

EXECUTIVE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON

THURSDAY, 2 SEPTEMBER 2021

Councillors Present: Steve Ardagh-Walter, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Hilary Cole, Lynne Doherty, Ross Mackinnon, Richard Somner and Howard Woollaston

Also Present: Kofi Adu-Gyamfi (Waste Manager), Melanie Booth (Group Executive (Lib Dems)), Melanie Ellis (Chief Accountant), Susan Halliwell (Executive Director - Place), Joseph Holmes (Executive Director - Resources), Andy Sharp (Executive Director (People)), Jake Thurman (Group Executive (Cons)), Councillor Adrian Abbs, Councillor Phil Barnett, Councillor Jeff Brooks, Stephen Chard (Democratic Services Manager), Councillor Jeremy Cottam, Councillor Carlyne Culver, Councillor Lee Dillon, Councillor Owen Jeffery, Jack Karimi (Democratic Services Officer), Councillor Royce Longton, Councillor Alan Macro, Councillor Steve Masters, Councillor Erik Pattenden, Shiraz Sheikh (Service Lead - Legal and Democratic), Councillor Jo Stewart and Councillor Tony Vickers

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor David Marsh

PART I

21. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2021 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Leader.

22. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

23. Public Questions

A full transcription of the public and Member question and answer sessions are available from the following link: [Transcription of Q&As](#).

- (a) A question standing in the name of Mr Nigel Foot on the subject of activities made available for young people in Newbury was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Children, Young People and Education.
- (b) A question standing in the name of Mr Ian Hall on the subject of the funding allocated for construction and stands at Newbury Rugby Club would receive a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (c) A question standing in the name of Mr William Beard on the subject of whether the Council's procurement arrangements would be limited to companies with a published carbon reduction plan was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development.
- (d) A question standing in the name of Mr Simon Pike on the subject of the statutory duties of the Council's highway works was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (e) A question standing in the name of Mr Paul Morgan on the subject of the Council forming its own housing development company was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development.
- (f) A question standing in the name of Mr Graham Storey on the subject of the potential improvements to the format of asking questions at Council and Executive meetings was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Internal Governance, Leisure and Culture.

EXECUTIVE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

- (g) A question standing in the name of Mr Vaughan Miller on the subject of the costs of the recycling centre permit scheme and the booking system would receive a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (h) A question standing in the name of Mr John Gotelee on the subject of the treatment of empty buildings in West Berkshire Council was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development.
- (i) A question standing in the name of Mrs Sam Coppinger on the subject of traffic movements and whether these were restricted by hours of work planning restrictions was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (j) A question standing in the name of Ms Bridgette Jones on the subject of the development of a master plan for Membury Airfield Industrial Estate was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (k) A question standing in the name of Mr Nigel Foot on the subject of mental health support provided to students was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Children, Young People and Education.
- (l) A question standing in the name of Mr Ian Hall on the subject of the measuring of the water table on the existing football pitch would receive a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (m) A question standing in the name of Mr Simon Pike on the subject of the time taken to install dropped kerbs in Henwick Lane in Thatcham was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (n) A question standing in the name of Mrs Sam Coppinger on the subject of the experience and qualifications of the Council's planning officers was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (o) A question standing in the name of Ms Bridgette Jones on the subject of the development of the Membury Airfield Industrial Estate would receive a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (p) A question standing in the name of Mr Simon Pike on the subject of contractual responsibilities for the movement of utility poles needed for the completion of the pavement on Henwick Lane would receive a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (q) A question standing in the name of Mr Nigel Foot on the subject of which body was responsible for the removal of dead trees, branches and other debris that had fallen into the River Kennet would receive a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (r) A question standing in the name of Mr Simon Pike on the subject of whether the Council had a written policy or standard in place for the assessment of maintenance of pavements would receive a written response from the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.

24. Petitions

There were no petitions presented to the Executive.

25. Separate Food Waste Collection (EX4009)

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 6) which provided an update on progress made towards the introduction of free, weekly separate food waste collections from households in the district; highlighted potential opportunities, risks and issues for the project; and sought approval to enable separate food waste collections to be introduced.

Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter advised that capital funding of £900,000 had been provided to enable a separate, additional, weekly food waste collection service to be run from next year. This would enable the Council to save money as it would no longer have to pay additional costs for disposal of food waste and allow residents to dispose of food

EXECUTIVE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

waste more frequently than at present. To date, the proposal had attracted cross-party support and negotiations with Veolia were drawing to a close with a commitment for funding to purchase the necessary food waste vehicles for a proposed launch of the service in the first quarter of next year. However, the lead time estimates had increased significantly to c. 10 – 12 months for the supply of these vehicles, likely due to the high number of Councils who were planning to introduce similar services in the near future. It was hoped that approval by Executive to the proposal would maintain pressure on the supply chain to enable a launch of the service as originally intended.

A question was asked as to the benefits for residents and the Council by introducing this service. Councillor Ardagh-Walter explained that this would be an entirely new service in comparison to the previous food waste service. The previous scheme saw food waste caddies emptied by green waste vehicles but the new scheme would be run by a specific service independent of green waste services. This would enable communications, publicity and encouragement to be much more forthcoming and for the service to be run on a weekly basis, which was not the case previously.

Councillor Carolyne Culver welcomed the initiative as a positive way of dealing with food waste and asked Councillor Ardagh-Walter to pass on her thanks to Kofi Adu-Gyamfi and his colleagues for their help in answering local queries and for their work on this important initiative. Councillor Culver sought clarification on the planned consultation with the public, how the scheme would work for residents living in flats and what would happen with the organic soil improver that would be produced as a result of the initiative. Councillor Ardagh-Walter said the public consultation had happened in several parts, most recently as part of the Environmental Strategy Delivery Plan, which had achieved a high level of enthusiasm and public support. The key area of consultation and engagement would be immediately prior to launch by communicating through as many channels as possible in order to encourage uptake. With regard to residents living in flats, the detail for collection of food waste had not yet been finalised but the need to make an attractive offer to those residents had been recognised. With regard to the soil improver, the food waste would be composted at the Padworth facility and was already being sold to and used by local farmers and horticultural businesses, and there was ample capacity to increase this. Councillor Culver asked if it would be possible for residents to have access to that soil improver. Councillor Ardagh-Walter was not able to give an answer to this question but agreed it would be an attractive idea and said he would consult with the team.

Councillor Vickers said that in light of the Government considering making Councils responsible for free collection of garden waste – which would include composted food waste – was this still the case or had this consideration been replaced by the separate collection of food waste? In addition, had the issue of reduction in food waste been looked at which would rely on an improvement in communication with the public by educating residents in how to achieve this. Councillor Ardagh-Walter agreed that the Government had been pressing local authorities for free garden waste collection, an area which was still very unclear and which had seen a financial push-back at regional and national level. It was hoped that funding would be available for this to be implemented but until such time the costed service would remain in place. With regard to educating and communicating with residents, it was hoped there would be a greater coordination between local authorities, Central Government, industry and other bodies in terms of messaging around the benefits and need for reducing food waste. Councillor Lynne Doherty added that as Portfolio Holder for Communications, she was very aware of what the team were doing around campaigns being undertaken in terms of recycling and reinforcing the message of how to achieve a reduction in food waste, particularly in the lead up to COP26.

EXECUTIVE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

Councillor Adrian Abbs highlighted the risk of the delivery lead time of 10-12 months as a risk for the provision of the waste truck vehicles but also mentioned the national shortage of drivers which had an impact on the need for an additional six drivers for the proposed weekly food waste collection. This risk was reinforced by Veolia publicly stating they already had issues with availability of drivers in certain locations. For these reasons, Councillor Abbs cast doubt on the service being launched in the first quarter of next year and sought clarification on the financial impact to the Council if this indeed was the case. Councillor Ardagh-Walter said the lorry driver risk had already been noted and remained a consideration. With regard to vessel composting, Councillor Abbs sought clarification on what materials currently went in there. Councillor Ardagh-Walter said this was currently all garden waste and food waste. Councillor Abbs said that as food waste was currently allowed in green bins, and the report stated that food waste would be deposited in exactly the same place as green waste, rather than wait for food waste trucks to be purchased, why not remove the green bin charge and implement a food collection strategy along with more green waste to fill capacity and move towards carbon reduction. Councillor Ardagh-Walter said a charge needed to be made for green waste because of the financial cost to the Council of not doing so.

