

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3  
HELD IN REMOTELY - VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS ON MONDAY, 19 JULY 2021 AT 09:30

Present

Councillor JPD Blundell – Chairperson

N Clarke	P Davies	DK Edwards	DG Howells
JR McCarthy	JC Spanswick	LM Walters	A Williams
JE Williams	RE Young		

Apologies for Absence

JC Radcliffe, RMI Shaw and MC Voisey

Officers:

Meryl Lawrence	Senior Democratic Services Officer - Scrutiny
Gill Lewis	Interim Chief Officer – Finance, Performance and Change
Janine Nightingale	Corporate Director - Communities
Jonathan Parsons	Group Manager Development
Zak Shell	Head of Neighbourhood Services
Tracy Watson	Scrutiny Officer

Invitees:

Councillor Stuart Baldwin	Cabinet Member Communities
Councillor Huw David	Leader
Councillor Hywel Williams	Deputy Leader

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of a Combined meeting of Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee dated 26 April 2021 be approved as a true and accurate record, subject the following amendments:

Page 6, last paragraph, last sentence:

“It was about active travel routes and ensuring ~~that~~ well lit connectivity and a nice route through, as well as bringing them past retail and shops, for ~~the~~ **increased footfall and spending.**”

Page 8, the penultimate paragraph, second line:

“Planning regulations would dictate how many **parking** ~~planning~~ spaces, particular residential developments would be permitted to have in place.”

9. **CLIMATE CHANGE RESPONSE AND NET-ZERO CARBON BY 2030**

The Corporate Director – Communities began by providing Members with some narrative in respect of the 2030 Agenda before introducing colleagues from the Carbon Trust to deliver a presentation. Following the presentation the Corporate Director explained that she was aware that the Committee had sent some questions regarding the report but that it had been too late for colleagues from the Carbon Trust to incorporate into their presentation but these would be picked up. The Group Manager - Planning and Development Services updated Members on the Authority's Ultra Low Emissions Vehicle work at the depots.

Following the presentation of the report, Members of the Committee asked the following:

A Member was concerned that discussions had centred on the Local Authority and focussed on how the public could play their part again, but what part would industry play as huge producers of carbon. He asked for the views of the Carbon Trust on the long term view of big industry and the military emitting carbon.

The Senior Manager - Carbon Trust explained that the Welsh Government (WG) had set the target of 2030 on the public sector because they would like the sector to lead by example. Public Sector emissions in Wales were only around between 1% and 3%, so what the Member had said about the public and industry and influencing those and putting targets on them, rang true because 90% of emissions were attributed to that. However, the Council was publicly funded and there was a responsibility to try and lead by example including the influence on the Council's supply chain which would drive industry, as procurement was around 75% of the Council's emissions and they would be the ones that would have to invest, taking up the challenge to demonstrate to the Council this was being addressed.

Heavy industry had previously fallen under the EU energy efficiency directive and had to spend quite a lot of money undertaking energy saving audits. Larger public sector bodies had been in the previous CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme, but the UK Government had decided not to include public sector bodies in the Streamlined Energy and Carbon Reporting Scheme that followed. However, heavy industry and large SMEs did have to report their emissions under that scheme. So recently there was a lot of regulation trying to drive activity in industry, but obviously there was a need for a requirement for the public sector with targets very much seen as Local Authorities' responsibility through the leadership role in influencing them.

A Member commented that the report had not mentioned the impact of manufacturing in and around the county borough, but had identified that 75% of savings should come from procurement. He asked whether the Authority should be buying from local providers that were emitters of carbon gases and how such procurement would operate.

The Corporate Director – Communities explained that a review of the procurement strategy was currently being undertaken, working with WRAP Cymru and the Procurement Section. They were trying to advise how best to direct spend in the local economy, to spend it more sustainably to grow and support local businesses, which would also cut down on mileage costs and carbon emissions. She acknowledged the Corporate Procurement Rules as a key part of this and how the Local Authority would know if it was being sustainable e.g. products from sustainable sources, although these may be slightly more expensive and that was something to be factored in as part of the procurement work, as well as the efficacy of the companies. The strategy had been drafted to allow the Local Authority the freedom to make those choices, but she

explained that this could come with consequences in terms of slightly higher costs as a result of that sustainable procurement.

