



**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL**

This meeting will be recorded and the sound recording subsequently made available via the Council's website: [charnwood.gov.uk/pages/committees](http://charnwood.gov.uk/pages/committees)

Please also note that under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 that other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting. The use of any images or sound recordings is not under the Council's control.

To: Councillors Ward (Chair), Boldrin, Forrest, Howe, Needham and Parton (For attention)

All other members of the Council  
(For information)

You are requested to attend the meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel to be held in Virtual Meeting - Zoom on Wednesday, 2nd February 2022 at 6.00 pm for the following business.

Chief Executive

Southfields  
Loughborough

25th January 2022

**AGENDA**

1. APOLOGIES
2. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY AND PERSONAL INTERESTS
3. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP
4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING 3 - 8  
To approve the minutes of the previous meeting.
5. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

6. LOCAL AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED TO BE LEADERS IN WASTE MANAGEMENT

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document, to investigate other local authorities considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood, taking into account demographics.

Presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

7. NEW RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY AND METHODS THAT COULD HELP IMPROVE RECYCLING RATES 9 - 11

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document, to investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve recycling rates.

Proposals/suggestions from members of the Panel attached for discussion.

8. FURTHER PANEL MEETINGS AND KEY TASK PLANNING 12 - 15

To schedule the key tasks in the scrutiny scope document to be considered at the next meeting of the Panel and to consider any work members of the Panel will undertake in advance of that meeting.

The scrutiny scope document, updated following the last Panel meeting, is attached.

To include a verbal update on the invitation to Jane Hunt, MP to attend a meeting of the Panel.

Further scheduled meetings of the Panel are as follows (at 6.00pm):

15th March 2022

26th April 2022 (final meeting to agree Panel's recommendations and report)

## WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL 9TH NOVEMBER 2021

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)

Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe, Needham and Parton

Councillor Harper-Davies (Cabinet Lead Member for Community Support and Equalities)

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces  
Democratic Services Officer (EB)  
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: None

The Chair stated that the meeting would be livestreamed and recorded and the recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

1. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY AND PERSONAL INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

2. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

3. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

*Councillor Needham arrived at the meeting at 6.09pm.*

4. SCRUTINY SCOPE DOCUMENT

Considered and discussed, the scrutiny scope document for the Panel, agreed by Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 11th October 2021 and updated to list Panel membership and meeting dates.

Matters suggested to look at/list on the scrutiny scope document were confirmed as matters for the County Council decision as waste disposal authority (provision of recycling and household waste sites, use of incinerator). These were excluded from scrutiny by the Panel, but this did not preclude making representations to other bodies. Confirmed that parties worked together, illustrated by forthcoming draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy. Whether the Council's fleet would be

suitable given the changes proposed by Environment Bill was appropriate for consideration under item 7 in the agenda.

## **AGREED**

1. Scrutiny scope document be noted;
2. Panel to consider forthcoming draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy at a later meeting. This included modelling of performance/carbon impact of different recycling arrangements/options and would be useful to Panel's scrutiny.

## 5. COUNCIL'S WASTE AND RECYCLING DATA AND COMPARISONS

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, a breakdown and analysis of the Council's waste and recycling data, benchmarked against similar local authorities, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Noted, downward trend in percentage recycled, particularly in 2016, reason not known, could be affected by change in regulations/categories.
- (ii) Increase in Charnwood garden waste charge over time had not adversely affected subscriber numbers.
- (iii) Current 50% recycling target set by EU Waste Directive in 2009. New Environment Bill proposed 65% (by 2035).
- (iv) Composition of waste important. Reference to significant effect of garden waste on percentage recycled.
- (v) Noted, peak performance in percentage recycled in 2011/12 for all authorities listed, reason not known. Reference to dry summers affecting garden waste tonnage. Some fluctuations could be due to factors not within Council's control.
- (vi) Noted, percentage recycled excluding garden waste, NWLDC significantly lower, only authority listed that did not have co-mingled collection (separation/sorting by residents required). Concern that the latter system being proposed in Environment Bill.
- (vii) Noted, gradual decline waste sent for composting since 2016/17. Difficult to know whether that had been impacted by any increase in home composting. NWLDC performed best, only authority listed with free of charge garden waste service.
- (viii) Noted, Charnwood collected most tonnage residual waste due to being biggest district and uptick of 10% due to Covid, but residual waste per household comparatively low in Charnwood, positive.
- (ix) Noted, comparatively, Charnwood recycling rates reasonably good, concern that 65% proposed by Environment Bill would be difficult to achieve.

## **AGREED**

The presentation and discussion be noted.

