



This information is available free of charge in electronic, audio, Braille and large print versions on request.

For assistance in understanding or reading this document or specific information about these Minutes please call the Committee Team on 01629 761300 or e-mail committee@derbyshiredales.gov.uk

COUNCIL (Extraordinary Meeting)

Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of Council held at Wirksworth Leisure Centre, Wirksworth at 6.00 pm on Tuesday, 27th July 2021.

PRESENT

Councillor Sue Bull, - In the Chair.

Councillors, Jacqueline Allison, Jason Atkin, Matthew Buckler, Martin Burfoot, Sue Burfoot, Neil Buttle, David Chapman, Paul Cruise, Tom Donnelly, Graham Elliott, Richard Fitzherbert, Steve Flitter, Helen Froggatt, Chris Furness, Clare Gamble, Dawn Greatorex, Susan Hobson, David Hughes, Stuart Lees, Tony Morley, Michele Morley, Dermot Murphy, Peter O'Brien, Garry Purdy, Mike Ratcliffe, Claire Raw, Mark Salt, Andrew Shirley, Peter Slack, Andrew Statham, Alasdair Sutton, Colin Swindell, Steve Wain and Mark Wakeman.

Paul Wilson (Chief Executive), James McLaughlin (Director of Corporate & Customer Services), Tim Braund (Director of Regulatory Services), Rob Cogings (Director of Housing), Lee Gardner (Legal Services Manager), Dave Turvey (Events Manager) and Simon Johnson (Democratic Services Officer).

Ronnie Coutts (SERCO) and Andy Smith (SERCO).

Members of the Public in attendance - 7.

This meeting was recorded and broadcast live on YouTube.

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Richard Bright and Alyson Hill.

87/21 - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In accordance with the procedure for public participation, the following questions and statements were submitted in writing.

See appendices attached:

Appendix 1 - Public Participation - Item 4 - Waste and Recycling Services.

Appendix 2 - Public Participation - Item 5 - Gypsies and Travellers.

Mr Mark Young (local resident) made a statement on the current provision of service by SERCO in respect of agenda Item 4 - Waste and Recycling Services;

Cllr Kath Potter (Rowsley Parish Council), Cllr Victoria Friend (Rowsley Parish Council), Mr Richard Bean (local resident), Ms Helen Johnson (local resident) and Dr Linda Merriman (local resident) made a statements on the proposals and progress on a temporary and permanent Traveller site in respect of agenda Item 5 – Gypsies and Travellers.

Note:

“Opinions expressed or statements made by individual persons during the public participation part of a Council or committee meeting are not the opinions or statements of Derbyshire Dales District Council. These comments are made by individuals who have exercised the provisions of the Council’s Constitution to address a specific meeting. The Council therefore accepts no liability for any defamatory remarks that are made during a meeting that are replicated on this document.”

88/21 - INTERESTS

Councillor Andrew Statham declared a pecuniary interest in Item 5 - Gypsies and Travellers and left the meeting at the start of this item.

89/21 - WASTE AND RECYCLING SERVICES

The Council considered a report seeking approval to provide temporary support to the waste and recycling contract by contributing towards an uplift in HGV driver rates of pay, the leasing of an additional garden waste collection vehicle and consideration of a temporary suspension of the Garden Waste Service.

Having regard to the various representations received in writing ahead of the meeting and by the public in attendance, Members of the Council put questions to the representatives of SERCO before commencing the debate on the recommendations in the report.

At **7:23pm** the representatives from SERCO left the meeting.

At **7:48pm**, during the debate of this item, Councillor Alasdair Sutton left the meeting and returned at **7:50pm**.

At **8:18pm**, In accordance with **Rule of Procedure 18.11 - Closure Proposals:**

It was moved by Councillor Jason Atkin, seconded by Councillor Chris Furness and

RESOLVED

A Councillor may move without comment, at the conclusion of a speech of another Councillor:

(b) That the question now be put.

Voting:

In accordance with **Rule of Procedure 19d**, a recorded vote was requested and proposed by Councillor Jason Atkin, seconded by Councillor Chris Furness and

For 19
Councillors:
Jason Atkin, Sue Bull, David Chapman, Tom Donnelly, Graham Elliott, Richard FitzHerbert, Helen Froggatt, Chris Furness, Susan Hobson, Stuart Lees, Tony Morley, Michele Morley, Dermot Murphy, Garry Purdy, Mark Salt, Andrew Shirley, Andrew Statham Alasdair Sutton and Mark Wakeman.

Against 16
Councillors:
Jacqueline Allison, Matthew Buckler, Martin Burfoot, Sue Burfoot, Neil Buttle, Paul Cruise, Steve Flitter, Clare Gamble, Dawn Greatorex, David Hughes, Peter O'Brien, Mike Ratcliffe, Claire Raw, Peter Slack, Colin Swindell and Steve Wain.

Abstain 0
Councillors:

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

It was moved by Councillor Jason Atkin, seconded by Councillor Tony Morley and

RESOLVED 1. That Council agree to offer a financial contribution of up to 50% for the increase in hourly rates of pay for HGV drivers until 31st March 2022.

Voting: In accordance with **Rule of Procedure 19d**, a recorded vote was requested and proposed by Councillor Peter Slack, seconded by Councillor Mike Ratcliffe and:

For 17
Councillors:
Jason Atkin, David Chapman, Tom Donnelly, Graham Elliott, Richard FitzHerbert, Helen Froggatt, Chris Furness, Susan Hobson, Stuart Lees, Tony Morley, Michele Morley, Dermot Murphy, Garry Purdy, Mark Salt, Andrew Shirley, Andrew Statham and Mark Wakeman.

Against 17
Councillors:
Jacqueline Allison, Matthew Buckler, Sue Bull, Martin Burfoot, Sue Burfoot, Neil Buttle, Paul Cruise, Steve Flitter, Clare Gamble, Dawn Greatorex, David Hughes, Peter O'Brien, Mike Ratcliffe, Claire Raw, Peter Slack, Colin Swindell and Steve Wain.

Abstain 1
Councillors:
Alasdair Sutton

In accordance with **Rule of Procedure 19.2 - Chairman's Casting Vote**, the Chairman Councillor Sue Bull exercised her vote in **FAVOUR** of the recommendation.

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

90/21 - DURATION OF MEETINGS (MOTION TO CONTINUE)

At **8:29pm**, during the voting on Item 4 - Waste and Recycling Service.

It was moved by Councillor Jason Atkin, seconded by Councillor Tom Donnelly and

RESOLVED That, in accordance with **Rule of Procedure 13**, the meeting
(Unanimously) continue beyond 2 hours 30 minutes to enable the business on the agenda to be concluded.

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

There followed a short adjournment at 8:30pm, returning at 8:39pm.

It was moved by Councillor Jason Atkin, seconded by Councillor Tony Morley and

RESOLVED 2. That Council agree to the cost of leasing an additional collection vehicle to help cater to the increasing number of subscriptions to the garden waste collection service, until 31 March 2022.

Voting:

For	34
Against	0
Abstain	1

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

RESOLVED 3. That Council agree to the temporary suspension of the garden waste service for a four week period, in order for Serco to redirect resources to clear the back log of recycling, food and general waste.

Voting:

For	20
Against	14
Abstain	1

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

RESOLVED 4. That Council agree to the retention and use of the contract's Key Performance Indicators, but not apply financial penalties where under performance is outside of Serco's control.

Voting:

For	20
Against	13
Abstain	2

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

- RESOLVED** 5. That delegated authority be granted to the Director of Community & Environmental Services, in consultation with the Legal Services Manager, to determine if any KPI penalties should be waived for a period of 3 months.

Voting:

For	22
Against	11
Abstain	2

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

- RESOLVED** 6. That, subject to the outcome of the recommendations above, the revised revenue budget for 2021/22 be updated to reflect the full cost implications, to be financed from the COVID-19 Funding Reserve.

Voting:

For	22
Against	11
Abstain	2

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

- RESOLVED** 7. That the **additional** recommendation that, for the financial year 2022/23, existing subscriptions (2021/22) for the Garden Waste Service be offered renewal of the subscription at £35.00 rather than the original £50.00 stated when signing up to the service; any new subscriptions for the financial year 2022/23, paid from 2021/22 onwards will remain at the £50.00 fee.

Voting:

For	32
Against	2
Abstain	1

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

At **8:49pm**, prior to consideration of Item 5 - Gypsies and Travellers, Councillor Andrew Statham left the meeting for the reason declared under Item 3 - Interests.

At **8:50pm**, prior to consideration of Item 5 - Gypsies and Travellers, Councillor Chris Furness left the meeting.

91/21 - GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

Council received an update report in respect of a Gypsy and Traveller family who have presented themselves as homeless and in relation to the work that has been undertaken to bring forward a site at Knabhall Lane, Tansley as both a permanent and temporary Traveller site.

For clarity the Legal Services Manager, with regard to a publicly circulated email inferring the contrary, confirmed that the land at Knabhall Lane, Tansley is in the ownership and title deed of the District Council; this being accepted by HM Land Registry and without current legal challenge.

It was moved by Councillor Tony Morley, seconded by Councillor Tom Donnelly and

RESOLVED

That Council agree recommendations 1, 2, 5 and 6, to the exclusion of recommendations 3 and 4 which are listed below:

3. That in the interim period prior to the provision of a temporary or permanent site, Council delegates authority to any two of the Chief Executive, Director of Regulatory Services, Director of Housing, Director of Community and Environmental Services, Director of Corporate and Customer Services, to direct the Traveller family to specific Council owned sites, for temporary occupation until such time that a temporary or permanent site is established.
4. That subject to recommendation 3, Council identifies the following sites as 'negotiated stopping places':
 - Agricultural Business Centre, Bakewell
 - Old Station Close, Rowsley
 - Matlock Station Car Park
 - Artists Corner Car Park, Matlock Bath
 - Matlock Bath Station Car Park
 - Land at Middleton Road, Wirksworth
 - Fishpond Meadows Overspill Car Park, Ashbourne

It was then moved by Councillor Claire Raw, to amend the resolution moved by Councillor Tony Morley and seconded by Councillor Tom Donnelly, to include all of recommendations 1 to 6 which was then put to the vote.

Voting:

In accordance with **Rule of Procedure 19d**, a recorded vote was requested and proposed by Councillor David Hughes, seconded by Councillor Paul Cruise and:

For

16

Councillors:

Jacqueline Allison, Matthew Buckler, Martin Burfoot, Sue Burfoot, Neil Buttle, Paul Cruise, Steve Flitter, Clare Gamble, Dawn Greatorex, David Hughes, Peter O'Brien, Mike Ratcliffe, Claire Raw, Peter Slack, Colin Swindell and Steve Wain

Against

17

Councillors:

Jason Atkin, Sue Bull, David Chapman, Tom Donnelly, Graham Elliott, Richard FitzHerbert, Helen Froggatt, Susan Hobson, Stuart Lees, Tony Morley, Michele Morley, Dermot Murphy, Garry Purdy, Mark Salt, Andrew Shirley, Alasdair Sutton and Mark Wakeman.

Abstain 0

Councillors:

The Chairman declared the motion **FALLEN**.

It was moved by Councillor Tony Morley, seconded by Councillor Tom Donnelly and

RESOLVED 1. The Council notes the progress to date concerning the identified temporary and permanent site at Knabhall Lane, Tansley.

Voting:

For 22

Against 9

Abstain 2

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

RESOLVED 2. That Council approves a capital budget of £25,000 in 2021/22 for costs associated with further assessment of the Knabhall Lane site up to and including the submission of applications for temporary planning permission and permanent planning permission, to be financed from Capital Receipts.

Voting:

For 21

Against 11

Abstain 1

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

RESOLVED 5. That authority be delegated to the Neighbourhoods Manager to initiate the installation of height barriers where appropriate, to protect the Council's vulnerable, town centre car parks where this does not undermine the provision of effective car parking provision for all vehicles.

Voting:

For 26

Against 14

Abstain 3

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

RESOLVED 6. That Council approves a capital budget of £10,000 in 2021/22 for costs associated with the installation of security measures, to be financed from Capital Receipts.

Voting:

For 28

Against 3

Abstain 2

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

It was moved by Councillor Peter O'Brien, seconded by Councillor David Hughes and

RESOLVED (unanimously) 7. That the **additional** recommendation, that the location of permanent sites to meet the requirement for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the District, are determined as part of the review of the Local Plan.

At **10:27pm**, prior to consideration of Item 6 – Stimulating Town Centres post COVID-19, Councillor Mark Salt left the meeting.

92/21 - STIMULATING TOWN CENTRES POST COVID-19

Council received a report outlining a request from Ashbourne Town Team for the introduction of a short-term, partial dispensation of car parking charges to apply to all town centres, in order to provide a stimulus for town centres post COVID-19.

It was moved by Councillor Colin Swindell, seconded by Councillor Tom Donnelly and

RESOLVED

1. That approval be given to Option 1, to permit Free Parking after 2:00pm for the month of September 2021.
2. That approval be given for a supplementary revenue estimate for 2021/22 to cover the estimated shortfall in income of £45,325, to be funded from the COVID-19 Funding Reserve.

Voting:

For	28
Against	3
Abstain	1

The Chairman declared the motion **CARRIED**.

MEETING CLOSED 10:35pm

CHAIRMAN

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

“Opinions expressed or statements made by individual persons during the public participation part of a Council or committee meeting are not the opinions or statements of Derbyshire Dales District Council. These comments are made by individuals who have exercised the provisions of the Council’s Constitution to address a specific meeting. The Council therefore accepts no liability for any defamatory remarks that are made during a meeting that are replicated on this document.”

Council – Extraordinary Meeting

27th July 2021

Item 4 – WASTE AND RECYCLING SERVICES

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Mr Luke Travis, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“After seeing yet another poor excuse for a facebook statement it is now showing that only excuses are given. Firstly to give an answer of pay rises to a already poor excuse of a company which has not fulfilled anywhere near what they should be doing, to say that you will not be terminating there contract due to having know where else to go is pathetic.

How about better answers to all you have already let down. People who pay a ridiculous amount of money to the council in tax which we have to work hard for, yet no comment from you have come in terms of giving some of this money back as you haven’t given the service in which we pay for? (This won’t be taken into account as you’ll make an excuse to which you need the money)

Why this has been going on for months now and no answers have been given or no emergency meetings called to sort this issue out. More chances of rats and mess coming from lack of leadership and someone acting.

The already poor idea of how to handle this matter which is just scrambling round for excuses let alone ways forward.

Do you expect serco to just get people from the drop of a hat to bring new people in?

Where is all the money coming from to pay for rises to serco (more rises in tax?)

In my own personal situation we have a house with a toddler and a 1 year old in which produces a large number of nappies and waste which without collections has meant overflowing and also rats being seen. We have had 3 new bins over the past few months due to the lids being broken and the old ones not being taken away which people use for there already full bins due to the bin men not taking any care and also our neighbours have had bin lids broken constantly. They take no care when going past cars either.

I would love to have my email answered as with kids will struggle to get to this meetings which I'm sure many will struggle to get to?

I look forward to hearing from you?"

The council has provided regular updates on any changes to the Waste and Recycling Collection services through our communication team. These have been on Facebook, Instagram, twitter and other social media platforms, our website and direct to residents who have signed up to the council's e-newsletter. In addition emails are sent to all councillors and Town & Parish Councils as they have an important role to make sure their communities have all the relevant information and understand more about those residents which may not have access to the aforementioned media platforms.

More recently these have been daily updates to make sure people are aware of the current situation and how this may affect them.

More information can be found in the report:

www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/images/Waste_Recycling_Services_report.pdf

Even with providing this additional money, there are no guarantees that Serco will be able to find the drivers, however Serco currently have four loaders currently working towards passing their HGV (various stages) all have been delayed due to COVID. They are looking for further four candidates to work towards their HGV licence however, these take months to progress to full operational HGV driver.

During 2020/21, the District Council received Coronavirus emergency funding of £937,877 from central government to combat service funding pressures arising from the pandemic. Whilst some of this money has been utilised, Council has recently approved the establishment of a Covid Funding Reserve of £608,040 as part of the 2021/22 budget. The purpose of this reserve is to meet the ongoing financial impacts of Covid-19. Any additional costs to be incurred by the Council would therefore be met from this reserve, without detriment or impact on the Council tax payer. The resources that have been provided by Government are intended to address the situation we are currently facing

QUESTIONS from Mrs Wendy Garvey, Brassington Local Resident

Two questions from me to the committee are as follows;

- 1. For all general waste and recycling failed collections will you be reimbursing us from our Council Tax payments?*
- 2. For all garden waste failed collections will you be reimbursing us from our separate payment we made?*

In the same way as Income Tax is a tax on your earnings and VAT is a tax on goods you buy, Council Tax is a tax on your property, not an itemised charge for services you receive.

So, for example, if you don't have family members currently attending school, you cannot claim back from Derbyshire County Council a rebate on your Council Tax because you believe you are not getting a direct benefit from the County Council's education budget.

We accept that, due to UK-wide issues outside our control, waste and recycling collections have been disrupted in recent times, but that does not mean you can seek to withdraw an amount from your Council Tax.

In terms of the Council Tax you pay, please note that although we as a District Council collect your payment, we keep only 11% of the total to spend on all the services we provide. The majority of your Council Tax (70%) goes to Derbyshire County Council, a further 12% to Derbyshire Police, 4% to the Derbyshire Fire & Rescue Service and 3% to your local town or parish council to pay for the services provided by those councils and agencies.

We are always transparent in letting residents know how we spend Council Tax - and on our website and in our Dales Matters publication we make it clear that the amount Derbyshire Dales residents pay for the kerbside waste & recycling service provided by the District Council is around £1.63 per week for a typical Band D Council Tax payer.

But, to repeat, you are not able to opt in or opt out of individual services provided by us or by any of the other councils and agencies listed above due to service failures, problems or the fact you feel you are not receiving a direct benefit. Council Tax is a tax on your property.

Please note that we are working hard to resolve this particular service issue, with recommendations aimed at clearing the current backlog of waste collections due to be put to an extraordinary meeting of the council on 27 July. The report to this meeting is available to read at:

www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/images/Waste_Recycling_Services_report.pdf

Should Members agree to suspend the Garden Waste Service for up to 4 weeks, it is recommended that the fee for next year's subscription be retained at £35.00, rather the previously agreed £50.00, by way of an apology and recompense for the current disruption.

QUESTIONS from Mr Vincent Garvey, Brassington Local Resident

Two questions from me to the committee are as follows;

- 1. Will you be covering the costs of pest control when the failed collections lead to high levels of storage of both general waste and garden waste?*
- 2. Will you be responsible for trimming the bushes and low level trees that overhang the Lane from our property when we cannot trim them anymore because of no collections of garden waste? Where do we send the invoice to from contractors we will have to employ to do this and to take the garden waste away?*

No, we have suggested these temporary changes so general waste can be collected regularly and on time. Although the council have suggested suspending garden waste collections for four weeks, we are aiming for less. Additional garden waste could be stored until the collections are reinstated or residents could take this to their local Household Waste Recycling Centre. Food waste could be used for composting rather than putting this in your household waste bin.

Overhanging trees and bushes are not the responsibility of the District Council unless they are sited on land owned by them. The responsibility for dealing with trees or bushes that are overhanging a public highway or private road is for the individual owners of those plants to address the issue.

QUESTIONS from Mr Philip Stanyer, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

The three questions which have been previously stated and should be addressed to the Leader of the Council are:

- **approve a Council contribution to a pay rise for Serco's drivers.**
 1. *Surely pay rises were been built into the contract with Serco when this was last negotiated. There has been no significant escalation in pay rates since the current contract was agreed so why should the Council be asked to approve a further contribution? There has been no notification of industrial action which could affect the collection of waste from our bins so why should this issue affect these collections?*
- **consider a temporary stop to the collection of the garden waste service.**
 2. *The Council are already in breach of a commercial contract which we, as individuals, are paying for under a contract which is distinctly separate to our Council Tax payments. When will the Council reimburse us for this week's uncollected garden waste and will the reimbursements continue until normal service resumes?*
 3. *In a second post, Councillor O'Brien has stated he has "been informed by the Chief Executive of the Council that he is "disappointed" that I have encouraged residents to let Councillors know their views on the bins and refuse situation". This looks like a gross intrusion and an attempt to interfere with the democratic rights of the electorate to express their views on the ongoing serious situation we are facing. Will Mr Paul Wilson issue a written apology to the Council and the Council Tax payers for misuse of his position?*
- 1. **Pay rises are built into the Contract these are index linked to Consumer Price Index (CPI). However, the national shortage of HGV drivers is, through market demand, inflating rates of pay beyond the contract's affordability limit**

'Derbyshire live' is reporting HGV drivers are asking £1000 per week, which is double the normal rate.
- 2. **Should Members agree to suspend the Garden Waste Service for up to 4 weeks, it is recommended that the fee for next year's subscription be retained**

at £35.00, rather the previously agreed £50.00, by way of an apology and recompense for the current disruption.