The Senior Manager - Carbon Trust confirmed that the boundary for the piece of work was the Council's own boundary not any regional area or area-wide footprint or strategy. He advised that there was city region work and regional energy planning which would be looking at influencing industry directly. One of the challenges the Local Authority would have is what could be done whilst adhering to public procurement regulations. WG were looking at that post BREXIT to try to understand what reform needed to happen in terms of public procurement, to help support local ownerships, support keeping the value in Wales and purchasing from local suppliers. There were a few tools that could be put into the strategy, and ways of working to influence and mandate low-carbon procurement both in activities and to support suppliers to reduce their emissions.

The Chair of the Bridgend 2030 Decarbonisation Programme Board noted that this was a good question as there was a synergy between public and private operations. While local authorities had the ability to assist private industry in moving towards decarbonisation, private industry had its own drivers as 75% of the costs of the two heavy industries in the County Borough, were probably energy costs. This was a driving force in itself and they would be in the forefront of looking at ways of getting cheaper energy i.e. decarbonising using various government grants, making their production more efficient. He also believed that public opinion was moving towards the decarbonisation agenda. In addition planning legislation was moving in a direction where companies would have to take into consideration any changes that industry makes in their production or if they want to open new plants there would be planning restrictions placed upon them to make sure that they became carbon reduced.

The Leader referred to WG's programme to abolish the use of single-use plastics introducing an extended producer responsibility scheme to incentivise waste reduction by businesses. There was also a commitment to legislate to modernise the vehicle sector although many of those powers and responsibilities were reserved to the UK Government. There was a compelling case for the Authority to be using locally produced steel and paper. The Authority wanted to reduce its overall carbon footprint but certainly for the time being it was far better for the environment that steel was produced locally, with British industry having some of the highest environmental standards in the world. In addition WG had made a commitment to developing the Welsh timber industry which not only helped in terms of jobs and sustainability, but also carbon capture and biodiversity, as well as flood prevention. There would also be careful consideration of what could be done on the Local Authority's land, working with partners around scaling up tree planting and forestry initiatives.

A Member referred to page 19, paragraph 4.4 regarding direct engagement with a Citizens Assembly once established and a Steering Group of interested delivery partners, and asked for the timeline for this. He also acknowledged that a lot of work had been done in the past with regards to tree planting, but a lot more needed to be done in the future for carbon offsetting. He felt there needed to be a commitment to tree planting, over and above what the Local Authority had committed to, especially with the Queen's Platinum Jubilee Green Canopy next year. He noted that Bridgend College had given a commitment to planting 60,000 trees by 2025 and felt that to make it work, it needed a lot more resource, needed to be starting soon and happening faster.

The Corporate Director – Communities advised that the Local Authority would plant 15k trees this year, starting in the autumn. Those schemes were planned in six different areas across the Borough on Council land, which was important as sequestration could only be counted if the trees were planted on land that the Council managed. The Council had committed to a Green Day, working with Bridgend College, Registered Social

## SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 19 JULY 2021

Landlords (RSLs), the Health Board and Public Service Board (PSB) Members to promote a day in the autumn where communities, school children etc., are invited to come and assist with the tree planting scheme. She explained that the other part of the Green Day initiative was that the Health Board were keen that people saw the benefits of being outdoors, gardening, biodiversity and arboriculture, so the agenda was much wider than just planting trees. The other piece of work was the Queen's Green Canopy, a nationwide drive to plant trees in honour of the Queen's Platinum Jubilee, which was something the Council were very keen to be part of, which was for the next financial year. In addition, the Council was having conversations with the Woodland Trust who provided grants, about offering a community planting scheme next year, where people could apply to have funding for a species of tree or hedge. It was acknowledged that the Council had difficult budget situations but the 2030 Agenda was extraordinarily important so there was a need to find other sources of funding to help the Council with the journey.

With regard to the Stakeholder forum this would include the Health Board, Police, Fire and Rescue, Ambulance, Bridgend College, other Education settings and RSLs etc., who were seen as partners in the 2030 Agenda. The intention was to set up regular meetings with them where best practice could be shared and make sure that all were doing similar things with an aligned vision e.g., tree planting, the ULEV charging strategy with the Health Board, electric fleet with the Police, and Valleys to Coast on their maintenance vehicles. The stakeholder group was very much partnership working, looking for shared opportunities. In terms of the Bridgend District Heat Network the Local Authority was keen to get as many people connected onto phases two and three.

