

**Confirmed**



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Scrutiny Committee** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton on **Thursday, 17 June 2021 at 6.30pm**

**Members of the Committee present:**

Councillor Edward Back, Councillor David Beavan, Councillor Stuart Bird, Councillor Judy Cloke, Councillor Linda Coulam, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor Andree Gee, Councillor Louise Gooch, Councillor Tracey Green, Councillor Colin Hedgley, Councillor Geoff Lynch, Councillor Keith Robinson, Councillor Caroline Topping

**Other Members present:**

Councillor Peter Byatt, Councillor Janet Craig, Councillor James Mallinder

**Officers present:** Katherine Abbott (Democratic Services Officer), Kerry Blair (Head of Operations), Helen Buckingham (Regulatory Consultant – Environmental Services & Port Health), Karen Cook (Democratic Services Business Manager), Simon Gilbert (Commercial Contracts Manager (Facilities)), Andrew Jarvis (Strategic Director), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer), Sue Meeken (Political Group Support Officer (Labour)), Andrew Reynolds (Environmental Protection Manager) and Daniel Wareing (Environmental Sustainability Officer).

---

**1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

There were no apologies for absence.

**2 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3 Minutes**

**RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Extraordinary meeting held on 18 February 2021 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**4 Review of waste management (Part 2)**

The Chairman welcomed the Cabinet Member for the Environment and invited him to make any opening remarks before the report was considered by the Committee.

The Cabinet Member stated that litter affected everybody and the current situation was a combination of a lack of local social engagement, lack of responsibility of producers dealing with their packaging, a lack of education and parental skills and a lack of being a responsible member of our society. He explained that more than 2

million pieces of litter were dropped in the UK on a daily basis from crisp packets, cigarette butts to a bag of rubbish and everything in between. Litter cost the taxpayer over £1 billion per year for street cleaning, was unsightly and made our local areas look untidy and uncared for. He pointed out that litter also took years to break down causing harm to wildlife and habitats. Dropped food could attract pigeons and vermin and it then migrated to the water system and seas as it slowly polluted the world and eventually entered the food chain. The Cabinet Member continued that litter was unattractive and could ruin views and countryside/seaside rambles. It was a huge danger to wildlife and he reported that the RSPCA received over 7000 calls a year about litter related incidents and Keep Britain Tidy had similar concerns as they had many reports of mammals stuck on disregarded bottles. He pointed out that there was also a need to remember that other materials than just plastic could be equally dangerous to our wildlife. Litter increased negative behaviour, reduced people's sense of wellbeing and attracted crime. It polluted locally and across the world at a huge cost to the taxpayer. The Cabinet Members reported that, in dealing with local litter, there was a need to focus on partnership working and encourage residents to be proud of where they lived and worked. The Council was part of the solution but so was individual behaviours, initiatives from MPs and Ward Members also had a role to play. He acknowledged that bins needed to be in the right place and emptied at the right frequency. He stated that he spoke to Parish/Town Councils regularly to understand the issues in their areas and Ward Members were asked to identify and report to him any local concerns. The Committee was informed that, this year, the number of bins and the frequency of collections across the tourist parts of the district in particular had been increased with three collections in one day in some areas. Pavement recycling bins had been piloted and a project with the University of Suffolk had seen bins microchipped so that they notified Norse when they were full and ready to be collected. The Cabinet Member stressed that another priority was the need to educate and influence and this was being undertaken in particular through the Greenprint Forum and the Plastic Champion Initiative which empowered residents to organise litter picks and make their environments litter free. He added that the annual Love Suffolk event had been moved from Spring to Autumn and it was hoped that a litter pick would take place in every Ward in the Autumn. He mentioned that a lot of information was put out on social media and partnership working remained the key. He added that he was currently working with Suffolk County Council and other local Authorities to introduce a Suffolk wide campaign which would include a full week of litter picks and engagement. He referred to the Council's website which contained a lot of information and reminded Members that they could contact him direct at any time with any specific issues. He concluded that, in light of Members' questions and information requested, he had arranged a briefing session on fly tipping and litter for all Members.

The Chairman then directed Members' attention to the report and invited questions.

