Good morning,
Please find below the reasons we believe EDR 237/24 should be called in to the Climate Change and Environment Scrutiny committee for further debate and scrutiny.

- 11.2.3 due consultation and the seeking of professional advice from officers;
- 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

- The decision to implement a £40 charge on the back of a consultation in which less people contributed to than those who signed a petition against a charge cannot be considered open and transparent. The consultation exercise was not open and did not give participants the opportunity to agree or disagree with the introduction of the charge.

- The decision taker has failed to consult residents in an open and honest nature in line with the Gunning Principles, the Councils adopted method of consultation;
    a. Not consulting residents at a formative stage of the proposed Green Waste Charge, instead consulting on a pre-determined decision to introduce the policy.
    b. Failure to consult residents at a formative stage in regards to the Green Waste Charge, instead consulting on pre-determined charging options where the most favourable option, the lowest, was the Councils preferred level of charge
    c. There was not enough information in the consultation about why a charge may be necessary, either the “reduction in core funding” argument or rising costs of the service.
    d. Failure to give sufficient time for an adequate consultation by running it split across either side of the General Election Period meaning residents attention was compromised.
    e. There is no evidence the decision taker has made a ‘conscientious consideration’ to the consultation response before the decision was made.
    f. The decision taker has not provided evidence he took consultation responses into account.

- 11.2.6 clarity of aims and desired outcomes;

- Reduction in core funding in 2011/12 is the only reason given. 2011/12 was 12 years ago and there have been many cost reduction exercises since that time and the council has a huge amount of reserves and investments.
- EDR does not demonstrate any positive reasons for bringing in a charge, what the impact will be on other services such as civil enforcement nor does it explain what this impact on climate change will be.
- Consulting residents on three charges where the most favourable option in terms of cost was pre-determined as the Council’s preferred charge.

- Failure to publish in full the results of the consultation to residents.
- Failure to give residents an open chance to consult on the policy by pre-determining its introduction and support by the public.
- Failure to document the financial costs associated with the administration of managing discounts based on passported benefits.

- 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;

There are no alternative options referenced which directly answer the core funding reduction reason. If this is about raising income in light of a core funding reduction in 2011/12 you would expect there to be great deal more in this part of the EDR.
There are no alternative options referenced which might be an alternative to a charge, s as a change to the collection cycle, combined residual household waste or a reduced service.

- 11.2.10 with due regard to any risks involved.

- Failure to consider the wider impacts on areas such as fly tipping and the associated increased cost with this.
- Failure to consider the impacts on the Grey Bin service and the likely increase in garden waste being deposited through these bins.
- Failure to consider the welfare, health and mental health impacts of such a policy by reducing the ability of residents, especially older residents, to use their gardens and gardening as an outlet health benefits by making it cost prohibitive.
- Failure to consider the legal implications where by the council has sold additional green waste bins to residents on the commitment that these would be emptied free of charge in perpetuity.
- No mention of the potential upswing in fly tipping, it isn't even included in the potential negative impacts section.

I've cc'd the Conservative group who will be able indicate their support, taking this call-in past the minimum of 10 required.
Thanks
George Allen
Councillor representing Uttoxeter Town
Leader of the Opposition

East Staffordshire Borough Council
The Town Hall
King Edward Place
Burton upon Trent
DE14 2EB

Good morning all,

I also support the reasons for this call-in as outlined by Cllr Allen.

Kind regards,
Cllr Adam Clarke

Dear John & Andy,
I wish to support this call-in as outlined by Cllr Allen.
Kind Regards
Bev George
ESBC Councillor for Bagots & Needwood

Good Morning, I support the call in for reasons identified in Cllr Allen's email detailed below.

Regards

Cllr Bernard Peters
Brizlincote Ward Councillor

Good morning

I support the call-in for the reasons outlined in Cllr Allen's email

Kind regards
Cllr C Smedley
Borough Councillor – Dove

I Fully support the Call In for the reasons outlined in Cllr Allen's email
Kind Regards
Colin
Cllr Colin Wileman
Ward Member for Brizlincote

Hi

I support the call-in for the reasons outlined in Cllr Allen's email

Cllr Liz Bullock

Dear All,

I fully support the call in for the reasons listed.

Kind Regards

Phil Hudson

Dear John, Andy,

I support the call-In for the reasons outlined in the email.

Regards,
Russell Lock
(Borough Councillor - Dove Ward)

Good morning

I support the call-in for the reasons outlined in Cllr Allen's email

Steve [Sankey]

Good morning

I support the call in for the reasons given in Cllr Allen's email.

Regards

Vicki [Gould]

Good afternoon Andy

I am supporting this call-in on the grounds detailed in the email below

Kind regards
Jacqui
ESBC Councillor for Bagots & Needwood