

Public Document Pack



CABINET

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 9 SEPTEMBER 2025

Present: Cllrs Nick Ireland (Chair), Richard Biggs (Vice-Chair), Jon Andrews, Shane Bartlett, Ryan Hope, Steve Robinson, Clare Sutton and Gill Taylor

Apologies: Cllrs Simon Clifford and Ben Wilson

Also present: Cllr Belinda Bawden, Cllr Matt Bell, Cllr Simon Christopher, Cllr Hannah Hobbs-Chell, Cllr Jane Somper, Cllr Ryan Holloway, Cllr Craig Monks and Cllr Louie O'Leary

Also present remotely: Cllr Beryl Ezzard, Cllr Laura Beddow, Cllr Alex Brenton, Cllr Richard Crabb, Cllr Barry Goringe, Cllr Rob Hughes, Cllr Jack Jeanes, Cllr Carole Jones, Cllr Stella Jones, Cllr Cathy Lugg, Cllr David Morgan, Cllr Andrew Parry, Cllr Byron Quayle, Cllr Gary Suttle, Cllr Roland Tarr and Cllr Tomes

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Jan Britton (Executive Director - Place), Sean Cremer (Corporate Director for Finance and Commercial), Kate Critchel (Senior Democratic Services Officer), George Dare (Senior Democratic and Governance Officer), Jonathan Price (Executive Director of People - Adults and Housing), Andrew Billany (Corporate Director for Housing), Lisa Cotton (Corporate Director for Customer and Cultural Services), Paul Dempsey (Executive Director of People - Children), Sunita Khattra-Hall (Corporate Director for Quality Assurance and Safeguarding Families), Tina Ironside (Strategic Commissioner), Jessica Maskrey (Head of Service – Assets & Property), Jack Wiltshire (Corporate Director for Highways and Engineering), Rachel Partridge (Deputy Director of Public Health), Grace Evans (Head of Legal Services and Deputy Monitoring Officer), Catherine Howe (Chief Executive), Sam Poole (Interim Corporate Director for Commissioning & Improvement), Richard Freed (Service Manager for Commercial and Procurement) and Jennifer Lowis (Head of Strategic Communications and Engagement)

34. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2025 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

35. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest to report.

36. Public Participation

There were two questions, and one statement received from the public. A copy of the full questions, the detailed responses and the statement are set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes.

37. Questions from Councillors

There were three questions from Councillors; these along with the responses are set out in Appendix 2 to these minutes.

38. Forward Plan

The draft Cabinet Forward Plan for October was received and noted.

39. Dorset Safeguarding Children Partnership (DSCP) Annual Report April 2024 - March 2025

The Cabinet Member of Children's Services, Education and Skills presented the information report and the 2024–2025 reporting year. This marked a significant milestone for the Dorset Safeguarding Children Partnership (DSCP), following its formal separation from the Pan-Dorset Safeguarding Children Partnership in August 2024. This transition had enabled Dorset to establish safeguarding arrangements that were more responsive to local needs and better aligned with national reforms.

The new structure reflected the principles set out in *Working Together to Safeguard Children (2023)* and the *Stable Homes, Built on Love* review, ensuring that Dorset's approach to safeguarding was both robust and forward-looking. The annual report outlined progress made under the new arrangements and set the direction for continued improvement in safeguarding outcomes for children and young people across the county.

Decision

That the annual report be received and noted.

40. New Street Lighting Policy

The Cabinet Member for Place advised Cabinet that Dorset Council was leading the way nationally with the introduction of the street lighting policy.

The recommendations set out in the report would enable the upgrade of thousands of streetlights across the county, placing Dorset at the forefront of sustainable and advanced lighting technology.

Dorset would be the first local authority in the UK to adopt a precautionary approach to potential human health impacts by implementing warmer colour temperature lighting. In addition, the policy promotes cleaner, greener solutions that aligned with Dorset's climate and ecological ambitions. Adoption of the policy would contribute to long-term improvements in energy efficiency, public wellbeing, and rural character.

It was proposed by Cllr J Andrews and seconded by Cllr N Ireland

Decision

- (a) That the Street Lighting Policy for new and replacement lighting in Dorset be adopted.