3. It is part of a healthy democratic society that residents are able to express their views to their locally elected representatives. However, it was neither necessary nor considerate to other Council members, for residents in the Hathersage and Eyam Ward to be asked to direct their concerns via email to the 38 other Members of the Council, without their awareness or consent. All Council members are aware of the extent of public concern that exists from information they have obtained from their own constituents.

QUESTIONS from Mrs Stephanie Stanyer, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

I wish to submit the following questions to be directed to the Leader of the Council at the meeting arranged to address the unfortunate problems we are facing by the non-collection of waste from our property

1. *Which bins should we use to dispose of our garden waste during this disruption?*

Why can the Council not terminate the contract with Serco due to their failure to perform? It would be possible to take back and operate the contract in-house and no jobs would be at risk under TUPE regulations. Would this be any more expensive than contributing to a pay rise for Serco's drivers?

2. *The Council will have been aware that Serco do not have an unblemished record in delivering public sector contracts. What actions did the Council consider in order to mitigate the risks of non-performance or under-performance of this contract when it was awarded to Serco?*

1. Residents could store this for when collections are back up and running, use this for home composting, or take this to their local Household Waste Recycling Centres.

Bringing the service back in-house would be significantly more expensive rather than the proposals suggested in the report.

The Contract between the District Council and Serco specify the situations in which the Council can terminate for failing to perform. At present the circumstances that would allow the Council to terminate due to the current service issues have not arisen or is currently disputed

2. The Council follow the Local Government procedure for procurement, which includes due diligence and a competitive tender process. KPIs are included in the contract which are referenced in the committee report www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/images/Waste_Recycling_Services_report.pdf and are there to monitor and manage the behaviour for the life of the contract.

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Dr Caroline Mitchell, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

Dear Councillors,

I believe you are holding a special meeting to

* approve a Council contribution to a pay rise for Serco's drivers

* consider a temporary stop to the collection of the garden waste service

As a council tax payer this is my feedback to the council and questions which I'd like answering.

1) I agree the drivers should have a pay rise but this should be entirely funded by SERCO because:

The two top executives at Serco, one of the companies behind the government's £37bn test-and-trace scheme, were handed pay of £7.4m for 2020, including bonuses worth £5.5m. 10 Mar 2021

A large company like SERCO has contingency funds and also will have undertaken a risk assessment when they put their bid in. I believe the reported hourly pay of £9.50 an hour is inadequate and many of those drivers families may have to also , in some circumstances claim universal credit to top up their meagre household income (also from taxpayers). SERCO should be paying for driving lessons and developing its workforce, offer good worker benefits eg better pensions and holidays. Then they would have long term loyalty.

This highly profitable outsource company has massively profited from other aspects of COVID through test and trace and NHS contracts and must fulfil all aspects of its contract- and be fined if it does not.

What's the point in the council outsourcing services through competitive tender if they then have to bail out a hugely profitable multinational company and sort out the outsource company's HR issues?

I'd obviously rather any extra money went to support vulnerable children!

2) no- they should be fined if they stop collecting the green bins.

3) any decision to put food waste in the black bins or bags, and cardboard is wrong and these services should be reinstated asap

4) Q: What is Serco doing to develop its workforce?

5) How many new drivers did SERCO pay for career development eg to do their driver training?

1. Pay rises are built into the Contract these are index linked to Consumer Price Index (CPI). However, the national shortage of HGV drivers is, through market demand, inflating rates of pay beyond the contract's affordability limit.

4 and 5. Serco currently have four loaders working towards passing their HGV (at various stages) all have been delayed due to COVID. A further four candidates have been selected, however these take several months to progress to fully operational HGV driver.

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Stuart McLean, Matlock Local Resident

I wish to ask the following questions in respect of the proposals to address the situation:

1. Cost sharing of wage increases for drivers.

Surely the contractor is responsible for the service they provide and the terms and conditions of its employees? Why do they not pay a fair and competitive wage? How do the council justify paying more public money to the contractor in spite of it failing to meet service level agreements?

2. Suspending Garden Waste collections

Why are the council considering denying residents a service they have had to pay extra for? Surely the contractor needs to up its game. The excuses are becoming tiresome and appear too readily accepted by the council who are now wanting to prop up the failing service. Will suspending the service lead to a risk of more fly tipping?

Not readily accepted by the council there is a pandemic

Given that the contractor has failed to carry out its duties, what measures are the council taking to hold the contractor to account?

1. During 2020/21, the District Council received Coronavirus emergency funding of £937,877 from central government to combat service funding pressures arising from the pandemic. Whilst some of this money has been utilised, Council has recently approved the establishment of a Covid Funding Reserve of £608,040 as part of the 2021/22 budget. The purpose of this reserve is to meet the ongoing financial impacts of Covid-19. Any additional costs to be incurred by the Council would therefore be met from this reserve, without detriment or impact on the Council tax payer. The resources that have been provided by Government are intended to address the situation we are currently facing.

The Council do not foresee an increase in fly- tipping directly related to the suspension of Garden waste or additional side waste. Residents do have other options, such as keeping until such time we are able to take this waste, take additional recycling waste to the HWRC sites and home composting for the garden waste.

2. Whilst there are mechanisms within the contract to address some of the wider and long term issues, it is recommended that the Council agrees to temporary emergency measures in order to be respond more promptly to the current back log of uncollected waste.

There are KPIs with in the contract for non-performance, however due to Covid the Government has produced Guidance PPN02 and PPN04 which were issued by the government on 19th March 2020 and 9th June 2020 respectively.

More information can be found within the report:

www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/images/Waste_Recycling_Services_report.pdf

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Tim Walker, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

1/ I wish to make a representation regarding the problems that your contractors Serco are facing and particularly some of the proposed solutions.

Serco is a private company which operates in a free market. Their profits are due reward for business risk. Their losses are the other side of that coin. Your proposal to indemnify this year's losses by meeting them "half way" out of the emergency/Covid19 fund is inappropriate. Serco are currently in profit of £151 million before tax and their share price is around the median for the last 24 months. They have contact revenue at £3.9 Billion and are financially sound. Why is the taxpayer and council taxpayer underwriting their business risk? Public money shielding private companies from business risk to facilitate continued dividend for shareholders is entirely wrong. Serco should bear the losses and if they cannot deliver the service they contacted for you should impose the penalties agreed in your contract.

I am concerned that your willingness to use taxpayers/council taxpayers money to indemnify Serco in the proposed way indicates a contract failure. What penalties do you have in place?

Should it be necessary to make additional payments in order to maintain service please will you explore appropriate repayment of the sums that were not agreed in the original contract?

2/ Garden waste collections. Do residents who paid £35 for an additional collection have the right to a refund in light of the fact that the service cannot be delivered?

Serco Group is fully supporting our Environmental Services business [waste division] across the UK and our Derbyshire dales contract specifically. We have been a strong partner of Derbyshire Dales throughout our long relationship. In the period 2015 to 2020 we accepted additional costs of £4.68 million that were not passed to residents of Derbyshire Dales. These significant costs were predominantly the additional costs of disposing of recycling materials in our previous contract and were borne by Serco. In our new contract (commenced August 2020) we have been hampered by delays to vehicle deliveries due to Covid affecting manufacturing and the effect of additional demands on our resources exceeding the assumptions for the new contract. These factors have resulted in additional hire vehicle costs, maintenance, overtime for staff to cover absences, etc. Neither the Council, nor Serco could have foreseen these factors and their impact. While our losses are less on the new contract they amount to greater than £100,000 in the 11 months of operation from Aug 2020 to end June 2021. These losses have been met by Serco.

The extent of the impact of Covid on the supply of drivers could not have been by either party and as such it is the responsibility of both parties to make sure this contact

delivers on its aims. As such the Council is offering to share the additional unseen burden which will be funded from the Coronavirus emergency funding.

During 2020/21, the District Council received Coronavirus emergency funding of £937,877 from central government to combat service funding pressures arising from the pandemic. Whilst some of this money has been utilised, Council has recently approved the establishment of a Covid Funding Reserve of £608,040 as part of the 2021/22 budget. The purpose of this reserve is to meet the ongoing financial impacts of Covid-19. Any additional costs to be incurred by the Council would therefore be met from this reserve, without detriment or impact on the Council tax payer. The resources that have been provided by Government are intended to address the situation we are currently facing.

Whilst there are mechanisms within the contract to address some of the wider and long term issues, it is recommended that the Council agrees to temporary emergency measures outside of the terms and conditions of the contract, in order to be respond more promptly to the current back log of uncollected waste.

There are KPIs with in the contract for non-performance, however due to Covid the Government has produced Guidance PPN02 and PPN04 which were issued by the government on 19th March 2020 and 9th June 2020 respectively.

Should Members agree to suspend the Garden Waste Service for up to 4 weeks, it is recommended that the fee for next year's subscription be retained at £35.00, rather the previously agreed £50.00, by way of an apology and recompense for the current disruption.

More information can be found within the report:

www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/images/Waste_Recycling_Services_report.pdf

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Simon Slifkin, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

A dependable waste collection is one of the few tangible benefits we see from what we view as an expensive council tax, one of our largest outgoings following retirement.

Is the proposal to increase driver pay an attempt to encourage more people to take up driving jobs? If the reason for a shortfall in drivers is Covid and Brexit, how will an increase in pay help?

As the council is not receiving a service it is paying Serco for, will Serco be providing a rebate or reduction which will be reflected in future council tax charges?

The Contract contains various provisions for the withholding of payment of any of the sums due as a result of performance failures, be that a complete failure to provide a route or failing to meet Key Performance Indicators. The Council is currently in discussion with Serco over which penalties will be applied to the contract.

The Council Tax is set each year by full Council how will take the full financial position of the Council into consideration when setting the rate for the year. This will include any savings made in the previous year as a result of contractual underspends.

The current rate of pay for HGV drivers is £10.82, which had previously not been problematic for recruiting appropriately qualified drivers. However, the national shortage of HGV drivers is, through market demand, inflating rates of pay beyond the contract's affordability limit. With the suggested increase it is hoped that this would be more attractive to prospective applicants. During this period, it is hoped that the national shortage of HGV drivers is stabilised or at least some form of Government intervention is made to improve the situation however there are no guarantees.

Derbyshire live is reporting HGV drivers are asking £1000 per week, which is double the normal rate.

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Sharon Fishwick, Ashbourne Local Resident

I would like to ask at the meeting;

Why do the council pay so much money to Serco just so that they can make millions of pounds profit. The council have already paid for vehicles and additional cost of worker's pay.

Why is the council's accountant's contracts not being terminated for even recommending all of these additional payments to a company who make such huge profits?

Why does the council not terminate the contract and find a more efficient company to do the job?

At present the Council is not considering termination of the contract. If the Council did terminate, the Council are at risk of not being able to find a replacement contractor and if so at a substantial increase on the contract price. It is the aim of the Council to work with Serco to ensure that they delivery on the contract specification and price as tendered.

We have had to pay additional money for garden waste to be removed as well as have a rise in council tax, which is an extortionate amount anyway. I feel insulted for it to be suggested that the cost should be kept to £35 next year, when it should be no cost after all of the disruption we have had this last 12 months.

It might come as a surprise to councillors who sit in the dark but we have had a heatwave. My food waste bin is still on the end of the driveway having not been emptied for 3 weeks! (Ashbourne) We have an excess of flies around the house and on the estate, not surprisingly, and have had to buy disinfectants to go in the bin to stop the maggots hatching! Is the council going to reduce our council tax bill to allow for this?

Hopefully these questions will get answered on the day.

In the same way as Income Tax is a tax on your earnings and VAT is a tax on goods you buy, Council Tax is a tax on your property, not an itemised charge for services you receive.

So, for example, if you don't have family members currently attending school, you cannot claim back from Derbyshire County Council a rebate on your Council Tax because you believe you are not getting a direct benefit from the County Council's education budget.

We accept that, due to UK-wide issues outside our control, waste and recycling collections have been disrupted in recent times, but that does not mean you can seek a reduction from your Council Tax.

Please note that we are working hard to resolve this particular service issue, with recommendations aimed at clearing the current backlog of waste collections due to be put to an extraordinary meeting of the council on 27 July. The report to this meeting is available to read at www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/images/Waste_Recycling_Services_report.pdf

Sadly we are not alone in this matter. Staff isolations due to Covid, together with a critical shortage of lorry drivers across the UK caused by a combination of Covid and Brexit impacts, mean bin collection issues are currently being reported in at least 25 council areas. These include Amber Valley, Coventry, Liverpool, Manchester, Stockport, Stockton, Solihull, South Oxfordshire, Stoke on Trent, South Devon, Tower Hamlets and Milton Keynes. Different contractors are impacted, as are some authorities that provide the service in-house.

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Brian Ward, Hathersage Local Resident

I would like to comment on the proposed recommendations per your email of 21 July 2021.

The cost of increasing drivers' hourly rates will of course be an ongoing additional cost beyond this year.

Who will bear the future cost of this?

How will this alleviate the problem of driver shortage as there will still not be any more drivers to fill the present national shortage?

You make the point that this cost will not fall upon Council Tax payers. This is a poor attempt to 'pull the wool over our eyes'. The cost of money from any government source, will of necessity fall upon us as taxpayers in one way or another, in the long term.

I object to the proposal to withdraw Garden Refuse collections at the exact time when it is most needed.

Could some five County or District Council HGV drivers be drawn off less urgent activities for these four weeks and be 'loaned' to Serco instead?

At this time we do not know if this is going to be an on-going cost. It is proposed that a review of the situation takes place before January 2022; if the position remains the same or if there are indications that a national increase in pay is likely to be a long term issue, then Serco will need to apply to the Council for a Variation Order for this to become a permanent feature. Should Serco wish to make this approach, Member approval would be required before formal agreement and amendment to the contract.

The current rate of pay for HGV drivers is £10.82, which had previously not been problematic for recruiting appropriately qualified drivers. However, the national shortage of HGV drivers is, through market demand, inflating rates of pay beyond the contract's affordability limit. With the suggested increase it is hoped that this would be more attractive to prospective applicants. During this period, it is hoped that the national shortage of HGV drivers is stabilised or at least some form of Government intervention is made to improve the situation however there are no guarantees.

Derbyshire live is reporting HGV drivers are asking £1000 per week, which is double the normal rate.

However, Serco currently have four loaders working towards passing their HGV (at various stages) all have been delayed due to COVID. A further four candidates have been selected, however these take several months to progress to fully operational HGV driver.

Using drivers from other local authorities to cover the shortages is not an option. Staff isolations due to Covid, together with a critical shortage of lorry drivers across the UK caused by a combination of Covid and Brexit impacts, mean bin collection issues are currently being reported in at least 25 council areas. These include Amber Valley, Coventry, Liverpool, Manchester, Stockport, Stockton, Solihull, South Oxfordshire, Stoke on Trent, South Devon, Tower Hamlets and Milton Keynes.

More information can be found in the committee report www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/images/Waste_Recycling_Services_report.pdf

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Dan Speed, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“Why should the council and ultimately residents of Derbyshire Dales contribute to a pay rise for Serco drivers? Whilst I agree that the drivers deserve a pay rise for their hard work throughout the covid pandemic Serco has posted massive profits off the back of Track and Trace and should pay the rise out of those profits. Serco have entered in to a contract in Derbyshire Dales and have failed to provide the service which they are contracted to provide. They should be financially penalised for breach of contract not given extra taxpayers money, furthermore their contract should not be renewed.

Residents including myself have paid extra money for the green bin garden waste collection, if you withdraw this service I will expect to be compensated in the form of a refund for every collection that doesn't take place.”

In the same way as Income Tax is a tax on your earnings and VAT is a tax on goods you buy, Council Tax is a tax on your property, not an itemised charge for services you receive.

So, for example, if you don't have family members currently attending school, you cannot claim back from Derbyshire County Council a rebate on your Council Tax because you believe you are not getting a direct benefit from the County Council's education budget.

We accept that, due to UK-wide issues outside our control, waste and recycling collections have been disrupted in recent times, but that does not mean you can seek a reduction from your Council Tax.

STATEMENT from David Naylor, Wirksworth Local Resident

"I am absolutely disgusted at the inadequate service being provided for bin collections. As you know, not only did our council tax rise AGAIN this year, but you also introduced the payment for green bin collections. Citing that this is separate to services you have to provide. So in essence, we had to pay for the collection of green bins, if we wanted to. I have paid you for services that you are failing to deliver should green bin collections be stopped. I refuse to accept that this is merely down to a lack of hgv drivers.

SERCO in my opinion have not been fit to hold this contract for a number of years. So to axe more services that have been paid for as a separate stand alone service, that we were promised would not be affected as we paid for this, means that your word on these services is not adequate, nor can be trusted. I have paid for this service and DDDC are not delivering. this year it has been missed collection after missed collection without suitable retribution for servo for the appealing level of service. Low and behold, on the approach to Christmas as the staff will be after Tips etc I guess service will improve for a very short time. How on earth is a pay rise going to solve this issue if it isn't good enough now. It's a reward for poor service. No incentive to improve it.

Until services improve drastically, NO contributions towards pay rises should even be remotely considered as well as Green Bin collections should remain. Do us proud for once and stand your ground regards the poor service we are getting."

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Colette Holden, Bradwell Local Resident

"I have followed, with increasing dismay, the ongoing story of missed recycling and refuse collections in the Hope Valley.

I am sure you will all, by now, know the full details of this saga. It doesn't take much more than a moment on any of our local social media to read how some residents have not had their recycling collected for literally weeks; others have paid extra for garden waste collections, only to be told it won't be collected; others have had collections on entirely wrong days, meaning refuse and recycling are left outside on the street for several days, leading to dog and vermin issues ... the list of problems goes on and on.

DDDC's replies have been cursory at best or non-existent at worst.

I was disgusted to read this week on the DDDC website re changes to start from 26 July for a period of THREE MONTHS: "We apologise again for the inconvenience but the aim of this plan is to ensure that all 34,000 households in the Derbyshire Dales get the best possible waste collection service in the current emergency situation. There will be no food waste collections." This from a council that has "Clean & Green" as one of its taglines.

Let me refer you to another quote from the DDDC website: "Tackling climate change is one of the Council's top priorities. In May 2019 we declared a Climate Emergency and pledged to make the Council carbon neutral by 2030."

Perhaps you can explain how DDDC's stopping of food-waste collections, and the subsequent dumping of tons of food into landfill, fits into this scheme? It is not simply an "inconvenience". It is a laugh in the face of any environmental programme the council has attempted to follow over the past few years.

It can be difficult enough in the best of times to encourage people to sort their waste and recycling. Telling people now to not bother for a few months will do untold environmental damage and carry serious implications for changing mindsets - if we don't need to bother now, why should we do so in the future?

There is another, darker side to this story too. The entire refuse and recycling collection is done under contract by Serco. The phrase "under contract" suggests that there is an agreement between Serco and DDDC that Serco will provide a certain service for a certain price - and if they don't provide that service, they won't get paid. This is how contracts work - whether large or small, public or private, personal or population-wide. Serco has demonstrated increasingly over the past year an absolute ineptitude to carry out the service it is contracted to do. So why - WHY? - has DDDC not pulled the contract or refused to pay Serco?

The continual excuse of "because of Covid" does not stand. We are all living through the Covid pandemic, and yet other businesses are still fulfilling contracts on a daily basis; those that don't are losing their contracts and falling by the wayside.

We should not be protecting Serco, and I absolutely fail to see why DDDC is. I demand a full and open explanation - and a complete resolution for this problem."

The Council would not recommend mixing in normal circumstances however, this is an emergency situation which means the council has to look at measure to address this. Requesting for the food waste to be placed in your household waste bin was in response to one of the recommendations which is suspend the garden waste service for up to four weeks.