In terms of the citizens' forum, it was really important to the Local Authority to offer a wide range of people in the community the opportunity to come forward and sit on this forum and help shape this agenda. This work was being led by the Climate Change Response Manager, who had just been appointed. As part of this he had been benchmarking and speaking to other authorities across the UK to find out the best way to set this up, who the best people were to invite and interested parties. Feedback was that a wide demographic across the borough was needed, and as many people that were pro 2030, as against it, as this challenged thinking. The group could not be too big so around 20 to 30 people would be the right size. People could feed in ideas via a web link / website, with the group chaired by an external person to ensure the agenda was being driven by citizens.

The Leader reassured the Member that action was happening now. The latest work on active travel was starting in Pencoed that day and he referred to the Capital Programme going to Cabinet and Council, including a proposal for £2.85m more to be invested in active travel, a proposal for £178k investment in Bryncethin Depot for developing the solar power capacity there, and the investment in the Bridgend Heat Network of £2.89M. In addition scaling up of the tree planting was being examined, although this was one stream and there were many streams of work being undertaken at the moment and there was also a need to deliver in partnership as well because one of the biggest landowners was Natural Resources Wales.

A Member asked what the Authority could do to educate people to stop cutting down perfectly good trees.

The Corporate Director - Communities explained under the statutory provision the highest protection trees were given was a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) but they had to be recognised as having a particular characteristic why they should be protected. If a tree was felled that did have a TPO there was up to a £2k fine and the tree had to be replaced and this would be enforced. However, there was a need to go further, because as part of the 2030 agenda, education and a communication plan was key. However, it

## **SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 19 JULY 2021**

was very difficult to stop people felling trees so it was about educating and appealing to hearts and minds now about how beneficial they were for the environment.

A Member asked if there were plans to encourage blended working or selling or upgrading energy inefficient council buildings and perhaps just using one in Bridgend and selling off the others or perhaps refurbishing them so they are made energy efficient, or using them as flats, rather than building more houses on what could be green spaces.

The Leader advised that working from home, wherever possible, continued to be encouraged and feedback from most staff was that they preferred it, so there were some cost savings and it was better for the environment in terms of less travelling to work. Sickness levels had also fallen, so the Local Authority had seen the benefit of that. As part of a wider review which was being undertaken, the office accommodation needs were being considered and going forward into the future the Authority would look to make further savings, although costs had already been significantly reduced and the overall footprint of the of the estate, due to the decommissioning of Sunnyside House. The Chief Executive was preparing a report on Office Accommodation and additional resources had been dedicated. Expressions of interest were being explored in some of the estate, so there were a number of options to consider.

A Member asked as a baseline hadn't been established how it was known that enough human and financial resource had been allocated to the effort to reduce carbon emissions and extra external funding may not be certain over the next eight years. He asked how the conclusion had been reached that £215k would be allocated from the Council and would there be key performance indicators to monitor progress on targets on an annual basis to ensure that the Local Authority is on track. He also asked would there be any penalties if the Authority did not meet the net carbon neutral target by 2030.

The Corporate Director – Communities explained that the £215k in the budget was just for staffing costs for the Climate Change Response Manager, Programme Manager and bringing in the Carbon Trust. Currently there was no capital or revenue allocated for that action plan, although it was hoped by the autumn to have the action plan finished with a timeline. There would be costs associated with the action plan and she noted that Denbighshire County Council had said that they would need £10m of funding to undertake additional schemes for them to get to 2030. 80% of funding had come from grants with the Capital Region, WG and WLGA offering grants and monies for different parts of the decarbonisation agenda. It was uncertain what would be available in the future, but clearly the Local Authority would not be able to achieve it alone and would have to seek external sources of funding for this program. Going forward the intention was to complete the baseline, compile the action plan, do the gap analysis, cost as good as could be done and then consult on the strategy and the action plan in the autumn. From there a report would be taken to Cabinet and Council for a decision to approve that action plan and strategy going forward.

The Senior Manager - Carbon Trust explained that in terms of capital budgets, the low carbon agenda needed to be threaded in every decision e.g. not spending maintenance money on replacing boilers but looking at low carbon heat solutions. WG had not yet defined what could happen if targets were not met, as they were still shaping the monitoring reporting of Local Authorities and Health Boards, however, there were legal firms out who would chase corporate bodies and probably public bodies for not meeting their commitments and hold them to account.

