

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 23 January 2024 at Shire Hall, Warwick at 6.00pm.

**Present:** Councillor Milton (Chair); Councillors Armstrong, Barton, Browne, Collins, Day, D Harrison, Luckhurst, Payne.

**Also Present:** Councillor Davison – Leader of the Council, Councillor Roberts – Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood; Graham Leach – Monitoring Officer and Head of Governance; Zoe Court – Neighbourhood Services Manager; Steven Leathley – Strategic Finance Manager; Darren Knight – Deputy Chief Executive; and Sophie Vale – Committee Services Officer.

## 67. **Apologies and Substitutes**

- (a) Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sullivan and Councillor Redford; and
- (b) Councillor Kohler substituted for Councillor Russell.

## 68. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made.

## 69. **Minutes**

The minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 3 October 2023 were taken as read and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

## 70. **Waste Enforcement Update**

The Committee considered a report from Neighbourhood Services which provided a further update on Waste Enforcement activities since the previous report in March 2023 presented to the Committee, which included the creation of a new post within Contract Services to work as a Waste Education & Enforcement Officer to tackle the increase in flytipping across the District for a period of two years (September 2023-September 2025). This officer started in September 2023 and reported directly to the Contract Development & Enforcement Officer, who reported to the Neighbourhood Services Manager.

The Council was now a member of Keep Britain Tidy, which would help support the Council on ways to prevent or reduce flytipping by 'influencing, advising, supporting and promoting best practice as well as raising awareness of the potential environmental damage flytipping could cause'. The Contract Development & Enforcement Officer attended the Enforcement Training Course, which was accredited by the Chartered Institute of Waste Management (CIWM). The Waste Education & Enforcement Officer would be attending the same training in Spring 2024.

The timescale for clearing flytipping had increased, as in April 2021 the new Street Cleansing contract with idverde saw a reduction in resources from two 'Rapid Response' teams (including 2 operatives and a vehicle) to one team.

Since Covid in 2020 and the start of the new waste contract in August 2022 there had been a marked increase in flytipping (including reports from the public and complaints), and additional resources and budget were required to tackle it through engagement, education, and, where necessary, enforcement.

In response to questions from Members, the Neighbourhood Services Manager, the Head of Governance & Monitoring Officer, and the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood stated that:

- Neighbourhood Services were not aware of any specific issues with unemptied bins in Whitnash, but encouraged Councillors and members of the public to report any concerns they might have;
- there had been some resource and contract management issues at idverde, but these were now being resolved and a new area manager had been brought in and an improvement plan implemented;
- Neighbourhood Services were finding that some of the litter bins across the District were being misused, and were being used for household waste. These instances needed to be reported so that they could be dealt with accordingly;
- the enforcement team were working closely with Licensing and Private Sector Housing following changes in the licensing conditions for Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs). They had written to all landlords and were working to ensure that enough bins were provided, including giving out waste containers free of charge for a period of time;
- the additional resources meant that the flytipping teams would be able to clear flytips more quickly, including in more rural areas of the District;
- at the moment, it took an average of 10 working days to clear a flytip. With dedicated resources this could be reduced to one to two days;
- Councillors needed to make the public aware of the challenges that the Council were facing regarding flytipping and how the Council was responding to it;
- with enough evidence, the Council would always seek to prosecute and fine those who flytip;
- the Council currently only dealt with flytips on public land. Flytips on agricultural or private land could be reported, but the Council could only advise the landowners on how to clear it themselves;

- the Rapid Response unit currently worked 10-hour days Monday-Friday. There had been issues with providing resources to work weekends, but this was being sorted;
- flytips could be dealt with at weekends, but this would need to be reported and passed to idverde. Eventually there would be integration between the Council's Customer Relationship Manager system and idverde, so reports would be sent directly to them. This was expected to happen next year;
- there would be an SMS reporting system rolled out in April 2024, beginning with play areas as a priority. By late summer, the Council aimed to have grounds maintenance and street cleansing added to this system;
- the Council had access to two or three re-deployable mobile CCTV cameras to monitor flytipping sites, but these were not easy to move around and required permission from the County Council. The Council were hoping to procure smaller and more portable CCTV cameras that could be dealt with by the Neighbourhood Services Team;
- the cameras could not be covert and would require signage, but this would act as a deterrent;
- exact weights of flytips were taken when it arrived at the tip, and these were monitored by the County Council. The new SMS system would potentially allow the clean-up crew to record the flytips in real time. Data showed that rural areas got heavier and more toxic waste dumped than urban areas;
- the CCTV cameras the Council aimed to procure would have ANPR and motion sensors to ensure identification of flytippers;
- the Council aimed to engage with the public to tackle the underlying causes of flytipping. It was thought that flytipping was due to the costs of removal for commercial waste, so subsidising costs would be looked at with the aim of preventing this from happening;
- bulky waste disposal used to cost £60 for three items, but this had now transitioned to a tiered price system and was set out in the Council's Fees and Charges report;
- the new CCTV cameras would be managed by Neighbourhood Services so there would be no extra burden put on the CCTV team. The overall cost would be low as it would be a one-off purchase of the hardware. The budget for this was currently around £30k;
- the Rapid Response team also dealt with dispersed litter, but they were under time constraints so it was difficult for them to keep on top of everything. A dedicated flytipping team would be able to deal with dispersed litter in a more effective manner;
- currently, Town and Parish Councils only paid towards the emptying of dog waste bins. They would have to pay for any extra bins they