Councillor Robinson referred to litter problems in two particular areas of Lowestoft and the Cabinet Member responded that he had already spoken to all Lowestoft Ward Members about dealing with this issue across Lowestoft rather than piecemeal so that resources could be focussed across the whole area. In addition, he had spoken to Lowestoft Town Council to get their involvement. The Head of Operations acknowledged this was a significant issue as the two rounds referred to had the worst contamination figures for East Suffolk and across Suffolk but he pointed out that there

might be specific streets or individual properties within the round area that contributed significantly to the figures so there was a need to look at the data. He added that HMOs generally posed high levels of contamination too. He explained that another potential option would be to look at changes in the way collections were made if there was a persistent problem with core compliance. People needed to know what should go in the right bin and education was key. Members were informed that, if a bin was contaminated, a sticker was placed on the bin to say what could go in the bin and Officers might have a conversation with the householder but where there was a continued problem, enforcement was looked at. The Environmental Protection Manager stated that the whole process of enforcement started with education so the first step to achieve that was to use the stickers and provide information. If they continued not to do it then sanctions can be delivered through the Waste Management Enforcement Officers employed by Norse on the Council's behalf who enforce the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act. A difficulty experienced with enforcement of putting bins out on the wrong day etc was that the enforcement process was weak so there was a need to build the case and gain evidence.

The Chairman firstly referred to the cost in lost recycling payments because of contaminated collections and the need to address that quickly and secondly he suggested that there seemed to be a staggering disparity between the figures in the north and south and queried why that was. The Environmental Protection Manager responded that a map of social deprivation indicators was overlaid over the waste enforcement problems map there would probably be a good deal of correlation so it was possibly due to social economics. The Strategic Director echoed this comment, adding that there were a range of disparities in the north of the district and he pointed out that a one size fits all approach would not deal with this. He suggested that a wider view needed to be taken rather than looking at it as a single issue problem. The Head of Operations acknowledged that, whilst there were external factors beyond the Council's control such as social economics, in recognition of the scale of the problem, resources were being committed to a project to reduce contamination and this was one of several projects launched with Norse to improve this area of performance eg looking at the historic contamination patterns, identifying specific areas down to individual properties and developing and implementing improved operating process. He added that some of that would be about education with the householder but some was good practice in refuse collection by ensuring there was diligent checking of waste before it got to the MRF and at transfer stations. The additional costs to East Suffolk and Suffolk County Council for this made a simple case to putting additional resource into dealing with this issue as it saved all parts of the system money. The Cabinet Member stated that, as chair of the Suffolk Waste Partnership, it was a great concern - contamination in blue bins such as bottles, dirty nappies and food waste were the main issues and he added that the Partnership ran campaigns across Suffolk so East Suffolk worked on this as well as Suffolk as a whole.

Councillor Topping commented that she had seen stickers being put on to bins but knew that those same bins were contaminated in other weeks when they did not get a sticker so she suggested that operatives needed to check the bins more thoroughly to deal with it on the doorstep rather than at the transfer station.

Councillor Coulam queried if the new equipment at the Haddenham Road site meant that the waste was separated better now. In terms of material being brought into the

recycling centre, the Head of Operations stated that because it went down a chute into a segregated area, it did not seem much of an issue. He explained that he had some evidence from Suffolk County Council that the booking system at Haddenham Road or at the other recycling centres had not increased fly tipping. Positive feedback had also been received about the new booking system itself, that it was a much better managed process and people did not have to sit in a long queue. Councillor Coulam also pointed out that some people might only have one large item rather than three and the cost for bulky item collections might encourage some to fly tip. The Head of Operations responded that it cost £40 for up to three items and the charge was benchmarked across several nearby local authorities. He added that people could take items to recycling centres or various charities would collect so maybe there was a need to promote the ways large items could be collected for free. The Cabinet Members stated that the key was about individuals taking responsibility - it was not acceptable to drop items round the corner and he suggested that Ward Councillors could publicise means of disposing of unwanted items freely.

Councillor Deacon referred to the report and queried how East Suffolk did actually compare with other local authorities. The Head of Operations acknowledged that his response in the report might not be what Members wanted to hear but added that it was difficult to get to a number for the collection cost at a district level. He added that Councils might get a headline cost for the waste service that was publicly available but there was so much variance within that and it was difficult to know how much of that budget went on frontline services. There were no costs per household figure publicly available. He stated that he would argue it was the effectiveness of each collection authority that Members and residents were interested in eg how much material was recycled. He referred to Three Rivers District Council who had recycling rates of 62/63% and stated that it would be difficult to know the cost of that because it was probably undertaken by a private company but he would like to know how they had achieved their recycling rates. Waveney had been in the bottom three quarters and Suffolk Coastal had been in the top 25th in the country so, perhaps to be expected, East Suffolk as the merged authority was just in the top half at 45% recycling. He explained that East Suffolk would need to hit 60% under the new RAWS so there was a real seachange that needed to happen to achieve that. He concluded that this was what needed to be focussed on rather than the costs as it would be difficult to find out those costs.