The policy includes the new environmental zoning, recommendations for dimming and the use of lower correlated colour temperature (CCT) LEDs in new streetlights, with the CCT typically not exceeding 2700K. The policy also enables town and parish councils to fund additional costs if there is a local preference for alternative equipment such as brackets, columns and lanterns.

- (b) Cabinet agreed to work with the street lighting service provider, who plans to invest in replacing 18,500 outdated lanterns over the next two or three years at no cost to the council. In return, the service provider will receive 75% of the energy savings until their contract ends in 2032.

Reason for the decision

Limiting colour temperatures for new and replacement street lighting in Dorset would bring health, ecological and dark sky benefits. The policy took a Dorset specific approach to street lighting that balances modern technological advancements, health and wellbeing, Dorset's unique environment, our climate ambitions and recognised best practice.

41. **July 2025 (Period 4) financial management report 2025/26**

In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Finance and Capital Strategy, the Leader of the Council set out the July (period 4) financial management report and proposed its recommendations. This was seconded by Cllr J Andrews.

In presenting the financial position, the Leader acknowledged the significant challenges outlined in the report, emphasising that while these challenges were real, so too was the Council's commitment to managing its resources responsibly. The report highlighted a projected overspend of £7.7 million, representing 1.8% of the total budget requirement of £417.2 million. The main financial pressure continued to stem from Adult Social Care, while Children's Services remained on track to achieve their savings targets. There was also a delay in savings from the Our Future Council (OFC) transformation programme. Members were further advised that efforts were ongoing to manage slippage, introduce tighter financial controls, and transparency would continue to be maintained throughout the process.

In response to a question, the Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education and Skills confirmed that "Birth to settled Adulthood" was not a separate directorate but a cross-cutting project between children and adult services. In response to a question about reprofiling, Members were advised that in relation to the capital programme, it's a process of adjusting the timing of planned spending or investment to deliver a project.

Other details set out in the financial paper were discussed and clarified.

In response to a question regarding compliance related spending failures, the Leader acknowledged the historic shortcomings in the Council's health and safety management of its buildings dating back to 2019. He confirmed that this matter was being actively scrutinised by Audit and Governance Committee, by a cross-party member group led by Cllr S Clifford, to review the work undertaken, outline next steps and report back to a future meeting of Audit and Governance Committee.

The Leader also confirmed that opportunity to recover funds was being investigated and that all members would be fully briefed in due course.

In reply to concerns about achieving the proposed OFC savings, the Chief Executive explained that work was underway to review how savings were being delivered, alongside strengthening in-year spending controls. This formed part of a complex change programme, which must align with decisions around the new ERP system to ensure coherence and effectiveness. However, there remained a commitment to delivering the in-year budget position with the proposed savings being met over the course of the programme.

Decision

- (a) That the Senior Leadership Team's (SLT) forecast of the full year's outturn for the Council, made at the end of July 2025 including progress of the transformational and efficiency savings incorporated into the budget, be noted.
- (b) It was noted that SLT will be bringing forward financial control measures in response to the forecast position.
- (c) That the capital programme for 2025/26 be noted.
- (d) That the number and extent of contract exemptions be noted.

Reason for the decision

The Council was legally required to set a balanced budget every year and so must deliver services within the resources made available through the revenue and capital budgets for 2025/26. The report summarised the Council's forecast financial performance for the year at the end of July 2025.

42. **Additional Procurement Forward Plan Report - over £500k (2025-26) and Modern Slavery Transparency Statement 2024-25**

The Leader of the Council asked members to consider the contents of the report in respect of the proposed additional procurement activity for 2025-26 as set out in the report's appendix. Members were also asked to agree the Modern Slavery Transparency Statement.

It was proposed by Cllr N Ireland and seconded by Cllr S Robinson

Decision

- (a) Cabinet agreed to begin each of the procurement procedures as set out in Appendix 1 to the report *(subject to an approved and available budget)*.
- (b) That authority be delegated to the relevant Cabinet Member, after consultation with the relevant Executive Director to make the following decisions:
 - (i) To agree final procurement documentation developed and refined within the broad scope of the procurement briefing notes *(available on request)*.
 - (ii) To agree contract award subject to an approved and available budget *(through a recommendation to award report and recorded in an Executive Decision form by the decision maker)*.
 - (iii) That the Modern Slavery Transparency Statement for 2024-2025 be published.