wished to have. WDC would install it and send the Town/Parish Council an invoice. However, it was cheaper to increase the frequency of bin emptying than to install additional bins; and

- the Council had quarterly waste partnership meetings with all councils in Warwickshire and had open dialogue with the County Council to ensure that their proposed closures of some household recycling centres would not impact the Princes Drive site.

The Committee noted the report. They also asked that the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood continue to update the Committee with the key performance indicators for this initiative.

## 71. **Waste Contract Update**

The Committee considered a report from Neighbourhood Services which provided a further update on the joint Waste Contract, following on from the previous report in October 2023 which reviewed the first 12 months of the contract. The Committee submitted further questions to ascertain more information on the finances and the Customer Service function conducted by Stratford-on-Avon District Council's (SDC) Corporate Contact Centre.

The Committee requested that the SDC Head of Environmental & Neighbourhood attend the meeting to discuss the content of the report, as they were the lead officer at the time this contract was awarded. They declined the invitation and so the report was presented by Warwick District Council's (WDC) Neighbourhood Services Manager (NSM).

WDC's NSM had worked with the SDC Environmental and Operational Services Manager, who had provided the information in section 4 of the report.

The Committee raised questions regarding the approved budget for this contract and enquired about the amount spent on the project in comparison to the amount budgeted within the delegated authority granted in 2021. The Deputy Chief Executive agreed to investigate this following the meeting and provide a written response to all Councillors, which has been included as Appendix 1 to these minutes for formal recording.

In response to further questions from Members, the Deputy Chief Executive, the Neighbourhood Services Manager, and the Strategic Finance Manager explained that:

- in paragraph 3.2 of the report, the 32k permits figure was not an error, but rather the number of garden waste permits that SDC recently advised would be sold in Warwick District based on their own take up rate. This was a much higher figure than originally predicted and recorded in the Medium Term Financial Strategy as the 2022/23 budget for garden waste collection was £64k in line with the permit take-up predictions at the time;

- WDC definitely had more communal/non-garden collection rounds than SDC, but the garden waste collection service was open to everyone;
- the Inter-Authority Agreement between WDC and SDC was in the process of being reviewed, and each party were assessing the options regarding the future of the waste service contract in order to ensure best value for money. Convenient access to recycling centres for residents would also be looked at;
- when calculating the recycling rates across the counties, invoices were issued based on the waste generated within the District. Any 50-50 splits between WDC and SDC in this area were mainly for core contract costs;
- it was specified in Biffa's contract that they could no longer add any more waste to a vehicle once it reached a certain threshold value (in this case 1000 properties). Biffa could therefore be provided an additional vehicle when 81k subscriptions were reached;
- regarding the governance of the contract, it needed someone in place who had experience in the industry and the authority to manage such a large contract and a commercial organisation. They also needed in depth knowledge of the local area and waste management in general. Whilst SDC did have members of staff who had these attributes, it was felt that some elements were missing. There was also no representative from SDC (as WDC client) present at the meeting who could answer questions regarding contract management. This sentiment would feed into the review process, especially when looking in terms of the Council's needs surrounding client management;
- the review of the functioning of the shared service would include an implications paper and options appraisal. These options would be explored and risk analyses undertaken to ensure the best outcome for both Councils;
- there had been increased promotion of the app to ensure that more people would download it. The service area phone number was also being promoted so that those without a smartphone could access any help. Cheques were now also being processed rather than returned to the sender to ensure inclusivity;
- all recycling in the District went to the Sherbourne facility in Coventry. A trip to this facility would be organised for Councillors in due course;
- no assumptions were made about what percentage of landfill could have been recycled. Warwickshire County Councils regularly conducted composite analysis of a random sample of properties, and had a look through their bins to generate statistics for recycled waste;
- gate fees were what the Council paid to access the recycling centre, and that offset the costs of running the new Material Recycling