Councillor Macro said the report stated the IVC facility at Padworth had suitable, spare capacity but he remembered two or three years ago he had received confirmation that there were times when the amount of soil or compost being produced there was greater than the demand and was consequently being given away to farmers, and he therefore sought confirmation that this was not likely to occur again. With regard to the issue of the lack of use of green bins for food waste, Councillor Macro asked why, when the green bin charge was introduced, did the Council not encourage people to retain their green bins to be used for food waste. Lastly, Councillor Macro said he noted that vehicles and caddies would be funded by the Council but procured by Veolia and he wondered where the ownership of the vehicles and caddies would lie, for example if ownership was with Veolia but they ceased to trade, what would happen to the vehicles? Councillor Ardagh-Walter said he was unable to comment on what might or might not have occurred in the past with regard to capacity, but currently there was spare capacity at Padworth for composting material so there would be no issue when the food waste service was launched. With regard to funding and ownership, the PFI contract set up in 2005 stated that vehicles were legally owned by Veolia, a large and reputable long-standing company and therefore should Veolia cease to exist, the newly procured vehicles would consequently form a very small part of a much bigger problem for the Council. With regard to residents continuing to use green bins for food waste, Councillor Ardagh-Walter said this had very much been encouraged and many residents were currently using their green bins in this way.

Councillor Somner said he had been encouraged by the positive messages that had been received about the scheme. He had seen the scheme carried out in Reading which had largely been received positively by residents and felt the proposed scheme in West Berkshire would eliminate problems such as flies as a result of food being left out in warm weather. Councillor Somner said he was in full support of the proposed scheme and was happy to second it.

RESOLVED that approval be granted for the introduction of separate food waste collections in the district.

Other options considered: Alternative options outlined in paragraph 6.1 of the report.

26. **Revenue Financial Performance Report - Q1 of 2021/22 (EX4012)**

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 7) concerning the financial performance of the Council's revenue budgets and which provided a year-end forecast.

EXECUTIVE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

There was a predicted underspend at year end of £0.3m taking into account under and over spends across the Directorates. In the People Directorate, there was a forecast overspend of £59,000 after the use of Government Covid-19 funding and service specific risk reserves which were allocated to the Adult Social Care and Children and Families Services budget in March 2021 which recognised the increased volatility, inherent in the ASC modelling in particular, as a result of the pandemic. In the Place Directorate, additional staffing costs were forecast reflecting pressures relating to the Local Plan and ecological assessments contributing towards a forecast over spend of £0.2m.

In the Resources Directorate there was a forecast overspend of £0.4m arising from less income than expected due to a number of schools leaving the Council insurance service in favour of cheaper Risk Protection Arrangements offered by the Department for Education and also additional temporary staff costs in the Finance Service. However, Capital Financing forecast a £1m underspend due to more efficient treasury management and more judicious use of lower interest rates and short-term borrowing.

In summary, the revenue budget was forecast to be underspent by just 0.2% which reflected the continued strong and robust financial management of the Council.

Councillor Lynne Doherty said the report highlighted the difficult circumstances the Council was still in with regard to the effects of Covid-19 as well as the uncertainty of funding going forward. Councillor Doherty thanked the Finance team for their excellent work in these uncertain times which were likely to remain for the remainder of the financial year. Councillor Doherty was disappointed to note from the report that the overspend in Children and Family Services was due to partners choosing not to contribute into the Family Safeguarding Model which was felt to be rather short-sighted given the impact on children and young people in the district.

Councillor Lee Dillon raised a concern over the use of risk reserves at this stage of the financial year and queried if those risk reserves were robust or would there be a call on general reserves to top up risk reserves at Q2? Councillor Ross Mackinnon said he felt the risk reserves were robust and could be relied upon, although it was generally recognised that any forecast or model might not prove to be accurate at the end of this financial year. With regard to reserves usage, Councillor Mackinnon pointed out that Covid-19 had hugely increased the volatility into that model and this had been recognised in the budget.