Reason for the decision

Cabinet was required to approve all key decisions with financial consequences of £500k or more. It was a statutory requirement for the Council to publish a Modern Slavery Transparency Statement on an annual basis.

43. **All-Age Pan-Dorset Appropriate Adult Service - contract extension approval**

Cabinet was asked to approve extending the Appropriate Adult Service (AAS) contract for 6 months.

The service was jointly commissioned by Dorset Council, BCP Council and the Dorset Police and Crime Commissioner. The need to extend the current contract arose due to delays in reaching formal agreement between the partner organisations. This postponed the re-procurement of the service.

It was proposed by Cllr S Robinson seconded by Cllr C Sutton

Decision

That the extension of the existing contract for the All-Age Pan-Dorset Appropriate Adult Service with the Appropriate Adult Service (TAAS) from 1 October 2025 to 31 March 2026, be approved.

Reason for the decision

In early 2025 Dorset Council scheduled a new procurement of this service so that a new contract would be in place for 1 July 2025. However, this was subject to all partners signing a Participation Agreement. Unforeseen delays finalising this agreement with partners had led to extending the re-procurement timeline and requiring an extension to the contract with the current provider. This agreement has now been signed by all partners.

44. **Dorset Council Property and Housing Repairs - Replacement of RMMSCW Framework**

The Cabinet Member for Property & Assets and Economic Growth set out a report seeking authority to replace the former Repairs, Minor Maintenance and Small

Capital Works Framework (RMMSCW) with new contractual arrangements for delivering building repairs and maintenance services across Dorset Council's operational, tenanted and housing properties.

The report also outlined the rationale behind the recommended approach, detailed the procurement process to be followed, and identified the needs for an interim solution from 30 September 2025 to 1 April 2026, with the options to extend to 1 April 2027.

It was proposed by Cllr R Biggs seconded by Cllr J Andrews

Decision

- (a) That the approach to the long-term replacement of the RMMSCW Framework be approved and the procurement of the measured term contracts and identification of an appropriate framework for the commissioning of small capital works, be authorised.
- (b) That the approach to the interim solution while the long-term contracts are procured be approved.
- (c) That authority be delegated to the Executive Director for Place in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Property & Assets and Economic Growth to award interim contracts described within Appendix B of the report, under the Westworks Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS), and subject to available budget.
- (d) That authority be delegated to the Executive Director for Place in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Property & Assets and Economic Growth, the Executive Director Corporate/ Section 151 Officer and the Director Legal and Democratic to select the most appropriate DPS for the procurement of Capital Works.
- (e) That authority be delegated to the Executive Director for Place in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Property & Assets and Economic Growth, the Executive Director Corporate/ Section 151 Officer and the Director Legal and Democratic to award and agree the terms of the long-term contracts described in Appendix B of the report, and subject to available budget.

Reason for the decision

To ensure the ability to deliver repairs and maintenance and small capital works to Council buildings and housing properties and to approve the procurement of the long-term solution which was intended to enhance the provision and cost effectiveness of these services to the Council's estate.

45. **Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan**

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Emergency Planning presented the report to adopt the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan. It was proposed by Cllr S Bartlett and seconded by Cllr N Ireland.

Decision

- (a) That the Council ‘makes’ the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan (as set out in Appendix A of the report) part of the statutory development plan for the Knightsford Neighbourhood Area.
- (b) That the Council offers its congratulations to Knightsford Parish Council and members of the Neighbourhood Plan Group for producing a successful neighbourhood plan.

Reason for the decision

To formally “make” the Knightsford Neighbourhood Plan part of the statutory development plan for the Knightsford Neighbourhood Area. In addition, to recognise the significant amount of work undertaken by the Parish Council and members of the Neighbourhood Plan Group in preparing the plan and to congratulate the Council and the Group on their success.

46. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items considered at the meeting.

47. **Exempt Business**

It was proposed by Cllr J Andrews seconded by Cllr S Robinson

Decision

That the press and the public be excluded for the following item in view of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the meaning of paragraph 3 of schedule 12 A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

Reason for taking the item in private

Paragraph 3 - Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The live streaming was concluded at this juncture.