Councillor Robinson expressed concern at the recycling rates and queried how much it affected the rates for those people that just did not bother and put things that could be recycled in the black bins. The Head of Operations reported that an annual compositional analysis of black bins was undertaken to inform publicity and education campaigns and it showed what was put in bins and could be recycled such as food, glass and garden waste but there was no enforcement around black bins unless someone put in a load of garden waste so the idea was to educate.

Councillor Lynch queried what powers the Council had to enforce against individuals or companies that continually contaminate. The Environmental Protection Manager stated that, under Sections 46 and 47 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, the Council could serve notice if someone did not do the right things eg put something in that they should not, put a bin out on the wrong day or left it out too long. The Deregulation Act had severely trimmed enforcement powers as it used to be an

offence by prosecution or Fixed Penalty Notice if a notice was not complied with but the Deregulation Act had added loads of clauses requiring several stages to be taken and it was now a civil enforcement issue so the process was virtually useless, therefore, it was very difficult to use those provisions. He added that, under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act, a notice could be served requiring people to do something and can have a Fixed Penalty Notice but again it was a long winded process to serve the notice, very labour intensive with uncertain results.

Councillor Hedgley referred to practices abroad where every town or village had a recycling facility and he queried if consideration had been given to having that here with Towns/Parishes being responsible. The Cabinet Member stated that this was something he would like to see and he explained that different types of recycling would be looked at as part of the Environmental Bill so he suspected there would end up being some more localised recycling facilities. The Strategic Director stated that the EU was ahead of the UK - Germany were quite strict and would fine people and in France the local Mayor ran it. He added that the main issue was that the waste legislation was out of date - districts were the collection authority and the County Council was the disposal authority which created difficulties. He suggested Districts were best placed to be the only responsible authority working with Parish Councils. He reminded Members that Parishes had previously been able to get recycling credits for schemes and this had worked well for a period. He concluded that he hoped the new Environment Bill would give some scope for a more localised approach but he felt that it was likely it would have a more centralised approach instead.

Councillor Gooch referred to the discussions at the previous meeting and the schedule at the end of the report relating to litter pickers/street cleansers and she queried how staff deployment was determined in terms of routes and if staffing levels were adequate given population growth and levels of fly tipping. The Head of Operations responded that he would need to get back to Members regarding the rostering but additional resource had been added this summer in the coastal towns in anticipation of the huge influx of visitors so frequency was reviewed regularly. Discussions were also being held with Norse about having walk throughs to assess the frequency streets needed to be cleaned or the standard was not correct and it appeared that in Lowestoft it might not be correct. He added that there were about 20 people dedicated to this in Lowestoft and that was the same as when Norse had been formed but the strategic approach to identifying what should be done in particular areas was also under review to check the operation was effective and efficient.

Councillor Gooch also queried how communication was facilitated between the community litter picker groups, what mutual support was offered to them and how was it ensured that these helpful community volunteers were not displacing Council contracted workers. The Environmental Sustainability Officer stated that he was aware of a number of groups that carried out ongoing litter picks across the district and he had been helping them raise their profile and make them aware of each other so they could contact each other if they wanted. He added that he was not sure if everyone was aware though because there might be some groups out there that he was not aware of but he stressed that he was happy to facilitate that mutual support. The Cabinet Member suggested that this was an example of where Ward Members could assist and talk to the groups to see if they wanted to talk to other groups. He added that he was happy for groups to contact him directly and he stressed the need to