More information can be found in the report www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/images/Waste_Recycling_Services_report.pdf

Whilst there are mechanisms within the contract to address some of the wider and long term issues, it is recommended that the Council agrees to temporary emergency measures outside of the terms and conditions of the contract, in order to be respond more promptly to the current back log of uncollected waste.

This is not an approach the Council would wish to take in normal times, however the legal dialogue and the due process could take some time and may not be successful on all counts, due to the pandemic and driver shortage situation. The main priority and the purpose of this report is to focus on restoring a regular schedule of collections as soon as possible. It is however, likely that further dialogue with Members will be needed in the near future regarding the wider contractual issues

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Rev. Julie Stanton, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“Thank you for trying to resolve this important issue for YOUR residents who pay DDDC to represent them well.

Complications around refunds in the future will ensue as confidence in the handling and giving of contract in the first place is now at it’s lowest. Those who paid early will also need a refund and those who won’t rely on this in the future will need cash repayments. As people will need to take their own collection to the recycling centre they surely can ask for a cash refund immediately to pay for their own fuel.

In paying OUR subscription are we not the employers and should you not have completed a firm consultation with the residents in spending our money, making the contractual promises public and accountable?

If contractual promises from SERCO to you the appointees and your contract therefore to ourselves are to be upheld please do not ‘fudge’ this because they are such a big company?

When will the full contractual promises made by SERCO be published publicly so that the residents can be informed where THEIR money has been used please and what they want to happen in the future?”

Under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 residents are entitled to see any related documents that is listed in the audited accounts for a period of 30 days each year. For this Council the period starts of the 2nd August 2021. The Council is obliged to withhold any information from the contract that the provider considers commercial sensitive or contains personal information prior to disclosure but the contract does specify the information that needs to be withheld. Please see link to the Council website below

<https://www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/your-council/budget-a-spending/statement-of-accounts>

QUESTION AND STATEMENT from Helen Juden, Matlock Local Resident

I have read the report and am dismayed by the suggestion that Serco can't afford to pay drivers enough to recruit more.

Serco is a profitable company, unlike the council. In my opinion they should be challenged on this. Otherwise they are bullying the council. It's time the subcontractors were put in their place, even if there's a short term impact on the service.

I look forward to hearing the outcome of the meeting.

Why are Serco not using profit from other contracts to pay for this additional cost response?

Serco Group is fully supporting our Environmental Services business [waste division] across the UK and our Derbyshire dales contract specifically. We have been a strong partner of Derbyshire Dales throughout our long relationship. In the period 2015 to 2020 we accepted additional costs of £4.68 million that were not passed to residents of Derbyshire Dales. These significant costs were predominantly the additional costs of disposing of recycling materials in our previous contract and were borne by Serco. In our new contract (commenced August 2020) we have been hampered by delays to vehicle deliveries due to Covid affecting manufacturing and the effect of additional demands on our resources exceeding the assumptions for the new contract. These factors have resulted in additional hire vehicle costs, maintenance, overtime for staff to cover absences, etc. Neither the Council, nor Serco could have foreseen these factors and their impact. While our losses are less on the new contract they amount to greater than £100,000 in the 11 months of operation from Aug 2020 to end June 2021. These losses have been met by Serco.

The extent of the impact of Covid on the supply of drivers could not have been anticipated by either party and as such it is the responsibility of both parties to make sure this contact delivers on its aims. As such the Council is offering to share the additional unseen burden which will be funded from the Coronavirus emergency funding.

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Roger Culverhouse, Wirksworth Local Resident

After reading the information about certain finance matters and delivery of service I make the following comments:

1. I urge the council NOT to approve a 'council contribution to the pay rise for SERCO drivers'. They, SERCO, entered into a contract with DDDC to provide a service at a cost agreed by the council. SERCO has entered into a contract with the council for the waste collection service. If SERCO wishes to give its people a pay rise then it is up to SERCO to find the funding. They are an international company and are in the top 150 of the FT index. It is not up to this council using tax payers' monies to fund this global private company. SERCO should reduce its dividend payment to its shareholders.

If you do agree with SERCO do not put up the council tax to cover it.

2. Not to approve a temporary stop to the collection of Garden waste. We, the residents, were asked to pay for this service as an extra. Therefore you have entered into a contract with us. I understand that the conditions provided say that you could suspend this service. If you do this then the residents who have paid must be reimbursed and compensation paid to them as it will cost the residents time and money to dispose of this waste at the council's tips.

This could also cause an increase in fly tipping which usually costs the council to clear it up.

3. *Waste food. On a previous consultation it was agreed that food waste would be collected on a weekly basis using the kerbside caddy. I understand that this means of waste collection is part of the recycling programme of the council. If it has to go in the domestic waste, (and left to rot in our bins for two weeks) and therefore disposed of with the household waste in landfill, what may I ask has been happening to the food waste at the moment?*

So to clarify;-

No to paying for the pay rise, SERCO should fund it.

No to Stopping Garden Waste.

No to changing the collection of Food Waste.

1. Serco Group is fully supporting our Environmental Services business [waste division] across the UK and our Derbyshire dales contract specifically. We have been a strong partner of Derbyshire Dales throughout our long relationship. In the period 2015 to 2020 we accepted additional costs of £4.68 million that were not passed to residents of Derbyshire Dales. These significant costs were predominantly the additional costs of disposing of recycling materials in our previous contract and were borne by Serco. In our new contract (commenced August 2020) we have been hampered by delays to vehicle deliveries due to Covid affecting manufacturing and the effect of additional demands on our resources exceeding the assumptions for the new contract. These factors have resulted in additional hire vehicle costs, maintenance, overtime for staff to cover absences, etc. Neither the Council, nor Serco could have foreseen these factors and their impact. While our losses are less on the new contract they amount to greater than £100,000 in the 11 months of operation from Aug 2020 to end June 2021. These losses have been met by Serco.

The extent of the impact of Covid on the supply of drivers could not have been by either party and as such it is the responsibility of both parties to make sure this contact delivers on its aims. As such the Council is offering to share the additional unseen burden which will be funded from the Coronavirus emergency funding.

2. Should Members agree to suspend the Garden Waste Service for up to 4 weeks, it is recommended that the fee for next year's subscription be retained at £35.00, rather the previously agreed £50.00, by way of an apology and recompense for the current disruption.

The Council do not foresee an increase in fly-tipping directly related to the suspension of Garden waste or additional side waste. Residents do have other options, such as keeping until such time we are able to take this waste, take additional recycling waste to the HWRC sites and home composting for the garden waste.

3. Food waste is currently taken to Vital Earth in Ashbourne where it is processed and made into compost.

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Sandra Cusick, Wirksworth Local Resident

I am a resident of Wirksworth, I am self-employed and pay council tax, which unfortunately this year the cost has risen.

I worked through the global pandemic both from home or from a work location (Liverpool and Manchester) as I fell into the Essential services, motorways and roads needed to stay open, to allow the transport services to deliver their goods and for the ambulances to be able to make transfers, and the company I am contracted to needed to do the activities safely. Even though I could have put myself on furlough and sat back and recovered my costs from the Government. But due to being a really honest person I decided that, to do this wasn't appropriate, that there are people out there that need the money far more than me, and I realise if you take something out, somewhere, somehow the costs have to be recovered, so I know that we will be paying for this for years to come.

As a resident of Wirksworth over the Christmas period I received a circular from the council asking me to pay for my green bin if I wanted the council to collect it. Which because I like gardening, even though sometimes it does get away from us, I put the money forward and paid for it. And yes every other week the council collect it.

Then the spring came and the rains and sunshine came which allowed the hedges, verges and open spaces grass and wildflowers etc. to grow, and whilst driving round the country (I have been to Stevenage, London and Doncaster and Stafford over the last 2 weeks) I notice that the only hedgerows and verges that haven't been cut are within Derbyshire. I am ashamed to report that driving through our council area, which we have the cheek to call the "Gem of the Peak" we look unkempt and dirty right up to the Staffordshire border. It is unsafe to drive to any roads that you need to pull in or out of, because of the vegetation that has been untouched.

This morning I have read an article by Councillor Peter O'Brien on the Facebook Wirksworth page that tells me there is a special meeting on Monday night to discuss the Serco service

and that you will be asked to consider:

Approve a council contribution to a pay rise for Serco's drivers

Consider a temporary stop to the collection of the garden waste service.

So I will give you the benefit of my opinion as a council tax payer on either of these options

My understanding of the law around contracts is that there is an "offer and Acceptance" in a contract you offered the contract and payment terms, and Serco accepted it and you all fixed a price as part of that acceptance and a contract of agreement was drawn up. So how can you change the terms of the contract mid-term through a contract, surely that is a contract breach

Then how can you ask me as a council tax payer, to pay for my green bin collection, then even think about voting to remove the service.

I think the above demonstrates that not only are you even think about contract breach, but you are doing it quite willingly

What have Derbyshire Dales Council done to mismanage the funding so badly this year, and how have you found yourself trying to alter contract conditions, why are you not considering terminating the Serco contract, and getting auditors in to see where all the money has gone, surely malpractice of council findings should be considered for this to go so badly wrong?

You need to seriously think about reimbursing some of the funding that you get through Council Tax as you are not providing the service you should, what happens if I stop paying the monthly direct debit, because you have failed to deliver my contract terms?

In the same way as Income Tax is a tax on your earnings and VAT is a tax on goods you buy, Council Tax is a tax on your property, not an itemised charge for services you receive.

So, for example, if you don't have family members currently attending school, you cannot claim back from Derbyshire County Council a rebate on your Council Tax because you believe you are not getting a direct benefit from the County Council's education budget.

We accept that, due to UK-wide issues outside our control, waste and recycling collections have been disrupted in recent times, but that does not mean you can seek to withdraw an amount from your Council Tax.

Please note that we are working hard to resolve this particular service issue, with recommendations aimed at clearing the current backlog of waste collections due to be put to an extraordinary meeting of the council on 27 July. The report to this meeting is available to read at

www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/images/Waste_Recycling_Services_report.pdf

Sadly we are not alone in this matter. Staff isolations due to Covid, together with a critical shortage of lorry drivers across the UK caused by a combination of Covid and Brexit impacts, mean bin collection issues are currently being reported in at least 25 council areas. These include Amber Valley, Coventry, Liverpool, Manchester, Stockport, Stockton, Solihull, South Oxfordshire, Stoke on Trent, South Devon, Tower Hamlets and Milton Keynes. Different contractors are impacted, as are some authorities that provide the service in-house.

In terms of the Council Tax you pay, please note that although we as a District Council collect your payment, we keep only 11% of the total to spend on all the services we provide. The majority of your Council Tax (70%) goes to Derbyshire County Council, a further 12% to Derbyshire Police, 4% to the Derbyshire Fire & Rescue Service and 3% to your local town or parish council to pay for the services provided by those councils and agencies.

We are always transparent in letting residents know how we spend Council Tax - and on our website and in our Dales Matters publication we make it clear that the amount Derbyshire Dales residents pay for the kerbside waste & recycling service provided by the District Council is around £1.63 per week for a typical Band D Council Tax payer.

But, to repeat, you are not able to opt in or opt out of individual services provided by us or by any of the other councils and agencies listed above due to service failures, problems or the fact you feel you are not receiving a direct benefit. Council Tax is a tax on your property.

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Debra Stone, Bakewell Local Resident

I am writing with our household's opinion on the matter of the waste collection situation that has arisen recently, in advance of your emergency meeting on 26th July. I would like you to consider our opinion and if possible, put our arguments forward.

Over the last 15 months we have been patient and supportive of the council in that we acknowledge and understand the reasons the collection service has come under stress and suffered occasional disruptions, and I'd like to say that our experience of the individual personnel who do collect our waste is very positive.

While I understand the reasons DDDC have given for a sometimes inefficient service over recent months (driver shortages, COVID/isolating restrictions, etc.) I do not accept that Serco, the company responsible for the collections, are unable to do anything about this without involving DDDC having to financially assist them in paying better wages to attract more drivers. I understand that Serco made over £200 million profit last year, and managed to pay their two top executives over £7 million pounds. This year their half year profits are £125 million pounds and they forecast a similar return for the remaining 6 months of this financial year. They are clearly capable of honouring their previously agreed contract with DDDC and can pay better driver wages from their own funds.

DDDC, in their social media posts, have stated that the money they intend paying to Serco will not come from council funds directly but from the government's Covid emergency fund. This fund is still taxpayers' money in the long run, so it will still mean we end up paying for it! The emergency Covid fund is quite vague in its description in that it's designed "to manage the immediate and long-term impacts of the pandemic" but surely there will be local services and businesses that are more deserving of this money rather than a company who should have its own large reserves given its recent declared profits and bonuses.

Also, I quote DDDC's Facebook post of 15th June which was rather more bullish than their recent:-

****IMPORTANT MESSAGE** | We're acutely conscious that bin collections in some parts of the Dales have not been happening to schedule in recent weeks - and we have demanded that our waste and recycling contractor, Serco, produces a workable catch-up plan no later than first thing tomorrow (Wednesday).*

There are some mitigating circumstances - a national shortage of HGV drivers is impacting not only on Serco locally but also on collection services provided by many other local authorities.

However, we will not allow the current situation to continue and will take legal action if necessary to ensure your collections happen as contractually agreed by ourselves and Serco.

It is likely that Serco's catch-up plan will involve weekend working and we will post more information on all our communications channels as soon as we have clarity. You can also sign up for free waste collection email updates at www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk/enewsreg

We are obviously taking a lot of calls about missed waste collections right now, which we completely understand, but if you could please hold off until we have a catch-up plan to communicate, that would be much appreciated.

Thank you - and our sincere apologies "

This posting suggested a rather more confident approach of taking Serco to task about their contractual failure, so I wonder why the Council are now suggesting they could default on it? I understand the Council wish to resolve the situation as quickly as possible - nobody wants overflowing bins hanging around attracting vermin particularly in the summer months - but not at the expense of paying even more money for a service we are paying a fair amount for already. To residents, Serco appear to be bullying the council by refusing to honour their contract and my opinion is that they should not be given any more of our money.

DDDC are also suggesting a reduced cost of next year's green bin collection of £35. Would this just be applicable to those of us who have paid for Green Bin collections this year, or to anyone new taking the service? If everyone, then new subscribers will benefit from existing user's lack of service for this year which seems unfair. The issue rests with previously undelivered services, so these should be refunded or part-refunded.

I hope you will consider the above at the up-coming meeting and I look forward to hearing the outcomes.

Whilst there are mechanisms within the contract to address some of the wider and long term issues, it is recommended that the Council agrees to temporary emergency measures outside of the terms and conditions of the contract, in order to be respond more promptly to the current back log of uncollected waste.

This is not an approach the Council would wish to take in normal times, however the legal dialogue and the due process could take some time and may not be successful on all counts, due to the pandemic and driver shortage situation. The main priority and the purpose of this report is to focus on restoring a regular schedule of collections as

soon as possible. It is however, likely that further dialogue with Members will be needed in the near future regarding the wider contractual issues

Should Members agree to suspend the Garden Waste Service for up to 4 weeks, it is recommended that the fee for next year's subscription be retained at £35.00, rather the previously agreed £50.00, by way of an apology and recompense for the current disruption.

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Mark Pickford, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

Dear all,

So many of your constituents have been adversely affected by the pandemic and have gone to extraordinary lengths to overcome the difficulties caused. Ordinary constituency members going the extra mile every day.

SERCO, on the other hand, have financially benefited from the pandemic to an eye watering scale.

Why are they not expected to fulfil their contractual agreement with your constituents? They have the resources to overcome these short term problems but will not invest to do so as their bottom line is their only concern.

Please hold them to account. Expect from them what you have received from your constituents who pay them.

As for supporting their pay increase for their drivers; how is this normal business practice? You are supporting big business ahead of your constituents.

Whilst there are mechanisms within the contract to address some of the wider and long term issues, it is recommended that the Council agrees to temporary emergency measures outside of the terms and conditions of the contract, in order to be respond more promptly to the current back log of uncollected waste.

This is not an approach the Council would wish to take in normal times, however the legal dialogue and the due process could take some time and may not be successful on all counts, due to the pandemic and driver shortage situation. The main priority and the purpose of this report is to focus on restoring a regular schedule of collections as soon as possible. It is however, likely that further dialogue with Members will be needed in the near future regarding the wider contractual issues

This is not normal circumstances and the government in response to this has provided Coronavirus emergency funding which is specifically intended to address the situation we are currently facing. During 2020/21, the District Council received Coronavirus emergency funding of £937,877 from central government to combat service funding pressures arising from the pandemic. Whilst some of this money has been utilised, Council has recently approved the establishment of a Covid Funding Reserve of £608,040 as part of the 2021/22 budget. The purpose of this reserve is to meet the ongoing financial impacts of Covid-19. Any additional costs to be incurred by the Council would therefore be met from this reserve, without detriment or impact on the Council tax payer.

QUESTION AND STATEMENT from Cllr. Vicki Raynes, Tansley Parish Council

“On behalf of our community we would like to thank the Refuse Collectors, who have worked in all weathers and throughout Covid. It would appear that their remuneration was below the expected level for the work done.

Derbyshire Dales District Council have awarded All of its Staff whatever their Level £150 each, as a thank you for work done during the pandemic, Government Covid funding is to be used for this one off thank you.

This un-ringed fenced money was given to Local Authorities to support the community, refuse collection was one of the suggested areas of use, the Parish Council therefore would find it difficult to object to monies being given to Refuse Workers.

However have DDDC assurances that the money will be used as stated?

Your Officer’s Report states that liaison has taken place with Parish Councils and posters have been distributed, it would seem that Tansley has not been included, as we are not aware of any liaison and certainly no posters have been made available for our notice boards.

Serious questions need to be asked about choosing Serco, the additional payments made to them during the pandemic appear to be disproportionate, and a waste of tax payers money. One also wonders why the legal contract with Serco was not more robust.

Tax payers may also be asking why the LA chose to outsource this vital service, when £3 million pounds was spent on buying vehicles for Serco to use, and Serco have asked, and been given by DDDC substantial additional funding during Covid.

Tansley Parish Council would like clarification and guarantees that the grey household bin which we are informed will now be used for food waste will be emptied on a regular two week basis.

To leave food waste in a bin during the summer months for in excess of two weeks is a health hazard and is not acceptable.

Finally, prior to any decision your Constitution states that all new decisions need to be costed, the Council are using public money to bolster a legal contract that appears to be dubious.

To glibly say that residents will not be affected financially as the money is Government Money – shows the ineptitude of the L.A.

Government money is tax payers money, money we all pay in addition to our Council Tax.

It is a legal duty of any LA to ensure they get best value for money for their residents, this latest debacle questions that premise.”

The Council has a number of legal which includes the duty to ensure that resident's bins are collected. Officers believe that the additional payments is the best way to meet a number of its legal duties while the contract performance issues are addressed.

There is no known disruption to the domestic household waste rounds and these round have seen minimal impact throughout the pandemic. Domestic household waste collections are the priority rounds and where collections are missed due to unforeseen circumstances then crews should return to these properties within 24 hours.

QUESTION AND STATEMENT from Cllr. Gladwyn Gratton, Wirksworth Town Council

"I would like the council to advise me of their response to the following.

1.2. Bullet point 2.

This is a RHA statement.

Are Serco suggesting this is a reason for them having insufficient drivers, if so.

How many divers in the Derbyshire Dales came from country's in the EU in 2020 and how many have not in 2021.

2.12 - 2.13.

The Financial Times of 25th February 2021. Serco had reported their underlying trade profit had risen by a third to £163 million.

Why is this council even considering covering any of Sercos cost.."

The extent of the impact of Covid on the supply of drivers could not have been anticipated by either party and as such it is the responsibility of both parties to make sure this contact delivers on its aims. As such the Council is offering to share the additional unseen burden which will be funded from the Coronavirus emergency funding.

Derbyshire Dales and SERCO are not suggesting the statement has directly impacted on the staff employed by SERCO, the national driver shortage has been one of the reasons, the shortage has a knock on effect to availability nationally of drivers for new employment.