48. **Acquisition of land for SEND provision**

The Cabinet Member for Property & Assets and Economic Growth set out the exempt report and proposed its recommendations. This was seconded by Cllr C Sutton.

Decision

That the recommendations set out in the exempt report be approved.

Reason for the decision

To allow the expansion for SEND provision and to meet existing need.

Appendix 1 - Public Questions and Responses
Appendix 2 - Councillor Questions and Responses

Duration of meeting: 6.30 - 7.42 pm

Chair

.....

Cabinet - 9 September 2025

Public Questions

1. Question from Geoffrey Chopping - Loal Plan Consultation

I am Geoffrey Chopping and although I am a Holt Parish Councillor, I am not asking this question on behalf of Holt Parish Council.

In the current Dorset Council Local Plan Consultation, some settlements are listed for Tiers 1 and Tiers 2 within the text, whilst Tier 3 Settlements are listed in Figure 3.2.

However, within the main document, there is no precise written definition of the extent of the current, or the extent of the enlarged settlements, in Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3. Consequently, sufficient information is not easily available to all residents to know if the areas, in which they are interested, are affected.

The only available precise definition of areas are Civil Parish Boundaries; and 3.2.8 states:

All other areas are either rural in character or comprise small villages/hamlets that do not have a sufficient services or facilities for everyday needs to be met locally. These areas are unlikely to be suitable for growth in line with National Policy⁵.

Without definitions of any precise areas to the contrary, the only practical textual definition that can be used for areas are Civil Parish Boundaries; and certainly not the vague whims of the strategic planning department.

QUESTION

Can Dorset Council confirm that as changes to the Green Belt can only be made during the Local Plan Consultation Process and as Holt Parish is not directly mentioned within Tiers 1, 2 or 3 as being suitable for development within this Local Plan Consultation, that there will be no changes to the Green Belt for any part of the Holt Parish area as a result of this Local Plan Consultation?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Planning and Emergency Planning

Changes to Green Belt boundaries can only be made through the adoption of new Local Plans. The current consultation process is an early step towards the preparation of a new Dorset Council Local Plan, and we cannot confirm where changes to the Green Belt will or will not take place, until we have considered all the evidence and the consultation responses, and taken the plan through further stages of its preparation, which include a public examination.

The consultation document identifies settlements that are potentially suitable for development, classified as Tier 1, 2 or 3 depending on their size and level of facilities. This is for the purpose of considering options for development around the edges of those built-up areas, that would function as an extension of that built-up area, regardless of whether it is in the same parish.

2. Question from Robert Horne

Good practice in the multidisciplinary assessment of needs for NHS Continuing Healthcare

My question to the cabinet meeting held on 25th February this year was:-

Has Dorset Council considered agreeing with NHS Dorset a joint model of assessment?

I posed the question because I knew that NHS Dorset had, in the case of one care home resident, interfered in the work of multidisciplinary team (MDT) to reverse its recommendation on eligibility for NHS Continuing Healthcare (CHC).

In response to my question Councillor Steve Robinson wrote:-

The National Framework states that only in exceptional circumstances, and for clearly articulated reasons, should the multidisciplinary team's recommendation not be followed.

That is correct, but in the case of interest to me I now know that NHS Dorset holds no records of exceptional circumstances. Nevertheless NHS Dorset tells me its CHC decision making procedure complies with the National Framework. That can't be right, so I investigated further.

I discovered that NHS Dorset has an internal procedure under which it requires MDTs to submit each completed and signed Decision Support Tool (DST) to its Decision Making Team (DMT) before issue to the subject person. Without citing or explaining exceptional circumstances or involving the subject person, the DMT can require an MDT to reconvene to take into account the DMT's assessments of the subject person's health care needs and the DMT's opinion on the eligibility recommendation, all before issuing the DST to the subject person. That certainly isn't right.

I sent to Councillor Robinson on 1st June my information document entitled *Good practice in the multidisciplinary assessment of needs for NHS Continuing Healthcare* which explains where NHS Dorset's reconvene procedure is non-compliant with the National Framework and how it disadvantages both Dorset Council and care home residents.