The Head of Operations – Community Services explained that in respect of Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) the Carbon Trust were doing the baselining exercise for

the Authority and would leave the software tool which would be used, to continue to monitor the carbon output in line with WG Guidance to track performance on an annual basis. While there wasn't a defined penalty enforcement regime linked to the agenda yet, waste recycling had started in a similar vein with targets and the direction of travel, and it hadn't been long before WG got to the point where missing those targets resulted in penalties and it was likely to be similar for this too.

A Member referred to page 22 of the report which referred to the six ULEV taxis and the mention of a rapid charging point in the Hillsborough Place Car Park in Porthcawl and asked why that particular Car Park. She also asked about the potential for streetlights to be used as charging points, as had happened in some London Boroughs.

The Corporate Director - Communities explained that as part of the Metro Scheme for the Cardiff Capital Region, there would be a metro link for the buses and the Cardiff Capital Region had proposed the rapid charging points for the taxis there and was paying for the provision. This was a pilot scheme for the six taxis and should they become successful then the Authority would roll that out along with the rapid charging points for them, more widely across the Borough.

The Group Manager - Planning and Development Services explained that every Authority within the City Deal had an allocation of taxis based upon their number of taxi licences. The package of taxis included the rapid chargers and was driven by the City Deal and tied into the potential for a transportation bus facility at Porthcawl. The rapid charging facility should be up and running by the time the taxis are operational, so in active use all the time. There would also be other charging facilities being rolled out in other car parks.

The Head of Operations – Community Services referred to the question regarding the possibility of using street lights as charging points for electric vehicles and advised that while some of the streetlights within new housing estates may have the electrical capacity to also be used as charging points, the vast majority of older streetlights would not be up to the demands placed on them without some major investment. While they could be part of the strategy, it was not the solution to fit out all street lights with charging points.

The Member asked, what was meant by 'rapid' e.g. how long for a taxi to be charged, e.g. 20 or 30 minutes.

The Group Manager - Planning and Development Services explained that it was to do with voltage and wattage. With the rapid charger it allowed a greater flow of power into the battery which means they can be charged within say 30 minutes, as opposed to a more conventional charger, which would take longer. It also depended on the technology of the batteries as well, as power could not be increased too far without causing damage to the battery pack.

Officers and partners from the Carbon Trust were thanked for the report and presentation to Members.

The Committee made the following recommendations:

1. That the next review of the Corporate Template for Reports considers the inclusion of a Section on: Implications of the 2030 Decarbonisation Agenda, to assist all services to demonstrate how they are working towards the 2030 Agenda to achieve net zero carbon.
2. That a Briefing with information on Tree Preservation Order requirements be provided to Members of the Committee.

## SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 19 JULY 2021

3. That the Local Authority employ a dedicated Tree Officer to work via a joined up one Council approach together with partners towards shared tree planting commitments and the Queen's Platinum Jubilee Green Canopy initiative.

That the development of the Action Plan include Key Performance Indicators (KPI's), to be reported for monitoring performance.

### 10. WASTE PROVISION POST 2024

The Corporate Director - Communities introduced the report regarding arrangements for the waste service post 2024, as a result of the current waste collection recycling contract ending in March 2024. She advised that while the current contract had performed well against national standards, the difficulty being faced was the number of uncertainties linked to a future waste service contract, which she summarised from the report. The Head of Operations - Community Services presented the report.

The Deputy Leader advised that it had been known that this stage was coming and discussions had taken place as a Cabinet. Welsh Government (WG) position had changed, and maybe the targets would also change but it was clear there were a number of uncertainties, so it would be unwise to proceed to a procurement stage at that point in time.

A Member advised that he was slightly disappointed to have not heard about the option of in-sourcing / bringing back in house and wanted to have the debate. He accepted there was lots of good data and performance but the comparison data was not always accurate because this was an externalised contract, compared to other Local Authorities. A big thank you needed to be given to the public, who had taken part and had made the figures work. In terms of the costs the Member was concerned whether some of the low costs could be due to staff not getting the best terms and conditions, that they could get if directly employed. The Member advised that he would like to hear the debate and have the figures, costs, analysis and cost benefits of bringing things back in-house, because having direct control, was he felt the best way to deal with the with all the uncertainties.

