

**REQUEST FOR INCLUSION OF AN ITEM ON THE AGENDA – KERB IT
RECYCLING SCHEME**

Report of the City Solicitor

1. Why has the report come to the Committee

- 1.1 To consider a request from Councillor Ian Cuthbert to include an item on a future Committee agenda.

2. Background

- 2.1 Councillor Cuthbert has requested an item be included on the agenda of the Review Committee.

- 2.2 Councillor Cuthbert requests that “Could the Head of Environmental Services present a report to the Environment & Planning Review Committee on the Kerb-it recycling scheme detailing:

1. An update on the progress made to date in identifying a replacement for the Black Box currently used for the kerb-it scheme, including timescales.
2. Details of how many black boxes have been replaced, and at what cost, since the scheme was introduced split by financial year, the replacement reason and by Ward (or postcode sector if Ward is not available). This should include the most recent year to date figures that are available for the current financial year
3. Details of why some streets only seem to be having black boxes collected from some of the houses and not all (e.g. Barmston Centre in Barmston)
4. Details of why some streets do not seem to have their black boxes returned to the door from which they are collected (e.g. Barmston Centre in Barmston)
5. Details of what the correct practice for returning a black box to it's collection point are, because they seem to be getting thrown back onto some resident's drives resulting in the boxes becoming damaged and requiring replacement
6. An explanation of why Councillors seem to be receiving preferential treatment when it comes to receiving replacement black boxes. Both Cllr Ivan Richardson and Cllr Angela Cuthbert have received completely differing levels of service recently when they have called to request replacement black boxes. Their initial call was made as if they were simply a member of the public and they were given a string of excuses why a replacement might take a significant time to be delivered. And a subsequent call made asking for it to be escalated to the area manager using their Councillor title resulted in a black box being delivered almost immediately. Councillors should be receiving the same service as any other resident of the city and this apparent two tier service level is unacceptable.

I would like to arrange for Cllr Ivan Richardson to be called to give evidence on items 3, 4 and 6”.

3. Current Position

3.1 In accordance with the Council’s Constitution and approved scrutiny protocol for placing items on the agenda, the Committee may choose to respond in one of the following ways:

1. The Review Committee may determine that the item is not relevant to the functions of that particular Committee. In these circumstances the Committee can resolve to take no action or may refer the item to another Review Committee, or to the Policy and Co-ordination Review Committee to determine responsibility
2. If the issue is linked to an existing work programme item (within the next two cycles) then it should be discussed as part of that item and included in any officer report
3. If the issue is a new item of business within the remit of the Committee, the Review Committee may:
 - a. Request a response in writing (with copies to all Members of the Review Committee), or
 - b. Request a presentation to a future Review Committee meeting, or
 - c. Request a report to a future meeting, or
 - d. Decide that the issue raised does not merit any response beyond noting the matter, or
 - e. Decide to express a view or make a recommendation, by resolving accordingly, if the Committee considers it has sufficient information to make a fully informed decision

4. Recommendation

4.1 The Review Committee is asked to consider the request from Councillor Cuthbert.

Background Papers

Council’s Constitution
Overview & Scrutiny Handbook

R C Rayner,
City Solicitor

Contact Officer: Jim Diamond (0191 553 1396)
james.diamond@sunderland.gov.uk