

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Wednesday, 1 April 2026.

PRESENT: Mr R G Streatfeild, MBE (Chair), Mr A Brady (Vice-Chair), Mr W Chapman, Mr J Defriend, Mr J Eustace, Mr A J Hook, Mr M A J Hood, Mrs S Hudson, Mr T Mole, Mr R Palmer (Substitute for Dr G Sturley), Mr M Paul (Substitute for Mr D Truder), Mr M Reidy, Mr T L Shonk and Mr P Thomas

ALSO PRESENT: Mrs G Foster, Mrs B Fordham, Mr J Henderson, Mr P Osborne and Mr P Webb

IN ATTENDANCE: Miss M Bundy (Democratic Services Officer), Mr C Chapman (Interim Deputy Director for Education: Access and Inclusion), Mr R Emmett (Head of Highways (Operations)), Mrs S Holt-Castle (Director of Growth and Communities), Mr S Jones (Corporate Director of Growth, Environment and Transport), Mr A Loosemore (Head of Highway Asset Management), Ms C McInnes (Corporate Director Children, Young People and Education), Ms L Miller (Business Innovation Manager), Mr M Smyth (Director of Environment and Waste) and Mrs A Taylor (Assistant Democratic Services Manager (Scrutiny))

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

38. Apologies and Substitutes

(Item A1)

Apologies were received from Mr Truder, for whom Mr Paul was substituting and Dr Sturley, for whom Mr Palmer was substituting.

39. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this Meeting

(Item A2)

1. The following declarations were made in relation to item C1 on the agenda:

- a) Mr Defriend declared that his partner's daughter was a non-verbal child with autism that attended a specialist school.
- b) Mr Reidy declared that he was a governor at St Simon's Stock Catholic school and Holy Family Catholic school in Maidstone.
- c) Mr Shonk declared that his wife was a chaperone for the Home to School Transport scheme.
- d) Mr Thomas declared that his granddaughter attended a specialist school.

40. Minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2026

(Item A3)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2026 were a correct record and they be signed by the Chairman.

41. What would a Sustainable SEND System Cost?
(Item C1)

1. The report was introduced by Beverley Fordham, Cabinet Member for Education and Skills, who provided an overview of major ongoing reforms to the Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) system, KCC's assessment and Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) processes and potential alternative models of provision in light of the Government's SEND White Paper and subsequent announcements. She also explained that the cost of a financially sustainable SEND system depended on the chosen policy direction, with KCC working towards a balanced approach aligned with national reform.
2. In response to questions and comments from Members, discussion covered the following:
 - a) Craig Chapman, Interim Deputy Director for Education: Access and Inclusion, advised that Central Government anticipated SEND numbers to rise for approximately 5 years before returning to current levels over a ten-year reform period, driven by increased support within mainstream schools. He recognised that Kent remained an outlier in specialist placements, raising the question of whether it would align with national trends by 2035. He further stated that Central Government's proposals broadly reflected the approach Kent had been pursuing, aiming to redirect resources from specialist to mainstream provision to reduce escalating costs.
 - b) Christine McInnes, Interim Corporate Director for Children, Young People and Education, emphasised that the White Paper did not propose removing specialist schools, rather it sought to rebalance the proportion of children placed in specialist and independent provision. She explained that special schools remained essential for children with complex needs, with some highly specialist provision continuing in the Independent sector.
 - c) It was emphasised that the paper could not provide costed scenarios without clearer expectations from Members on the preferred model of a 'sustainable SEND system' as different models would generate different financial outcomes. It was also highlighted that KCC had to produce reform plans modelled on Central Government proposals, meaning further detail could only be provided once this full funding information was released.
 - d) Mr Chapman advised that if Kent continued operating at its current capacity, the SEND budget would reach an overspend of around £100 million in 2027. Central Government's deficit plan only addressed historic overspend, meaning that ongoing annual deficits would still rise unless there were reforms. He explained that while KCC was working with the Department for Education (DfE) on reform plans, the financial risk and potential future overspend ultimately sat with the Council.

