



***STREETSCENE AND ENGINEERING SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE***

***10.00 AM FRIDAY, 17 DECEMBER 2021***

***VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS***

**All mobile telephones to be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting**

**PART 1**

1. Welcome and Roll Call
2. Chairs Announcements
3. Declarations of Interest
4. Minutes of Previous Meeting (*Pages 3 - 18*)
5. Pre-Decision Scrutiny  
To select appropriate items from the Cabinet agenda for pre-decision scrutiny (reports enclosed for Scrutiny Members)
6. Forward Work Programme 2021/22 (*Pages 19 - 22*)
7. Urgent Items  
(Whether public or exempt) at the discretion of the Chairman pursuant to Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972

**K.Jones**  
**Chief Executive**

**Committee Membership:**

**Chairperson:**      **Councillor S.M.Penry**

**Vice  
Chairperson:**      **Councillor R.W.Wood**

**Councillors:**      A.R.Aubrey, C.Galsworthy, D.Keogh, A.McGrath,  
W.F.Griffiths, R.Davies, J.Hale, S.A.Knoyle,  
S.Jones and S.Lynch

**Notes:**

- (1) If Committee Members or non-Committee Members wish to have relevant items put on the agenda for future meetings, then please notify the Chief Executive/Chair eight days before the meeting.*
- (2) If non-Committee Members wish to attend for an item of interest, then prior notification needs to be given (by 12.00 noon on the day before the meeting). Non-Committee Members may speak but not vote, or move or second any motion.*
- (3) For pre scrutiny arrangements, the Chair will normally recommend forthcoming executive items for discussion/challenge. It is also open to Committee Members to request items to be raised - though Members are asked to be selective here in regard to important issues.*
- (4) The relevant Cabinet Board Members will also be invited to be present at the meeting for Scrutiny/ Consultation purposes.*
- (5) Would the Scrutiny Committee Members please bring the Cabinet Board papers with them to the meeting.*

## Streetscene and Engineering Scrutiny Committee

(Via Microsoft Teams)

**Members Present:**

**24 September 2021**

**Chairperson:** Councillor S.M.Penry

**Vice Chairperson:** Councillor R.W.Wood

**Councillors:** A.R.Aubrey, C.Galsworthy, D.Keogh,  
W.F.Griffiths, R.Davies, J.Hale and S.Jones

**Officers In Attendance:** D.Griffiths, M.Roberts, N.Headon, C.Plowman,  
H.Hasan, P. Jackson and J.Smith

**Invitees:** Councillors M.Harvey, R.G.Jones and P.A.Rees

---

### 1. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2021 were approved.

### 2. **Pre-Decision Scrutiny**

The Committee scrutinised the following Cabinet Board items:

Welsh Government proposed 20mph default speed limit across Wales

Members were advised of the current position regarding the Welsh Government proposed 20mph default speed limit for Wales. A discussion took place regarding the financial impacts of this scheme; it was asked if Officers will be lobbying for increased funding for speed cushions and physical restrictions that will slow motorists down, as it was recognised that there was not enough resources within the Police to enforce this across the whole of the County Borough.

Officers explained that the intention from the blanket order was that hard engineering measures weren't planned as part of the wider default 20mph limit; and to move away from the extensive number of

speed cushions that would be required as part of this scheme, due to the costs that Local Authorities would be facing across the whole of Wales. It was added that there could be money available for entry features into communities, forewarning people that they were entering a built up area from a strategic route.

Members were informed that Welsh Government were undertaking pilots across eight Local Authorities; Neath Port Talbot was included in this pilot, with specific reference to the Cilfrew community.

It was confirmed that Officers had been raising the issue of funding with Welsh Government, and the circulated report set out a number of areas which were in discussion including undertaking a review of their maps.

The Committee noted that there would be significant costs in terms of the quantum of signage that may be required, and any changes to the legislative orders. An example of a change in legislative order would include if the Council decided that some of the main roads or strategic routes, where bus services running, would be best kept at 30mph; the Council would have to advertise to request that the road becomes 30mph, as in the proposals from Welsh Government, all roads will be defaulted to 20mph.

The circulated report stated that the financial impacts were currently unknown, and it was confirmed this was due to this being such an extensive piece of work; Officers were lobbying Welsh Government, and were being assured that funding will be available. It was mentioned that there would be significant work in terms of supporting the roads that were felt should be maintained at 30mph.