Councillor Carlyne Culver referred to paragraph 4.3 of the report which noted a spend of £0.5m in the Chief Executive's Office and queried what this spending activity related to. Councillor Mackinnon said the Chief Executive's Office was an administrative and back-office function but did not have the detail for the spend and would endeavour to answer this query as soon as possible.

Councillor Erik Pattenden sought clarification on the overall loss of £100,000 caused by what looked like the Department for Education undermining the Council and offering an alternate source of insurance. Councillor Mackinnon said this was not the case but thanked Councillor Pattenden for pointing it out.

With regard to partner agencies not currently contributing to the Family Safeguarding Model, Councillor Pattenden asked whether there was a risk to that service being cut if partner agencies continued not to contribute. Councillor Dominic Boeck said it was extremely disappointing that the CCG and Thames Valley Police had not seen fit to replicate the commitment to funding this model as they had done in earlier years and which they had been encouraged to continue to do so by both Members and Officers. Nevertheless, Councillor Boeck felt there was no risk to the service and all efforts would

EXECUTIVE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

be made to continue with the service as it had become part of the culture in West Berkshire.

Councillor Adrian Abbs said the report mentioned the natural carbon reduction methods project and asked for clarification as to what this related to. Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter was unable to advise at the present time but would look into it and report back.

Councillor Alan Macro noted in the report that Long Term Services were overspent by £2.1m due to higher client numbers than modelled – 1,734 vs 1,689 – and asked whether the latter was the original model number or whether the number had been adjusted as a result of Covid-19. Councillor Jo Stewart said that as far as she was aware the figure of 1,689 was the original model number. The model was one of those conversations that appeared every quarter and took place with Finance Officers who helped to build the model along with information and expertise provided by the Adult Social Care team and Commissioning team. The model was built on known data, i.e. things that had actually happened, and then expected to predict what would happen. If the situation then changed substantially, it could appear that the model was incorrect even though it had relied on known data. The report showed the model numbers as well as a forecast line and Councillor Stewart suggested that it was the forecast line that should be worked with as that was based on actual numbers and she had asked the Finance and Adult Social Care teams to work out how the model could be tested if numbers did not appear to match what was happening in reality. Councillor Stewart said the strategy for care homes was also being looked at as there were some clients with complex needs which the Council's own care homes were unable to meet, necessitating a need to approach the external market. This review might lead to an expansion in the Council's care home provision or a change in the services provided which would involve a consultation with the public, though there was no timeframe for this currently.

Councillor Mackinnon said from a budgetary perspective of the model, it should be recognised that the volatility relating to Covid-19 had hugely increased and prudent measures had been put in place to deal with it to the Council's credit. Councillor McKinnon thought it was fair to point out that by their very nature models would never be 100% accurate and were therefore subject to regular update. Councillor Dillon suggested that in terms of the modelling review Councillor Stewart had referred to, there might be merit in benchmarking against other Councils modelling to see how accurate their modelling was compared to West Berkshire's and whether the LGA could offer any support.

RESOLVED to note:

- the year-end forecast of £0.3m under spend. The year-end forecast took account of provision that was made in reserves for specific risks at the time of budget setting. Without this provision, the forecast would be an over spend of £0.5m.
- the ongoing impact that Covid-19 would have on the 2021/22 budget as the Council saw increased demand for some services, but continued to be supported by external funding.

Other options considered: None.

27. Capital Financial Performance Report - Q1 of 2021/22 (EX4013)

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 8) which outlined the forecast outturn position for financial year 2021/22 as at Q1.

The capital programme invested in the future of the district with new schools, improved roads, an active transport infrastructure, outstanding new sports facilities and environmental projects. The projected capital investment for the year was £56.5m, a

EXECUTIVE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

forecast under spend of £3.7m. The under spend did not mean that projects had been lost but were merely delayed and the reasons for delay were project-specific. Overall, the vital capital programme remained on track to deliver outstanding new amenities and environmental improvements for all residents.