- e) Mr Chapman stated that tribunal decisions had a clear financial impact by potentially directing pupils into high- cost independent provision. He explained that KCC supported the proposed SEND reforms, which aimed to reduce conflict in the system and to ensure limited resources were benefitting the greatest number of children. He also outlined that previous increases in spending did not necessarily improve outcomes and contributed to an unsustainable model. It was added that a detailed report on the tribunal system was published the previous year and could be updated for Members. It was also highlighted that Kent performed better than the national average, with approximately 96% of tribunal cases decided in favour of the parents.
- f) Mr Chapman advised that it was too early to assess whether Central Government's national estimates for a sustainable SEND system was accurate as KCC was still awaiting significant clarification on expectations and funding. Mrs McInnes also reminded Members of the proactive action taken, including £20 million of capital assigned to expand specialist resource bases and create nearly 900 additional places. The investment was informed by detailed mapping which showed that some pupils moved into the independent sector at secondary levels due to gaps in local provision.
- g) Mrs McInnes highlighted that evidence showed significant increases in SEND and mental health spending did not lead to improved outcomes for children, with mental health indicators continuing to decline. She added that both national and local data indicated that spending and decision- making had diverged from the national average since 2017 without improvement, raising concerns about the effectiveness of existing arrangements if future levels of support were reduced. She also outlined that wider societal considerations about appropriate support for children with SEND needs, particularly in preparing them for adult life, were central to decisions on future spending and investment.
- h) Mrs McInnes confirmed a focus on early identification and support for children with additional needs at the nursery stage. This included specialist nursery staff providing outreach support in mainstream settings, reducing the need for children to move into special schools, with early feedback reported as positive. Work on neurodiversity in mainstream schools, focused on early identification, reasonable adjustments and closer partnership with parents, was also delivering positive outcomes without necessarily increasing costs.
- i) Mr Chapman explained that the costs of scaling up current pilot initiatives across the county could not yet be quantified. He advised that costs depended on strategic and political decisions about where limited resources should be prioritised, as increasing investment in one area would require reductions elsewhere without necessarily meeting the provision required. Different approaches, such as investing in earlier identification pathways or in upskilling mainstream schools to meet needs without formal diagnoses, could use these same resources in different ways. He stated the direction set out in the white paper would shape these decisions and their associated financial implications.
- j) It was confirmed that current government policy encouraged schools to bid to include nursery provision, indicating an expectation that more primary schools would have attached nurseries. It was highlighted that outcomes for early

years children were improved when they had access to qualified teaching staff. SEND projections were also published annually in the Kent Education Commissioning Plan, with data broken down by district and updated each year using a range of data sources.

- k) Mrs McInnes confirmed that the High Needs Funding Block would remain frozen for the next financial year. While further Government announcements suggested that additional funding may be forthcoming, details had not yet been confirmed. It was stated that any additional funding was expected to be directed to schools, and that for the next financial year Kent had applied a small uplift to school budgets. Government guidance also indicated that schools were expected to review their budgets, including managing expenditure and considering the use of reserves.
- l) Mr Chapman confirmed that the Safety Valve agreement had ended and that a write-off of the accumulated deficit had been applied, taking account of the Council's contributions, meaning Kent was not disadvantaged. He advised that future SEND reform plans remained uncertain, as Central Government expectations and funding arrangements had yet to be confirmed. It was stated that Central Government anticipated continued growth in demand for approximately five years before reforms took effect, with funding expected to reflect this period of growth followed by longer-term reduction. Mr Chapman also confirmed that the write-off of 90% of the accumulated deficit was conditional on KCC reaching agreement with Central Government on the reform plan.
- m) It was explained that home to school transport costs were being considered as part of the wider SEND system. Work to improve the efficiency of transport delivery had resulted in significant savings over recent years while maintaining provision. Although transport was taken into account alongside SEND decision-making, decisions remained primarily driven by pupil need, with transport considered as a contributory factor.
- n) Mrs McInnes confirmed that cost-benefit modelling had been undertaken to assess the balance between local specialist provision and associated transport costs. This modelling supported the successful bid to the DfE for two new special schools. The Council was also continuing to develop a wider continuum of provision, including a £20 million investment in Specialist Resource Provisions (SRPs), and also investing in improvements to accessibility within mainstream settings, such as hoists and ramps.
- o) It was confirmed that provision planning took geography into account and sought to locate services closer to families where possible to reduce transport. Where children were already settled in placements, particularly historic ones, changes were avoided to prevent disruption to education.
- p) Mr Chapman reported that, in recent years, some Local Authorities (LAs) placing looked-after children with EHCPs in Kent provision had refused to meet the associated costs. However, the DfE had consulted on and was reverting to the previous position in which the placed LA retained both financial and corporate parenting responsibilities.