Officers explained that there was a meeting scheduled with the Deputy Minister, Leaders of Councils across Wales and relevant Cabinet Members; at this meeting, all concerns will be raised, particularly the financial implications of this scheme.

It was noted that an All Member Seminar had been arranged for Monday 27 September 2021 to brief Members on the Welsh Government proposed 20mph default speed limit across Wales. Officers were also going to be providing Members with a draft to the Welsh Government consultation that had been prepared from an Authority perspective; Members were asked to review this document before the Seminar. It was added that a lot of the questions contained within the consultation, were unable to be answered as an Authority

as they were directed to individuals; Officers would be asking Members to respond to these particular questions based on the streets within their Wards.

Following the All Member Seminar, it was stated that Officers would take on board all of the feedback and incorporate it into the consultation; it would then be proposed that the Cabinet Member for Streetscene, the Director of Environment and Regeneration and the Head of Engineering and Transport be granted authority to submit the consultation to Welsh Government.

Following scrutiny, the Committee noted the report.

Footway/cycleway link to Eglwys Nunnydd and St Davids Park, Margam

Officers provided a report on the proposal for capital investment in the provision of a footway/cycleway on Water Street to link Eglwys Nunnydd and St Davids Park to the A48 Margam.

Members queried how many times had there been a bid made for this scheme, and why the Council was still bidding on it despite being unsuccessful to secure Welsh Government external grant funding.

The report highlighted that a number of bids for Safe Routes in Communities had been made for this project; in the past, grants had been approved for works on the highways in the area, however these works weren't specific to the footpath. It was determined that this area required a Safe Route in Communities for the residents for a number of reasons.

It was explained that the Council had a long history of progressing Safe Routes in Communities across the County Borough, and after trying on several occasions to secure the funding from Welsh Government, the Council was not able to on this occasion; therefore, the Council were being asked to contribute to the funding of the scheme due to the elements of concerns with road safety in the areas.

The concerns with the safety of this particular site were explained to Members. It was noted that the Local Development Plan (LDP) included dormitory settlements across the County Borough, some of which weren't served by footpaths; the link to Eglwys Nunnydd and St Davids Park, Margam was one of those areas. Officers highlighted

that the estates in discussion did not have any safe access way out on foot.

Furthermore, Members were informed that there had been some changes in terms of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic movements, which was detailed within the circulated report. It was stated that several years ago, the Leadership in Bridgend County Borough Council, approached Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council (NPTCBC), following issues with HGVs driving through the small villages in Pyle. It was noted that a major project was undertaken to alter the highway to allow HGV access to the industrial estate which was accessed via Water Street in Margam; this resulted in a higher volume of HGV traffic utilising this route to access the industrial estate.

Following a query regarding the lack of school children that would use the proposed footpath, it was explained that at the time of the first bid to Welsh Government, the Safe Route to School Programme was a factor contributing to the succession of funding for these types of projects; due to the low number of children that would have used this route to walk to school, Welsh Government did not approve the funding. However, since then the Safer Routes in Communities Programme had been established which considers all users and residents within various areas. It was mentioned that although the children in the area had transport to school, there was no route out of this area for residents on foot and that was a concern.

A discussion took place in regards to the cost of the scheme, to which it was predicated that it would cost around £550k. Officers provided information regarding the various products and materials that would be required, and highlighted that certain products were currently very volatile. Members were informed that Officers were hopeful to deliver this project within its budget; the figures had been based on a schedule of rates for the Council's Streetcare Services, which had been reviewed by an external consultant. It was stated that until work is contracted there is always the potential to be variances; however, this was the case for every project that the Council considers.

It was asked if there were plans to put in a footway/cycle way from the estate in discussion, towards the area of Pyle, which was located in Bridgend; this route would be in the opposite direction of the route detailed in the circulated report. It was noted that the Council was currently reviewing the Active Travel Routes, and a consultation was currently being undertaken on this matter; if a footway/cycleway was

to be established towards the area of Pyle, then joint proposals would need to be considered with colleagues in Bridgend Country Borough Council due to the link between communities. Members were informed that there were plans to join up communities across the County in that respect, however this rested with the Active Travel future plans.

Reference was made to paragraph six of the letter that was received from the residents of Eglwys Nunydd and St Davids, which was detailed in the circulated report; Officers were asked to elaborate on this.