Facility (MRF). There were two elements to this; the fixed rate and the variable rate, which were based on the running of the MRF itself, and also the amount of tonnage brought in;

- the Council were still waiting on actual annual income figures for the MRF. There had been delays in obtaining the sales values as it was a new service. There had been a financial meeting with the MRF and it was due to be discussed at the upcoming board meeting;
- there had also been delays in obtaining the actual setup costs and costs of transport;
- the Council were owners of the MRF. The Deputy Chief Executive was Board Director, and the Head of Neighbourhood Services and the Strategic Finance Manager were on the client side, serving to represent waste expertise and financial expertise. The Board worked together to track the tonnage and money against the business case;
- there would be much more information available about the new MRF as the contract moved on. There would be a portal created which would have direct input that the Council could pull live data from directly. This was due to come into effect in April 2024; and
- The new Waste Education Officer would encourage residents to recycle more often and efficiently.

The Committee noted the report and encouraged the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood to provide further updates to the Committee going forward.

## 72. **Development of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Work Programme**

The Committee considered a report from Governance Services which brought forward proposals to revise the operation of the Committee and update its Work Programme, based on the previous deliberations of the Committee regarding its workload.

The Committee had previously expressed concerns about its overall workload since its area of responsibility was redefined by Council in the Summer of 2022. This had been mitigated by the addition of four meetings within the calendar when the Committee would focus solely on its work rather than that of the Cabinet.

The Committee set a clear remit for considering Cabinet reports, supplemented by the use of written questions in advance of the meetings, about issues that either affected residents or in which they had an interest, and the responses being published online (unless the report was confidential).

The Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules focused the Committee on those Cabinet items that had due significance and fell within the following

criteria:

- a) *The number of residents impacted and the significance of that impact.*
- b) *The amount of spend involved.*
- c) *It concerns a strategic priority of the Council or key project.*

*Scrutiny committees should only consider items where there is a tangible reason to do so. This should broadly fit into one of the following criteria:*

- a) *Where there are concerns about the basis for a recommendation e.g. the data that had led to the recommendation is deficient, or new data or information deemed material to forming a view on the item has been provided too late for a written question and answer to be circulated before the meeting, or members are aware of contradictory evidence.*
- b) *There is an alternative policy, development or direction which needs to be explored.*

The Committee, in partnership with the Audit & Standards Committee, also established the Budget Review Group, which met twice a year to consider the following items, when they were part of the Cabinet agenda:

*Annual Fees & Charges*

*Setting of the General Fund Budget*

*Setting of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA)*

*Annual Treasury Management Strategy (if it was reported to Cabinet in February)*

With this collective good practice and approach by the Committee now in place, it was undertaking its core functions well, which was recognised within the recent LGA Peer Review. Demand on the Committee's time was still significant because of the ambitious nature of the Council meaning that there were many matters progressing at the same time.

The Committee sought to continually improve on its performance and had a number of areas where it considered it needs to become more effective by looking at the inter connections between issues. These could be summarised as; financial scrutiny, how could the Committee reassure the Council of its budgetary position and spot any early warning signs of issues; using performance monitoring effectively to identify issues; reviewing of major projects; looking at performance of Council services, assessing the effectiveness of alternative delivery models; and the identification and management of risk within the Council.

By focusing on these themes, the Committee should have been able to move away from being reactive to Cabinet papers and more proactive in identifying issues and adding value, along with helping to develop policy within the Council, which the Committee also had responsibility for. With this context in mind the Chair of the Committee presented a briefing to the Committee at its meeting December that proposed some new approaches. These were broadly supported by the Committee and officers were asked to bring a report to this meeting based upon those

approaches.

It was considered appropriate that with the Committee meeting almost monthly, as part of the Chair's briefing ahead of the meeting; the briefings would also review and identify themes across the local government sector and the planning of meetings. Members of the Committee were also encouraged to undertake this reflection through reading of local government sector publications and wider media channels to bring forward proposals to the Committee, with support from the Scrutiny Officer and Deputy Chief Executive, for discussion and development.

