
Executive Decision

Household Waste Collections

Decision to be taken by: City Mayor

Decision to be taken on: 22 August 2025

Lead Director: Sean Atterbury

Useful information

- Ward(s) affected: All
- Report author: Debbie White, Waste Strategy and Programme Manager
- Author contact details: debbie.white@leicester.gov.uk
- Checked By: Mark Loran
- Report Status: version number 1.0

1 Purpose

- 1.1 The existing arrangements for household waste collection expire in May 2028. This report sets out the proposed arrangements for future service provision in relation to household waste and recycling collection services, including the impact of legislative reform.
- 1.2 The report seeks a decision to introduce a revised approach to household waste collection services from May 2028 and the capital investment required as part of a new contract.

2 Recommended Decision

It is recommended that the City Mayor:

- 2.1 Approves from May 2028, the Council provides a household waste and recycling collection service that delivers alternate weekly residual waste collections, and alternate weekly dry mixed recycling collections in a blue wheeled bin.
- 2.2 Notes that there is a legislative requirement for authorities to provide separate weekly food waste collections for all households by April 2026. This is an additional requirement on the existing and future contract arrangements. The capital cost of introduction of food waste collection is not included in this decision report.
- 2.3 Notes that whilst the underlying cost of future collection provision is estimated to be broadly in line with current costs, the Council will no longer receive PFI credits. This will represent an annual revenue budget pressure of £2.5m from 2028/29 and will need to be included in the revenue budget.
- 2.4 Approves the addition of £9.8m to the 2026/27 General Fund capital programme for the vehicle and container costs of the new arrangements for recycling and residual waste collection, to be financed by Prudential Borrowing. The cost of the borrowing is included in the £2.5m detailed above.

3 Scrutiny

- 3.1** Findings from the household engagement survey (Appendix 2) were presented to the Culture and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny panel on 19 June 2025.
- 3.2** An informal sitting of the Culture and Neighbourhood Commission took place on 07 August 2025 to brief members on the recommended option contained in this report. Feedback and comments are taken into account in the report.

4 Background with supporting evidence

- 4.1** Local authorities have a statutory duty to arrange for the collection, management, treatment and disposal of household waste in their area. As a unitary authority, Leicester City Council is both a Waste Collection Authority and a Waste Disposal Authority, being responsible for end-to-end household waste management.

Current Service Arrangements

- 4.2** The majority of the Council's waste management services are currently delivered by Biffa Leicester Ltd. (BLL) under a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) arrangement. The services currently provided by BIFFA include:

- Kerbside collections of residual waste and dry mixed recycling (DMR)
- Garden waste collections
- Servicing a network of bring banks
- Carrying out bulky waste collections
- Undertaking clinical waste collections on demand
- Operating two Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs)
- The treatment and reprocessing or disposal of all of the above collected waste.

- 4.3** In addition, the Council manages the collection of public realm waste, as well as a Reuse Shop and trade waste facility located at the Gypsum Close HWRC.

Current Approach to Household Waste and Recycling Collections

- 4.4** Waste and recycling are collected from 143,000 households, of which 20% are flats / properties served by a communal collection service. Collections take place on Tuesday to Friday each week.
- 4.5** A black bin containing residual waste, and single-use orange sacks of dry mixed recycling, are collected weekly from City households. Flats / communal collection services are bespoke, with wheeled bin sizes and collection frequencies subject to waste capacity requirements.

4.6 A chargeable fortnightly garden waste collection service is also offered to households between the months of March and November. Collections take place on a Monday.

4.7 Residual (black bin) waste is processed at the Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) facility - known as the Ball Mill – at the Bursom site in Beaumont Leys. The process extracts around 20,000 tonnes of recyclable material per annum, with an annual average of 16,000 tonnes of additional recycling collected at the kerbside (via the orange bags).

4.8 Separate / segregated food waste collections are not currently provided, although the Council is exploring options to implement the service by the 2026 target date.