ensure that everyone who picked litter was thanked. In response to Councillor Gooch's question regarding the displacement of Council contractors and her query about what ideas were being explored to support vulnerable residents where free time civic engendering activities were not an option, the Environmental Protection Manager outlined the long list of duties the three Waste Management Enforcement Officers had in addition to dealing with litter across the whole district. The Strategic Director stated that he did not have an exact figure but hundreds of thousands were spent per year dealing with anti-social behaviour from residents who did not care and they know it was difficult to enforce so it should be about individual and community responsibility as the problem would not be solved without community support. He added that litter picks were essential and it was everyone's responsibility - if you see litter pick it up! The Head of Operations stated that it was relatively easy to get people to pick litter up from certain areas such as beaches and beauty spots but not other more urban places so posts were needed and volunteers were an enhancement to the street cleansing operation. In relation to civic pride, he agreed that there was a need to use all our powers to support people who had other issues in their life or did not understand the system and if necessary use education and then enforcement. He added that the operational and strategic review would be the key to answering a lot of the questions raised tonight. The Cabinet Member agreed with the comments about reaching out to the vulnerable and he added that he regularly talked to Housing colleagues about any areas of concern.

Councillor Deacon queried if this Council could be a pilot for returning deposits on plastic bottles and packaging similar to schemes in Germany and the Strategic Director responded that the deposit scheme was likely to be brought in as part of the Environment Bill so it would be looked into more deeply in the next few years. He also pointed out that the Council had contracted a company to run the re-process of the district's recyclables, therefore, if a significant amount of waste was taken out to run a deposit scheme then there might be some contractual issues.

Councillor Deacon also queried what mechanism there was for communicating with the County Council about clearing highways and verges and what provision there was if Ward Councillors were not happy. The Head of Operations responded that this year there had been an increase in weeds going through pavements etc and East Suffolk and other Local Authorities had asked County when they would be sending their contractors out to do this work. He clarified that, as the County was the responsible authority, there was no service level agreement, therefore, other Councils could only add political pressure to get County to undertake the work rather than enforcement. The Cabinet Member stated that he had recently spoken to County Councillor West who was the new relevant Cabinet Member to express dismay at the state of some of the pavements and highways and ask him to get rid of the weeds. He added that he urged residents and Members to contact the County Councillor for their area to add pressure about this.

Councillor Back referred to the amount of fines and he queried how much control the Council had in setting the Fixed Penalty Notices fines. The Environmental Protection Manager stated that the Council had some degree of control as the range of Fixed Penalty Notices for littering was approximately £50-£100 but he would check. He explained that currently it was set at £60 if paid within 10 days and £80 within 14 days and if people did not pay then they were taken to Court. He suggested it was the

amount of people who get fined rather than the amount that was the key issue. He added that there was between 100-150 fines issued per annum. The Chairman queried if there was any statistical monitoring that an increase in fine levels decreased the amount of littering. The Environmental Protection Manager responded that there was none that he knew of but added that the levels had originally been set approximately ten years ago in unison with the rest of Suffolk and he thought the other Councils had subsequently increased their fines so this was an area that could be reviewed. He added that he would check the maximum level of fine.

Councillor Topping queried what would happen to the contract that the Strategic Director referred to earlier if there was less to recycle, for example the Council was successful in getting people to stop using single use plastics. She also referred to the response to her question 18 in the report and asked if it would be possible to have a schedule of where Norse was litter picking in advance to ensure that community groups were not picking in the same area a few days later. The Strategic Director clarified that the contract was not a set volume or weight but the company was contracted to supply the Council's residential recyclable collection material to the MRF so if a rival recycling scheme was set up which took out a valuable product that the MRF expected to receive then there would likely be some problems, although that did not mean pilots could not potentially be operated. The Head of Operations stated that he would be happy to ask Norse to provide the schedule to help coordinate volunteers but he stressed that if there was any feedback on the details of the Schedule then that would be dealt with as part of the wider review.

Councillor Green expressed concern that the north of the district had such high tonnage of contamination and she asked whether it would be worth only having black bins in those specific areas given it was so difficult to get the message across. She added that some vulnerable residents would never be able to do it and suggested that Housing Associations ensure that when someone moved in or out that they were given information about local charities to dispose of packaging and items etc. She also suggested a roadshow across the district to say what could/not be recycled. She referred to the report which stated that bring banks would be fully reviewed and queried if any new sites had been identified. The Cabinet Member stated that working with Housing Associations was an ongoing project and he was engaging with them to ensure that where bins were in communal areas they were kept secure and reemphasising what should be recycled. He agreed that for those areas where there was a turnover of tenants they needed to be informed. In relation to clothes and bottle banks, he stated that if any community wants to arrange to have some in their areas then he was happy to assist. The Head of Operations stated that it was recognised that in some housing schemes maybe the Council should only fulfil the statutory responsibility to collect refuse rather than collect recycling because if it was contaminated from a few properties this then contaminated huge loads that would hinder our efforts. He added that some Councils had decided to only have black bins in those small areas whilst still trying to educate the residents. In relation to roadshows, Members were reminded that the RAWS Member Briefing session next week would give more details but an example was if glass and food were not being put in black bins but collected separately that would make a significant difference, although obviously that meant there would be costs of having more collections.