The Committee was informed that there was a group of Officers within the Local Authority who were part of the Capital Programme Steering Group; this Group considers issues relating to capital projects and associated funding including unforeseen incidents across the County Borough such as flooding or landslides. It was stated that this Group had been in operation for some time and prior to the recent review which proposed changes to the procedures around how schemes were authorised the scheme in discussion was approved. As a consequence Officers had been asked to present this report to the Streetscene and Engineering Cabinet Board to share the information and to ensure that Members were sighted on the proposal for consideration. It was explained that the residents were informed of the scheme as it had been thought, incorrectly, the project had been incorporated into the works programme via its Capital Programme Steering Group approval.

It had been noted in the meeting that the project had been raised for consideration in the annual Members' Surgery meetings regarding the Highways and Engineering works programme. Given the scale of the project Members queried the breakdown of programme spend throughout the Wards. Officers stated that whilst spend was limited there was potential for schemes to start as small feasibility projects under the programme however a project of this scale could not be funded out of the programme; this was the reason why it went to the Capital Programme Steering Group for consideration of investment from the Capital Programme. It was mentioned that this had happened in many areas in the past. Officers could provide information as required and noted spend as discussed in the surgeries formed part of a wider asset management approach under the Highway Asset Management Plan including essential safety work such as surfacing needs, barrier repairs and other safety hazards that may come to light from asset surveys.

It was noted that over the past few years, the Head of Streetcare, had sent all Members a briefing note in advance of the Member Surgeries which set out the available budget and the process. Officers noted that if the available budget was averaged across all wards the amount would only be around £40k, however actual spend varied according to need, for example, there could be bridges that needing repairing or drainage assets that needed addressing in specific wards in a given year. Officers confirmed again that a scheme of this scale and nature would not come under the Highways and Engineering Programme but as noted some feasibility work might be undertaken. Following a study, the outcome would inform future decision taking; over the years, various Members had requested a range of studies into potential schemes in their Wards.

The Local Member for the Margam Ward addressed the Committee, and expressed the need for the footway/cycleway link to Eglwys Nunnydd and St Davids Park.

It was raised that there was an error contained within the circulated report; on pages 211 and 212, it mentioned '*a reduction in the National speed limit along the A48 route from 50mph to 40mph*'. However, it was confirmed that it should state '*a reduction in the National speed limit along the A48 route from 60mph to 40mph*'.

Following scrutiny, the Committee were supportive of the recommendation to go to Cabinet Board.

#### Traffic Regulation Order/s: Glais to Pontrdawe

The Committee received a report regarding a 40 mph Speed Limit Traffic Regulation Order at the A4067 Glais to Pontardawe.

Officers explained that the vast majority of this network falls within the adjoining Council, the City and County of Swansea; for some time they had been concerned with the number of road accidents that had taken place on the highway network in the area. It was stated that there was evidence of motorists speeding on the road; colleagues in the City and County of Swansea had expressed that the only way in which the speed of traffic on that part of the network could be controlled, would be to reduce the speed limit. Members were informed that Neath Port Talbot Council had a small section of the network that would need to be changed in order to allow for the whole A4067 to have the average speed cameras; the average speed



cameras seemed to work effectively, as there was evidence of a lot more compliance with cameras of this nature.

The Committee discussed the placement of the average speed cameras. It was confirmed that they will be placed on both sides of the network, in Neath Port Talbot and the City and County of Swansea in order to capture the average speed across the length of the road.

In regards to the advertisement of the order, it was confirmed that it will need to be advertised in the press, such as local newspapers, and on the Neath Port Talbot Council website. Members were also informed that signage will need to be placed in specific areas to inform motorists of the average speed cameras. Members were informed that the grant that was submitted by the City and County of Swansea and the money had to be spent by March 31 2022; therefore, the preparatory work was in hand and the order just needed to go through the legal process. It was mentioned that colleagues in the City and County of Swansea were completing a parallel exercise on their part of the network, and were aligned with the Neath Port Talbot Council's work on the order.

Following scrutiny, the Committee were supportive of the recommendation to go to Cabinet Board.

### 3. **Forward Work Programme 2021/22**

Members noted the Streetscene and Engineering Scrutiny Forward Work Programme for 2021/22.

It was stated that the Streetscene and Engineering Scrutiny Forward Work Programme Workshop was scheduled for 14 October 2021.