Cost of Existing Service

4.9 In 2023/24 the council paid BLL a combined (unitary) charge of £24.7 million for delivering the contracted waste services. In addition to the contract cost, the Council has an internal team for contract management, customer care, engagement, communications and project work.

4.10 The Council currently receives PFI credits from DEFRA to the annual value of £2.5 million. These credits will cease on expiry of the current PFI arrangement in May 2028.

Requirement for Service Change

4.11 The integrated arrangement with BLL expires in May 2028, and there are a range of factors that have significant influence on the design of future household waste collection services. These factors include:

National Waste Reform

4.12 Requirements set by government / recent legislative reform that requires the Council to:

- Implement separate weekly food waste collections for all households by April 2026.
- Focus on reducing the volumes of waste produced by households.
- Ensure that packaging waste / recycling is collected and processed cost-efficiently.
- Work towards achieving enhanced national recycling targets.
- Significantly reduce waste that ends up in landfill.

Financial Pressures / Future Affordability

4.13 Management of household waste is one of the significant cost burdens for a local authority.

4.14 Of the £24.7 million the Council paid to BLL in 2023/24, more than 75% (£18.7 million) relates to the collection and treatment of household waste, with a large proportion of this relating to collection and treatment of residual (black bin) waste.

4.15 Even without change, the cost of providing household waste and recycling services in their current format from 2028 would increase significantly, with the requirement to deliver new services, such as weekly food waste collections, expected to add to operating costs. Whilst new burdens funding is to be provided, change is essential to minimise future cost increases.

4.16 The loss of PFI credits (income to the authority) to the value of £2.5 million p.a. from May 2028 adds to the future financial burden.

Closure of the Ball Mill – Implications for Recycling Rate and Residual Waste Processing Costs

4.17 Leicester's recycling rate currently relies on costly "ball mill" technology to capture a significant proportion of its recycling. Future plans for residual waste management do not include waste processing at the ball mill and recycling rates are likely to reduce as a result.

4.18 Treating and disposing of residual waste costs at least three times as much as processing recycling.

4.19 To maintain levels of household recycling and to minimise potential cost increases that would result from reduced recycling / an increased proportion of residual waste collected, future services must be designed to maximise household recycling at the kerbside.

Climate Change / Reducing the Environmental Impact of Waste

4.20 The Climate Ready Leicester Plan reaffirms the Council's ambition for the City and the Council to reach net zero in terms of direct and energy-related emissions and includes an aim to reduce emissions from waste management and resources used from outside the City.

4.21 Food waste has a disproportionately high carbon impact due to its release of the potent greenhouse gas methane from landfill sites, and management of food waste is therefore considered a priority in reducing emissions.

4.22 It is essential to reduce emissions through waste reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, alongside emissions reduction achieved through operational efficiency.

Requirement to Evidence Operational Efficiency

4.23 The existing approach of collecting both household waste and recycling every week is operationally inefficient in terms of numbers and cost of vehicles, staffing and journeys required. In addition, it relies on a costly processing facility to maintain recycling rates.

4.24 Existing grant funding allocated to waste authorities by DEFRA is determined annually. Authorities will be required to evidence both cost and operational efficiency of waste collection services in order to maximise annual funding allocations, meaning that service change is essential.

Simpler Recycling – DEFRA Guidance

- 4.25** In late November 2024 a DEFRA announcement on household waste and recycling collections set out guidance on a default maximum of four bins / containers for i) residual waste, ii) food waste, iii) paper and card, and iv) all other dry mixed recycling. The guidance does not impact garden waste.
- 4.26** Local flexibility to co-collect paper and card with other recycling remains in place where separation is either technically, environmentally and/or economically impracticable, e.g. high-rise flats or houses with limited outside space. Authorities that plan to provide mixed household recycling collections should complete a Technical, Economic and Environment Practicability (TEEP) assessment to evidence their decision.
- 4.27** Minimum requirements and legislative guidance from DEFRA around the maximum number of bins / containers has been considered as part of the household collections options appraisal process.

