Scrutiny Areas of Focus following Call In request relating to Waste Disposal Contract - Household Waste Recycling Centre Efficiency Savings – Decision published 16 August 2024

Following consideration of the call in request form, the following areas have been validated as the focus of the call in review meeting.

Decision making principle	Area of focus
1.Consultation	The decision notice states that there has been consultation with the provider of the service however no consultation has been carried out, prior to the decision, with ward councillors or residents on closure or any other option. No engagement has been carried out with users of the Nab Lane site to ascertain whether they could or would travel to the Weaving Lane site. The cabinet report refers to consultation on the Waste Strategy. Whilst this strategy directs the work on the overarching waste contract, there is no mention of any engagement or consultation on the closure of a HWRC site and therefore the strategy consultation cannot be seen as being appropriate for closing a site. The strategy itself does not indicate closure of a site. The WRAP guidance (2018) gives a list of what to do if considering closing a site – which it indicates should be a last resort. The list includes obtaining support from council members early in the process, communication with residents and council members is listed as vital and discussions with stakeholders regarding the available options (WRAP, 2018, p.93). As there has been no consultation with residents/users of the Nab Lane facility as to options then no consultation/engagement has been undertaken. In fact, ward councillors had to learn about the proposed decision from sources external to the council. List supporting evidence:
	https://www.wrap.ngo/sites/default/files/2021-02/HWRC_Guidance_2018_4.pdf https://democracy.kirklees.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?Id=12181
2. Openness	The Budget papers give savings in the current and next financial years for a review of HWRC opening times. There is no reference in the budget papers that this review would include closure of a site (budget line 24EC9). At a scrutiny meeting, subsequent to the Budget Council, a cabinet report was discussed at which there was verbal reference to the review and one site closure mentioned but no detail given as to which site. At the April cabinet meeting the proposal to close one site was not mentioned in the information read out about the report nor was it mentioned in the cabinet report. The April cabinet paper refers to HWRC capital pipeline projects of c£27m that are not currently in the capital plan but would be kept under review, it was recommended to keep the HWRCs under the waste contract but did not mention that the number would be reduced. However, the relevant recommendation that has been used for this decision is:

	"Approval is also sought for a future delegated officer decision to progress with any potential further efficiency opportunities, such as HWRC and MRF operations, and the Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (NRIL) replacement of the Weaving Lane HWRC." In the delegated authority recommendation, there was no mention of closure of a HWRC site or which site that would be. Neither was this mentioned in the detail of the cabinet report. Therefore, there was a lack of public openness when the decision was being made to delegate authority as to what efficiencies were part of the consideration. There was also a lack of public openness in relation to the budget papers and what the review was involving. Therefore, the decision notice is the first public information from the Council in respect of the closure of Nab Lane site. List of supporting evidence: https://democracy.kirklees.gov.uk/documents/s56076/Budget%20Motion%202024.pdf
3. Options	The WRAP guidance is referenced in the decision notice in relation to accessibility and it is recognised that the site needs to be made more accessible for users and an assessment carried out as to whether this would improve use. The decision notice states that there is no statutory guidance for level of provision and drive time however there is guidance. The WRAP document also provides standards for minimum levels of provision with a catchment radii of 3 miles in urban areas and 7 miles in rural (WRAP, 2018, p.13). A specific example of Leeds having at the time of publication a 20-minute drive time standard is given. There is also a maximum throughput for a site given in the guidance however because there is no public information on what the options are and what the data indicates, the resulting throughput for the Weaving Lane site is not known. The drive time standard that the WRAP recommends is not assessed in the decision information as to whether this can be met from all parts of North Kirklees. There are also population recommendations for HWRC sites, and the population of North Kirklees is greater than the recommendation for at least one site. Whilst reasons for decision have been given, the options considered have not been laid out nor has the reason for not following the guidance in relation to drive time been explained. List supporting evidence: https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/information-and-data/area-and-ward-profiles.aspx