Serco Group is fully supporting our Environmental Services business [waste division] across the UK and our Derbyshire dales contract specifically. We have been a strong partner of Derbyshire Dales throughout our long relationship. In the period 2015 to 2020 we accepted additional costs of £4.68 million that were not passed to residents of Derbyshire Dales. These significant costs were predominantly the additional costs of disposing of recycling materials in our previous contract and were borne by Serco. In our new contract (commenced August 2020) we have been hampered by delays to vehicle deliveries due to Covid affecting manufacturing and the effect of additional demands on our resources exceeding the assumptions for the new contract. These factors have resulted in additional hire vehicle costs, maintenance, overtime for staff

to cover absences, etc. Neither the Council, nor Serco could have foreseen these factors and their impact. While our losses are less on the new contract they amount to greater than £100,000 in the 11 months of operation from Aug 2020 to end June 2021. These losses have been met by Serco.

QUESTION AND STATEMENT from Mr Steve Martin, Matlock Local Resident

1. *Serco is now asking the Council for extra funding to pay its drivers more money. In the original contract that Serco agreed with the Council there will have been a profit margin. Are Serco retaining this profit margin?*
2. *The extra funding is proposed to only run until March 2022. So what happens to the drivers after this? Is Serco proposing to reduce their wages?*
3. *What penalties are Serco paying, as of now, for their failure to meet their contractual obligations?*

Recommendation "That Council agree to the retention and use of the contract's Key Performance Indicators, but not apply financial penalties where under performance is outside of Serco's control". The lack of HGV drivers is not outside Serco's control. Part of any commercial contract means taking on staffing risks like this. Serco need to pay the going rate to attract staff. They need to forego their profit and pay a proper wage to their drivers.

Proposed suspension of the Green Bin Collection: Residents who have paid this charge this year, must be refunded. It is not acceptable to give residents a rebate on next year's charge, as there is every likelihood that Serco will come up with more excuses next year and not deliver the contracted service. I suspect that many people, like myself, will not pay for the Green Bin service next year. So, a rebate on next year's fee will not compensate me for a service that I have paid for and not received.

1. *Over the term of the contract Serco are expecting to operate this contract at a profit as per the contract, and not a loss.*

A response from Serco which addresses some part of this question:

Serco Group is fully supporting our Environmental Services business [waste division] across the UK and our Derbyshire dales contract specifically. We have been a strong partner of Derbyshire Dales throughout our long relationship. In the period 2015 to 2020 we accepted additional costs of £4.68 million that were not passed to residents of Derbyshire Dales. These significant costs were predominantly the additional costs of disposing of recycling materials in our previous contract and were borne by Serco. In our new contract (commenced August 2020) we have been hampered by delays to vehicle deliveries due to Covid affecting manufacturing and the effect of additional demands on our resources exceeding the assumptions for the new contract. These factors have resulted in additional hire vehicle costs, maintenance, overtime for staff to cover absences, etc. Neither the Council, nor Serco could have foreseen these factors and their impact. While our losses are less on the new contract they amount to greater than £100,000 in the 11 months of operation from Aug 2020 to end June 2021. These losses have been met by Serco.

2. The proposal is a response to the current national picture and to attract new drivers in order to carry all collections efficiently. This short term measure allows both SERCO and the Council to monitor the driver situation over the coming months. If SERCO were to request a further contribution to wages then this decisions would go back to Council for debate.
3. The issue of financial penalties is ongoing, the council has restored all KPI's which is under challenge form Serco and yet to be determined which ones will be purposed to keep.

QUESTION from Ms. Christina Colley, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"The proposed £15 off the garden waste bin collection next year as a way of apology for the present lack of garden waste bin collections is an insult to households that have already subscribed and paid this year don't you agree ?

Why should Joe Bloggs who hasn't subscribed and paid this year potentially get a discount on next years subscription when I will get nothing extra off ? Or do you intend to give households who have subscribed and paid this year an additional discount on top of the £15"

The fee for new subscribers in 2022/2023 will be £50, there will be no early bird offer as there was this year. The proposal is to make the service £35 for those residents who subscribed this year.

QUESTION from Ms. Fiona Thomas, Ashbourne Local Resident

"I am concerned about the latest issues with waste collection and recycling. It seems there is a nationwide issue with people being pinged, unable to work and this is having an effect on a range of services and supplies.

However, my biggest concern is with Serco. This is the multi-billion pound organisation with which you recently signed a new contract for waste collection, at an increased cost of £1 million to us in Derbyshire Dales. This is after Derbyshire Dales had financially helped out Serco over the issues last year with waste collection.

My concern specifically is that Derbyshire Dales will again financially assist Serco in order to raise wages for HGV drivers. I don't understand why this is necessary. Didn't Serco sign a contract to collect our waste and if they are failing to do that, aren't there financial consequences to the company? It seems that the financial consequences are ours. (I understand the extra money will come from government Covid support funds but this really is not the point. Serco are already forecasting profit increases of 50% compared to last year, on the back of countless Covid contracts).

<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2021/jun/30/serco-expects-jump-in-profits-covid-contracts-nhs>

I'd like to know why Serco is not being held to the contract to collect our waste. The company is more than pleased to boast of its achievements in this area.

<https://www.serco.com/uk/sector-expertise/citizen-services/waste-and-recycling>

I'd also like to raise the suspension of the collection of kitchen waste. I think this is collected separately from the garden waste, as the processing required is different. With a new fleet of vehicles, why can't Serco collect the kitchen waste too? Was it too much to plan for this?

I hope you have a successful meeting and I look forward to your response."

Discussions are ongoing in regards to KPI's and penalties for Serco not being able to fulfil the contract, however this does not solve the national problem of a shortage of HGV drivers. The Council also has to take into consideration, the reasons why the contract is currently not being fulfilled which includes the impact of the pandemic, Brexit and the national shortage of HGV drivers.

We have a new fleet of vehicles but the current issue is shortage of drivers to driver the vehicles, once Serco can recruit more drivers food waste collections will return to separate collections.

STATEMENT from Dr Richard Campen, Grindleford Local Resident

"I am responding to information on the Grindleford Village Facebook site concerning the DDDC waste collection service. For some years now this has been an excellent service, and I have let the Council know my views on a couple of occasions in very recent years. However, I cannot support a proposal that the Council should meet some of Serco's costs due to the pandemic and general shortage of drivers caused by Brexit. I know that Serco has boasted significant profits in 2020/21, not least due to the test and trace operation. We are always being told by politicians in, and associated with, the present Government of the flexibility of the private sector that can somehow provide better value for money more efficiently than the public sector. Profit is key. Why should the public sector subsidise the costs incurred by a profitable company? (This, bearing in mind that no doubt you would call Serco 'our partners': what partnership? It's just a contract).

I don't know enough about the costs and income streams in the waste collection sector, but I would prefer to see the service run in-house if at all possible (and accountable to residents), or as a not-for-profit enterprise. I say that against an appreciation of the background to costs and controversies around waste management and recycling, so perhaps what I am saying is just not possible. However, the 'bottom line' is 'no' to subsidising Serco. Why not re-let the contract?

Further, I cannot agree to a suspended garden waste collection service: not at this time of year, not of a service that I am being charged extra for. I didn't mind making the extra contribution to secure the service, but your proposals are going too far. It is bad enough that you will be suspending extra cardboard collections and telling us to mix food waste with the general waste.

I am sorry, but you would be going too far with all of your proposals, and we should not be subsidising the private sector (yet again, when set in a wider context).

Thank you.

STATEMENT from Chris Swire, Mappleton Local Resident

Thank you for outlining the key recommendations.

I live in Mappleton, DE6 2AB and if our recycling collection does not materialise today, we will enter our 5th week of accumulation. Because this is getting critical for us and the statement "4 weeks suspension" of garden waste is open to interpretation I would ask that collection of any type of waste during an emergency is never more than four weeks apart. Also, since the introduction of fortnightly collections of recyclable waste, our bins have been fully utilised so if you believe a four weekly gap may recur, I would suggest that you distribute bags that can be utilised to store this type of product and make it easier to take to collection points should the need arise. I have assumed that for reasons of hygiene, you will endeavour to maintain weekly collections of food waste widening to fortnightly with general waste, in an emergency.

STATEMENT from Louise Oram, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"I am writing to express my concern regarding a post made by Councillor Peter O'Brien in which, as I understand it, says, that on top of the existing waste and recycling issues resulting in potential reductions in this service in the Derbyshire Dales, that at a special Council meeting on 27 July, councillors will be asked to, amongst other things, consider a temporary stop to the collection of the garden waste service. I appreciate that the priority should be to provide personnel to ensure that the removal of household waste and recycling that may eventually result in an unhealthy environment, however, the fact remains that a subscription has been paid for the garden waste service and so therefore, would very much like to know if some of that subscription would be refunded if this service were to be suspended.

Finally, may I say, that I have the utmost respect for your waste removal crews. They have worked cheerfully, tirelessly and politely throughout the pandemic and I would like to commend them. For their sakes, I feel that a swift conclusion to the issues with the bin rounds should be a priority."

STATEMENT from Sue Bliss, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

Please make sure that my comments are submitted to the meeting to be held 27 July.

The current refuse collection restrictions that have been announced are unacceptable and I think the council's management of the refuse collection in recent years has been extremely short sighted.

I have always been totally opposed to the contracting out of services. Private companies are only interested in financial gain. Serco have and will continue to cut corners in order to maximise their profit

I thoroughly disagree with the notion that the service is excellent. Recyclables are dropped (and not picked up) on every collection. Food from food bins also get dropped. I have complained about this on numerous occasions over a period of many years. I

have been told by the waste management department that the workers don't have time to pick it up. I've also been told that the bins on Morledge blow over in the wind and this is why there is rubbish left on the ground; this explanation is utterly ridiculous and also untrue. Bins get damaged, which is done by the careless handling of bins by the Serco teams not householders.

Bolsover District Council's refuse collection is I believe done 'in house'. I have been reliably informed that they don't charge for green waste and if they do drop litter they pick it up. This supports my view that when these services are not for profit they are of a higher quality.

Whilst I fully support an increase in HGV driver's pay I do not support giving any more money to Serco. We the tax payers have already given Serco over £100,000 and Serco has had 37 billion of tax payer's money for a test and trace system, which is not fit for purpose - they should not be given anymore of hard working tax payer's money.

I take issue with the recent comment that DDDC cannot exit the contract with Serco. If Serco are not fulfilling their contractual obligations it should be very easy to withdraw

STATEMENT from Andrew Keyworth, Derbyshire Dales District Council

Hi, I find it quite appalling, that there is a motion, at the next meeting, of the councillors, to pay for an increase in wages for serco drivers. There is a report in the guardian newspaper, that serco have seen an increase of 50% in profits, for the last year. To my mind, if serco can't fulfil the contract, or default on it, like they have done, the contract should be taken away from them. It's about time the council got tough with their contractors and demanded, value for money

STATEMENT from Mat. Adlam-Stiles, Chair Ible Parish Council

I am led to believe that the extraordinary meeting will discuss two main proposals, namely:

** approve a Council contribution to a pay rise for Serco's drivers*

** consider a temporary stop to the collection of the garden waste service*

On behalf of my parishioners, I must object most strongly to both of these proposals, as follows:

Serco are a private company who make a considerable profit – 2020 profits were estimated at £165M. Whilst their operational difficulties may be genuine, and they may claim that these profits represent different operational areas of the business that should not be the concern of the council. Serco are contracted to provide services, which they are consistently failing to honour. The pandemic is not new – they've had 16+ months to get their act together. And any shortage of drivers due to Brexit was both predictable, and predicted – if they have not prepared sufficiently, and/or are not paying drivers the market rates, this is for them to sort out - the council should not be baling them out.

Any additional payments to Serco would necessarily result in either additional precept for residents, or a reduction in spending elsewhere – to help fund a private

company. This is wholly unacceptable. Moreover, this is not a free service, it is one for which each and every resident is paying via their council tax. If Serco are not fulfilling their duties, then they should actually be refunding the council for missed collections.

The garden waste service is one for which residents are explicitly paying extra. Suspending this service can only be done if those residents – and the council - receive a rebate for missed collections; and if the local recycling centres are tolerant of and able to cope with additional volume. That said, suspending this service is highly undesirable. It will almost inevitably lead to increased bonfires, and the associated pollution and fire risk – a very real concern during such hot & dry weather - and to an increase in fly-tipped garden waste.

The options the council should be discussing are, in my opinion:

- 1. Recompense for services that have not be fulfilled*
- 2. Suspension of Serco's contract / outsourcing to a-n-other supplier*
- 3. Bringing waste collection services in-house*

STATEMENT from Andy Marshall, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

You have outsourced a service. Therefore you have transferred management risk (assuming you agreed a reasonable contract). It is therefore very generous of you to make proposals to reduce the service to the public because the supplier cannot fulfill it's commitments.

I surmise that you have no penalty clauses in the contract that would allow you to find an alternative or to get compensation. That is to be regretted and a lesson to be learned for the future.

May I suggest that the supplier be asked to agree to shorten the contract progressively as they fail to deliver to the contracted standards thereby keeping the contract value the same?

STATEMENT from Frank Smith, Matlock Local Resident

Whist I understand the the reasons behind the proposal to suspend garden waste collections to allow the backlog of other waste to be collected, it does not address the problem of storage by the householder of waste accumulating during the suspension. Inevitably with an accumulation of waste it will also take some time to deal with the backlog of that which seems to me to defeat the initial object.

I am against this proposal, if sufficient contingency plans had been in place when the contract was determined this wouldn't be an issue.

STATEMENT from Helen Radford, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

Whilst I understand the many difficulties being faced by many people during the current Covid climate I believe giving Serco more money to do the job they tendered for would be immoral. Serco had a large increase in their profits this year. They should be made to spend some of this on improving their services and recruiting staff. Surely part of the consideration of awarding the contract to Serco would have

been to make sure that their staff were being paid the going rate for the job. I am aware of staff leaving and starting back through an agency on more pay. This surely comes down to poor management. It doesn't matter if the bill to increase the HGV drivers' wages comes out of the Covid fund or directly from the council at the end of the day it is public money provided by tax and council tax payers. It should come from the company that are making a profit for not delivering the service they promised.

As for non-collection of food waste or excess recycling starting soon that's nothing new it's been happening on an informal basis since Serco took over. I fill the appropriate form in each week. There is no space for comments which could be helpful and although you give all your contact details I know of nobody that has ever received a response or apology. I am now of the opinion that they're never even looked at.

The whole system is fundamentally flawed. Getting replacement bins is taking over 6 months. When you ring to chase to be told you're on list is no help especially when you know that others have got their bins haven't been on the list nearly as long as you. To be told you can put an extra 3 bin bags out is missing the point. With 2 children in nappies, bin bags full of smelly nappies in the heat we are currently experiencing is unpleasant.

For those people made unemployed or on furlough this money given to a profiteering company is another kick in the teeth. Perhaps they could have a month off council tax payments, or pay less for 3 months. We're all struggling most of us are making less money. Serco appear to be being given more money for doing less and all the time they're making an increased profit. The rich get richer & the poor get poorer.

A disgraceful way to run a council.

STATEMENT from Ian Pykett, Ashford-in-the-Water Local Resident

Thank you for the opportunity to make a written representation to Derbyshire Dales District Council's extraordinary meeting, to be held on July 27th 2021, regarding the Council's Waste & Recycling report.

I voted for the Council's proposal that residents pay for garden waste ('green bin') collections in the spirit in which the Council proposed it – to raise extra revenue to balance out the impact of its new waste and recycling contract.

As you know, of course, the proposal was enacted and, consequently, the removal of garden waste is now a service for which a separate fee is levied – above and beyond the usual council taxes.

I therefore paid the 2021/22 £35 'early bird' price for my first green bin, plus £50 for a second green bin.

I have recently invested significantly (and continue investing) in the renovation of the garden at my house, and there is an ongoing need for my garden waste to be removed for composting, as I have no local space to do this, and no vehicle suitable for transporting the waste myself to a composting centre.

The council's 'recommendation to temporarily suspend for four weeks garden waste collections' will not only put my ongoing garden renovation on hold, but could also cause damage to some of the work already done, as I will be unable to maintain the works during this summer's season of rapid growth of vegetation, grass, plants, etc. As a result, a proportion of my investment is at risk of being wasted – something that I believe to be unreasonable, given my willingness to vote for the council's proposal to pay separately for my garden waste removal, and to pay a levy of £85.00 for this service.

STATEMENT from Wilhelmena Mee, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

I am really cross about the non-collection of waste.

We have made allowance after allowance but now with stinking waste piling up, my patience is wearing thin.

Serco are making millions yet Derbyshire Dales are offering to help pay for an increase in drivers' wages!!! I cannot believe what I am reading!

Do Serco not have a contract to collect our waste? Why is this not being enforced?

Also we have paid in advance for the garden waste collection - a service that we are not receiving. A refund is due this year, not next year when residents might decide not to renew this unreliable service.

Delaying or deferring collections during the summer months, when we need them most, will just encourage fly tipping.

We were served better during the complete lockdown.

Councillors - stand up to this company and insist they fulfill their contract.

STATEMENT from Jon Griffiths, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

I write with reference to recent measures implemented due to the ongoing problems with waste and recycling collections. Firstly, I'm well aware of the wider macro issues behind this; namely the levels of employee self-isolation and challenges with shortages of HGV drivers (and subsequent wage inflation).

Recent communication has advised that Serco will temporarily stop collecting "excess" recycling. Can I lodge my opinion that this should only be allowed to happen when a regular service has taken place the fortnight prior. Our blue bin was not collected last time and is full. By the time this comes to be collected again, there will be excess which presumably under these new rules will not be taken. If the excess is caused by a failed collection, I don't believe it to be fair or viable to refuse to take the excess caused by that lack of service.

For absolute clarity, I'm only referring to the collection of "excess" being a problem if a prior collection has not taken place.

STATEMENT from Tony Young, Baslow Local Resident

I note that there are several proposals being put forward by DDDC to assuage the current difficulties being experienced by your contractor Serco and that a key suggestion is the curtailment of garden waste collections for 4 weeks.

I would point out that we are at the height of summer with lawns requiring mowing at least once a week as well as cutting and trimming of plants and bushes etc. We have already experienced non collection of garden waste quite recently and a lot of that not collected during this period ended up on

Road verges etc and this will happen again.

I would suggest that any delay to collections involves the recyclable and cardboard/paper collection. This can be more easily taken by the householder to the DCC recycling sites. Reducing the price for garden waste collection for year 2022/2023 may encourage more people to buy an extra bin which will obviously result in more drivers being required and probably more vehicles.

STATEMENT from Stephen Priest, Tansley Local Resident

I totally disagree with the proposals set out in your Waste and Recycling Report dated 21st July 2021. These proposals seem designed to bolster Serco's profits and to reduce the level of service provided to Derbyshire Dales by the Council and its chosen contractor.

I make the following points to illustrate my objections:

- *Serco have announced in the last three weeks that their expected profits are increasing by 50% - and most of the increase comes from the widely discredited track and trace system. They are taking plenty of money from the public purse and we should not be encouraging or allowing them to take more.*
- *The idea of contracting out services to firms such as Serco is to allow them to make a reasonable profit. This profit should take into account the fact that they are bearing the risks associated with running the contract. They should not be coming back and asking for more money as soon as one of those risks becomes a reality – especially so early in the new contract.*
- *The proposal to increase payments to Serco until the end of the financial year funded from a grant from Central Government implies that the increase will be carried over into future years – assumedly funded by Derbyshire Dales residents. This must not be allowed to happen.*
- *Whilst I have sympathy with firms suffering staff absences due to Covid the report seems to be saying the main problems are as a result of Brexit and the shortage of drivers. I assume Serco were aware of the Brexit proposals when they negotiated the contract and this should have been a foreseen risk. We have tolerated service disruption for the last few months because of Covid. I have no great objection to that. We should not now be paying again.*
- *The cost of waste disposal has increased greatly this year when you take into account the extra charge for green waste collection. The idea of reducing the service on green waste collection during the first six months of the new charging system is just wrong. This will result in more vehicle journeys to dispose of*

garden waste and the resultant negative environmental impact and extra costs for residents.