NHS Dorset should not require Dorset Council to provide additional CHC Social Worker input to an MDT without having good reasons (capable of being clearly

articulated) for believing that there are exceptional circumstances which entitle the return by the DMT of a completed DST to the MDT for reconsideration. I suggest that, as a standard procedure, NHS Dorset is required to produce that information before Dorset Council agrees to commit additional staff time to an MDT reconvene.

My question to the Cabinet is:-

Will Dorset Council require NHS Dorset to produce the evidence of exceptional circumstances with clearly articulated reasons whenever NHS Dorset makes a request of additional Social Services staff time for the reconvene of an MDT?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

Thank you for your question

Dorset Council is committed to active participation in Continuing Healthcare multi-disciplinary team processes.

The Council employs specialist Continuing Health Care Social Workers to undertake CHC assessments and typically attend the Decision Support Tool (DST) meetings either in person or virtually.

If a Decision Support Tool meeting is reconvened by NHS Dorset, then they usually provide Dorset Councils CHC Social Workers with detailed information to highlight the discrepancies between the evidence presented and the recommendation made in order to agree a way forward.

Your question highlights how complex this area of practice is. We would like to offer you a written response where we can set out in more detail the areas of the CHC framework that governs the way we should work with NHS Dorset to resolve this.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet – 9 September Statements

Statement from Dr G Rider

Response to the briefing document on the review of Dorset's Street Lighting Policy

The briefing document for the review of the street lighting policy contains several errors and illogical statements that I have outlined in detail to Jan Britton and Jack Wiltshire. This is a summary of the issues I have highlighted and which I wish to be revised.

1) 7.1 is incorrect. The classification of Environmental Zones using SQM values, as defined in ILP

Guidance Document GN01, is a **requirement** for compliance with BS5489 when lighting residential roads. It states this in table A5. It is not optional, if the lighting policy is to be compliant with the British Standard.

2) 7.3 is entirely incorrect. Setting the lighting brightness in compliance with the specifications in

BS5489, table A5, will not be unsafe and will not lead to the negative outcomes stated.

3) 5.8 confuses Environmental Zones and areas where different levels of lighting are required

because of different traffic speed and similar considerations, which are specified in BS5489,

Annexe A. The two issues must not be conflated. The Environmental Zone classification modifies

the lighting standard to be used in inherently darker residential areas. The proposed "D" zoning

system is not compatible with BS5489.

4) 5.9 The new lighting policy needs to correctly classify Environmental Zones, as defined in GN01,

because this also sets the maximum spill light that should be produced. In all residential areas of

Dorset the maximum spill light level should be 1 lux, according to current standards, national

guidance and Dorset's lighting policy. Curtains should not be a requirement to block stray light.

5) 5.9 proposes dimming the lights by 50% after 10pm, so presumably this is considered to be safe.

Adopting the P5 lighting standard in residential areas, as rejected in 7.1 and 7.3, would involve

reducing the light intensity at all times by only 40%, which logically cannot be considered unsafe
(and it would not be specified in the British Standard if it were unsafe).

6) The proposal to pay the PFI contractor an additional sum based on a calculation of the anticipated energy saving, in return for replacement of 18500 obsolete lamps at no cost to the Council, is unsound. I have given my reason for this comment to Councillor Suttle.

7) The choice of 2700K for all future LED lighting is arbitrary and does not necessarily deliver the optimum energy saving. The recognised optimum lighting for environmental protection is amber, with a CCT value around 1800K. The 1850K lights currently being evaluated in Swanage meet the requirement for low blue emission and are more energy efficient than the 2700K LEDs detailed in the APSE report submitted as part of the policy review.