The Cabinet Member Communities replied that it wasn't to say that those discussions were not going to happen; it was just at the moment the report was about the potential to seek an extension of the current contract to allow the Local Authority to look at what is going to be the best options going forward. In terms of the figures, 85% of people considered the service to be average and above and he would accept an average over a poor or a very poor, considering it was a service that was often criticised by the public. He advised that the idea of the report today was about extending the contract and not to look at the wider issues at the moment, but when those wider implications were looked at this could come back to Scrutiny.

The Head of Operations – Community Services explained in relation to the options this would be about future discussions around how the Local Authority could provide the service long term. Meanwhile, this report was looking to explore all of the reasons there was so much uncertainty, that for now the best and most straightforward solution was to have a short extension, given that all the data showed things were okay at the moment

The Member stated that he could not see why those discussions could not take place now and over the coming months, because that was what scrutiny was looking for.

The Corporate Director - Communities explained that those conversations would be had on a future contract, but it was slightly premature to be having those discussions now

## SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 19 JULY 2021

with regards to the uncertainty and the unknowns. She understood that Members were concerned, but reassured them that those discussions would take place.

A Member referred to legislation being introduced by WG, whereby local authorities would have to enforce pavement parking in place of the Police enforcing it. He was concerned this would impact on large refuse / recycling vehicles being able to access quite narrow streets. He asked if the Authority would be putting traffic regulation orders in place and when would local members have sight, ward by ward, of where the regulations would be permitted and where they would not.

The Head of Operations - Community Services advised that there were two big changes in traffic legislation over the coming year; 20 mile an hour residential area speed limits, and; enforcement for pavement parking. Neither was yet in force and the finer detail would be available in the coming weeks. In terms of pavement parking, it would not suit everywhere and there would have to be designated areas where pavement parking was allowed to continue. He advised that the budget approved for this year included a budget pressure that set out that more resource was needed in the Traffic Section to be able to deal with additional requirements over the next few years and recruitment was underway to fill those posts. He was aware there was a potential for impact, it would have to be planned for very carefully and there would be future reports.

A Member referred to residents placing food in their blue bags and the efforts made to educate residents to place food in the food waste. She was surprised that it had not been tackled in a big way before and felt there was a need to be working with the contractor to try and alleviate this problem.

The Head of Operations - Community Services acknowledged that report touched on that this was one of the areas of focus over the next few years in order for the Local Authority to get to the 70% statutory recycling target. However, right now, this was such a big issue that there wouldn't be much point in trying to identify individuals and needed to be a little bit broader. A number of recycling campaigns targeting food, had been done, in the past and they had been successful because some before and after measurement had been done. Although this was still an issue people were engaging with the food recycling service. However, there was an opportunity to drive more food out of the bags using a range of measures that would include some education, working with the contractor and ultimately some sort of enforcement measures as a fall back, to drive forward food recycling for those still not fully engaged with the food service.

A Member advised that the approach to seek an extension of the contract for 2 years being taken, did not sit well with him and asked for more information why a competitive tender would not be pursued. He added that there was clearly no appetite for bringing the service in-house and asked for confirmation on how long the extension would be, although he did not believe it represented a rigorous approach to public procurement and value for money. He asked the Interim Chief Officer Finance, Performance and Change to comment on whether she believed that it represented value for money for the public purse.

The Head of Operations - Community Services advised that the current contract was procured in a competitive environment, with a 70% weighting on finance, to ensure good value for money. The Authority was not looking to extend for the entire seven years, because that would mean discussion about a new fleet of vehicles and the problems talked about in why choosing a new fleet of vehicles right now would not be appropriate. It was about obtaining an extra couple of year's lifespan from the existing vehicles.

The Interim Chief Officer Finance, Performance and Change confirmed that she was not actually responsible for procurement but acknowledging what the Head of Operations -



## **SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 19 JULY 2021**

Community Services had said, that this was a proper procurement and would be looked at in terms of value for money. It did perform well across the piece in terms of the indicators compared to other refuse contracts. This was about an extension, rather than the whole contract running again and there would be heavy involvement in looking at alternatives and costs. She noted the pressure on the revenue and capital budget if the Local Authority was to embark on buying a fleet of vehicles, that in itself would be a huge cost, and there was no guarantee that by bringing in-house this would give better value for money. Authorities with an in-house collection often struggled to attract staff, which was a reputational issue for the Council, not for the provider.