- *The idea of suspending the garden waste service to provide Serco with the ability to fulfil their contractual obligations in another area (i.e. reduce the backlog) whilst paying them even more money is not reasonable. You are asking us to pay twice (or more) for their failure. If you were to go ahead and agree to a suspension I will request a pro-rata refund of money paid.*

STATEMENT from Roger Crowther, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

I feel that this is totally wrong why should the council be using money set aside for covid 19 to shore up a limited company serco when they have already had a very significant increase in there remuneration to collect and deal with our waste and recycling which I assume sell to make up part of the sum which they take

If THIS WAS AVAILABLE WHY WERENT LOCAL BUISNESSES OFFERED HELP when they had to close due to covid because of the increase they have had they should be made to shoulder the whole cost of the increases themselves also why isn't there a penalty clause in there contract to cover for lack of service I am appalled that the council are talking about baling out such a large company

Lastly with the Covid Figures as they are we may need that money to be used for what it was given to the council for COVID 19

STATEMENT from Nicholas Binns, Darley Dale Local Resident

I am concerned at the proposal to withdraw the Garden Waste scheme for 4 weeks/2 collections WITHOUT RECOMPENSE for those that have paid for the scheme, at a time of peak growth in gardens.

In 6 months' time it is likely that we will be in lockdown again as the Pandemic will not have gone away. Temporarily removing the Garden Waste scheme then will be of little consequence.

I recognise the problems that the council has and support the proposal BUT I do think those of us who will lose a service we have paid for deserve more than a discount off a future price rise.

Thank you. I do not feel the need to attend the meeting in the present circumstances.

STATEMENT from Becca and Ben Timperley, Tansley Local Resident

My husband and I have just seen the proposals for the bin collections.

We do not support the allocation of the coronavirus emergency fund to Serco for the purposes of subsidising the drivers' wages. They are a private company, contracted to do a job and they have failed. That isn't the purpose of the fund, they are perfectly able to pay their own wage bill. They have failed on their contract and they are not fit for purpose. They should be sacked and replaced.

We are disappointed that you propose to temporarily suspend the green bin collection. We have paid extra for this service and expect to get what we pay for.

We are happy for this representation to be used.

STATEMENT from Ian Walker, Darley Dale Local Resident

I'm astounded at the proposals being put forward at this emergency meeting regarding how to resolve issues with Serco and their complete inability to honour the contract that we the tax paying residents of Darley Dale were forced into signing up to.

At the beginning of the pandemic with lockdown in place we suddenly found that Serco employees were beginning to self-isolate - has anyone within council or a paid representative taken the trouble to investigate the circumstances surrounding this?

If they had they would have discovered that until the beginning of the pandemic Serco would only pay statutory sick pay if an employee was off work. Once the government stepped in and offered help to businesses Serco were forced to pay their employees in full if self-isolating.

Three other councils that I contacted who also use Serco's services for waste collection experienced exactly the same circumstances as we have faced.

The comment that many councils are experiencing difficulties may be correct but unless you understand the background you cannot use that as a case for not enforcing the service level agreement in place with Serco.

Serco knew what they were committing to when they signed the agreement to now use national driver shortage as yet another excuse is clearly not acceptable.

Not once in any communication from council on this matter has any mention of the service level agreement been made is that because they agreement council signed is weighted in Serco's favour no matter the prevailing circumstances?

We need some honesty on this one - make the service level agreement public ...

The additional £1m being paid from April this year should be immediately suspended and any suggestion that we pay them even more money is frankly ridiculous.

Serco have proven in the past with both government and local authority contracts that they are very good at creeping costs while not delivering on services.

Council will be failing in its duty to the public if further cash meant to help local businesses during the pandemic is given to this extremely profitable large public company who themselves have had considerable furlough, business rates and VAT payment reliefs which are still ongoing.

The biggest error council have made was deciding that outsourcing will be cheaper and more efficient as Serco have proven time after time prior to the pandemic that they fail to meet both criteria.

Other councils who switched to using Serco's services have experienced the same issues prior to the pandemic.

I trust council will take these comments into consideration during the upcoming meeting.

STATEMENT from Mr. Alan Pickering , Wirksworth Local Resident

Having received an email yesterday from the DDDC, about their proposal to pay Serco, a substantial amount of money from the Emergency Covid Fund, to help alleviate the ongoing and worsening missed waste collections in the Derbyshire Dales, I wish my objections to be carried forward to the proposed council meeting next week.

To additionally fund Serco, by 50% to create a more attractive job package to potential and existing HGV drivers, will not solve this situation. It would be more likely to cost the council (or more precisely, revenue from taxpayers money - in the guise of Government Emergency Funds), many thousands of pounds, and to what end? More sick pay?

Has our council been bullied by a multi-million pound profit making business (Serco) into funding their own failures to deliver on their existing contract?

Throwing money at this situation will not solve the problem and only infuriate the local constituents (as can be seen from comments on their social media sites).

Put in simple terms, Serco have failed to keep their side of the contract. Granted it was originally due to Covid related issues last year, but the perpetuating problems occurring now should have been predicted and forward initiative methods put in place before we arrived at the situation we are in now. For Serco to have made as much profit as they have forecast, and now to expect the Council to further prop up their mounting failings is totally unacceptable. Pay rises are their own in house issues, not the Councils and ultimately the tax payer.

Then to further exasperate the problem, DDDC suggest a reduced fee for next year's Green Bin Collections, to what was the initial (Early Bird) cost of £35. This is outrageous and it is further penalising those who initially paid the early bird fee last year, to those customers (and potential new customers) who paid the full price of £50. Given that this is now an additional cost to our Council Tax, it is a slap in the face to be told that this service will now potentially be suspended for a minimum of 4 weeks, again, due to Serco's failure to provide the service contract they were originally paid to do.

That's in addition to the suggested suspension to Food waste collections (until further notice).

This must be costing our Council thousands of pounds in lost recycling revenue, never mind a further cost of thousands, to prop up Sercos Wages issues!

The DDDC should be putting into place the mechanisms for a breached contract and either looking towards new Tenders, or bringing the service in house, NOT paying money set aside for Covid Emergencies. Considering that we are yet still in the throws of a Global pandemic. Surley that money should be used for more worthy causes (perhaps ones not even known about as yet, as Covid has not gone away), not bailing out a company who can certainly afford its own staffing issues.

Well Sir, I think I have waffled my objections perhaps a little more than I ought, but please note my objections at the forthcoming meeting, or pass onto whoever will be representing our Ward on the day of the meeting.

STATEMENT from Ms. Anne-Marie Aitchison, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"I have seen the recent announcements regarding the waste collection problems and would like to pass on my views for the meeting next week.

As one of the households who have paid for Garden Waste collections I would like the money for any missed collections refunding to me this year. Giving a discount next year isn't fair to those residents that may decide not to carry on with the garden waste scheme and based on the way this year is going that may be quite a few!

I would also urge the council not to give into demands from Serco for more money. They are a profit making company who entered into a contract to provide a service. If they are experiencing problems due to driver shortages they should take the hit and sort out their employees pay and conditions to ensure they want to work for them rather than another company, then on the next contract negotiations include any increases they have had to absorb. If the issues are due to Covid isolation they should approach the government to be included in the daily testing method to ensure essential workers can continue to work and the council should support them in that request, if all the councils you refer to in your emails do the same the government should listen. As a company Serco should take the rough with the smooth, they should not be asking the council for more money. That would be like asking residents for more money now for garden collections whilst not collecting!

Sorry for rambling on but I feel strongly that the council should not be giving more money to Serco, even from a special Covid fund. Serco could have applied to the government for support themselves to get them through Covid and all companies across the Uk including the one I work for are having to deal with Covid issues and driver shortages and they are not going to their customers after agreeing a contract and failing to deliver to get more money!"

STATEMENT from Ms. Ellen Ashin, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"I'm sure you have had plenty of emails about missed bins and I am 1 of many.

I am disgusted with the way Serco are treating their staff. They are getting all the flack of the missed collections. This is not their fault, the fault is with Derbyshire Dales District council and Serco as a company. I do not feel Derbyshire Dales giving more

money to Serco to get more HGV drivers is solving the problem. Don't tell me I am not paying for it because I am through my income tax when tax payers start paying off the COVID budget. The COVID budget is not a bottomless pit. We have to start paying it off soon and will be paying for it for years to come. As for Brexit it has happened deal with it. Derbyshire Dales can give me more than a 3% pay rise as a health worker if they want? Freeze the green waste collections and give me a refund! I want my garden waste emptying I have paid for a service. Let's put it like this you want me to pay again next year at a £15 discount forget it! I will take it to Harrison way in black bin bags put it in the general waste skip. Where is that a saving for the environment?

Serco need to sort this out they have a contract. If I am in breach of a contract then I am (excuse the pun) binned off. This is not acceptable, environmental issues arise from waste materials. It is a hygiene and health risk for it to build up. This could make people ill as much as COVID. It will attract rats, maggots, other pests. As well as the hot weather making the smell unbearable. This needs resolving ASAP.

Why should Joe Bloggs who hasn't subscribed and paid this year potentially get a discount on next years subscription when I will get nothing extra off ? Or do you intend to give households who have subscribed and paid this year an additional discount on top of the £15"

STATEMENT from Ms. Sarah Gregory, Bakewell Local Resident

"I have seen Councillor Peter O'Brian's post on Facebook encouraging residents to contact you with our comments regarding the current situation regarding waste collections.

I live in Bakewell and have always been very happy with the waste collection and recycling service that we benefit from. The workers are always pleasant when I have encountered them and I have never had any complaints about the service.

The recent situation is not one limited to our area. There is a workforce shortage and jobs across the board are extremely difficult to fill. Job seekers are in an unusual position where they can accept the job offering the highest pay, negotiate higher wages and in a lot of cases, when leaving one job for another, the current place of work will offer a higher wage to keep them rather than having to begin the recruitment process themselves. Good staff are incredibly difficult to recruit at the moment, but simply throwing money at the problem is not the answer.

I really worry that excessive spending now is going to be damaging in the long term.

Also, I think it's a bad idea to pause the green bin collections. Residents have paid for that out of their own pockets and if there is no alternative but to pause it, refunds should be given."

STATEMENT from Ms. Jennifer Reynolds, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"Good morning In anticipation of next Tuesday's extraordinary meeting of the Council to discuss temporary emergency measures for the Derbyshire Dales bins and recycling I would like to request that you advertise the new, temporary arrangements for residents regarding bin collections, not only via social media and email, but also by

posting notices on public notice boards and posting flyers through letterboxes. There will be a large number of residents who do not have access to computers and smart phones, for a number of reasons, and many will not be informed by friends or neighbours.”

STATEMENT from Ms. Wendy Astill, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“The costs should not be shared with serco, they are a commercial company who have a contract they should be made to perform under that contract or damages sort from them for not performing, they’ve already been given extra funds on top of their contract despite making a healthy profit, any other commercial company in a commercial contract would not expect to get extra. It is up to Serco to pay the going rate to its drivers, if that rate is rising then so be it, prices are rising in many industries but they don’t get a council handout, financials penalties should definitely be applied, the underperformance is not outside their control, they have the ability to recruit new drivers or give exiting drivers the going rate of pay. When entering inot a contract all these factors should be considered before putting in a bid for a contract

I am not in agreement with the suspension of green waste collections which have been paid for, if they do have to be suspended then a refund needs to be made this year to those that have subscribed to compensate for the poor service, it’s no good giving a discount next year, different people will be subscribing next year due to moving, death or change of requirements, Serco should be paying this refund.”

STATEMENT from Ms. Beverley Bagshaw, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“As most residents are disgusted with the current situation I will do my best to get straight to the point, please forgive me if I start rambling....we are all completely fed up with the current situation

1. Living on the back row of cottages on Chatsworth Road in Rowsley, we are constantly being missed for collections, most of the time we haven't reported it as it is such a regular occurrence. What is upsetting and frankly discriminatory is the fact that bins on the main road of Chatsworth Road and indeed the rest of the village are generally collected on time. This just isn't good enough. Many of us park our cars out of the way on collection day, only for them not to come. Or we get up early in the morning to move the bins for the binmen.

2. Putting food waste into the black bins in the height of summer is disgusting! It the bins won't be collected for 2 weeks the black bins are going to stink, be awash with fermented food juices, and crawling with maggots. I clean my own food waste bin out every week after collection but when the food waste wasn't collected last week, within 8 days I started to see maggots. I cannot clean my black bin out as it is just too big. Will the council pay for someone to come round and clean the black bins? Surely if food waste is not going to be picked up fortnightly we could at least still use the green bins as they can at least be cleaned afterwards?

3. *As I understand it Serco reported huge profits last year, where has all that money gone? They should be honouring the contract they made to the council. And surely the profits they made last year could be used to retrain people who lost jobs due to Coronavirus/furlough last year in order to recruit new HGV drivers. Which would in turn solve some of their issues.*

4. *The council cannot rely on social media, email and word of mouth to reach everybody. Stickers could be put on bins the same way they do at Christmas.*

Serco have been an utter failure and should be held accountable! If the council feel they need to make financial contribution to Serco it should be on the understanding that Serco are made to pay it back with interest!"

STATEMENT from Mr Gregg Pearce, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"I'm writing in relation to the current issue around waste collection and Serco. I'd like to place on record my disgust at the current situation.

Without knowing the full circumstances, which I believe, if we're shared, would help local residents better understand the challenge faced. It feels like Serco aren't being held to account.

I appreciate these are challenging times, but your lack of communication isn't acceptable. Why not be 'straight up' with the challenges faced, and the reasons behind your decisions.

If articles published previously are to be believed, the current contract includes a 50% per annum uplift on the prior contract, and a number of top ups were given to Serco during the pandemic. It does beg the question as to if there are 50% more bin collections!

I'm unsure bin collections could be more sporadic, so maybe holding Serco to account is a challenge that you have to undertake, after all, their operating profit dwarfs your annual budget.

I'd be more than happy to understand your perspective, and maybe even explain the mitigating circumstances."

STATEMENT from Mrs Helen & Mr Martin Seddon, Great Longstone Local Resident

"We are writing to express our concerns as residents of Derbyshire Dales about the refuse collection service.

We pay our Council Tax every month and for this we expect a reasonable level of service. Throughout the pandemic lockdown we received no green bin service for weeks on end, we were, however, very grateful that our black bin and blue bins were both collected. We understood that things were very difficult at that time for everyone.

Next we were asked to pay to have our green bins emptied at a reduced (?) price of £35 per year, again we paid for this as we understood your (what we felt were) valid reasons.

This next move on your part- stopping extra cardboard collection, green bin collection and no food waste collection -beggars belief.

We totally object to any more of OUR money going to this organisation- you negotiated a contract with SERCO on our behalf and they are not fulfilling this contract, you should be sorting this out with them NOT penalising your residents!

Please note that we DO NOT wish you to contribute to wage increases for their staff, that is SERCO's affair if they wish to pay their drivers more, NOT ours.

Please DO NOT agree to stopping green bin collection - we have paid for this and you should provide this service.

If the green bin service is stopped we will expect a refund of our money straight away (not knocked off next years fee - we may not wish to subscribe next year, or we may have moved out of the area!)

Reinstate the food waste collection immediately- if it is ok to put it in the black bin what is the point of it in the first place.

We would be grateful if you could take our concerns into your consideration.

Thank you"

STATEMENT from Mr Andy Cross, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"I write to object to the additional payment to Sirco in connection with bin collections. Whilst it is accepted that there is a National shortage of drivers, and that the covid 'pingdemic' is causing further shortage, the council should not be bullied in to handing over additional funds. The reduction in collections through the suspension of green bin and food caddy waste is a significant contribution and has already gone above and beyond. I am sure that Serco and quoting a 'force majeure', but I would ask you, what are they doing to contribute to the problem? It appears very one sided."

STATEMENT from Cllr Kevin Oscroft, Litton Parish Council

"It is unreasonable to charge for a service in advance and then not to perform that service.

Offering a discount next year to have the green bins emptied is not good enough or acceptable compensation

Myself, I will not be paying next year anyway, so a discount is not compensation anyway.

I want a full refund and I will deal with my garden waste myself.

If I do not get this I will take this to the courts and should I succeed, you can pay the £35 courts cost as well as the refund to me.

I have urged others to take this step also on social media groups for Litton, Cressbrook and Tideswell.

The council should be ashamed of this diabolical situation.

*Have you screwed the contract price down so hard that Serco cannot deliver I wonder?
Don't blame Covid, as so many other inefficient businesses do to cover incompetence.
I will also bring this issue up at the next meeting of Litton Parish Council."*

STATEMENT from Ms Ruth Whiteside, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"I am appalled by the diabolical situation regarding house hold waste collection and the Serco contract and I object to the proposed solutions-

**Proposed 4 week suspension of our garden waste collection- I do not understand how you can now withdraw this service. I do not have capacity to dispose of garden wastes myself. How do this council suggest I deal with this??*

** £15 off next year's charge is likely to be approved- I DO NOT want £15 off next year. I want my money back now if you are not going to fulfil this service. The council should not be holding everyones money for the next 12 months.*

** there will be no collection of food waste, or cardboard not in the blue bins or sacks, for 3 months from 26 July. food waste can be put into black bins, for fortnightly collection. Or if you have black sacks, can STILL be put in food caddies which WILL be emptied This has ALREADY been agreed by officers. - this is appalling. You should be considering the environmental impact of this. It should be a priority to collect this waste and not add it to land fill. Shame on you council for not protecting the environment.*

** residents will not receive any letters, all communication will be via social media and email - not everyone one is on social media. The least you could do is send emails .*

** The Council to give Serco any contribution to increasing the pay of drivers. - you must be joking. Do you realise how absolutely ridiculous this looks to people???? Serco agreed a service at a certain price and should fulfil that contract. WE should not be paying more of our council tax to a private company that has made millions out of the pandemic. How could you even consider a contract with Serco after the disastrous track and trace, and other mess there have made, with directors being paid 7million a year; how can give them MORE money?????!!!! Can you really not see how ludicrous this is??? This makes me very concerned about the competency of the council.*

** the advice from officers is that if the Council tries to ditch Serco, it could be an expensive and long drawn out process - you have signed the wrong contract then if you don't have a clause to end the contract with non-fulfilment. This really is a concern that the council have got it so wrong with public money."*

STATEMENT from Mr Roger Crowther, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"Reference the meeting I have just read a statement by Councillor O brien on face book which I believe shouldn't be aired in public before the meeting to reiterate I believe that the money set aside for covid should not be used to pay wages in part for SERCOS drivers this may be needed for what it was given the PANDEMIC is not over

Why should we have to settle in part a pay increase for sercos drivers just to keep the management of our small part of serco strutting about in suits Serco profits are 50 percent higher as reported in the guardian so the share holders will have to take the rough with the smooth and councillor Obriens comments about the council CEO not liking it is tough he doesn't like it I'm sure that his resignation would be accepted and his salary could be a nice addition to the dividend of serco share holders as well im appalled that this is even been discussed by the council they have had a massive injection of extra cash and should not be given any moneys set aside for covid 19 THE PANDEMIC ISNT OVER GET REAL

MORE THAN SLIGHTLY ANNOYED.”

STATEMENT from Mr David Horsley, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“I wish to comment on the following:-

1) Proposal to suspend garden waste collections.

This is totally unacceptable having paid an annual fee for the first time based on the collection of the green bins on a two weekly cycle. Any suspension at this main gardening time of year is a total misunderstanding of why the green bin collection is essential, especially to older and infirm persons.

It is also totally unacceptable to receive our money and utilise it to bolster other collections, you are acting directly contrary to the terms and condition we agreed to provide this money for.

Finally to actually propose that a reduced charge next year would compensate totally ignores the fact that nobody will want to renew next year based on the performance of the service this year therefore our money will be lost.

2) Proposal to utilise Government COVID allowance money and other Council moneys.

Can you honestly support this proposal:

Key officer recommendations to that meeting include sharing with our contractor for a temporary period the cost of an uplift in HGV driver wages as well as a one-month suspension of garden waste collections to enable the current backlogs to be cleared.

This is a mockery of the purpose that our green waste money was provided for, as well as any other money the council has obtained from Council Tax, as was your previous allocation of Government COVID money to give Council staff a present which was an absolute disgrace. Government money should be used to assist persons directly affected by COVID or to assist in the testing and vaccination of the outstanding population and our money should be used for the purpose of what we provided it for I.e. garden waste collection every two weeks.

Do you really think upping Serco drivers wages will overcome a shortage of drivers having told us there is a National shortage, what are you proposing double/treble to make Serco more attractive!!

Garden collections must be given priority when they have been specifically paid for.