There was a need for the Audit & Standards, Asset Compliance and Overview & Scrutiny Committees to work together and to share information/themes they might have identified from their work. Therefore, quarterly meetings had been arranged between the Chair & Vice-Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee, the Audit & Standards Committee and Asset Compliance Committee with support from the Deputy Chief Executive, Head of Finance, and Head of Governance to discuss common themes across the Committees.

A new report format for reports, had been developed for this Committee (with the first use at this meeting). This would be no longer than four pages (with appendices used only after approval from Deputy Chief Executive and Chair of Cttee), and would include information under the following headings:

1. Why O&S asked for the report (defined objective by O&S)
2. What was being delivered (and its performance and how performance was validated e.g. benchmarking)
3. The key risks to the service and how they were being managed
4. What was working well and what was not working so well
5. One change to improve performance

If agreed by the Committee, it would need to be reviewed for its effectiveness over the coming months to ensure that it was providing the information Members expected. Members were encouraged to provide feedback on this as they and Officers get used to the format and might consider any changes after this time.

At present, the Committee reviewed the Significant Business Risk Register each time it was presented to Cabinet and passed comment on this. There were significant comments from this Committee, in August 2023, on format and approach of the SBRR. These were being considered by the Cabinet as part of a wholesale review of the SBRR to align it with the new Corporate Strategy. Moving forward, it was proposed that when the SBRR was considered by Cabinet, the Committee used it as a tool to, considered the associated risks and moved to a project-based scrutiny and scrutiny of risk-based themes within the SBRR, rather than challenging a specific risk rating for an item on the register.

The Committee would also look to move to review risk across the Council. Each Councillor would have access to each Service Area Risk register, corporate project lists (which included the overall risk rating for each project), and performance data for each service area. This would enable



the Committee to identify and focus on core themes within each year where it could add value or assurance.

The Cabinet was due to formally consider the list of projects the Council had at the present time later in the year. That report would need to be considered by the Committee based on the budget exposure, resources and risk associated with the project and from this the Committee could identify ones it wished to look at further.

The Committee could also review the list of current contracts the Council operates and undertake a risk-based review of these. The Council had a significant number of contracts and therefore to start with the Committee wanted to look at the performance of the of the five most expensive or high risk services, following on from the approach they used with the review of the Waste contract.

All Members were provided access to the Service Area Plans (SAPs) and performance data within them. Members needed to review these regularly and would receive quarterly reminders about them. Within the next few months, the SAPs would be made available via the website and all members would also receive a quarterly report on service performance, highlighting significant changes away from expected performance along with the narrative for this change. The Committee wanted to use this information as a tool for looking at performance within the Council and wanted to have an agreed informal indicator of when they would look at matters i.e. not before x number of quarters of falling performance. With these points in mind the Work Programme was amended to enable the Committee to consider if an item should still come forward or if they wanted to revise the scope of the proposed report. The criterion for review was set out in the report and an officer recommendation was provided next to each item along on the approach to be taken with it.

The Committee needed to make a continued commitment to training and development, both collectively and individually. Returning to the concerns around understanding finance, while wider finance training was in place, as reported to the Committee in August 2023, it was considered that the Committee needed to have collective and specific understanding of the General Fund Budget/Medium Term Financial Strategy, how it was calculated and associated risks and of the HRA Budget along with the risks associated with it. These were proposed to come forward as reports later in 2024 with a view to consider the areas of risk that needed to be looked at in more detail by the Committee. These reports would be used as a training opportunity and therefore ahead of the report the Committee members would be asked to set out the key aims they would like to get from the report.

The Committee had a number of tools available to them in terms of scrutinising work once areas had been identified. This could allow for small groups of the Committee (or other non-Cabinet members) to work together on specific areas using their own personal skills and knowledge to maximum effect. There would be more resource to support this work with the introduction of a Scrutiny Officer at WDC which was currently being advertised.

Officers were working on setting up training with the LGiU for all Councillors to help answer: How do I know we have a financial problem?

And what were the indicators that there might be a financial problem? However, this was proving a challenge in minimising conflicts with other training sessions and meeting dates. Therefore, it was unlikely to take place until after budget setting in February.

Taking these points into consideration, the Committee previously considered three themes within the Climate Emergency Action Plan that it wanted to look at more closely. These were:

- Offsetting and any potential for getting involved in early policy development;
- Issue of adaptation; and
- Data tracking and how this could be most efficient.

The Committee needed to consider if they wanted to progress detailed review of these areas and if so the criteria for this. The Committee could also ask about wider themes within the Climate Emergency Action Plan and how they could be reviewed during the ongoing work of the Committee on each report.

