extremely fluid. However, we are advised these are nearing completion. The full extent of the implications on the provision of a food waste service are still emerging. However, recently WSCC has indicated that the physical changes required to the MBT would take around 12 months to implement and that any disposal savings associated with the provision of a food waste collection service would only be realised if and when the service was rolled out across a 'critical mass' of households across the whole county.
22. Without a critical mass, WSCC would be required to provide and finance a short-term alternative outlet for food waste collected by the "early adopter" Councils whilst continuing to process residual waste still containing food from any later adopters. There would also be a need to financially compensate Biffa for the additional energy costs and/or loss of revenue that would result if there was not sufficient organic waste delivered to meet the energy demands of the plant.
23. WSCC are hoping to finalise their negotiations with Biffa in early 2022, but as outlined above they would not be able to commence work on reconfiguring the plant until a commitment has been secured from most, if not all Waste Collection Authorities in West Sussex. This means that at this stage there are no guarantees that the County will be able to support a district wide roll out of the food waste service. However, WSCC are hoping that once their negotiations are completed the other districts in West Sussex will have more confidence to plan for the introduction of food waste.

### **MSDC Service Redesign**

24. Following the decision to work with Serco to deliver a business case for the future operation of the service, extensive modelling was carried out and Serco identified a service model that both provides the best value for money and enables the Council to achieve the Government's recycling targets as follows:
- Weekly food waste collections via dedicated vehicles
  - Fortnightly dry recycling collections
  - Three-weekly residual waste collections
  - Scope to expand garden waste capacity from 23,000 to 28,700
  - 61% recycling rate by 2028
25. The costs of providing this standalone district wide service are provided in the appendix to this report. This appendix is exempt from publication because the costs are regarded as commercially sensitive by Serco and were supplied to the Council on that basis. They are significant, and without certainty from the Government, and from West Sussex County Council about their ability to support a district wide service, there is a significant risk to this Council of proceeding with the business case.

26. Members will be aware that as a result of the pandemic the Council has a significant gap in its Medium Term Financial Plan and as currently forecast, notwithstanding the risks around the national and county strategy, the Council could not afford to implement a district wide food waste service without making commensurate significant savings and service cuts in other Council services.

### Next Steps

27. The introduction of any service change is complex and lengthy; however, the introduction of a food waste service has been further complicated by changes that impact on the Council's direction of travel, over which we have had no control.
28. To date our work has been based on a range of sound assumptions about the WSCC strategy and the emerging direction of the Government's Resources and Waste Strategy. During this year, it has become clear that there is no certainty over the outcome of either of these, and without this certainty there is a significant risk to the Council's resources. This impacts on the approach this Council takes to the trials and/ or the implementation and timing of a district wide food waste/ 1-2-3 service.
29. In summary, the provision of a food waste service is predicated on:
- The Government's Resources and Waste Strategy and any adjustments in collection and disposal methodologies it may require.
  - Successful renegotiation of WSCC's contract with Biffa, subsequent conversion of the MBT and an understanding of the financial implications.
  - Agreement of all the Districts and Boroughs in West Sussex to roll-out food waste collections and the revision of the Joint West Sussex Waste Strategy to reflect this agreement.
30. If the Council decide to either trial or roll out a district wide service, based on a 1-2-3 collection model, there is a risk that this may need to change in 2023/24 (or possibly 2025) subject to the Government national strategy and West Sussex's negotiations. This could be both costly and disruptive for residents.
31. However, the Council could re-instate the trial now and run it until the beginning of 2024/25 at no additional cost other than a top up of approximately £56k. This may however leave a gap of a year before the national roll out of food waste collection, based on the most recent Government announcement. The annual cost of providing the service from 2024/25 onwards would be approximately £160k; however there is currently no guarantee that WSCC would be able to continue to provide temporary support with the disposal of food waste until a permanent facility is established.
32. It is anticipated that by the middle of 2023 there will be greater clarity on both the Government's and WSCC's strategies. In addition, New Burdens Funding (revenue) may be available to finance roll out across the district by that time, although this is not guaranteed, and the Council should not rely on this being available.
33. It is important that Members appreciate that starting a trial does not mean the Council will be able to move to a full roll out of the service because of the uncertainties outlined in this report.
34. If the trial is re-instated there is a nine-month lead in. This is to enable Serco to provide the necessary vehicles and staff, and for WSCC to put in place the necessary disposal infrastructure to support the trial.