3) The mixing of Food Waste and General Waste

This is directly against your recycling basic principles and health and safety considerations and requires weekly collection. The latest heatwave has shown this and to throw food waste into the general bins is absolutely disgusting whether in bags or not. We have direct evidence of the failure to collect this waste has led to maggots and flies in non collected caddies so this will occur in general waste bins left for two weeks.

Please ensure my comments are raised and discussed at the above meeting.”

STATEMENT from Ms. Christine Martin, Matlock Local Resident

“As a resident who pays year on year I am writing to let you know how appalled I am with how much DDDC’s contract with Serco is costing ratepayers. They really have the upper hand and the company has already been bailed out with extra cash from the Council.

Whoever drew up and signed off the contract has a lot to answer for as most of the costs are being carried by DDDC when Serco makes millions. So much for outsourcing and saving the Council and rate payers money.

Bring it back in house, after all Council services offer better value for money and are not for profit. Giving tenders to save money means the quality of service is cut but the company that gets the contract squeezes the service to make money - I don’t understand why this is better.

Refund everyone who paid extra for the green waste collection this year as a gesture of goodwill and ask residents to put food waste in with the green waste to be collected fortnightly for the foreseeable future. I understand green and food waste is processed together and it will keep general waste and recycling separate on a fortnightly basis. From next year it may be possible to start afresh with weekly food waste and paid green waste collections with an early bird offer every year to those who sign up early.

I’m not happy to read on Facebook “it hasn’t gone down well with the Chief Executive” that members of the public have been emailing in their comments (Councillor Peter O’Brien). This absolutely sums up the total disregard DDDC have for their residents. They should be engaging with the public and be openly transparent regarding all aspects of business and decisions that are ultimately paid for by residents - don’t get me started on the “consultation” for the Local Plan and planning decisions affecting residents in Matlock!”

STATEMENT from Mrs Gaynor Delaney, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“I should like to register my concern around the proposed services provided to our household and the proposals regarding the management of the waste contract.

First of all, I’d like to comment on the waste collections. I understand there is a proposal not to collect cardboard for a period of three months. This is completely

unacceptable. There are two things that will happen with cardboard should you not collect:

- a) It will be burned
- b) It will be taken to the local recycling centre (not everyone will have this choice as its dependant on transport availability)

Both of these options are bad for the planet and should be avoided.

Personally, I think it is utterly appalling that garden bins are not being emptied, particularly when this is a service that households pay for on top of the contribution towards waste services we pay for via our council tax. £15 next year when we are now faced with having to ferry that waste to the recycling centre too is not satisfactory. Our local centre is twenty minutes away and this is the height of summer when gardening waste is also at its most.

Finally, the proposal to contribute towards the salary increase for drivers. I work in Facilities Management and have spent 16 years in a Head of Estates position and understand the nature of waste contracts and also waste contracts in the public sector. They will have tendered for the contract and won with a series of terms, one of which will be linked to pay, no doubt with an agreed uplift based on certain criteria at agreed points in time. I assume, given the timing that this is not one of the agreed points in time. Serco tendered for the contract and built in their profit margin. In signing the contract, they agree to provide a service in return for a fee. It is not the council's issue if they are struggling to recruit – it is for the company to sort out how they deliver the service agreed. If they can't, they are in breach of contract and it should not cost the council a penny. I feel that the issue is robust contract management and do not feel that any more of my hard earned money paid to you to run our services should be given to this shambolic outfit. I would much prefer that the staff concerned managed the contract robustly – Covid has nothing to do with pay!

I am hoping that you will manage the situation to ensure that our services can be delivered in line with our expectations. I sincerely hope this is not another situation where we will again pay more for less.

I should be very grateful for a reply with an update on the service please!"

STATEMENT from Mr Mike Hooton, Comford Local Resident

"I don't fully understand the current situation with waste collection, but based on what I have seen on social media, both officially and unofficially, the following thoughts come to mind:

- The situation is due to a driver shortage? If there is a shortage of staff, then the service would keep falling further and further behind, and it would not be possible to clear a backlog (which would require even more service than normal). I'm baffled.
- It's a shame that the advantages of dealing with food waste separately need to be sacrificed. I guess the advantages don't really have much value after all, as this is the first service to go.

- *Serco is a large, highly profitable, dividend paying company. I see no reason whatsoever to subsidize them. They are paid for their service according to an agreed contract. If fulfilling the contract turns out to be more expensive, that is unfortunate, but how about drawing on profits first? It is tempting to want to contribute money to get the service we require, but, as the saying goes, don't buy a dog and then bark yourself! All I see is that any such funds are ultimately just about supporting Serco's profits and share price. We've paid for a service, it's up to them to figure out how to provide it. Or maybe they're in the wrong business.*
- *Suspending garden waste collection is a total NO for me. My wife and I have a large garden and fill the garden bin most collections Spring through Autumn. Now that we are having to pay for this service (which we can accept), it is quite unbelievable that this may be suspended. What on earth are we paying for then?"*

STATEMENT from Ms Joan McKenna, Hathersage Local Resident

"I am a Hathersage resident and I wish to let you know that I am absolutely against the proposal that public money is used to subsidise the multinational corporation, SERCO. SERCO is failing to deliver its contractual obligations to the council and residents. It is its responsibility to correct this. Rather than receiving a handout from the cash-strapped council, it should be using some of the many million pounds of profit that it pays its shareholders and chief executive to carry out its obligations. It seems utterly wrong that SERCO can choose to benefit and profit when things are going as right for them but pass the buck on to the council when they find they cannot deliver what they agreed they would. I appreciate that the impact of both Covid and Brexit have complicated matters, but SERCO's wishes, and one could say greed, should not take precedence over the rights and well-being of residents and constituents. Even with the proposed handout to SERCO, we are receiving a reduced, sub-standard service. You are custodians of public money, and you should be ensuring that it is spent in full in ensuring that this essential service is delivered in full and in accordance with what was presumably agreed legally, not lining the pockets of a company whose main priority is profit for its shareholders."

STATEMENT from Ms Merrilyn Middleton, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"Re the recent issues with Serco, can I suggest that the only viable short term is probably to go with Servos requests, although only paying out as little as possible.

However, longer term I'd look to replace them. They have proven that they are unreliable and greedy and therefore don't deserve any of our money. I'm sure your can start a project to replace them.

It might also be worth having a good look at how the contracts are worded to avoid a future reoccurrence of this, with clauses to limit requests for additional fees and a break clause of they even ask!

They just treat public services as a money bank!"

STATEMENT from Ms Fiona Lichfield, Bakewell Local Resident

“As a resident of Bakewell I am contacting you as our representatives, voted for by the communities you serve, please can you take note of my wishes as one of those voters.

The waste collection service has been a mess over the last few months. I've had to contact the council, at least once, to get my black bin emptied. I don't have green waste collected, but I do send food waste.

I understand you want to suspend green waste collections and have us put food waste in the black bins. All because Serco, a highly profitable, private Company, have realised that they can't operate the contract they signed with you AND make a profit now that there is a shortage of drivers and they need to pay them more! Have I got that right? I am also aware of the short term measures that you are proposing, to get Serco out of the mess that they have created.

In this case I would like you NOT to give Serco any more money and hold them to their contract. If not give their contract to someone else or take it back in house. I understand that this is not a simple matter, but feel sure that you must now be able to renegotiate the contract, change the Ts & Cs so that you can more easily break the contract in the near future when Serco inevitably ask for more money, yet again.

I will be watching closely the result of your council meeting on 27th July.”

STATEMENT from Mr William Handley, Tideswell Local Resident

“I am very much against the Council giving more money to Serco in order to ensure bin collections. Serco are a very well resourced FSTE top 250 company with a £3.9 billion turnover and £163 million trading profit last year, projected to be £200 million this year. (Source Serco website). They have a contract and should keep to it using their reserves or shareholders to help out as is normal in a free enterprise culture.

It is not acceptable for the public to take all the risk when private companies take all the profits. Similarly they should meet the paid for garden waste collections or offer a refund.”

STATEMENT from Mr Stephen Cairns, Matlock Local Resident

“I am emailing to give my views on the shambolic state of the waste and recycling service provided by Serco on behalf of the council.

Whilst I understand and sympathise to some extent on the predicament created by the shortage of HGV drivers nationally, partly as a result of Brexit, and the issue of drivers having to self-isolate due to being pinged by the Covid-19 app (or heaven forbid suffering from Covid-19), the lack of service provided by Serco is nothing short of disgraceful.

A multinational company like Serco, who in June awarded it's shareholders a dividend, and has made huge profits during the Covid-19 pandemic, should not be allowed to hold Derbyshire Dales residents to ransom. Their paltry offer of paying 50% of the increase to driver's wages while demanding the council pays the other half is unacceptable. I trust that when the contract is up for renewal, Serco will not be considered as a future service provider.

Myself and many other residents have had to endure the smell and health risk of rotting rubbish over the last few weeks during the hot weather. I cannot fully convey how livid I am over this farce. Derbyshire Dales District Council needs to get it's act together and do the right thing by it's local residents."

STATEMENT from Ms Lynn Spreyer, Grindleford Local Resident

"I am appalled that the council is considering additional payments to SERCO.

As a company with assets of almost £4000m and an annual net income of £140m, then it would be a travesty to award extra sums of taxpayers' money for what is essentially a failure to fulfil a contractual obligation.

If there is a problem with recruitment, then surely it is Serco's responsibility to pay workers a fair rate. It is not the responsibility of councils to subsidise a commercial company - especially such a large one as this.

With so many services being cut and withdrawn, it cannot be just that money is being thrown at this company to the obvious detriment of those much needed services the council provides.

I trust that the council will decline to award extra funds to Serco. A contract is an agreement for the giving and receiving of a service.and Serco have patently failed to deliver.

A multinational company like Serco, who in June awarded it's shareholders a dividend, and has made huge profits during the Covid-19 pandemic, should not be allowed to hold Derbyshire Dales residents to ransom. Their paltry offer of paying 50% of the increase to driver's wages while demanding the council pays the other half is unacceptable. I trust that when the contract is up for renewal, Serco will not be considered as a future service provider.

Myself and many other residents have had to endure the smell and health risk of rotting rubbish over the last few weeks during the hot weather. I cannot fully convey how livid I am over this farce. Derbyshire Dales District Council needs to get it's act together and do the right thing by it's local residents."

STATEMENT from Mr James Miles, Hathersage Local Resident

"It is self-evident that if Serco had found ways to make a higher than expected profit from the bin contract that they would not pass on the excess profit to the council. There is no justification whatsoever for them being subsidised if they find that they will have to make less profit than they expected. If privatised contraxts mean that the service providers are guaranteed a profit while the council tax payers have to retain all the risk and pay for any losses then there is no point whatsoever in privatising services. Covering their losses for hem will simply encourage future contractors to underprice contraxts and recover losses from the council in order to maintain their profit.

Serco should simply be required tofulfil their contract, and if they fail to do that the council should seek recompense.

I also object to the use of emergency funds for this purpose. These are council funds just as all other funds are. Their use may seem expedient but it remains a misuse of public funds for the reasons above.

If the council decides to endorse the non-collection of green bins then a discount on next year's bin collections is not acceptable. The charges for the bin collections this year should be returned.

This is the same principal as any situation where a service is paid for and not provided - in consumer law a refund is a legal obligation, a credit note against future hypothetical purchases is not a suitable substitute as the purchaser may well not wish to order the same service again. If the council fails to refund the charges in a proper manner then those paying for the undelivered service may well be able to reclaim the charges."

STATEMENT from Ms Trudi Shortis, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"I have been following the recent posts on social media (Facebook) from Peter O'Brien and also the information emailed to me by the DDDC.

I would like to thank Peter as he has given a well presented and unbiased report on the proposed changes to the bin collections in our region over the next few months and also future changes to the green bin scheme to start in the next financial year.

Firstly I would like to say that up until April this year I cannot thank enough the waste collection teams for the service they provided.

Since then, however I don't think there has been a single week when all our bins have been collected on our appointed service day, resulting in rubbish being kept on the streets for some time.

Now to address the proposed short term plans -

Green bins - service to be suspended for four weeks and a reduction to next years charge for this service.

I am not happy. I can understand that freeing up one team allocated to green bin collection to focus on other collections makes sense in the short term. I am happy to make a short term alternative plan. However, not refunding the charges for this service, once the collection resumes is not acceptable. At present, I am considering my options and very much doubt that I will be subscribing to this service again. As such, I want to be reimbursed for the period the DDDC did not honour their contract to remove garden waste.

Food caddy collection - service to cease for an unspecified period and compostable waste to be placed in the grey household bin or equivalent.

I am not happy. We live in a world where reducing waste to land fill etc. is ecologically important. Even during the first lockdown we had a food caddy collection - ever two weeks with our household waste.

Why is it not possible to adopt this approach again as we are not in such extreme times. To me this seems far more logical and I cannot understand why this is, at the very least, not being tried in the first instance as an approach.

The DDDC to make a contribution to Serco to help cover a needed increase in driver remuneration.

I am not happy. A contract was agreed, and this contract honoured up until recent times. In my opinion, Serco must accept that this needed pay rise is their, and only their, responsibility. Any financial loss incomed is their responsibility and not that of the people living in the Derbyshire Dales to address. In my opinion, Serco are in breach of contract as they have not provided the service expected or agreed. They are financially responsible for ensuring the work force is well able to do the job expected by the people, the job the DDDC accepted the tender for.

I await to hear the outcome of the meeting.”

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

“Opinions expressed or statements made by individual persons during the public participation part of a Council or committee meeting are not the opinions or statements of Derbyshire Dales District Council. These comments are made by individuals who have exercised the provisions of the Council’s Constitution to address a specific meeting. The Council therefore accepts no liability for any defamatory remarks that are made during a meeting that are replicated on this document.”

Council – Extraordinary Meeting

27th July 2021

Item 5 – GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Ms Linda Pelc, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“Dear Sirs,

Re: Extraordinary Council meeting 27/07/2021 Agenda item 5 - Gypsies and Travellers

I write to you to strongly object to the use of the land adjacent to the Agricultural Business Centre in Bakewell as a temporary traveller site.

Within 150m of the site there are 16 dwellings, many housing elderly and infirm people. There is a footpath crossing the site which used to be regularly used by dog walkers and there is an adjacent footpath in regular use by local people and visitors walking to the Monsal trail. The closeness of the site to the paths, the shouting, the loud music, car horns and hammering on the metal fence is intimidating especially to children, the elderly and the freedom of local people is being restricted.

The site is within the Peak District National Park.

The site has already been occupied since 20/06/2021 by one family (three caravans) with additional caravans present intermittently. As I write this tonight a fourth caravan with another family has arrived. The main gate to the site is unlocked this evening.

This leads me to ask these questions: (summarised)

- 1 When was planning permission obtained to use the area as a caravan site and at which council meeting was the area authorised as a temporary traveller site; If it was not authorised then how did the travellers gain access?
- 2 You say you have a duty of care to the travellers, but what duty of care do you have to local residents, towns people and local businesses, What happens when local people want to use the land for Bakewell events or when the ABC wants the land for overflow parking and Why was there no consultation with the town council or local residents

- 3 What provision are you making for when the site floods, why were concrete blocks placed in front of the secondary access gates and who is collating evidence of damage and disruption to the area, people and environment so that the site can be monitored?

Re: Recommendations in the report "Gypsies and Travellers"

Item 4: I disagree that the Agricultural Business Centre, Bakewell is a suitable site for a "negotiated stopping place" since it is in a residential area of Bakewell.

If it becomes council policy to offer this site then can we expect a review and reduction of council tax commensurate with our living next to a caravan site?

Re: Background document (part of report "Gypsies and Travellers")

Item 3.3: There should be a maximum time limit on the use of the negotiated stopping places (2 years?) to prevent this scheme carrying on for perpetuity and to ensure provision of a permanent site is expedited.

Item 3.4: It is useless specifying an 8-week maximum period without giving a term in which it applies. I would suggest a maximum of 8 weeks in any calendar year for ANY travellers to be on that site. It would minimise anxieties and uncertainties if the 8-week period was designated in advance and residents informed.

Item 3.5: The Agricultural Business Centre, Bakewell has previously been used as a "temporary" traveller site and you state that it has been "previously managed successfully". What was successful about the fires, damage, abuse, intimidation, rubbish, crime, noise, disruption to the market and the cost of the court order to evict?"

REPSONSE

- 1. At the present time there is no planning permission to use this site as a caravan site. However, because the Council owes a homelessness duty to the family group currently on site but has not identified a site to which they can be directed, it currently has no power to move them to a site that might be considered more suitable than where they are currently located. It is not known how the group obtained access to the site.**
- 2. One of the purposes of this report is to identify a number of sites that might be suitable for occupation for limited periods of time, whilst a permanent site is found and made ready. The recommendations of the report would allow for the family to be moved from one of these sites to another, thereby ensuring that the land does not become unavailable to others in the long term.**
- 3. If the site was subject to flooding it would be possible to move the caravans from the land to another of the identified sites. Concrete blocks were moved to the Coombs Road gates to prevent any further incursion and blocks were moved on the access road to allow for the construction of fencing. The site is visited at least twice weekly by Council officers who amongst other things collate any information about any damage to the site.**

QUESTIONS AND STATEMENT from Mr Richard Barraclough, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“Dear sirs,

I understand there will be an extraordinary meeting on the 27th July to discuss the current situation regarding the currently illegal Travellers encampment on the Bakewell Showground.

I am sure the council will recall the events of 2020 when we had around 40 caravans arrive in Bakewell will the inevitable antisocial behaviour, abusive behaviours to residents, poaching, illegal destruction of wild bird nests on the river (all witnessed by myself). To date I have not seen any costs declared by the council for cleaning up the mess left behind by this. Sure the council cannot be considering making the ABC centre a LEGALISED site after such events. At the time we were assured by Sarah Dines that action was being taken to resolve the permanent site.

Q1. Please can the council explain what has been done over the last 12 months to secure this permanent site?

With regard to the current encampment, I would like the Council to confirm exactly how the travellers have gained access to the Showground. All access points to the site have been secured by concrete blocks - their purpose to solely prevent access by Travellers. Yet the one gate, not protected has been breached. I have witnessed the Travellers using a key to lock and unlock the padlock on the said gate.

I have spoken with the Police, who have advised that the Council have GIVEN the travellers a key to the padlock and granted them access.

Q2. Has the Council granted the travellers access to the Bakewell Showground Please can the Council confirm the view of this Third Party and whether they are aware their land is occupied by Travellers?

The areas of land currently occupied by the Travellers does not belong to the Showground. It has been cordoned off and I understand is owned by another third party.

In terms of the councils duty to provide these travellers with a site, it seems somewhat undemocratic that the wishes of the residents of Bakewell are being totally ignored by the council. It is my understanding that the Peak District National Park does not have any legal obligation to provide temporary sites for travellers.

Q3. Please can the council confirm the reason why they do not feel the views and wishes of the constituents matter (i.e. those currently paying Council tax)

Finally, I would welcome a view from the council regarding the following, how does the Council propose to deal with the loss of value of properties along Coombes Road as a direct result of their negligent actions. Will the Travellers have the rules of common decency imposed upon them? Despite Council Payers funding toilets, I have on numerous occasions witnessed them urinating in the field, in open view of the public.

Will the Travellers be instructed to control the noise emanating from their encampment? This is a public nuisance. This issue has created much angst and frustration in the town and it is time for the Council to start telling the truth. If it is incapable of resolving this issue, or representing the wishes of its constituents it needs to admit to it without hiding.

I will be watching and look forward to hearing the outcome.”

REPSONSE

- 1. The first part of the report explains the work that has been done to progress the potential permanent site previously identified by Council.**
- 2. The Council has not granted access to the land currently occupied by the Traveller family. The owners of the land have been notified of the encampment and have not as yet come back to the Council with any comments.**
- 3. The Council believes that the views of its constituents do matter. The report suggests a way in which the current encampments of the Travellers to whom the Council owes a homelessness duty may be managed to reduce the time period for which an encampment would be sited in one place.**

QUESTIONs AND STATEMENT and QUESTION from Ms Jackie Starbuck, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“Dear Sirs,

Please be aware that this email will be circulated amongst my neighbours and any reply will also be circulated amongst my neighbours.

I am extremely hopeful that we have misread your intentions and that what is currently being considered is not the back door way of gaining a legal temporary or permanent traveller encampment site on a public showground in a residential area.