- q) Mr Chapman explained that strengthening early support and intervention could reduce the likelihood of parents progressing to appeals or tribunals. Whilst the right to appeal remained with parents, the current system potentially pushed cases towards a more adversarial process. He asserted that shifting focus and resources earlier could improve support and parental confidence in the system. It was also stated that tribunal outcomes did not necessarily reflect poor LA decision-making, as tribunals operated under different criteria and did not consider wider system impacts or affordability. Cost figures could be circulated to the Committee outside of the meeting.
 - r) Mrs McInnes added that access to specialist support for mainstream schools had been simplified through professional resource groups, giving each school named professionals and faster access to services which was expected to reduce long waiting times. She outlined that programmes such as This is Me and Partnership for Inclusion of Neurodiversity in Schools (PINS) aimed to build parental confidence and support early intervention in mainstream settings, though the impact would take time to embed.
 - s) Mrs McInnes explained that she could not provide a definitive cost for a “sustainable” SEND system as KCC was required to deliver a statutory SEND service within the funding made available by Central Government and this future funding allocation was currently unknown. She also highlighted that clearer information from Central Government would support future planning, particularly in three areas: a clear definition of complex need, clearer expectations of what provision mainstream schools should provide and wider public debate about the role and level of specialist provision for children with additional needs.
 - t) In response to a question on the definition of a “good” SEND system, Mrs McInnes acknowledged the answer was complex and outlined examples of inclusive practice where schools worked in partnership, challenged each other constructively and met needs through shared resources, rather than additional funding. She highlighted the Council’s aim to achieve greater consistency across mainstream schools and the challenge of establishing a clear baseline of what all mainstream schools were reasonably expected to provide.
 - u) Mrs McInnes emphasised that defining SEND thresholds was a critical and challenging issue, frequently subject to differing expectations and challenges. She continued by explaining that delivering sufficient SEND provision relied on professional judgement and approach rather than easily visible outcomes. She confirmed that a future paper could be brought back to the Committee, subject to guidance from Members on these parameters.
3. Mrs Fordham, suggested a more structured approach be taken to define what constituted a good and sustainable SEND system before seeking a cost analysis. She advised that agreed evidence, outcomes and principles be developed in advance to support informed debate based on logic and a rational flow.
4. The Chairman summarised the discussion by referencing the critical Ofsted reports and the multi- agency SEND planning that had preceded the item coming to the Scrutiny Committee. He highlighted that the paper usefully set out recent improvement activity within current resources, whilst acknowledging the key

tension between a needs-led SEND system and the requirement to maintain a balanced budget amid rising demand. Members were reassured that further opportunities would be available, both publicly and privately, to continue this work. The Chairman proposed the Scrutiny Committee note the report. This was agreed by the Committee.

5. RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Committee note the report.

42. Winter Service - Update Report

(Item C2)

1. The report was introduced by Peter Osborne, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, who updated the Committee on the progress of KCC's Winter Service up to the end of January 2026 and outlined pressures experienced during the most recent winter period and lessons learned. He also highlighted adequacy of resources and capacity, clarity on the definition and responsibilities around street cleanings, pothole maintenance, future planning and long-term resilience.
2. Following questions and comments from Members, discussion covered the following:
 - a) Simon Jones, Corporate Director for Growth, Environment and Transport (GET) confirmed that the data showed an increasing number of surface defects, supporting perceptions of worsening pothole conditions linked to recent winters, unusual weather, and the overall condition of the highway network.
 - b) Andrew Loosemore, Interim Director of Highways and Transport, explained that while January typically saw a spike in surface defect reports, February experienced an unprecedented increase due to cumulative severe winter conditions. Although this created a significant pressure and backlog, report levels reduced in March and recovery work was continuing.
 - c) Mr Jones highlighted the existing scheme through which Parish Councils could invest their own funding into Highway Improvement Plans. Parishes that wished to accelerate local repairs were also advised to engage with the Highway Improvement team, who could liaise with operations as appropriate.
 - d) Mr Jones explained that it was not possible to set a fixed timescale for when surface defects would reach intervention levels, as deterioration rates varied and were managed through a routine inspection regime. Mr Loosemore further confirmed that repairs were prioritised using a risk-based approach in line with the national Code of Practice for Well Managed Highways, with defects allocated to timed repair categories. Lower-risk issues were addressed through planned maintenance and asset management programmes.
 - e) Richard Emmett, Head of Highways (Operations), explained that primary salting routes were planned to capacity and could not currently be expanded. However, additional "snow routes" may be deployed during severe weather once primary routes were complete, and in some cases single access routes to villages had been added. Members could raise requests through their Local

Highway Managers, and post- season reviews of routes were undertaken over the summer months.