The Corporate Director - Communities reassured Members that this was an extension and alternative methods and contract forms, would be looked at and if necessary a procurement option would be considered.

The Member noted that the Head of Operations - Community Services had mentioned the original contract with Kier was procured with value for money in mind and asked how the Local Authority knew this would represent value for money come 2024. Surely tendering the contract to a number of providers would allow the Local Authority to benchmark against private contractors. If the contract was extended further clarification was needed on what that stop gap would be because in the report it says up to seven years and did not provide a limit on time scale.

The Corporate Director - Communities confirmed that the intention was for no more than two years extension to provide enough time to get to the bottom of the uncertainties, work through them and then procure a new contract if that was the preferred option and that the lifespan of the existing vehicles was two years.

The Head of Operations – Community Services clarified that the report stated two to three years, but absolutely it was governed by what the Local Authority could get out of the existing fleet.

The Member noted that if it was up to three years it would tie the hands of the next administration altogether and that did not sit well with him.

The Cabinet Member Communities clarified in relation to Member's statement of there being no appetite to in-source the service, it was not that there was no appetite for it, rather those options hadn't been looked at yet and so it could not be determined whether there was an appetite to in-source or to continue to outsource. The options would continue to be looked at in order to make the decision on the best way forward.

The Member questioned why the options hadn't been looked at before the end of the contract period so the Local Authority was not in a position where the contract had to be extended.

The Corporate Director Communities reiterated to the Member that the contract had been looked at but there were so many uncertainties it was unwise to make those decisions currently based on everything that was in the report. Those uncertainties needed to be worked through to make sure the correct contract was procured.

A Member thanked the Cabinet Member for confirming that all options were still on the table, and reiterated points made by the previous Member, but felt disappointed that the in-house option and other options were not now being discussed as part of the report.

The Corporate Director Communities reiterate her point again that there were so many uncertainties currently it would not be an informed decision to discuss those options. There was nothing to benchmark a new contract on if the targets for recycling were not

## SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 19 JULY 2021

known, what the return bottle scheme and environmental standards would be, and what an ULEV fleet would look like. Officers had been open and honest and had committed to coming back to Scrutiny to discuss the new contract at the right time including telling Members about the four areas of uncertainty, when more was known about them. A line had been drawn under what had happened in 2017 and the same mistakes would not be made going forward.

The professional advice to Cabinet was that this was not the right time, the uncertainties would be unlocked and those discussions would be had with Scrutiny.

The Cabinet Member Communities advised that a prudent decision was being made in respect of spending public money in the best way.

A Member thanked Officers for the report and asked about the possibility of ULEV vehicles becoming far cheaper in years to come and what would be the current cost of replacing the fleet.

The Head of Operations - Community Services explained that it would be a large sum of money which was why the difference in price between ultra-low emission vehicles (ULEV's) and diesel vehicles, and buying in at the right time was so important to the Local Authority. WG would be supporting the purchase of ULEV's and making grants available and the Local Authority would fully want to utilise that and get some of these vehicles on board to trial them and start finding out what the pros and cons of using them were, how well did they work for the area, particularly as the tipping point down at the MREC was not local, how good were the batteries, etc. There was a lot to learn over the next year and it would be good to see a few being trialled in Bridgend, but an entire fleet would currently cost many millions of pounds.

The Committee made the following recommendation:

That Members could not support the extension of the current Waste Contract for a further two years, without having the debate about options, costs, and cost benefits analysis and value for money for the public purse.

### 11. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Committee made the following recommendation:

That a report on the introduction of the **WG Pavement Parking Enforcement** be added to the Committee's Forward Work Programme, following the surveying of streets and collation of information for potential Traffic Parking Orders, but before implementation.

There were no requests to include specific information in the item for the next meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Committee approved the Forward Work Programme in Appendix A, subject to the above addition, noted that the Forward Work Programme and any updates from the Committee would be reported to the next meeting of COSC and noted the Recommendation Monitoring Action Sheet in Appendix B.

### 12. URGENT ITEMS

None

**SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 19 JULY 2021**

The meeting closed at 12:42