Cabinet – 9 September 2025 Councillor Questions

1. Question from Cllr C Monks

Residents have expressed significant concern to me over the recent reduction in services on the X51 and X53 bus routes, which are vital for connectivity in our area. Can the portfolio holder clarify the rationale behind these changes, and will he intervene to ensure that these essential services are improved rather than reduced?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Place Services

Thank you, Cllr Monks, for your question regarding the X51 and X53 bus routes. I understand the concerns raised by residents about the winter timetables on these routes, which are essential for connecting communities across West Dorset. To clarify, the X51 and X53 are operated as commercial services run by First Bus. Each winter, First introduces a reduced timetable, as has been their long-standing practice. In recent years the bus company has requested financial assistance from Dorset Council to maintain services through the winter months. This year, First Bus requested a significantly higher amount, an increase that Dorset Council could not support due to the sharp rise in cost and limited public funding available. To keep the route going through the winter, Council officers worked quickly with First to revise the route and operating pattern. These changes reduced costs and helped improve the long-term viability of the service, not just for the winter period, but with improvements for the Weymouth area throughout the year. It's important to note that this was not a council decision. Timetables for commercial services are set by the operator. The Council can only influence them when public funding is involved, and even then, we are constrained by available resources and the operator's legal obligations, such as driver hours and rest periods. We are currently investigating with First how improved connections with train services at Axminster, particularly the 7:35 service to Exeter, can be achieved. We will also continue to engage with local groups and stakeholders to monitor the winter services. Looking ahead, First Bus has agreed to start planning earlier for next year's service and to work more closely with the council and the community to ensure the service reflects local needs as far as possible. However, it's important to recognise that the Government does not currently provide the level of bus funding required to deliver the kind of rural bus services that residents in Dorset rightly expect and deserve. Thank you again for raising this important issue.

2. Question from Cllr L O'Leary

The junctions coming onto Littlemoor Road continue to grow in congestion made worse by an increase in housing and due to be made worse by more holiday caravans in nearby Preston and New proposed homes within the local plan. On busy periods of the day residents are subjected to a lengthy wait that is increasing the busier the area gets.

What steps will the council take to relieve this measure and what steps have been taken since this issue was raised at previous meetings by both myself and Cllr Peter Dickenson?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Place Services

The transport assessment for the approved 500 dwellings to the north of Littlemoor Road included both the junctions of Louviers Road with Littlemoor Road. This identified that no improvement works were required. We have kept the junctions under review as people move into the new houses and will continue to monitor the junctions as the development continues.

3. Question from Cllr L O'Leary

Aster are currently selling off two former social houses on Littlemoor and have sold one already this year. These are well built sturdy large family homes that housed long term residents for many years and hold many fond family memories within them. Aster claim these are sold off due to the upkeep and then re-invested in new homes. However, these homes do not appear to be in the same area as those sold. Many of my residents wait years on the housing register and have the double hit of watching family homes they could fill be sold off and then when housing is offered it is normally miles away from their family friends and community. This policy by Aster is breaking up and watering down working-class communities such as mine by splitting up families and moving people miles from their home neighbourhoods.

Will the council formally write to Aster imploring them to review this policy and put communities at the heart of their decision making?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Health and Housing

Thank you, Cllr O'Leary, for raising this important issue. I share your concern, and I'm actively pursuing it at a senior level with Aster Housing.

Aster is the largest Registered Provider in the Dorset Council area, managing over 7,000 tenancies and delivering a major development programme of new homes in our area. Their role in delivering and developing affordable homes is vital — but so is making sure those homes remain in the communities that need them most. That's why I'm challenging the pattern and number of sales, in areas such as Littlemoor, where larger family homes are being lost and not always replaced locally.

This Council relies on Registered Providers like Aster to meet housing need and tackle homelessness. Although we understand that some homes may be sold when refurbishment is unviable, the concentration of sales in certain areas—without equivalent local replacement — is deeply concerning. This issue has been raised not only by residents but also by councillors across **all political parties** through our Housing Member Group.

Aster does build more homes than it sells in Dorset, and we value that. But we need to see a more balanced approach—one that protects community interests and reflects local housing needs.

In June, I met with Aster's senior leadership, alongside our Corporate Director for Housing, Andrew Billany, following a formal letter outlining our concerns. This was a frank and robust meeting, so please be assured that I asserted the Council's position fairly and firmly. I've since written again, urging them to review their disposal policies and involve the Council in shaping a more community-focused approach. I'm pressing for a date for the promised follow-up meeting with me and will ensure your concerns—and those from other Members—are part of that conversation.

Thank you again for raising this. I've made Aster aware that this important issue is being raised here today and have shared your question with them. I'll keep you and other interested Members updated as we push for progress.

This page is intentionally left blank