Councillor Tony Vickers asked for more detail on the re-design of the Robin Hood roundabout and the delays on the A4. Councillor Richard Somner stated that the re-design being looked at was to take further opportunity for active travel funding and to build that into the previous draft design so that the outcome would be bigger and better than was originally planned.

Councillor Erik Pattenden asked why there had been a delay with the i-College project. Councillor Dominic Boeck said it had been very difficult to reach agreement over the tenancy of the site that would now be developed. However, Councillor Lynne Doherty said, having been involved with the project for some time, she was very pleased to see that it was now progressing.

RESOLVED that the proposed reprofiling of £4.3 million of future expenditure from 2021/22 into financial year 2022/23 be approved.

Other options considered: None.

28. **Key Accountable Performance 2021/22: Quarter One (EX4000)**

The Executive considered a report (Agenda Item 9) which sought to provide assurance that the core business and Council priorities for improvement measures in the Council Strategy 2019-2023 were being managed effectively. During Q1, strategic management and Members of the Executive had identified additional outcomes to be included in the Council Strategy Delivery Plan and arrangements were being made to include them in the Q2 performance report.

The report highlighted successes and, where performance had fallen below the expected level, presented information on the remedial action taken, and the impact of that action.

Councillor Howard Woollaston said the statistics in the report showed the outstanding performance of the Council and he thanked Officers for their efforts in difficult times. Some of the previous quarter's indicators had been seriously impacted by Covid-19, including the collection of Council Tax and Business Rates as well as Ofsted inspections but these were now back to normal levels. Councillor Woollaston flagged two areas – appraisals and training – though these had measures in place to allow them to return to previous acceptable levels.

Councillor Lynne Doherty drew the Executive's attention to paragraphs 5.8, 5.9, 5.10 and 5.11 of the report which showed several awards had been made to West Berkshire Council. These were noteworthy in particular as they had been achieved over the last 18 months when it had been very difficult to continue business as usual whilst responding to a global pandemic. Councillor Doherty said it was also reassuring to see some of the positive economic indicators considering the concerns with regard to recovery following the impact of Covid-19.

Councillor Jo Stewart clarified that the provisional numbers on the dashboards on page 79 of the report were because the majority of the Adult Social Care figures had to be given final sign-off from the Department of Health and Social Care to make sure that the Council aligned internally with what was reported statutorily.

Councillor Lee Dillon noted that the average number of days to make a full decision on new housing benefit claims was 20 which was one day over the target of 19 days and the rationale was that the team was down one member of staff, the vacancy for which was

EXECUTIVE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

currently being advertised. In addition, self-isolation grants were due to end in September 2021 and recruitment would take place for an additional staff member. Councillor Dillon asked for clarification as whether it was intended therefore to recruit one or two new additional staff members and whether the need for additional resource should have been recognised earlier. Councillor Ross Mackinnon said as far as he was aware the intention was to recruit two new staff members. The Revenue and Benefits team had proved to be an invaluable resource throughout the pandemic and had been redeployed across the Council in various guises to form a rapid response team across many different services. The Government had provided financial support but unfortunately no additional staff had been provided in order to administer it. Rather than it being the case that the need for additional resource had not been recognised, it was more a case that staffing and recruitment had been a challenge and there had been an inability to bring in staff with the appropriate skills and expertise.

Councillor Alan Macro drew attention to paragraph 5.29 of the report which stated *“the Regulation 19 consultation to inform the submission of a New Local Plan for examination (Strategic Goal) in November 2022 is on track and in line with the Local Development Scheme agreed in April 2020”* and asked whether that had been updated since the Local Plan had been put on pause. Councillor Doherty said she believed the report had been published before the pause of the Local Plan so there was likely to be a change for Quarter 2.