6. ENVIRONMENT BILL - WASTE MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS AND CHANGES REQUIRED

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, the proposals in Environment Bill regarding waste management and changes this would necessitate, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

In advance of the meeting, members of the Panel had been asked to read: DEFRA – Consultation on Consistency in Household and Business Recycling in England May 2021 (included at item 7 on the agenda).

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Noted, likely to have considerable impact, including in respect of costs.
- (ii) Noted, problem of over-consumption increasing, importance of establishing a more circular economy, better that was done, less new raw materials needed.
- (iii) Reference to Council being in the middle, between manufacturers/Government and waste disposal authority (County Council). Limited impact Charnwood as waste collection authority could have. Unable to decide type of packaging being produced or disposal facilities. Noted, this Council could have influence, work to play its part, ensure residents had opportunity to manage waste in a responsible way.
- (iv) Noted, effect of waste and how it was managed on carbon emissions.
- (v) Noted, Environment Bill included proposals to encourage packaging that was easier to recycle, Extended Producer Responsibility, to be explained later in presentation.
- (vi) Difficult to find out how much recycled material was being used in packaging.
- (vii) Waste hierarchy outlined, better to prevent waste or reuse items than to recycle, including in respect of carbon footprint. Recovery of, for example, energy from waste better than disposal. Noted, around 70% Leicestershire's residual waste incinerated for energy/heat recovery. No revenue to Charnwood from that, cost to County Council.
- (viii) Noted, Environment Bill expectation/legal obligation was improved recycling rates despite the ideal being prevention or reuse of items first, difficult for waste collection authority. Better to consider how much waste a household produced than how much was being recycled? View that correct to consider prevention and reuse of items, even if that adversely affected recycling rates.
- (ix) Currently, Charnwood recycling at around 43%, step change would be needed to achieve 65% proposed in Environment Bill. Significant change had been affected in the past, had started with one bin that all waste went in.
- (x) Proposed Deposit Return Scheme and likely issues for Council outlined. Hopefully assist people in understanding value of packaging. Understood that promised burden funding from Government would not cover loss of revenue from receiving less materials via household waste collection. Noted, this was more a risk for the County Council. View that proposal was good idea, despite likely impact on Charnwood's recycling rates, better that recycled than not.
- (xi) Proposed Extended Producer Responsibility outlined, "polluter pays". Levy for hard to recycle items. Noted, most of recycling collected was packaging, could be significant source of income to Council, offset increased costs anticipated

from other elements of Bill. Not much detail yet on how payments would be decided/made, possibly based on what collected and its composition. Confirmed that Council already recorded this information via sample checks. Unclear how what manufacturers were producing would be recorded.

- (xii) How much recyclable material was within the residual waste was known, although not monitored as frequently/not required by DEFRA. Done every few years, wagon of residual waste examined, was cost involved. Results of last exercise (about 2 years ago) could be shared with Panel. Better prevention of that could assist recycling rates. Noted that residual waste, 30-40% by weight was food, did get small amount of recyclable materials, garden waste, nappies. Concern that charging for garden waste meant it ended up in residual waste, this was not the case based on analysis of its composition.
- (xiii) Noted, Environmental Bill did not support co-mingled collection of recyclables, rather sorting/separation by residents. Reason, prevention of fragments of glass causing problem for paper mills. Exemption would be possible (TEEP). View that proposal was more complicated for residents and would result in lower recycling rates, however considered that materials would be cleaner/better quality. Considerable debate on issue. Better to address paper mill issue than change way 100s local authorities collected recycling in a significantly more resource efficient way (co-mingled). Re: burden funding, understood that would be for food waste/garden waste, not this proposal, so Council likely to have to meet cost of new receptacles, vehicles, training. Concern that cost would be considerable, must be case for economic exemption. Noted, significant waste likely in form of existing bins that may no longer be fit for purpose. Concern that harder system was, less likely that residents would do. Twin stream option easier than multi stream.
- (xiv) Re: when Bill would be effective, some elements would require secondary legislation, contact with DEFRA had suggested 2023/24 originally, anticipated may get pushed back to 2025, but that was an assumption/not certain. Considerable work needed to introduce.
- (xv) Re: core set of recyclables that would need to be collected, Council already collected all of those. Positive, but did mean the task to increase recycling was more difficult. Some scope if materials were added to collection, those would be counted in recycling performance, for example textiles, batteries, small electricals, specialist items such as toothbrushes. Noted, worth considering potential to do this.
- (xvi) Proposed weekly separate collection of food waste outlined. Already stated, 30-40% of residual waste. Considerable cost for the Council, both revenue and capital estimated in presentation. Burden funding would apply, but unclear if in full and ongoing. Concern that proposal might legitimise food waste when progress had been made in people considering the matter more. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces' previous experience with food waste collection suggested the opposite, that seeing food waste separately increased awareness and resulted in action to reduce it. Important that any food waste collection was accompanied by information campaign, principal aim should be to prevent. Concern that food waste might be transported some distance for processing.
- (xvii) Re: whether residual waste collection could be reduced if 30-40% food waste was collected separately and those resources transferred, may not be an option, achieving all of that 30-40% in the food waste collection rather than residual

would be difficult and number of households not static. Food waste collection would required separate/new fleet.