- f) Mr Jones advised that weather forecasting services were kept under regular review and confirmed that the Council had recently starting using Met Office forecasting. Alongside this, operational experience and innovations under the new contract were expected to improve preparedness for future extreme weather at no extra cost to the Council. Mr Emmett outlined these potential innovations, including the use of vehicle telematics to enable live tracking of gritting vehicles. They also included recognising pressures caused by the same staff covering both winter operations and pothole repairs, with work underway to explore designated crews to better manage emergencies and reduce operational strain.
- g) Mr Loosemore confirmed that the use of spray markings to identify temporary pothole repairs had been explored previously, but practical issues and potential confusion with utility markings meant this did not progress. The issue had recently been revisited, and it was acknowledged that there was a need to improve public understanding, with further consideration and a potential update to be provided outside the Committee.
- h) Mr Loosemore confirmed that there was no evidence to suggest that salting caused roads to deteriorate more quickly. The quantities of salt used were minimal and had little impact on road surfaces, with deterioration primarily caused by freeze- thaw cycles, prolonged rainfall and the age of the roads.
- i) Mr Loosemore outlined that the Highways Term Maintenance contract covered a wide range of services beyond pothole repairs, including highways management, winter service and drainage. Sub- contracting was used to manage peaks and troughs in demand and to provide specialist services, as it would be unaffordable for the contractor to retain sufficient core staff to meet maximum demand at all times. In addition, the Council also used the contract to engage directly with local Small and Medium- sized Enterprises (SMEs) to provide added resilience when required. Mr Jones also identified that the new contract separated fixed overhead costs from operational costs, providing transparency and ensuring contractors did not profit from increased subcontracting or additional work.
- j) It was explained that decisions on patching versus resurfacing were based on balancing budgets, demand, available resources and the need for durable repairs. Inspectors assessing defects were required to choose the most appropriate and cost- effective intervention, which could involve individual repairs, larger patches or resurfacing. Whilst resurfacing could be more sustainable, it was not always feasible due to demand and budget constraints.
- k) Mr Jones explained that for larger developments, pre- and post-works inspections were undertaken to help identify potential damage and seek contributions where possible, although this could be challenging, particularly with smaller developers. Discussions were ongoing with major developers, including the use of commuted sums for future maintenance, but a balance needed to be struck where new adopted roads may reduce long-term maintenance needs.

- l) Mr Loosemore advised that a fixed timescale for permanent repairs could not be given as once temporary repairs had made defects safe, the permanent repairs were programmed as part of the wider works programme. The timing depended on priorities and whether further planned works were scheduled for the road, which could be months or years later.
 - m) Mr Osborne confirmed that arrangements were in place with lower- tier authorities' street cleansing teams to clear detritus from the Highway to help manage surface water flooding.
 - n) Mr Emmett explained that salting routes were based on the Resilient Kent Network, focusing on A and B roads and other strategic routes that provided key access to towns and villages. The criteria was established to ensure resources were targeted where they were most reasonably practicable during severe weather, given limited capacity. While requests from Members and the public were considered, not all roads could be included, and the strategic network provided the necessary boundaries for route selection.
 - o) Mr Emmett stated that the use of farmers to assist with rural road maintenance was reviewed annually, alongside their rates. However, the scheme was becoming more challenging to sustain as long- standing participants had retired and changes in farming practices had reduced the availability of suitable personnel.
 - p) A Member highlighted the value of engaging with the Highway Improvement Plan and thanked officers for their work.
3. The Chairman summarised the discussion and highlighted the following actions for further consideration: potential innovations discussed by Members, the provision of a publicly available document setting out salting routes and criteria for their selection and clearer guidance for Members on how routes may be reviewed. The Chairman also reiterated the importance of Parishes engaging with Highways officers and concluded by recognising the unprecedented challenges faced by the road network. The Chairman proposed the Scrutiny Committee note the details of the report and the actions being taken regarding KCC's ongoing winter service and highways repairs. This was agreed by the Committee.
 4. RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Committee note the details of the report and the actions being taken regarding KCC's ongoing winter service and highway repairs.