Councillor Tony Vickers noted that paragraphs 5.13 and 5.23 referred to child protection issues for which reporting of these had understandably increased since lockdown and he asked where West Berkshire stood against their peers, whether this reflected a national pattern and what action was being taken to deal with this increase. Councillor Dominic Boeck confirmed there had been an increase in referrals and incidents to Children’s Services. Close working was being undertaken with partner agencies and Social Workers were focused on supporting those families who were at greatest risk. Councillor Boeck added that some of the issues children were facing were affected by their home circumstances but also that some of the referrals were at the extreme end of the spectrum that started with anxiety in schools. Councillor Doherty said the increase in referrals was a reflection of the national picture and issues that had been hidden over the last 18 months had now come to the surface. Councillor Boeck said that in 2020, the Council’s Psychologists had warned there was a hidden problem and subsequently the department had prepared themselves for the realisation of the concerns that were being raised.

RESOLVED to note the progress made in delivering the Council Strategy Delivery Plan 2019-2023, a maintained strong performance for the core business areas, good results for the majority of the measures relating to the Council’s priorities for improvement, and remedial actions taken where performance was below target.

Other options considered: None.

29. Members' Questions

A full transcription of the public and Member question and answer sessions are available from the following link: [Transcription of Q&As](#).

- (a) A question standing in the name of Councillor Adrian Abbs on the subject of additional costs incurred following the fire at Faraday Road was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development.
- (b) A question standing in the name of Councillor Phil Barnett on the subject of the disturbance that could be caused by drones was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Strategic Partnerships and Transformation.

EXECUTIVE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

- (c) A question standing in the name of Councillor Martha Vickers on the subject of the Council's previous car club contract with Co-Wheels would receive a written response from Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (d) A question standing in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of the funding collected from developers since the start of the Newbury Car Club and how much funding was unallocated at the time the Council changed its service provider was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (e) A question standing in the name of Councillor Jeremy Cottam on the subject of the Council's highway maintenance programme and the policy for cutting back overgrown shrubs and trees on urban roads was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (f) A question standing in the name of Councillor Alan Macro querying whether any consultation had been undertaken regarding the effectiveness and popularity of the booking system used for the Council's two HWRCs (outside of the centres themselves) was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (g) A question standing in the name of Councillor Royce Longton on the subject of how people booked to visit the HWRCs without internet access was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (h) A question standing in the name of Councillor Erik Pattenden on the subject of the decision path taken in deciding to maintain the HWRC booking system that restricted residents to one visit per week (until this was recently lifted) was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (i) A question standing in the name of Councillor Owen Jeffery on the subject of why the HWRCs had not extended their opening hours in the spring and summer months was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (j) A question standing in the name of Councillor Lee Dillon on the subject of why it was considered to be unfair on other users if a resident visited the HWRCs more than once a week was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (k) A question standing in the name of Councillor Jeff Brooks on the subject of what communications had taken place with Vodafone regarding Vodafone's retrenchment of their office space at their Headquarters was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Economic Development.
- (l) A question standing in the name of Councillor Adrian Abbs on the subject of why a booking system remained in place for the Council's HWRCs was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (m) A question standing in the name of Councillor Phil Barnett on the subject of whether one visit per week to the HWRCs was enough for each household, particularly during spring and summer, was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (n) A question standing in the name of Councillor Jeremy Cottam on the subject of the Council's footpaths maintenance programme and policy for cutting back overgrown shrubs and trees on urban paths was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.
- (o) A question standing in the name of Councillor Martha Vickers on the subject of methods for payment of the green bin charge would receive a written response from Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (p) A question standing in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of Member involvement or public consultation of Car Club members that took place prior to the change to the Car Club contract was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport.

EXECUTIVE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

- (q) A question standing in the name of Councillor Jeremy Cottam on the subject of direct debit payment processes would receive a written response from Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (r) A question standing in the name of Councillor Jeff Brooks on the subject of whether any savings had been negotiated with Veolia as a result of an, until recently, restricted service was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (s) A question standing in the name of Councillor Tony Vickers on the subject of restrictions to commercial operators as opposed to residents to HWRCs was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.
- (t) A question standing in the name of Councillor Jeff Brooks on the subject of what the cost and effort has been of providing a telephone contact within the Waste Service so that residents could book extra visits to the HWRCs was answered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Waste.

(The meeting commenced at 5.00pm and closed at 7.38pm)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'M. D.', is centered on the page.

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

14 October 2021