- (xviii) Reference to NWLDC food waste collection trial, taken to plant in Warwickshire. Were capacity issues in respect of anaerobic digestion facilities. Re: transport distances, local transfer stations may be needed. Government wanted food waste collection due to methane it generated in landfill, but waste in Leicestershire mostly incinerated.
- (xix) Confirmed, Charnwood had responded to consultation on Bill proposals, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces happy to share those responses with the Panel. Many questions had required yes/no answers, but concern expressed regarding costs and inability of Council to fund if Government didn't fully cover costs long-term.
- (xx) Proposed free of charge garden waste collection outlined. Substantial loss of income given Council currently charged. Government had indicated contribution to costs, but not for loss of income, adverse effect on those already providing. Re: concern that county councils already in difficult funding position for higher priority services such as adult social care, clarified that for food and garden waste proposals, costs would be to collection authority, disposal authorities likely cost saving as disposal of residual waste most expensive and should be less of this. Financial benefit to recycling more, but this would not be shared by collection authorities. Question as to whether the Government understood the financial position of local authorities? Likely costs to Council of implementing proposals was a significant concern. The Cabinet Lead Member for Community Support and Equalities advised that Jane Hunt MP for Loughborough was a member of a Government Waste Management Panel, it might be useful to raise the concern on this with her. It was understood that representations to MP had been made, also reiterated that Council had made its views known. Reference to forthright response of LGA on the matter.
- (xxi) Discussion regarding use of sanctions, encouragement, information to improve recycling rates, whether evidence of effectiveness elsewhere. Noted, Fixed Penalty Notices no longer available to Council, increasing awareness, effective communication, incentives such as competitions were options, could be cost effective, particularly social media. Council did refuse to collect bin if aware contaminated. Noted, important to explore this, not sure residents always aware of all the items that could be recycled via co-mingled collection, for example various soft plastics. Important to communicate a positive message. Related to key task for Panel, "identifying barriers and ways to overcome them".

## **AGREED**

1. The presentation and discussion be noted.
2. The Council's responses to the consultation on the Environment Bill be sent to members of the Panel.
3. Further to (xii) above, results of the most recent examination of a wagon of residual waste be sent to members of the Panel.

4. Further to (xx) above, Jane Hunt MP for Loughborough be invited to attend a meeting of the Panel to discuss the concerns regarding the Environment Bill outlined above, particularly the cost implications for the Council.

7. FURTHER PANEL MEETINGS AND KEY TASK PLANNING

Considered and discussed, the key tasks in the scrutiny scope document to be considered at the next meeting of the Panel and any work members of the Panel would undertake in advance of that meeting.

**AGREED**

1. Key tasks to be considered at next Panel meeting on 14th December 2021:

*“Investigate other local authorities that are considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood Borough Council, taking into account demographics” – via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.*

*“Investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve our recycling rates” – via investigation by members of the Panel prior to the meeting, the Chair would provide guidance on what was required in this respect.*

2. A visit by members of the Panel to the Casepak Materials Recycling Facility be arranged as soon as possible.
3. Draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy be scheduled for consideration at Panel’s meeting on 2nd February 2022 – via presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.
4. Further scheduled meetings of the Panel, as set out on the agenda, be noted.

NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.

## WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL – 2ND FEBRUARY 2022

### ITEM 7 NEW RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY AND METHODS THAT COULD HELP IMPROVE RECYCLING RATES

#### **Key Task – Investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve recycling rates.**

At its first meeting on 9th November 2021, the Panel agreed that the above would be via investigation by members of the Panel prior to this meeting.

Therefore, members of the Panel were asked to identify something they had seen that could help improve recycling rates. This could be, for example, an App, an article, a facility, device or product, a publicity campaign, or a practice. A brief explanation of the suggestion and the source was requested.