35. Alongside the implementation of a 1-2-3 trial, it would also be sensible to start to prepare for a wider service redesign, by putting in place those aspects of the business case that would both improve service delivery now and prepare the way for the introduction, in due course, of a district-wide food waste collection service (and any other new/ amended services) as mandated by the Government.

### **Communications**

36. A key aspect of the project is the development and implementation of a comprehensive communications plan. Work was previously at the advanced stages on this. This will be updated and refreshed to ensure that all those taking part in the trial, and other key stakeholders are fully informed and provided with all the support they need to participate in, and get the most out of, the new services they are being offered.

### **Monitoring and Review**

37. The success of the trial will be closely monitored against an agreed set of key deliverables, looking at a range of aspects from recycling rates and residual waste reduction to customer perception/feedback and participation rates.
38. Analysis and evaluation will take place throughout the trial, and these findings will be used to inform the future shape of the service.

### **Legislative / Policy Context**

39. The Government's Waste and Resources Strategy outlines the Government's intention to legislate and introduce new statutory responsibilities.

### **Financial Implications**

40. WSCC have confirmed that the previously agreed funding of £364k remains available to finance a food waste and absorbent hygiene products (1-2-3) collection trail in Mid Sussex.
41. The picture in respect of funding a district-wide service (or sustaining the service in the trial areas) beyond the two-year trial remains unclear.

### **Risk Management Implications**

42. Key risks and issues related to the trail have been captured and will be managed through a Project Risk Log Document.

## **Background Papers**

Report to Scrutiny Committee for Community, Customer Service and Service Delivery- Food Waste and Absorbent Hygiene Products Collection Trial- 28 January 2020

<https://midsussex.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s7488/Food%20Waste%20and%20Absorbent%20Hygiene%20Products%20-%20Collection%20Trial.pdf>

Report to Cabinet- Food Waste and Absorbent Hygiene Products Collection Trial- 10 February 2020

<https://midsussex.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s7636/Food%20Waste%20and%20Absorbent%20Hygiene%20Products%20-%20Collection%20Trial.pdf>

Report to Council - Revised Corporate Plan- 30 September 2020:

<https://midsussex.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s8791/Revised%20Corporate%20Plan%202020-21.pdf>

This page is intentionally left blank



## SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR COMMUNITY, CUSTOMER SERVICES AND SERVICE DELIVERY WORK PROGRAMME 2021/22.

REPORT OF: Tom Clark, Head of Regulatory Services  
Contact Officer: Alexander Austin, Democratic Services Officer  
Email: [alexander.austin@midsussex.gov.uk](mailto:alexander.austin@midsussex.gov.uk)  
Tel: 01444 477062  
Wards Affected: All  
Key Decision: No

---

### Purpose of Report

1. For the Scrutiny Committee for Community, Customer Services and Service Delivery to note its Work Programme for 2021/22.

### Summary

2. Members are asked to note the attached Work Programme. The Work Programme will be reviewed as the final piece of business at each meeting, enabling additional business to be agreed as required.

### Recommendations

3. **The Committee are recommended to note the Committee's Work Programme as set out at paragraph 5 of this report.**
- 

### Background

4. It is usual for Committees to agree their Work Programme at the first meeting of a new Council year and review it at each subsequent meeting to allow for the scrutiny of emerging issues during the year.

### The Work Programme

5. The Committee's Work Programme for 2021/22 is set out below:

Meeting Date	Item	Reason for Inclusion
Wed 2 February 2022	Review of Air Quality	Report for information and discussion
Wed 2 February 2022	Complaints and Compliments Report & Review of Customer Services across the Council	Report for information and discussion
Wed 23 March 2022	Equality and Diversity Scheme Progress Report.	To update Members on the operation of the Council's Equality and Diversity Scheme.

**Policy Context**

6. The Work Programme should ideally reflect the key priorities of the Council, as defined in the Corporate Plan and Budget.

**Financial Implications**

7. None.

**Risk Management Implications**

8. None.

**Background Papers**

None.