If the Committee supported these proposals, then they would be shared with all Councillors so they were aware and all senior officers at the Council would be briefed as part of the monthly Managers' Forum in February 2024.

Members each gave feedback on the remit of the Committee and the amendments suggested in the report. The Chair also reminded Members that they could come to him with any concerns, and he could make changes with his delegated powers as Chair.

The Head of Governance & Monitoring Officer explained that Cabinet had agreed funding for a Scrutiny Officer to add extra support and resource to the Committee. There had also been procurement champions appointed at Council to review contract management. The Council's top 10 most valuable contracts would be appended to the Committee's Work Programme for review.

The Chair reminded Members about their access to the Service Area Plans (which included performance and risk management data) and urged them to look at them regularly.

The proposed changes outlined in the report were agreed by the Committee. However, Members decided that the Final Accounts/Q4 Budget Update 2022/23 should be kept on the work programme for future discussion. Two additional themes – Biodiversity Action Plan and Resident Engagement & Communications- were also added.

**Resolved** that

- (1) the revised report format for reports to the Committee, be agreed;
- (2) the Monthly planning meetings with Committee Chair, Vice- Chair, Deputy Chief Executive and

Scrutiny Officer be noted;

- (3) the quarterly meetings between the Chair & Vice-Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee, the Chair of Audit & Standards Committee and the Chair of the Asset Compliance Committee with support from the Deputy Chief Executive, Head of Finance, and Head of Governance to discuss themes across the Committees, be noted;
- (4) the revised work programme for the Committee, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report be approved subject to the following amendments:
  - (a) an additional report on the General Fund Budget Medium Term Financial Strategy, how it is calculated and associated risks – April 2024;
  - (b) an additional report on the Housing Revenue Account Budget the risks associated with it – June 2024;
  - (c) the Final Accounts/Q4 Budget Update 2022/23 remains on the Work Programme; and
  - (d) the five key themes for the Climate Emergency Action Plan to consider in detail, are [insert three from work plan], Biodiversity Action Plan and Resident Engagement & Communications

(The meeting ended at 8.15pm)

CHAIR  
26 March 2024

Further to Overview & Scrutiny. Please find below answers to the questions that were raised.

Apologies this has taken longer than originally anticipated. There has been a lot of information to review and many of the people originally involved are no longer around.

If there is anything missing or not fully answered, then please let me know.

### **1. What the approved/delegated budget was for this contract**

Please see a timeline to summarise this work:

[17/11/2020 Executive Meeting](#) – Item 10 (Waste Contract Renewal). Decisions:

#### **Resolved that**

- i. the options considered in Appendix One to the report be noted, and the procurement of a joint waste contract with Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC) through an OJEU compliant process, be agreed;
- ii. the current waste collection arrangements be changed to a '123+' waste collection model, as detailed at Appendix Two to the report, and that the new joint contract is procured on this basis, be agreed;
- iii. the indicative procurement timetable as set out at Appendix Three to the report, be noted;
- iv. the final tender specification will be agreed by a Joint WDC and SDC Project Board, co-chaired by the WDC Deputy Chief Executive (BH) and the SDC Deputy Chief Executive, and operating under a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed by both authorities, be noted;
- v. authority be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive (BH) and the Head of Neighbourhood Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Neighbourhood, Finance and Housing & Property, to agree the final version of the MoU and, subsequently WDC's requirements for the specification, to be taken to the Project Board for agreement;
- vi. the procurement process will allow for the exploration of a future introduction of electric or hydrogen powered vehicles and for other carbon reduction measures to support the Council's Climate Emergency Action Plan, be noted;
- vii. authority be delegated to the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance, to determine whether it would be more advantageous for the Council to purchase the vehicles necessary to deliver the contract and that, if this is to be the case, the capital programme is amended accordingly and reported to a subsequent meeting of the Executive;
- viii. the Finance Programme Advisory Board (PAB) will receive updates to allow it to monitor the progress and evaluation of the procurement process and the Neighbourhood PAB will subsequently receive updates on the implementation of the contract after it has been awarded, be noted; and

- ix. the cost of new recycling bins and food waste caddies, estimated at £1.4m, will be included in the Capital Programme and funded from Public Works Loan Board borrowing, as set out in section 5 of the report, be noted.