Suggestions have been submitted as follows:

(i) Cllr Howe – Nappies

“We all know disposable nappies cause a great deal of recyclable waste to be rejected. Apparently, Keep Britain Tidy has launched a new campaign and Leicestershire County Council is one of the participants. Bearing in mind LCC recycle our waste we need to engage with them and take part in this campaign:

[www.keepbritaintidy.org/news/new-campaign-development-prevent-recycling-contamination-nappies](http://www.keepbritaintidy.org/news/new-campaign-development-prevent-recycling-contamination-nappies)”.

(ii) Cllr Howe – Visible Display of Waste Items and What Bin They Go In

“I thought you might be interested in this photo I took the other week which shows waste bins with transparent boxes on top showing what goes into each waste bin. Maybe we could do the same with wheely bins?”



(iii) Cllr Howe – Publicity

“Charnwood already carry out a great deal of publicity for example I received an email only this week about it. But it is one area that we can make a difference especially with children who seem very keen on this type of thing”.

(iv) Cllr Ward – Scrap Stores/Library of Things

“This is something I’d like us to look into – Scrap Stores. I was discussing it with Matt yesterday, who also suggested looking into a ‘Library of Things’. I’ve been thinking about starting a Scrap Store in Loughborough for a while, and even went to visit one in Nottingham, which has sadly since had to shut down. This one in Derby has been running for nearly 30 years, so they must have a successful model. I’d quite like to go over and have a look round and a chat with them! I did say to Matt is it worth talking to Sofa on Nottingham Rd about using some of their upstairs space to house it?”

[derbyplayandrecyclingcentre.org](http://derbyplayandrecyclingcentre.org)  
[reusefuluk.org](http://reusefuluk.org)  
[libraryofthings.co.uk](http://libraryofthings.co.uk)”.

(v) Cllr Ward – Items Not Collected in Household Recycling

“I also think we need to make it easier for people to find out what to do with things that can’t go in the household recycling, by publicising things like this:

[recycleyourelectricals.org.uk/electrical-recycling-near-me/](http://recycleyourelectricals.org.uk/electrical-recycling-near-me/)

And places like this, where you can pick up cheap nearly new paint (but we also need somewhere nearby in Charnwood for people to donate paint – the nearest one is Whetstone):

[exaireo.co.uk/](http://exaireo.co.uk/)

I’d also like us to look into establishing a recycling point for more difficult to recycle items that Terracycle will take, like crisp packets, toothbrushes, etc.

[terracycle.com/en-GB/](http://terracycle.com/en-GB/)

I also think we should be supporting Transitions to start up their Repair Cafes again in earnest.

[lesswaste.org.uk/events/transition-loughborough-repair-cafe/](http://lesswaste.org.uk/events/transition-loughborough-repair-cafe/)”.

(vi) Cllr Boldrin – Package Free Shops

“Councils should promote/back/highlight package free shops that sell products that are compostable, recyclable and reusable”.

(vii) Cllr Boldrin – Olio App

“The Olio app links neighbours and also the public to businesses so that people can advertise unwanted or un-needed food for others to pick up and use either for free or at reduced prices. It also enables people to advertise unwanted kitchen utensils”.

(viii) Cllr Boldrin – Food Waste Recycling

“There is likely to be a large increase in food waste should free food waste collection be implemented in the Environment White Paper. China successfully uses Blue Soldier fly larvae to recycle organic waste. 2.5 lbs of fly larva can consume 5 lbs of food waste in 4 hours. They can then be used to feed fish, chicken and other animal feed so it’s a win win and can be found on: [citizensustainable.com/](http://citizensustainable.com/) along with other useful suggestions”.

(ix) Cllr Boldrin – Publicity and Suggestions from Public

“We need buy in from the public so councils should agree a way of publicising some if not all of the suggestions above and ask the public to submit suggestions or approaches that they have found, and these should be included in newsletters/publicity/websites with due recognition for those submitting ideas”.

(Note: Cllr Boldrin states that not all above suitable at Borough level, therefore strategic approach should be adopted by councils, also that duplication of work needs to be avoided).

(x) Cllr Parton – Education/Publicity re: Recycling

Focused education/publicity in respect of recycling requirements, particularly in student areas.