**CHAIRPERSON**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Streetscene and Engineering Scrutiny Committee

(Via Microsoft Teams)

**Members Present:**

**5 November 2021**

**Chairperson:** Councillor R.Wood

**Councillors:** A.R.Aubrey, C.Galsworthy, D.Keogh,  
A.McGrath, W.F.Griffiths, R.Davies, J.Hale and  
S.Lynch

**Officers In Attendance** D.Griffiths, M.Roberts, C.Plowman, J.Griffiths,  
C.Powney, S.Cook and J.Woodman-Ralph

**Invitees:** Councillors M.Harvey, A.Wingrave and  
H.C.Clarke

---

### 1. **Chairs Announcements**

It was announced that Agenda Item 9 on the Cabinet Board Agenda '*Design Options for the Remediation of Cilmaengwyn Tip above Godre'r Graig Primary School*' had been withdrawn from consideration at this meeting to enable Officers to seek further supplementary information. It was confirmed that a report regarding this matter would be brought for consideration at the next meeting.

### 2. **Declarations of Interest**

The following Member made a declaration of interest:

Cllr. M. Harvey -

Re. Cabinet Board Agenda Item 8  
– Annual Parking Report  
2020/2021 as in his role working  
for South Wales Police, he assess  
car parks mentioned in the report  
as part of the Safer Parking  
Scheme.

### 3. **Parking Enforcement Operation 2021**

The Committee received a report regarding the Parking Enforcement Operation 2021, which detailed current staffing levels within the Authority's parking services section.

Members asked if the Council restricted the amount of permits given out in regards to the parking spaces available; and if this had any impact on the neighbouring streets, in particular terraced areas. In terms of the current policy, it was stated that two residents per household could receive parking permits; this was reduced to one permit if there was off-street parking areas or if the property had a garage. The current permit scheme did not guarantee a space within the resident bays, however it offered residents a better opportunity to park closer to their properties. It was noted that when Officers assess a street they must retain around 30% of the street as unrestricted, which allows for visitors and those who weren't able to park within a bay, to then be able to park within an unrestricted area; where there were very restricted streets, inevitably sometimes residents will have to park on nearby streets. Officers mentioned that with the increase of the number of vehicles privately owned, there were more cars than physical spaces on the streets in some areas, particularly where there were terraced properties. It was added that for a permit to be issued on a street, the car must be registered to a property on the street.

It was mentioned that there were some areas and spaces across the County Borough which could potentially be suitable for additional parking bays, for examples verges; Officers were asked if they could look into this type of solution and if there were any grants that could be utilised to complete this work. Officers stated that there were no specific grants to create off street residential parking bays; in the past, there had been schemes in which the Council was able to create off street parking bays, however there had not been any for some time due to the pressures on the highway maintenance budget. It was noted that this type of work was do-able if unplanned monies became available; the Team were open to suggestions and would always try and create additional parking, where possible, for residents. It was explained that Officers would need to be informed of specific issues in Members Wards in order for them to identify any funding opportunities to fund particular projects of work.

Members raised points concerning the shift pattern of the staff and the need for more resources in the service; and stated that although certain elements of enforcement had been effective, such as the mobile CCTV van, there would need to be more of them in order to carry out enforcement more effectively. Officers confirmed that the CCTV van had been very effective since it had been introduced; however, under the legislation, the CCTV van could only enforce certain traffic orders such as those relating to double yellow lines, bus stops and bus laybys, zig zags and school orders. It was noted that complex changes were made when this vehicle was introduced due to the fact that every traffic order throughout the County Borough had to be digitalised; this was because the CCTV van picked up where an order starts and ends from a GPS. It was added that Officers recognised that traffic orders around schools also had to be completely regularised across the County Borough; this took a considerable amount of time to complete. Officers confirmed that they were currently working through costs to potentially purchase another vehicle due to the effectiveness of the current van and the amount of requests for an additional vehicle from Elected Members; this would increase enforcement in the County Borough, however the vans could only be in particular locations at certain times. It was confirmed that when the existing van needed to be replaced, a low emission, electric vehicle would be purchased and the same will apply when purchasing additional vehicles.

In terms of resources, it was highlighted that the staffing levels had more or less stayed the same since Local Authorities were given enforcement powers; since that time, over the last 20 years, there had been around 600 additional enforceable traffic orders that have been implemented across the County Borough, the number of surface car parks and off street car parks had increased, as well as some of the Country Park car parks that the Council enforces. In addition, it was mentioned that there had been an increase in activity at Aberavon Sea Front in the summer months and a lot of other tourist destinations in the County Borough; this was also impacting the service due to these areas becoming more popular, therefore Officers had to react to these factors. It was stated that there were severe pressures on the parking service due to these issues raised.