I am under the belief that the DDDC has leased the parcel of land in front of our houses and provided the travellers with keys to gain access, without any planning permissions, thereby fueling the belief that this area is seen as a resolution to the traveller problem you have.

I would be grateful for written confirmation if any of this is not the case.

RE: Item 5

I write in objection to the proposal of travellers location - Agricultural Business Centre Bakewell.

We have rights too you know!

Here are my comments/questions:

The traveller location - Agricultural Business Centre Bakewell.

The current location of the travellers who have been in situ for the last 5 weeks is not acceptable by any stretch of the imagination. DDDC have located the travellers right in front of our houses on the Bakewell Showground. The other proposed sites mentioned in the report in our neighbouring towns are either rural or car parks, not residential.

There has been no consultation or agreement with residents to allow DDDC to put the site so close to our properties.

I cannot understand why this is even a consideration after the experiences suffered by residents, during the 6 months before the travellers were evicted, last year. The memories are still too raw. Now to bring them back, right under our noses is a disgraceful lack of respect and total disregard for the residents. Last year we were subjected to fires, abuse, swearing, fighting, rubbish piles, constant horn beeping early hours of the morning, and urination in public. My 80 year mother was subjected to one of them dropping his trousers and urinating right in front of her, yards from where we live.

For the last 5 weeks we have once again been subjected to a fire on the showground, 6 more vans turning up, shouting, screaming, swearing, horn beeping, (last Sunday was the worst, shouting all day and into the evening) waste and mess.

We work and have worked very hard to be able to live where we live and currently our houses are unsaleable due to the location of the travellers site, would you pay up to 1 million for a house within yards of a travellers site? Consider the value of the properties you are messing with and consider the circa 50-60,000 council tax revenue you are currently getting from the houses you are messing with within 200 yards of this site.

Last year caused a lot of stress and mental anguish to a lot of people who have given their time and lives to Bakewell either in business or service.

We have rights too you know!

Security

What protection do we or our properties get from your security budget? what about vulnerable people and property? Last year neither the fire service or police were interested. Attached 3 images of what we were subjected to yards from our houses.

Visibility

The visibility of the current site will, in no doubt, attract other travellers. Please don't say it won't or they cannot get access, last year hedgerows were broken through and damaged, gates lifted and concrete blocks moved to one side.

Knabhall Lane

My only comment re: Knabhall Lane after reading though all of the traveller living requirements, research work, permissions, utilities needed, looking after the badgers and cost, would be that it is unlikely to happen this century if at all!!!

Stopping Places

Comment - Absolutely pointless.

If we were given a chance, yes us the taxpaying residents, to be fair to Matlock, Tansley, Rowsley, Ashbourne, Wirksworth to only have the travellers in situ for 8 weeks a year, work with the other sites, in a controlled time limited rotation, with no risk of other travellers joining the site, and they were moved more away from our houses into the showground where there is space, it could be very slightly workable.

BUT BECAUSE

the DDDC has no permanent site

the DDDC has no temporary site

the DDDC has no negotiated stopping place

the DDDC has extremely limited ability to control the location

the DDDC officers cannot redirect them

the DDDC will be directing all homeless families our way! How many homeless families are there?

the DDDC recommend 8 week stay, with consideration to health and welfare of the travellers and can stay in situ at will ? - what about the health and welfare of residents, when is this taken into consideration?

the DDDC has no control over the length of stay or where the travellers choose to reside or who suffers as a result.

the DDDC officer consultation of movement is agreed between themselves, when is the residents consultation to take place?

WE HAVE TO SUFFER WITH THE CONSEQUENCES AND UNDOUBTABLY THERE WILL BE

POINTLESS, there is no authorised control and the travellers could just stay where they are for how ever long they wish. Another DDDC disregard for residents.

In no way was last years encampment on the ABC managed successfully - or if you consider, as mentioned above, residents suffering from abuse, swearing, fires, devaluation of property, mental anguish, security issues, etc etc, as successful, I dread to think what an unsuccessfully managed encampment would be.

Vulnerable Car Parks

More attention is being paid to 'vulnerable car parks' than people, what about vulnerable people, people who are retired and in some cases ill who reside within yards of the site? What about their vulnerability?

Budgets

I can see there is not enough money to resolve this issue in the immediate future, this could take years - oh and it has done already. Someone needs to remember where

the money is coming from and who is picking up the tab for all of this! The taxpaying residents!

The DDDC is truly out of order, to even consider this site so close to our homes after being the victims of the events of 2020.

We have rights too you know!"

RESPONSE:

Derbyshire Dales District Council has not located the encampment on this site, the Travellers moved there of their own accord without the prior knowledge of the Council. However, as the group is owed a homelessness duty by the Council and because no alternative sites have been identified, the Council is not able to evict the group. The report suggests a way whereby a number of sites may be used to site the 2 groups, thereby minimising any nuisance experienced by any one community.

QUESTION from Mr Alex Lane, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"Derbyshire has many disused quarry sites, can't these be used?"

RESPONSE:

Derbyshire Dales District Council does not own disused quarry sites and therefore has no ability to use these sites.

STATEMENT from Bill Storey, Bakewell Local Resident

As a long-time resident of Bakewell, I object most strongly at the proposal for a stop off site for Travellers, in Bakewell.

*The proposed site is not owned by DDDC
AND is in a National Park.*

The land is on the flood plain and any development would increase the risk of flooding in Bakewell and down river residences.

This would be the thin end of the wedge. Allow this and the next step would be a permanent site.

The filth and rubbish left on previous occasions is unacceptable.

The threats to shop owners by some travellers, are totally unacceptable.

The lack of a Police presence in Bakewell has raised the level of fear for many residents already. This will make their lives more miserable.

The present traveller family have been offered housing which they refused. They should not now be classed as homeless. It is of their doing, their choice.

It's about time DDDC stood up for residents rather than give in to travellers. This decision will not be forgotten by the electorate of Bakewell for a long time.

STATEMENT from Carole Dean, Town Clerk, Ashbourne Town Council

Ashbourne Town Council object to Fishpond Meadow being used as a traveller site; temporary or otherwise. Trade in the Town has suffered immensely during the Covid pandemic and a travellers site so close to the Town Centre will certainly have a negative impact on visitors, tourists, local people shopping in the Town, and traders. The close proximity to the residential areas of Lakeside and Shaw Croft flats will have a detrimental impact on the residents, many of whom are elderly or vulnerable.

The area needs to be opened up for its original intended use, which is a car park. Ashbourne is already in desperate need of the additional parking that Fishpond Meadow provides, particularly during the summer season. Ashbourne Town Council are concerned about the ongoing costs associated with the maintenance and continual clean-up of the areas inhabited by travellers. The cost of a temporary traveller site will no doubt be paid for by the residents of the Town.

Ashbourne Town Council respectfully ask DDDC to consider the loss of revenue they will suffer from the car park not being used for parking, the cost of the clean-up, the visual impact of the site, the loss of the recreational amenity of the Fishpond itself, the surrounding playing fields and footpaths along with the inevitable loss of trade on an already struggling Town. The area is also unsafe at the moment for public and travellers alike, with areas already fenced off for safety.

STATEMENT from John Rowe, Town Clerk/Responsible Financial Officer, Bakewell Town Council

I have been instructed to write to you to strongly object to the proposal to establish or a temporary traveller site in within the Peak District National Park at Bakewell.

Views received include the following:

- *“Object to the proposal to legitimise any type of temporary site within Derbyshire Dales and especially in Bakewell Parish which is in a National Park”*
- *“Members have been approached by residents who do not want the creation of the temporary site in this town ever.”*
- *“It should not even be considered as an option.”*
- *“Wouldn't want a 'temporary' site on the [Agricultural Business Centre/] Showground and thought that this location had been dropped from the sites available.*
- *“This family have been offered several houses to live in and have declined them all. To keep calling them homeless is wrong, and just plays into their hands. It's about time the DDDC gave them an ultimatum. Accept what's offered or leave.”*
- *“Ask anyone and they'll say they don't want gypsies/travellers setting up camp on their doorstep.*

Unfortunately legislation requires DDDC to make provision for them. It is encouraging to read that the permanent site at Tansley is making progress which should provide a solution.

As I understand it, the big problem is that the law intended to provide for genuine gypsies is being swamped by 'travellers' climbing on to the bandwagon. That lifestyle is not compatible with modern society and legislation should not encourage it - as it does at present - by granting special rights. This is a national problem that parliament needs to address.

Yes we want to oppose the use of the ABC as a negotiated stopping place, but I can understand the DDDC officers' position. What we need reassurance that if it is agreed, that any use of that land will be short-lived and for but a few vans."

I would be grateful if the foregoing could be drawn to the attention of the meeting.

STATEMENT from Mr Mark Pickford, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"Dear Sirs

Whilst I fully accept that everyone has to be somewhere, the proposed site in Bakewell is completely unacceptable. The recent history of encampments in the town has been a travesty putting residents and businesses at risk. The lack of any additional police to meet the influx was very frightening.

The town is in the Peak District National Park, therefore encampments are illegal whilst it has been made quite clear by your representative that the policies of PDNP are held in low regard I believe that you are legally bound by them.

To be in breach of your lease, overnight parking is a breach of your own regulations to wilfully allow environmental laws to be broken (business cannot burn trade waste), unsociable behaviour to be tolerated, yet uphold complaints made by the travellers puts you in a very poor light.

The residents and businesses of Bakewell have been generally very tolerant and polite as this situation was supposed to have been dealt with.

I believe that the electorate will show their contempt at the inefficiency of the council and the officers of the DDDC need bringing to account."

STATEMENT from Mrs Lynda King, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"If the site on the ABC in Bakewell is allowed it should be moved onto the car park near the river on the left of Agriculture Way, not on the showground/meadows where the 3 caravans are currently situated.

This site on the car park is away from residential properties and the travellers access would be on Agricultural Way. Not coming down Coombs Road.

As a resident of Coombs Road, in Bakewell, in 2020, when forty or so travellers broke down fences on Coombs Road, to access the meadows, causing criminal damage and where they stayed for months, we had to endure their aggressive and threatening

behaviour, speeding vans on a residential road and all the noise and mess associated with the travellers.

This site should be temporary for a period of eight weeks, when they should be moved onto another negotiated site until the permanent site at Tansley is ready.

My understanding of the Gypsy/Traveller community is their way of life is moving from area to area so how they can describe themselves as homeless is baffling, their caravan surely is their home. My worry is that once these sites are negotiated that will become the status quo, as I believe they don't want a permanent site."

STATEMENT from Mrs Debra Evans, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"Dear Sir, I wish to register my objection to the proposal to make the ABC centre a stop over site for travellers - I pay my council tax for services that you provide to me - I object in the strongest terms to my money being used to finance people who do not contribute in any fashion. The proposed site is not owned by DDDC AND is in a National Park.

The land is on the flood plain and any development would increase the risk of flooding in Bakewell and down river residences.

This would be the thin end of the wedge. Allow this and the next step would be a permanent site.

The filth and rubbish left on previous occasions is unacceptable.

The threats to shop owners by some travellers, are totally unacceptable.

The lack of a Police presence in Bakewell has raised the level of fear for many residents already. This will make their lives more miserable.

The present traveller family have been offered housing which they refused. They should not now be classed as homeless. It is of their doing, their choice.

It's about time DDDC stood up for residents rather than give in to travellers. This decision will not be forgotten by the electorate of Bakewell for a long time.

STATEMENT from Mr Hugh Wright, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"Please note that planning policies as enacted by Derbyshire Dales District Council are not applicable to be considered by the Peak District National Park Authority. Hence, any potential travellers sites, whether permanent or temporary, considered inside the national park boundary will be considered ultra vires by the National Park Authority for DDDC exceeding its powers."

STATEMENT from Ms Vicky Hewitt-Smith, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident and secretary for FORRG (Friends of Rutland Recreation Ground)

"I am writing to strongly object to the DDDC proposal to establish a temporary negotiated stopping place on the Agricultural Business Centre, Bakewell, for the following reasons.

For many years the Gypsy and Traveller community have used this site and/or surrounding fields to set up camp illegally.

Once in town, members from these communities have created many problems for residents, shop keepers and the local environment.

Anti-social behaviour is common, children in particular are rude and unruly. Some individuals have been aggressive and confrontational. One of my neighbours was spat at!

There have been incidents in town with intimidating behaviour towards shop workers and customers alike and an increase in thefts, from bikes to the illegal poaching of fish from the river Wye.

Dogs are often tethered and left to bark incessantly, not to mention laundry strung up between trees, open fires and a regular build-up of refuse which is not only an eyesore but no doubt attracting local wildlife. This general disregard of the wider community and the local environment is both unpleasant and disrespectful.

The recent and significant investment to prevent further illegal access has been made a mockery of with criminal damage inflicted to gain access, with no consequence from the police or Council authorities.

There is no evidence to suggest that by the granting of the ABC, Bakewell as a temporary negotiated stopping place, that the afore mentioned incidents and behaviours will improve. In fact, it is more likely that we will see increased numbers of Gypsy and Traveller families arriving and therefore a proportionate increase in these issues and a growing friction between Travellers and local residents.

Aside from the negative impact on local residents, the encampment is visible from Rutland Recreation Ground where many visitors share their sympathies and comment on what an eyesore the site is. Over the long term it is feasible that the ongoing presence of travellers will have an adverse effect on the reputation of the town, its charm and the reasons why people visit Bakewell. This in turn puts pressure on the townspeople, local business owners, the tourist industry and ultimately the local economy.

Similarly, would you want to purchase a property next to/near to a gypsy site? Surely you can recognise the potential impact on the local housing market?

Furthermore, unlike residents, Travellers camping illegally do not contribute to the local authority by means of Council Tax and therefore unfairly benefit from local services and resources, effectively being paid for by those who do contribute i.e. residents.

- Realistically, how would an authorised site be policed, managed, controlled any differently than it is today?
- What would be the costs of effectively managing the site?
- Who will monitor the number of weeks stay and the validity of family connections?
- How will extraordinary circumstances, used to extend a stay beyond the suggested 8 week limit be verified?
- What would happen when a family refuse to be directed to another site?
- How does legalising a site prevent any future and protracted legal proceedings that are both costly and funded from the public purse?
- How is temporary being defined e.g is this for a specific period of elapsed time and if so what period has been proposed?
- How do DDDC propose to ensure that 'temporary' would not become permanent?
- Is a regular review period being considered to manage any potential extension to the temporary period?
- How will an authorised temporary negotiated stopping place change the behaviours of the traveller community, as described above?

The idea that the ABC site has previously been managed successfully as a Traveller site is ludicrous. Police have failed to attend and/or take appropriate action when in attendance and ongoing complaints to DDDC have fallen on deaf ears.

It is also astonishing that nominated personnel within the Council who have no first hand experience of living with Gypsies and Travellers on their doorstep, are being tasked with identifying sites for negotiated stopping places. In the case of Bakewell, it would seem that the ABC has made the list based on the continued illegal use of the site and an inability to control the stem of Travellers, rather than the suitability of the site or recognising the genuine concerns and impact on the people of Bakewell.

The weight on the Committee to find a solution is not unrecognised however, I would be grateful if the afore mentioned representation could be drawn to the attention of the meeting.”

On behalf of FORRG

I am the secretary for FORRG (Friends of Rutland Recreation Ground) and I represent over 100 members who have instructed me to register our objections to a Traveller site being authorised in the Peak District National Park.

STATEMENT from Mr Nicholas Branch, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“Once again we find that travellers have found their way onto the showground.

It should be of note that had the Bakewell Show been on, then this would create significant difficulty for the Show organisation. This area is a tourist hotspot, for parking access to the town and a hub of activities annually outside of the remit of the Show. Therefore this is not and should never be a site of permanence for the travelling community. I appreciate that a site is currently being prepared elsewhere, yet as you will be aware more travellers are likely to arrive in the future. In conclusion the measures taken to protect the Showground are not sufficient and will require further consideration, planning and cost to prevent such activity in the future.”

STATEMENT from Mr Robert Merriman and Mrs Linda Merriman, Derbyshire Dales Local Residents

“Having read the background paper to inform discussion of item 5 on the agenda for the extraordinary committee meeting of the 27.07.21 we would like to raise the following issues;

- The paper commences with reference to ‘a homeless family with connections to the local area’ and on initial reading the paper implies that the ‘establishment of a negotiated stopping place’ on Bakewell Show Ground is solely for this family. However, having established such sites it is unclear how access to these sites would be restricted to this one family. It is apparent that the Council are well aware of this as by item 3.2 and 3.3 the term family has been changed to ‘homeless families’. It, therefore, appears that the Council are wishing to establish permanent ‘negotiated stopping places’ for any homeless family to address the problem of having no permanent traveller site within its borders.
- We object strongly to the establishment of such a site on Bakewell Showground on the following grounds;- the site is far too close to residential dwellings, the noise pollution in particular foul language, relentless shouting, dog barking and generator noise is unacceptable (primarily because the site is too close to local houses). There is a footpath that runs straight through the site – local residents and visitors are prevented from using the footpath due to the erection of metal fencing around the site. In addition any person attempting to walk on the footpath through the site would be subject to the ongoing abuse and shouting an issue that the Council is all too familiar with. We wonder whether the Council is within its rights to prevent access to a local footpath?
- An internet search of ‘negotiated stopping places’ reveals that the relatively few local authorities with such sites have very clear guidance as to management arrangements for such sites. For example, Northumbria (www.northumbria.gov.uk/housing - 27th May 2021) states that such sites should be more than 200 metres away from local housing. The proposed site at Bakewell is a road width away from the nearest houses. In addition there is a footpath (in frequent daily use by walkers) right through the proposed site. It would appear that the Council have complete disregard for local residents albeit other councils in their management plans clearly state ‘equal consideration will be given to the rights of travellers and the settled community’ and have instigated minimum distances for such sites from local houses
- Northumbria and Leeds councils have a ruling regarding ‘keeping noise pollution from persons, animals and generators to a minimum’ at their ‘negotiated stopping place’. If this requirement is not observed the council have

the right to evict the travellers. The Council is well aware, from previous experiences of travellers on Bakewell Showground, that this has been an ongoing issue, local residents and visitors to our town are subjected to relentless shouting and swearing, barking dog and noise from generators. The fact that the site the Council chooses to place the travellers on the Showground is so near to local residents and people walking through the showground is the cause of this.

- In Leeds (gypsy-traveller.org 2018) the length of stay at a 'negotiated stopping place' cannot be for longer than 28 days. Why has the Council chosen to make the length of stay at the proposed sites 8 weeks and which could be considerably longer if there are health and other issues? The residents of the Bakewell are well aware of the impact of this due to the very lengthy previous stay by travellers on the showground site."

STATEMENT from Mr Nick Murphy and Mrs Suzanne Murphy, Derbyshire Dales Local Residents

"We strongly disagree with any decision to allow travellers to stay in Bakewell.

One time when they came last autumn, for just one night, our garage was broken into (from over the river) and £6,000 worth of bikes were stolen. They left early the next morning.

Previously, in the summer, the children noisily waded down the river several times, playing around directly in front of our garden, and on one occasion (that we know of) entered our garden and were peering in our garage windows.

Co-incidence? Maybe. But there seems to be a lot of "co-incidences" in town when they are here.

When the 25/30 caravans were here last summer the Agricultural Way was almost a no-go area to walk as it felt quite threatening. They raced horse & carts up and down the streets and they also left it in a disgusting state when they were eventually moved on.

If they are allowed "temporary" residence for up to 8 weeks I do not believe they will leave. Or if they leave they'll be straight back again for another 8 weeks, or different ones will move in. Who will count who's been here for 8 weeks?

Once a site is established it will become a magnet for other travellers and that will lead to a very different image of Bakewell, which I am sure nobody wants."

STATEMENT from Ms Ali Payne, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"It has been brought to my attention that there is a proposal to allow gypsies and travellers to stay on Bakewell Showground for 8 weeks prior to a proposed site being ready in Tansley.

From previous experience the gypsies and travellers cause damage to gates, they urinate and defecate the local area and also leave mountains of rubbish.

Bakewell is a place of beauty that will be detrimentally affected by any agreement to inhabit gypsies and travellers. I therefore do not agree that this should be allowed and wish to register my opposition to this proposal.”