<b>REVIEW TITLE: WASTE MANAGEMENT AND RECYCLING REVIEW</b>
<b>SCOPE OF ITEM / TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>
To provide the Council with the technical information and necessary evidence base to aid future decision making on the waste management strategy.
<b>REASON FOR SCRUTINY</b>
<p>Charnwood Borough Council’s recycling rates have been below the 50% target set by the Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament for some time now. The Panel will seek to identify why this is the case and make suggestions on how to improve the recycling rate in the Borough.</p> <p>Recycling waste contamination is approx. 12%. The Panel will seek to identify how the Borough can reduce this level and educate its residents.</p> <p>Waste minimisation is vital for future generations. The Panel will look at educational initiatives and the activities of organisations set up with the aim to reduce waste.</p> <p>The Environment Bill is likely to significantly impact our service delivery. The Panel will seek to explore what this means in practice.</p> <p>To provide public reassurance that scrutiny is looking at the matter in light of Climate Change.</p>
<b>MEMBERSHIP OF THE PANEL</b>
<p>Chair – Councillor Ward                  Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe, Needham and Parton</p>
<b>WHAT WILL BE INCLUDED</b>
<p>To identify waste prevention strategies, maximise waste as a resource, and recover usable materials, balancing this with exploring ways to improve our recycling rates.</p> <p>To look at how the Environment Bill will impact our waste management and make some proposals for appropriate changes to our service in light of this if necessary.</p>
<b>WHAT WILL BE EXCLUDED</b>

Areas of waste management that Charnwood Borough Council are not responsible for or have influence over. However, this will not preclude the Panel making representations to other bodies.

**KEY TASKS** \* including consideration of efficiency savings

- ~~Breakdown and analysis of our own waste and recycling data. Benchmark against other similar authorities. Completed 09 Nov 2021.~~
- Identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them.
- Investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve our recycling rates. *Scheduled 14 Dec 2021.*
- ~~Overview of proposals of Environment Bill regarding waste management. Look at what changes this will necessitate. Completed 09 Nov 2021.~~
- Research waste prevention activities and organisations both within the Borough and elsewhere that are committed to waste reduction
- Investigate other local authorities that are considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood Borough Council, taking into account demographics. *Scheduled 14 Dec 2021.*
- Visit recycling and processing plants (e.g. Casepak). *Visit to Casepak to be arranged asap.*
- **Added 09 Nov 2021** Draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy. *Scheduled 02 Feb 2022..*

**STAKEHOLDERS, OUTSIDE AGENCIES, OTHER ORGANISATIONS \***

Matt Bradford, Head of Service; Cllr. Leigh-Harper Davies, Lead Member for Community Support and Equalities; Cllr Rollings, Lead Member for Transformation; SERCO; LCC, Loughborough University; Climate Action Leicester & Leicestershire; Transitions Loughborough; Residents Groups, Leicestershire & Rutland Reuse Network, LetsRecycle.com, Tenant Groups and Resident Associations.

**EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

To be considered at the Panel's penultimate meeting

**LINKS/OVERLAPS TO OTHER REVIEWS**

n/a

**RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS**

Officer time including Head of Service and Democratic Services Team.

**REPORT REQUIREMENTS (Officer information)**

Report and recommendations to Scrutiny Commission

**REVIEW COMMENCEMENT DATE**

**COMPLETION DATE FOR DRAFT REPORT**

April 2022

\* Key tasks and stakeholders may be subject to change as the review progresses.

## PROGRESS OF PANEL WORK

MEETING DATE	PROGRESS TO DATE
09 November 2021, 6pm	<p>Key Tasks Completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breakdown and analysis of our own waste and recycling data. Benchmark against other similar authorities.</li> <li>• Overview of proposals of Environment Bill regarding waste management. Look at what changes this will necessitate.</li> </ul> <p>Actions Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visit by Panel members to the Casepak Materials Recycling Facility be arranged as soon as possible (Key Task).</li> <li>• Jane Hunt MP for Loughborough be invited to attend a meeting of the Panel to discuss concerns regarding the Environment Bill, particularly the cost implications for the Council.</li> <li>• Council's responses to the consultation on the Environment Bill to be sent to members of the Panel.</li> <li>• Results of the most recent examination of a wagon of residual waste to be sent to members of the Panel (composition).</li> </ul>
14 December 2021, 6pm	<p>Key Tasks Scheduled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigate other local authorities that are considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood Borough Council, taking into account demographics – <i>via presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.</i></li> <li>• Investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve our recycling rates - <i>via investigation by members of the Panel prior to the meeting, the Chair to provide guidance on what was required in this respect.</i></li> </ul>
02 February 2022, 6pm	<p>Scheduled (task added to scope):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy – <i>via presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.</i></li> </ul>
15 March 2022, 6pm	<p>Penultimate meeting should consider Equality Implications.</p>
26 April 2022, 6pm	<p>Proposed final meeting, to agree Panel's report.</p>
<p>NOTES:</p> <p>To facilitate witness attendance, it is anticipated that times of the meetings will be a mix of daytime and early evening.</p> <p>Panel meetings can be run online apart from the final meeting where recommendations are agreed</p>	

upon.

**REPORT SUBMITTED TO SCRUTINY COMMISSION**