The Committee was informed that new developments have had a substantial impact on the urban areas, and had caused some residential streets to be affected; for example, there had been a lot of difficulties with displaced car parking at the university campus on

Fabian Way, and because of this Officers had deployed enforcement to the area when the university was in operation.

Another difficulty noted was the taxi ranks; however, colleagues in the Licensing Team had recently taken a report to Cabinet to enable a more joined up approach on the enforcement of the taxi ranks.

In regards to staffing levels, it was noted that the service had 10 Officers in total, two of those being Senior Officers; one job was currently being advertised as an employee had recently left the Council. It was confirmed that with the new recruit, the staffing levels would total at nine employees, as one Senior Officer had been deployed to assist with the Test, Trace Protect (TTP) Service. It was mentioned that the staff worked a split shift, and Officers highlight the various times and days that were in the schedule; Officers were also asked to work overtime to support night time enforcement.

A discussion took place in regards to the new parking meters, which now had contactless payment; Members queried whether they were easy to use. It was explained that the contactless feature was relatively easy to use; it required the user to enter their car registration number and tap their contactless card against the machine before a ticket would then be provided. Officers stated that there had been a phased plan of renewal of all of the pay and display parking meters across the County Borough; some were now solar powered meters, and others were hard wired. It was added that all of the machines were now bilingual, and there were various options to pay for parking; this included chip and pin payment, cash payment and contactless payment. Members were informed that the service was also in the process of rolling out a pay by phone option via the MiPermit facility, to all car parks across the County Borough; this was already in place at the Aberavon Sea Front car park, and allowed the public to pay for their ticket on their phone.

Officers highlighted that cash collection from the parking meters had been reduced significantly due to more people opting for card payment or cashless payment; the service had been able to review the cash collection system as a whole because of this. It was noted that there was very little cash now in the meters, and signs had been put up informing the public of this; there had been numerous incidents where individuals had tried to break into the machines, therefore it was important to ensure that the public were aware that the system was now predominantly cashless.

It was asked, where there were major issues with parking in certain streets, would it be possible to take away some of the grass verges to allow for additional parking spaces. Officers confirmed that they were content to identify opportunities where this could be carried out; there were various stages to doing this, one of which would include involving the Road Safety Team to obtain their views from a road safety perspective. It was mentioned that in some locations within the County Borough, Officers had advised against creating parking spaces on grass verges particularly around schools; in these instances Officers had looked at putting other mitigation measures in place. It was confirmed that in all cases, it would need to be identified if capital funding was available for the work to be carried out.

Officers provided information regarding the new legislation that was due to be issued during the term of the current Welsh Government; one of the main elements of this was pavement parking. It was explained that the powers of enforcement of pavement parking was going to be taken from the Police and provided to Local Authorities in Wales; this will provide significant additional pressures to the enforcement teams.

A suggestion was made to involve residents in discussions regarding identifying solutions to parking issues in residential areas.

Following scrutiny, the report was noted.

#### 4. **Pre-Decision Scrutiny**

The Committee scrutinised the following Cabinet Board items:

##### Three Yearly Grit Bin Policy Review

Members were provided with the review of the Council's grit bin policy.

Officers explained that the grit bin policy was set in 2012, and had been presented to the Committee on a three yearly review basis since then; there had been no changes to the policy since it was set in 2012. It was highlighted that due to previous difficult decisions regarding the budget including cuts to the Neighbourhood Services, there was currently not a lot of monies available for extra activity within the service.

Members were informed that the grit bins were purchased in batches and were replaced when necessary, along with refills which could be purchased in line with the policy; last year, three grit bins were

reported as damaged and nine grit bins were absent from their usual location.

It was noted that the grit bin maintenance generates a significant amount of work and service demand for the Neighbourhood Team; in addition to the regular refills that were usually carried out, there were 100 requests for additional refills last year. Officers highlighted that there was a finite level of resource which was required to balance across a range of activities that the Neighbourhood Team carry out; due to the fact that the budget position hadn't improved, the recommendation was to maintain the policy for a further three years. Officers added that if Members wanted to review the detail of the policy, it would be important to consider the entirety of requests for grit bins from all Elected Members and ensure that whatever changes were made, fitted in line with the budget so that they could be funded and maintained.