STATEMENT from Mr Mark Payne, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“I am aware that it’s being discussed to make Bakewell show ground a temporary site for travellers

I must wholeheartedly object to this, Bakewell is not suitable for this type of community which seems to use anywhere for a toilet and leave lots of mess for others to pay to be removed

I also know they do work for vulnerable elderly residents ripped them off and butchering trees to which if I did I’d be fined by the Peak Park

I feel a more suitable site needs to be found outside the beautiful Peak Park and not in the heart of the jewel of the Peaks”

STATEMENT from Mr Alan Nowill, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“I would like to object to the proposal that the Agricultural Business Centre, Bakewell be used as a "Negotiated Stopping Place" for the above mentioned community.

Item 3.5 of your report states "The list below has been compiled from officers' knowledge of District Council owned sites where encampments comprising of homeless families have been successfully managed". To my knowledge there was no management by the Council, there was a rise in crime rates in Bakewell, the whole ABC was covered in litter, fire debris, broken glass and worst of all human excreta all over the ditches, footpaths and walkways. There were drunken travellers in various pubs in Bakewell. By allowing these "homeless" people to camp in the ABC the whole area was made a "no go area" too dangerous to walk through or go near. They also poached fish out of the river using lures. Could I also point out that these people are not homeless but choose to live in a mobile home.

I also think that there should be no "Negotiated Stopping Place" in the Peak Park.”

STATEMENT from Mr John Brocklehurst, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“Just get rid of these noisy abusive people from a highly rated area and give more consideration to those who are paying you their hard earned money annually.

Are you within Peak Park Planning rules to make the above area a holding area for these people? I don’t think so.

Why has money from rate payers been used on barriers, fencing, and concrete blocks to deter these people only to have an official come and open the gates to let them in, it beggars belief!!

I understand the travellers website or whatever they use refers to DDDC as a soft touch, I like many other rate payers have our views on the people who we hand over our hard earned money to annually.

A good idea might be to sell my house and present myself at DDDC with caravan as homeless, no rates I will even be provided with a toilet and waste bin.

Not that you will interested but today Sunday the shouting and radio commenced at 5-45am or that's when I was woken up, and as continued all day, 4-25pm an argument is going on mostly with words which aren't in the dictionary, knowing how our council officials seem to think led by Paul Wilson that it has entertainment value, all I say is come and live next to it, minds may be changed and something done about it."

STATEMENT from Ms Jean Slater, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

"What is the legal definition of a "traveller"?????"

It is totally unacceptable to place and KNOWINGLY allow the so called group of "travellers" situated on the Showground at the junction with Coombs Road.

What is the Legal definition of "A Traveller"?

On what legal grounds are this group of people regarded outside the Legal system?

Are non "travellers" allowed to park on non-planning permission land within the Peak park. Are Travellers allowed to decide which land they opt to park on? If so WHY?????

What financial contribution do they pay to the facilities and amenities of the local communities?

Is it a legal status and if so how do they prove such? What paperwork have they to demonstrate this fact as a legal status? If they are allowed to park on that ground within the boundaries of Bakewell they Must abide by the laws both of the Land AND all the local by-laws too. If as has happened again in the last 2 weeks they are found to display Anti-social behaviour they should be arrested and charged as every other citizen would be. Having been found Guilty they should be permanently banned from returning to that site. Why has that not happened? Why are you allowing them to be exempt from the laws of the land?

I presume that as there are many so called Travellers parked in the large car park in Matlock we are unable to pay cash for our parking ticket I wonder why??? It is not hard to find a MOST unacceptable answer. They stay for free, we must and do pay for our time. Why is this? This situation is just the tip of the problem.

What would the DDDC response be if WE withheld our rates etc? How would you justify that situation?

WE heartily endorse ALL the points so clearly made by Mrs Jackie Starbuck. We shall demand full and legal answers to all her very important points made. At the previous meeting you avoided making any decision or even allowed any TIME for a

democratic discussion to resolve this most important question Why?? Are you not capable of making a clear and democratic decision??? If you had NO aim to openly discuss the point included on the published agenda of "Travellers" why was it placed on the agenda?? Did you EVER think that time would allow a meaningful discussion and expression of public opinion to take place?

Chairmen are there to structure the meetings so allot time for open discussion on every item on the submitted agenda. When Time allotted used, the Chair then calls for a legal decision to be placed for a democratic vote and if passed that decision must be acted upon in an acceptable timeframe so the wishes of the PAYING local population are carried out. Will this EVER be achieved???? Do you even wish to reflect the wishes of the local population in your action, what prevents you from achieving that?

It would appear that so called Travellers can and do operate OUTSIDE the law. How can that be???????

STATEMENT from Vicki Raynes, Chair Tansley Parish Council

"Tansley Parish Council OBJECT strongly to the proposal of DDDC to spend £25k of tax payers money on assessments of Enclosure Award Land at Knabhall Lane Tansley.

This land was originally gifted to the people of Tansley for the quarrying of road stone, after which the land was used as a village tip.

The land which is subject to a legal dispute, was transferred through the generations to Derbyshire County Council as the council responsible for highways, DDDC have yet to provide evidential proof that the land was legally transferred to them by DCC.

It is highly likely that the land is contaminated and unstable because of previous uses, we therefore consider the land unsuitable for human habitation.

The Constitution of DDDC states that any new project brought before the Council should have a financial assessment. We are not aware your Constitution has been changed to enable this Council to make new decisions without adhering to the Constitution? To ignore the legality of your own Constitution gives little credibility or confidence in the integrity of this Council.

Please can Officers' inform us all of the total cost of this proposed project, to include road widening, provision of fresh water, disposal of sewage, provision of power, cost of building works and rental expectation from the residents.

We are also informed that guarantees have been given to the Travellers that the access roads to Knabhall Lane will be gritted during the winter months to ensure safe access for welfare support.

Bearing in mind DCC only grit primary routes, have DCC given this assurance? Or has this 'promise' been made by the Local Authority?

Either way, ALL homes in Tansley will be expecting the same treatment, which will reassure many of our residents, who in snowy weather are unable to access the main primary routes.

Additional sites have been put forward in the recent 'call for sites' two sites put forward by TPC are close to primary routes have hard standing and services, both are vacant.

It would appear that the choice of Knabhall was purely political, a choice by majority councillors who are prepared to put travellers anywhere other than their own back yard. With no thought to the social welfare of the travelling family, and their apparent medical needs, to even consider 'housing' anyone on a contaminated tip, on a remote lane without services of any kind beggars' belief.

The lack of a financial assessment – and the apparent lack of concern related to cost, is worrying for the tax payer.

DDDC obviously are not providing value for money for its residents, as no comparisons related to cost of this proposal are available to the public.”

STATEMENT from Ms Angela Gregson, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“I would like to register my strong objection to the proposal that the Agricultural Business Centre land in Bakewell be recognised as a designated temporary stopping place for gypsies and travellers. The family that have been on this site - illegally as I understand- for the last five weeks are creating considerable problems for local residents. The anti-social behaviour and noise levels are unacceptable and should not be tolerated. This site is clearly unsuitable as a potential traveller site and the considerable efforts that were made to evict them and the other traveller groups a year ago seems to have been in vain. Designating this site as a temporary stopping place will generate a great deal of opposition and ill feeling from local residents. The council seem prepared to go to any lengths to condone the travellers at the expense of law abiding, tax paying local residents and it is time the council took account of local residents views. Thank you, Angela Gregson.”

STATEMENT from Ms Moira Locke, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“Having spent many hours helping to clear the river banks of disgusting rubbish left by travellers last year including used nappies. I am horrified that the showground area is again being used by travellers. I understand we have to make land available to them but surely not prime riverbank and Bakewell centre. Having been caravaners ourselves, we had to book and pay for sites in advance of travelling. Why do these travellers not do the same? They cannot be allowed to just take whatever they want and turn our beautiful park and town to squalor. I had some sympathy with them early last year with COVID restrictions, but they took advantage and abused us. Can a farmer's field not be used and charges for services like refuse collection and sanitary services be paid by them as the rest of us have to do.”

STATEMENT from Mr Mike Pindar, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“Dear Sirs

Further to the forthcoming debate, is that the provision of additional traveller sites is largely unwanted by the majority of the community.

Besides the anecdotal evidence, of which it is not hard to find, it cannot be ignored that often crime and anti-social behaviour increases when travelling communities arrive. However unpalatable this is, I understand it to be a statistical and recorded fact.

How do people defend themselves from a community that largely distances itself from the police preferring to sort disputes in its own ways. Policing is hardly reassuring in terms of easy access, availability and presence; particularly during the night!

The premise that these people are homeless is not surely in accord with the spirit of a law that was passed to help genuine homeless people. It is a life style from a tradition that like others now gone, at odds with a changed world and the organisation of mainstream society. In days of old with horse drawn caravans settled on the wide verges of sleepy lanes, and in their limited numbers and interaction with the locals undertaking country practices it was a sustainable way of life. Today with Lorries, plant, industrial waste, modern service requirements it is unrealistic to expect local people to put up with the inconvenience and imposition of large travelling groups living outside of the community requirements the rest of us have to live within. Subsidising this way of life against in a modern environment is unsustainable and surely it is not unreasonable for people who are hard pressed to sustain mainstream community services to be unhappy at providing the funds many travellers being wealthier than those struggling to pay their community rates. It is widely known that many of those travelling actually have homes in Ireland or other parts of the UK

It all very well for highly principal led people living safe in their urban enclaves to pronounce worthily on the needs of travellers but it is ordinary folk who take the strain and they should be listened to.

The council is I realise between ‘a rock and a hard place’ over this but for the sake of the community generally I think it should not be bounced into giving in to these demands and listen to the people at large.”

STATEMENT from Ms Paula Hunt, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

“It has been brought to my attention that there is a proposal to allow gypsies & travellers to stay on Bakewell Showground for 8 weeks prior to going to the proposed site being ready in Tansley.

Last year the gypsies were on the showground much longer than eight weeks, and it took a long time to move them on.

They cause damage to gates, without being prosecuted, they urinate in the field, even with a toilet provided and leave lots of rubbish behind.

The people that live down Coombs Road pay the highest rates of Council Tax and it must be very disheartening for them to look at all this mess. Bakewell is meant to be a place of beauty, but if they are allowed to stay for any length of time, the area will look like the slums. I therefore do not agree that this should be allowed.”

STATEMENT from Mr Richard Chaplin and Mrs Mary Chaplin, Derbyshire Dales Local Residents

We live in Wyebank Grove opposite the Showground in Bakewell and have 350 metres of river frontage onto the River Wye. There are seven houses in Wyebank/Wyebank Grove that adjoin the river. Bar one all the houses are occupied by people over the age of 70 years.

It is proposed that the land opposite which is leased from the Guiton Family Trust by DDDC becomes an approved temporary site for the Group of Travellers, known as REDACTED. Also the application says that it might well be for longer than 8 weeks 'with respect to issues such as health and welfare'.

This family has a very long history of encamping on the lands in this area. I understand they have been offered housing but have declined therefore they cannot be considered homeless. It is appreciated that they are recognised as a separate ethnic group but the only way they can live their lifestyle is by owning a piece of land themselves - it is not reasonable for them to expect other groups to fund their life style.

This family occupied adjoining land for many, many months before and during Covid. The Judge allowed them to stay as the senior member of family was ill. He subsequently died and they were evicted. In light of the above statement regarding 'welfare' it could well mean that they could be reside here for many months as they have an elderly relative in the family and could well use that lady as a bargaining tool. They ignored all the lockdown rules by regularly leaving the site, having guests and did not practise social distancing between them and their guests. They have no respect for the rules by which everyone else lives.

The matter to be discussed is to agree if the area might become one of seven tolerated sites for them. This is unacceptable for the following reasons:

1. The site is located in the Peak District National Park and it is their policy not to have recognised Travellers sites in the Park. It would need planning permission for it to be even a temporary site.
2. The area is used for parking on Market Days by farmers but then there would be nowhere else for them to park as the Car Parks on the Show Ground have restricting head bars.
3. The REDACTED have REDACTED who lives with them who REDACTED who has REDACTED. REDACTED shouts and swears most of the time sometimes starting at first light and going onto sunset and on occasions REDACTED for a wire cage to be erected to REDACTED. A loud radio is also played which can be heard in our houses. When REDACTED enters the local Co-Op store (our only supermarket in the town) people move away from the aisle in fear from the aisle where REDACTED

is standing. Bakewell has 60% of its population over 60 years of age. There have also been incidents when the REDACTED have gone into stores and demanded free food and the shop keepers are scared to report them as they are told if they do 'their shop will trashed'.

4. The site at Tansley was suggested at a Council Meeting over two years ago it would seem no progress has been to evaluate if this is suitable for them to reside on either temporarily or permanently. Why has it taken so long?

5. The Bakewell Show Ground runs many events - dog shows, horse events, athletics, cycling, farm animal events, charity runs and so on. Surely it is unreasonable for people participating or watching such events to have to be adjacent to Travellers who choose to live in a different way than the rest of society. They are provided with toilet and showers at the our expense but often prefer to use the land for excretion rather than the toilets. They have no respect in relation to rubbish which they just throw on to the surrounding areas.

6. All the recent prosecutions for illegal fishing along the river have been against Travellers! This area of the River Wye is internationally known as one of the best fishing rivers for trout and grayling. They also bring their cars/vans to the river to wash them polluting the river. Not even the River Bailiff is permitted to enter the river for fear of pollution. In the past they have dumped tree branches in the river from their work. On one occasion a crane had to be used to remove the branches.

7. It is wrong in a democratic society for Officers to be given the power to decide where the Travellers should live. If it is decided to go ahead an elected member from each of the areas should be involved in the decisions.

STATEMENT from Mr Andrew Howard, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

I strongly object to the use of the ABC for itinerants.

They have used that location for years on short time stops, and have always brought problems, rubbish etc etc.

Why pander to them?

We have to pay our taxes, and rates, and car tax, and for the car parking, and to use the toilets, and we have to take our rubbish home or be prosecuted.

I know by law they must have a site, but if they do have one designated, it must be made clear that they will have to stay on that site and they will not be tolerated anywhere else, including fishpond, ABC etc.

No I do not support this.

STATEMENT from Ms Patricia Lunn, Derbyshire Dales Local Resident

I would be obliged if the following comments were drawn to the attention of the Council.

The proposal to designate land at Coombs Road, Bakewell, (known as The 20 Acre/Showground), not in the ownership of DDDC but subject to an agreement with the owner for use as additional parking facility when the livestock market is in operation

is totally unacceptable. It is pasture/grazing land. Any change of use would surely be subject to planning approval. To designate the site as a temporary, tolerated one, for gypsies/travellers for any period is totally unacceptable. Temporary can become permanent.

I accept the Council has a major problem on its hands being in contravention of its statutory duties. It must find a solution elsewhere other than Bakewell whose residents have had enough. It is rumoured that the homeless family have over the years been offered accommodation which they have declined. Surely that should be the end of your duty towards them.

For over a decade there have been illegal encampments, by the current homeless family, it's extended family and others, on land between Coombs Road and the River Wye, access obtained via Meadan Bridge from the A6 causing nuisance to residents of properties surrounding the area, damage to site and leaving considerable amounts of litter. Encampment on the car parking area adjoining the Old Show Office also contravened the lease and planning consent for the car park.

During 2000 gypsies/travellers occupied a large portion of that land area for several months. They broke through the boundary hedge on Coombs Road and an adjoining gateway to provide access onto and off the site for living vans and vehicles. The internal roadway was used as a race track and they moved trailers and vehicles across the site at will. That internal roadway leads on the stock field adjoining my property and another gate onto Coombs Road which they broke through to provide access for living vans. Having lived in my property for over 50 years I suddenly felt insecure and vulnerable, having 4 living trailers in less than 100 yards from the back of my property and constant movement around it.

STATEMENT from Mr John Rowe, Bakewell Town Clerk

I have been instructed to write to you to strongly object to the proposal to establish or a temporary traveller site in within the Peak District National Park at Bakewell.

Views received include the following:

- “Object to the proposal to legitimise any type of temporary site within Derbyshire Dales and especially in Bakewell Parish which is in a National Park”
- “Members have been approached by residents who do not want the creation of the temporary site in this town ever.”
- “It should not even be considered as an option.”
- “Wouldn't want a 'temporary' site on the [Agricultural Business Centre/] Showground and thought that this location had been dropped from the sites available.
- “This family have been offered several houses to live in and have declined them all. To keep calling them homeless is wrong, and just plays into their hands.

It's about time the DDDC gave them an ultimatum. Accept what's offered or leave.”

•“Ask anyone and they'll say they don't want gypsies/travellers setting up camp on their doorstep.

Unfortunately legislation requires DDDC to make provision for them.

It is encouraging to read that the permanent site at Tansley is making progress which should provide a solution.

As I understand it, the big problem is that the law intended to provide for genuine gypsies is being swamped by 'travellers' climbing on to the bandwagon. That lifestyle is not compatible with modern society and legislation should not encourage it - as it does at present - by granting special rights. This is a national problem that parliament needs to address.

Yes we want to oppose the use of the ABC as a negotiated stopping place, but I can understand the DDDC officers' position. What we need reassurance that if it is agreed, that any use of that land will be short-lived and for but a few vans.”

STATEMENT from Mrs Kirstin Sykes and Mr I Sykes, Derbyshire Dales Local Residents

We are local residents and are aware that the issue of Traveller Encampments has been a continuing problem for a number of years. Whilst we accept the Council has a legal duty of care to assist these families, they also have a duty of care to the local, tax paying residents, and to protect the local area. This, unfortunately, appears to be lacking as you have identified a number of key local sites as potential stopping places.

Please note our objection to the proposed 'negotiated stopping places' identified by the Council, most specifically the Agricultural Business Centre, Bakewell.

Our objection is based on the following:-

1. By creating a legitimate stopping place for the travellers, you will be issuing an open invite for many more travellers to stay by attaching themselves to the so called 'homeless family'.
2. If the ABC became a designated stopping place, I would imagine costs (to the tax payer) would be associated with developing the site, plus a considerable cost of 'clean up' after their 8 week stay.
3. The lack of any police presence in Bakewell means that any potential anti-social behaviour or crime associated with the encampment could go unchecked.
4. It is highly unlikely that the Traveller families will happily move on after 8 weeks, this will lead to further expensive court action and their stay will undoubtedly be much longer.
5. 2 officers from the Corporate Leadership Team should not be making decisions that have a massive impact on local residents – they have not been elected to do this.

6. The proposed site is on a flood plain, development of this site will risk further flood issues for local residents who have already suffered due to the lack of maintenance of the river and its banks.
7. This site is a significant pedestrian Gateway in to our town. It is the first point of contact for many tourists & visitors arriving in Bakewell. Their arrival point will now be a Traveller Encampment, they are unlikely to be impressed with their welcome. You will see a decline in tourists visiting the area if you choose to build stopping places in key gateway areas of the Peak District. Our local economy has suffered already, this will cause a further decline in visitor footfall and therefore local income and investment.

Overall, please consider your Duty of Care to your tax paying residents. You have allowed this situation to continue over the years by being reactive rather than proactive and it just gets worse. This proposal is one step closer to a permanent site and we are astounded that the Council are even considering this. Please listen to your voters, this is not an appropriate solution.

STATEMENT from Mrs Jo Wildgoose, Derbyshire Dales Local Residents

I wish to strongly register my objection to Rowsley old station car park being used as a temporary traveller site or a 'negotiated stopping place' as per item 5 in the agenda for the meeting on 27th July. This site has not been 'negotiated' with anyone.

The travellers leave a horrendous mess, exhibit anti-social behaviour, pollute the river Derwent and openly defecate on the cycle track. They cause problems for the businesses on Station Close and cause parking problems for the said businesses.

The planning has now lapsed on the car park for any traveller to be there, the family which used the site have previously rejected the site, and use of the site has not been 'negotiated' with anyone.

I feel 'slipping' this in on the agenda is very underhand by DDDC, all publications for this meeting are weighted heavily to make people believe this meeting is only to discuss the waste issue currently being faced locally.

I look forward to your comments

STATEMENT from Dr Siobhan Spencer, Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group

If you could add to further comments I made from last meeting would be grateful

It is very urgent that a site comes to fruition as quickly possible due to deteriorating health needs, it is extremely urgent that electricity and water are now provided