The Chairman queried if it was possible to have a combined bin to separate out different types of recyclables. The Head of Operations stated that there were options eg a separate container for food waste could sit within a wheelie bin. He explained that the huge advantage to having lots of separate containers were high recycling rates but the disadvantage was that crews struggled because there was lots of manual lifting and bending and it could contribute to littering if boxes of newspapers for example blew down the street. It was noted that the Officers were working with EELGA on the way the Council would implement RAWs including the type of bins and vehicles.

Councillor Gooch referred to the process on the website for reporting littering and fly tipping and queried why residents had to give a lot of their own personal details before they even got to the point of reporting the incidence and she queried why there could not be a dedicated number to make it easier to report. She also asked how officers and Norse monitored the reporting of littering and fly tipping on social media such as Facebook and Next Door as well as how much notice was taken of cleanapps/websites. The Cabinet Member stated that Officers were not looking at app technology because it could be too restrictive and a lot of people did not have access to technology particularly the elderly and the Council had an adequate reporting process in place that went straight to Norse. He added that residents could contact Ward Members or himself if they were struggling to report it. The Environmental Protection Manager agreed that it should be made as easy as possible to report to the Council for the reason that complaints were better than customer services and that the current process captured every litter report and mapped it out which gave good data for statistical planning. In relation to apps and third party sources of reports, he pointed out that the call centre operators used a script to capture details of the fly tip etc which was useful but when the Council only had a photo from an app it was completely disassociated with that person and the Council had limited ability to ask any questions to find out more to help provide context to determine the level of response and follow up action. He also queried why people would want to go through a third party app when they could ring or email the Council direct.

Councillor Gooch referred to the trial period of the new microchip bins and queried the cost implications of a full or partial roll out and also asked if the solar powered crusher bins would be in remoter areas not easily accessed by dustcarts. The Commercial Contracts Manager (Facilities) reported that there were 18 bins being monitored as part of the project with Suffolk County Council, University of Suffolk and Norse and the data so far looked very positive. He added that the data was a live feed that went to himself and Norse to enable Officers to monitor the status of each bin. He stated that he had asked for a report on how it had impacted on collection times and if it had reduced mileage as the idea was that bins would only be collected when required. The estimated cost was being assessed by the County Council and University and details would be sent to Members in due course. He explained that the solar powered bins were approximately £5K each and a business case would be needed to proceed but there was some scope for them. It was noted that if the project was successful, the sensors could be deployed in many different locations such as grounds maintenance, gulleys, street lighting etc and the Council should know the results of the bin sensor trial in approximately six months time. The Cabinet Member stated that if the price of solar powered crusher bins was reduced then that might be something that would be looked at in future but, in the meantime, the microchipped bins looked like the way to go.



Councillor Deacon queried what the barriers were for tackling fly tipping on private land particularly in rural areas, how the Council was liaising with Police Crime Commissioner and Suffolk Constabulary to address this and what initiatives were being designed by the Suffolk Fly Tipping Action Group. The Strategic Director stated that this was something they would take away and come back with a detailed answer but, in the meantime, he responded that whilst he acknowledged that this was a real issue, fly tipping on private land was a private issue and whilst the Council could do a lot of education to try and stop it, when it was on private land it was generally an issue for the landowner. The Environmental Protection Manager clarified that if someone fly tipped on private land it was the landowners problem but it was still a waste offence which the Council had a duty to investigate and prosecute if possible.

Councillor Gooch asked if it was a waste of time for Officers to look through bins for names and addresses etc if it did not lead to successful prosecutions and queried how Breckland achieved so many prosecutions. She also asked if CCTV evidence could be used if a perpetrator could be clearly identified for example in the case of HMOs or flat occupations and how was this Council going to raise the bar of prosecutions. The Environmental Protection Manager acknowledged that the number of prosecutions was low with the last being in 2018. He explained that the reason was because Fixed Penalty Notices provided a much more cost effective method of following up on waste offences and 24 Notices had been issued in the last financial year for fly tipping. He added that the main issue was that there were only three Norse Waste Management Enforcement Officers who, as he had detailed earlier, had a very wide range of duties.