17/11/2020 Executive Meeting – Item 4 (Sherbourne Resource Park Proposal to become a partner) relevant decisions:

**Resolved** that

(3) the financial appraisal of the project proposals and the implications for this Council, as set out in confidential Appendices One and Two

(13) the potential beneficial impact of the approach proposed is subject to the proposed joint waste contract that is the subject of the Waste Contract Renewal Update Report (Minute Number 56), and that the overall financial position will not be known until the proposed waste collection tenders have been analysed in summer/autumn 2021, at which point the Council's Medium Term Financial Projections will be updated.

*\*AJ replaced BH 9/3/21*

5/1/2021 Tender Notice published on Find a Tender:

Stratford-on-Avon District Council and Warwick District Council (The Authorities) are looking to jointly procure a supplier to provide joint Waste Collection Services across both districts from 1st August 2022. The initial contract term will be eight (8) years with the option to extend the contract by further periods not exceeding 96 months. The estimated total value of the contract is **approximately £7.5 million per annum\*** or £120,000,000 over the maximum 16 year period.

Estimated total value - Value excluding VAT: £120,000,000

\*equated to £3,750,000 per authority

June/July 2021 – Merger of SDC Service Head with WDC

6/8/21 Joint Waste Board - Action/decision log

The decision to award the contract sits as an Officer decision providing that the contract comes within budget. This is because it has already gone through the Governance process at both Councils in December last year. SDC will be formally update on the increased costs due to the fire at Pure Recycling facility. [A £1m contingency was put into the MTFs to support any additional costs incurred from this]

23/9/21 Joint Waste Board – Action/decision log

Warwick District Council and Stratford-on-Avon District Councils Julie Lewis (Head of Environmental and Operational Services at both Council's) has authority to make the decision on awarding the contract providing it is within budget (this is an Executive Decision under delegated Authority). The Board have looked discussed and understood the spreadsheet provided by finance 'DD of waste cost forecast' ( the joint contract figure to be awarded was which demonstrates that the contract is within budget.

The Board agree that the contract is within budget, considering the whole waste service. The Board unanimously agreed to recommend that the contract is awarded to Biffa who are the highest scoring bidder.

17/11/21 Contract Award Notice published on Find a Tender:

Information on value of contract/lot (excluding VAT) Initial estimated total value of the contract/lot: £120,000,000

Total value of the contract/lot: £160,000,000

## 2. What are we actually spending vs the delegated authority

From the above information, the delegated authority budget was: **£5.707m**  
 In addition, **£1m** contingency agreed for short term recycling until MRF operational

The total spend is as follows:

<b>2022/2023</b>	<b>Actual spend</b>	<b>12 months estimate based on 8 months</b>
<b>Biffa August 22-March 23 (8 months)</b>	<b>£3,221,908</b> Including 'one off' costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queens Funeral - £18,684</li> <li>• Sherbourne Recharge Legal/Contract - £8,500</li> <li>• Frith Consultants - £2,150</li> </ul>	<b>£4,832,862*</b>
<b>Sherbourne MRF August 22-March 23 (8 months)</b>	<b>£723,453</b> (Includes bulkage/haulage/recharge of recycling whilst MRF being built)	<b>£1,085,179</b>
<b>2023/24</b> (No Biffa invoices have been received from SDC since October 23, these have been chased)	<b>Actual spend</b>	<b>12 months estimate based on 8 months</b>
<b>Biffa April 23-October 23 (8 months)</b>	<b>£3,194,975</b> Including 'one off' costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kings Coronation - £19,389</li> </ul>	<b>£5,588,708*</b> Based on inflation increase applied in August 23
<b>Sherbourne MRF April 23-November 23</b>	<b>£699,948</b> (Includes bulkage/haulage/recharge of recycling whilst MRF being built)	<b>£933,264</b> Expect this to drop significantly now the MRF is operational + first recycling income is due anytime.

\*The variable costs should reduce from January 24 as 2 of 3 additional vehicles have been received (Communal and Recycling) – no longer leasing vehicles, just awaiting delivery of additional Green Waste vehicle.

Although the original contract procured was within the delegated officers approved amount. Once the contract was live, due to original estimates by the lead officer being surpassed, contract triggers were met where increase to the value of and usage of the contract were required to meet the ongoing needs of

the Districts Waste Management requirements. This included additional vehicles and routes to be added to districts plan. This all fell within the parameters of the original contract, and therefore delegation from Cabinet.

**3. What was the procurement route and did will follow it and was our procurement correct**

The joint waste contract was procured via a Competitive Procedure with Negotiation in compliance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015.