43. Fly-Tipping (Item C3)

1. The item was introduced by Jamie Henderson, Cabinet Member for Environment, Coastal Regeneration and Public Health, who outlined the impact of fly-tipping on streets and rural areas. He highlighted the significant costs associated with clearance and disposal and the pressure placed on County and Borough Council budgets, as well as the impact on landowners, farmers and businesses.

2. Following questions and comments from Members, discussion covered the following:
- a) Mr Henderson assured the Committee that businesses were required to be licensed as waste carriers and pay for lawful disposal and that commercial waste should not be subsidised by Council taxpayers. He also explained that £345,000 was spent dealing with fly-tipping in 2025 in gate fees alone, increasing the case for investment in stronger enforcement activity. He suggested that in light of the current Lords review, it could be timely to seek assistance from Central Government to support enforcement and help struggling businesses.
 - b) Matthew Smyth, Director for Environment and Waste, explained that commercial operators could use waste transfer stations at cost, but that expanding access would add non-statutory costs to Kent taxpayers. He also outlined that commercial waste volumes could be comparable to household waste, making limits on access impractical. He added that the booking system had reduced costs by £1.4 million and was supported by 96% of users.
 - c) Mr Henderson agreed with a suggestion that clearer promotion of licensing requirements could support legal compliance and reduction in fly-tipping, citing the numbers of under-licensing among small companies.
 - d) Mr Smyth highlighted that residents were legally responsible for ensuring their waste was disposed of correctly, even when using a third-party waste carrier. He therefore agreed that any educational campaign should target not only businesses, but also residents to raise awareness of their waste responsibilities.
 - e) Mr Smyth acknowledged inconsistencies within a table in the report and assured the Committee the source would be reviewed and a correct table reissued.
 - f) Lucy Miller, Business Innovation Manager, confirmed that there was currently no assistance available from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) for farmers or landowners affected by mass fly-tipping. However, this issue of clear up costs for farmers and private landowners was being considered as part of the ongoing House of Lords Inquiry, and Members would be kept updated as further information became available.
 - g) Ms Miller elaborated that fly-tipping and enforcement was being widely considered at national level, through the House of Lords Inquiry. She outlined that the Environment Agency had published a 10-point action plan to address fly-tipping and illegal waste sites, including measures such as improved intelligence handling, greater transparency and community engagements. Further relevant links could be shared with Members outside of the Committee.

- h) Mr Henderson also encouraged Borough Councils to apply maximum penalties available to ensure a consistent approach across Kent and help prevent displacements of offenders between areas.
- i) Ms Miller reported that the Council had strengthened its working relationship with the Environment Agency over the past 18 months. She confirmed that the waste carrier registration system was being reviewed due to not being fit for purpose, roadside checks were taking place in Kent with partner agencies, and that encouraging greater consistency in fixed penalty notices was supported. She also raised concerns that court fines could be lower than fixed penalties, with undermined deterrence, and confirmed that the issue was being raised with DEFRA and the Environment Agency.
- j) Mr Smyth stated that differences in fly-tipping figures between districts largely reflected inconsistent reporting practices, as there was no single agreed definition of a fly-tip. While this made direct comparison difficult, he agreed to take further consideration on what differentiated Dover from other areas.
- k) Mr Henderson agreed to seek further information from the Environment Agency on numbers of enforcement activity over the previous 12 months and plans going forward. Ms Miller explained that many fly-tipping incidents could not be enforced due to a lack of evidence, meaning enforcement figures did not always correlate with reported incidents. She added that the number of prosecutions was comparable to other areas and that investigations could take between six and twelve months to conclude.
- l) Paul Webb, Cabinet Member for Integrated Children's Services, welcomed the proposals for a multi-agency enforcement hub, highlighting that significant work was already underway to strengthen partnership working.
- m) Ms Miller explained that traders should provide householders with a waste transfer note detailing how waste was disposed of, although the current paper-based system was recognised as outdated and open to abuse. She advised that a national electronic waste-tracking system was expected to be introduced to improve transparency and compliance. She also assured Members that stronger sanctions, including action against company directors, driving license penalties and tougher enforcement against illegal waste sites were being considered nationally as part of the Environment Agency's 10-point action plans. While progress was positive, it was acknowledged that implementation would take time and further detail could be provided to Cabinet Committee in future, if required.
- n) Mr Smyth clarified that the proposed hub was still at an early, exploratory stage and not yet a fully developed project. As a result, no timescale had been set, and further work would be needed before it could be progressed.
- o) Ms Miller stated that proposals to make it mandatory for any business who registers with Companies House to register as a waste carrier would need to be considered at a national level by DEFRA and the Environment Agency, rather than led by KCC. She highlighted limitations, as not all