Members expressed their concerns in regards to the current grit bin policy and highlighted the difficulties that were experienced during the winter months; particularly in areas where there weren't many grit bins or any at all. Members had hoped that more grit bins would be available, especially in areas where there were hills; it was asked if a mapping exercise had been completed to identify where the various grit bins were located and if the equability of them could be looked into.

Officers confirmed that the Council's geographical information system had a layer which covered where all of the grit bins were located across the County Borough. It was mentioned that the grit bin policy had an eligibility criteria which covered the necessary qualities and conditions of obtaining a grit bin for various areas; there were some areas within the County Borough which had more hills than others, therefore they would be a priority in obtaining a bin. Members were informed that because of this, the distribution will not be equal. It was added that under the current policy, Members were permitted to move a grit bin to another location within their Ward if required; however if the Ward did not have a grit bin to move, then this would not be able to happen.

A discussion took place in regards to the current guidelines contained within the policy. Members made various suggestions relating to what could be added to the policy and reviewed in order for improvements to be made; for example, taking age and vulnerability for residents into account, identifying if particular areas were prone to icing up



during the winter period and providing Officers with discretion if there was a solid case for an area to obtain a grit bin.

Following the discussions and concerns raised by Members, a formal amendment to the recommendation contained within the circulated report was proposed and seconded:

‘That the current Grit Bin Policy be continued pending a review of the policy by the Streetscene and Engineering Scrutiny Committee and a report be brought back for consideration to a future meeting of the Streetscene and Engineering Cabinet Board’

It was determined that the Committee were in support of the amendment to be considered by Cabinet Board.

#### Key Performance Indicators 2021/2022 - Quarter 1 (1 April 2021 - 30 June 2021)

Officers reported quarter 1 performance management data for the period 1 April 2021 to 30 June 2021.

Members made reference to the performance indicator relating to the percentage of waste, reused, recycled or composted; and highlighted that the target figures were increasing. Officers confirmed that the current target for this performance indicator was 64%, which would increase to 70% for the civic year 2024/25.

Following scrutiny, the report was noted.

#### 5. Forward Work Programme 2021/22

Members requested that information relating to side waste enforcement within the Waste Service be added to the Forward Work Programme. It was agreed that this element would be included in the report on litter and fly tipping enforcement which was scheduled to be presented to Committee on 28 January 2022.

The Forward Work Programme for the Streetscene and Engineering Scrutiny Committee was noted.

#### 6. Access to Meetings

**RESOLVED:** that pursuant to Section 100A(4) and (5) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded for the following items of business which involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 14 of Part 4 of Schedule 12A to the above Act.

7. **Pre-Decision Scrutiny of Private Item/s**

The Committee chose to scrutinise the following private Cabinet Board items:

Section 38 Highways Act 1980 Agreement, Commuted Sum Payment - Cae Morfa, Phases Three and Four Skewen

Members received a report in relation to the Cae Morfa Development Section 38 position regarding the level of commuted sums for the long term maintenance of the development.

Following scrutiny, the Committee were supportive of the recommendation to go to Cabinet Board.

**CHAIRPERSON**

**SCRUTINY**  
**FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME**

**March 2021 – 2022**

## Streetscene and Engineering Scrutiny Committee (All starting 10am unless otherwise stated)

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Contact Officer
<b>2021</b>		
26 <sup>th</sup> March	Please see Cabinet Board FWP for items	
21 <sup>st</sup> May	Please see Cabinet Board FWP for items	
2 <sup>nd</sup> July	Please see Cabinet Board FWP for items	
24 <sup>th</sup> September	Please see Cabinet Board FWP for items	
20 <sup>th</sup> November	Parking Enforcement Operation 2021	Steve Cook
17 <sup>th</sup> December	Please see Cabinet Board FWP for items	
<b>2022</b>		
28 <sup>th</sup> January	Report on Litter / Fly Tipping / Side Waste Enforcement	James Davies
	Management and Maintenance of Playgrounds	James Davies
11 <sup>th</sup> March	Joint Report on Subway and Footway Maintenance	Hasan Hasan
29 <sup>th</sup> April	Public Transport / Passenger and Community Transport Update	Peter Jackson

	Report on Land Drainage and flood Defence	Steve Owen

To be programmed in:

- Quality Assurance Report