Councillor Gooch queried if there was a pan-district schedule of street and pavement cleaning and if there was any redress if there was a lot of takeaway waste from fast food outlets. The Environmental Protection Manager stated that there used to be a Street Litter Control Notice under the Environmental Protection Act which could be served on frontages of businesses to require the business operator to provide bins and sweep up outside on pain of a Fixed Penalty Notice or prosecution but when that law had been replaced, we now had Community Protection Notices under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 to serve notice on the occupier of a property that caused detriment that was unreasonable and likely to reoccur. He added that the Waste Management Enforcement Officers could use them but again stressed that they had a lot of other duties. The Head of Operations stated that streets were not washed routinely but each street was cleaned according to a grading system, although it was felt that this was not a particularly satisfactory system or if it was then it might be that it was not being applied very well, therefore, the KPIs had recently been reviewed with Norse and changes would be introduced on how streets were graded, the frequency and priority. He added that it was also being reviewed as to who would assess and make the judgement because if it was the crews then it would not be an independent view so that would also be part of the new KPIs. The Cabinet Member stated that big brand fast food restaurants in particular should be forced to take responsibility for the litter that was left across the district but they did not engage in their local communities and did not tend to be interested in things like sponsoring litter picking etc. The Strategic Director stated that the Council realised that there was a need to take a new approach to street cleaning as part of the HAZ work and Town Centre Regeneration project so he suspected that in those heavy footfall areas there would be more pavement washing in future than done at the moment.

Councillor Gooch stated that, following the last Scrutiny review meeting on waste, Radio Suffolk had interviewed an RSPCA officer who said that there had been 4000 reports of litter damaging wildlife and she queried if this fact could have a higher profile in our education programme as school children loved animals and this might make them think before littering. The Cabinet Member responded that he agreed but schools were the County Council's responsibility. He added that the Greenprint Forum was working with schools and was focussing on Nature First this year with various campaigns and grants available so it was possible to focus on this in future but in the meantime he urged people to contact County Councillors and for Ward Members to engage with their local schools to emphasise this as well. The Environmental Sustainability Officer reported that the Council had produced some lesson resources on the theme of plastic pollution on behalf of the Greenprint Forum and these were available to download from the Council's website. He explained that the lesson touched on the environmental harm that plastic litter and other litter had when it escaped into the environment including the impact on wildlife and one of the learning objectives was to get children to think about what the impact on animals were. He added that the pack was being reviewed and he was happy to incorporate this before hopefully relaunching it again later in the year.

Councillor Gee expressed concern that there were only three officers dealing with this issue and given the amount of development particularly in the north of the district that would result in more residents, she queried if the Council should consider having more officers. The Chairman stated that this was a potential recommendation the Committee could consider.

Councillor Green observed that Felixstowe Town Council had been required by Norse to pay an additional fee for deep cleaning one of the streets in Felixstowe so they felt Norse had not been working with the Town Council.

Councillor Coulam expressed concern at an earlier comment that street cleansing would be looked at within a year and commented that this was an urgent matter. The Cabinet Member reassured the Committee that Lowestoft was a top priority for the whole Cabinet and improvements would be made as quickly as possible.

The Committee discussed potential recommendations and the Chairman stated that, once the general recommendations were agreed, they would then be turned into SMART recommendations and circulated to Members for final approval. The Cabinet Member reminded Members that he was also the Chairman of the Suffolk Waste Partnership in case the Committee wanted to make any recommendations to that group.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That, having considered the report on Waste Management in East Suffolk, it was agreed that a number of recommendations would be circulated to Committee Members for approval prior to submission to Cabinet.
2. That the Cabinet Member and Officers be thanked for their assistance on this review and be asked to email details of the Norse litter picking schedule to

Members to avoid duplication with community litter pick groups, and further details be sent to Members on the approach to fly tipping on private land particularly in rural areas.

**5 Scrutiny Committee's Forward Work Programme**

The Committee received and reviewed its current Forward Work Programme including receiving updates on the progress of several Scoping Forms. It was noted that, although the Covid-19 Task and Finish Group had now been disbanded, it did have a positive impact because a group had now been set up between Adult and Children Services at County and East Suffolk's Housing Department.

The meeting concluded at 9.15pm.

.....  
Chairman