businesses were registered with Companies House, including sole traders and partnerships, but confirmed the suggestion could potentially be fed back to relevant national bodies.

- p) Mr Jones clarified that National Highways were responsible for fly-tipping on motorways, including on lay-bys, hard shoulders, and verge clearances, and this was managed through their maintenance contracts. Fly-tipping on A roads, however, fell under the responsibility of District and Borough Councils as the waste collection authorities. Other than two locations that were managed by independent contractors on behalf of National Highways, National Highways were responsible only for Design, Build, Finance and Operate (DBFO) roads in Kent.
 - q) Ms Miller explained that deterrence activity was developed jointly with District and Borough councils. This included identifying fly-tipping hotspots through intelligence-led approaches and deploying appropriate enforcement and monitoring measures. She recognised that while cameras were one option, other operational and enforcement techniques were also used. It was added that effective deterrence relied on sharing intelligence with districts to target hotspots and applying proportionate interventions beyond signage alone.
 - r) Mr Smyth clarified that camera funding and deployment responsibilities sat with District and Borough Councils, with KCC's role in limited to facilitating coordination and information sharing rather than direct deployment.
 - s) Mr Smyth explained that the Kent Resource Partnership (KRP) provided the main mechanism for standardising approaches and sharing best practice across Kent. The Partnership brought together waste officers from all 13 authorities and reported to a Members' group of portfolio holders. It was also acknowledged that Members' views on best practice could be raised with the KRP in future.
 - t) Mr Henderson advised that communication with Central Government would take place after publication of the House of Lords' report, with information then used to inform steps. He also outlined examples of modern approaches, including Maidstone's use of AI and use of camera technology to tackle littering.
 - u) Mr Henderson acknowledged that fly-tipping figures did not account for incidents on private land, where landowners disposed of waste at their own expense without reporting it. As a result, the true scale of the problem was likely under-reported, and potential value was recognised in enabling landowners and businesses to share this information.
3. The Chairman proposed to note the report and to make the following recommendations to the Cabinet Member for consideration:
- i) For KCC to promote waste carrier licenses for small and medium businesses.

- ii) To promote tradesperson licensing including the use of electronic tracking and informing the public on what they should expect in terms of information from tradespeople.
- iii) To encourage District and Borough councils to adopt consistent, maximised fines and messaging.
- iv) Request the Cabinet Member consider writing to the Environment Agency regarding licensing and businesses operating without appropriate licences.
- v) For there to be consideration of the implementation of a multi-agency hub.
- vi) Request the Cabinet Member consider writing to the relevant department with regard to getting consistent levels of fines in prosecutions to ensure fly-tipping is not treated as a business cost.

4. This was agreed by the Committee.

5. RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Committee note the report and make the following recommendations to the Cabinet Member for consideration:

- i) For KCC to promote waste carrier licenses for small and medium businesses.
- ii) To promote tradesperson licensing including the use of electronic tracking and informing the public on what they should expect in terms of information from tradespeople.
- iii) To encourage District and Borough councils to adopt consistent, maximised fines and messaging.
- iv) Request the Cabinet Member consider writing to the Environment Agency regarding licensing and businesses operating without appropriate licences.
- v) For there to be consideration of the implementation of a multi-agency hub.
- vi) Request the Cabinet Member consider writing to the relevant department with regard to getting consistent levels of fines in prosecutions to ensure fly-tipping is not treated as a business cost.

44. Work Programme

(Item D1)

RESOLVED to note the Work Programme.