Options Appraisal / Suitability Assessment

- 4.28** Evidence from analysis and benchmarking of UK waste data identifies clearly that reducing frequency of waste collections, segregation of food waste and separation of recycling has the impact of reducing waste and increasing / improving the quality of recycling. This, in turn, improves the cost-efficiency and carbon impact of waste collection and treatment services.
- 4.29** A robust options appraisal was completed, to model and evaluate ten potential future approaches to household waste and recycling collections – representing minor, moderate and major change - to understand the financial, environmental and social impacts. (Appendix 4)
- 4.30** On completion of the options evaluation the suitability of the highest-performing options was tested with providers and other local authorities, and by mapping property types across the City and assessing space and waste capacity.
- 4.31** Options considered suitable were subject to feedback from residents through the household engagement survey. Engagement findings are set out in Appendix 2.

Options Appraisal / Suitability Assessment Findings

- 4.32** The best performing options from a financial and carbon perspective were those that altered the frequency of residual waste collections to three-weekly. Moving from weekly to three-weekly residual waste collections is considered a major change for households and, in practice, is likely to result in significant levels of recycling contamination in the medium term that would increase treatments costs. Due to the high risk this approach was not considered as suitable at this time. Reassessing this option in the future would however be prudent.
- 4.33** Of those options that did not propose three-weekly residual waste collections, the lowest cost option included a multi-stream approach to recycling, i.e. it

required households to separate their recycling into three different streams and place them in separate boxes and bags. This approach would introduce major change for households, have a significant adverse impact on street scene and, recommending a total of 5 bins / containers (excluding garden waste) is not aligned to the guidance issued by DEFRA regarding the maximum number of containers. The approach presents a higher financial risk, as cost savings would rely on household high levels of compliance to ensure good quality recycling materials.

- 4.34** Mapping property types across the City, and assessing the suitability of collections approach, particularly to flush-fronted terraces and flats identified that multiple / additional containers for recycling would be problematic for a less than 5% of households due to space issues.
- 4.35** The DEFRA recommended approach, i.e. Introducing two bins for recycling (as set out in 4.25), did not perform well in terms of cost-efficiency, practicality, ease of use, or street scene.
- 4.36** Reducing the frequency of residual waste and recycling collections to fortnightly performed significantly better than retaining weekly collections as it is more cost-efficient, reduces emissions, and encourages households to reduce their residual waste - that is most costly element to collect and treat - and increase their recycling at kerbside. Simple to use, the approach is also both flexible and scalable.
- 4.37** Alternate weekly collections of residual waste and mixed recycling in a bin is the approach adopted by the majority of local authorities in England, including in Leicestershire, as it combines cost and operational efficiency with ease of use and practicality and encourages waste reduction.
- 4.38** The approach would continue to provide regular, reliable and easy to use household waste and recycling collection services – identified as a key priority in the engagement survey – whilst also recognising that around 60% of households reported that they do not fill their black bin each week. Space in black bins will increase further once food waste is collected separately.
- 4.39** Collecting mixed recycling in a bin rather than bags is more cost-efficient as it allows collections to take place fortnightly rather than weekly without having an adverse impact on household recycling capacity and street scene. It is also considered a minor change for households.
- 4.40** Alternate weekly collections of residual waste and mixed recycling in a bin is the approach supported by providers in a city environment.
- 4.41** Engagement with households identified that bring banks are not well used in some areas of the City.
- 4.42** Providing bins of standard colours (black, blue, green, brown) is less costly and has shorter procurement lead times.

4.43 Our Waste Composition Analysis, supported by WRAP data, identifies that, on average, each household in Leicester puts around 230kg of food waste in their black bin each year. Separate weekly food waste collections reduce waste (black bin) capacity requirements and should encourage households to reduce their food waste – with the potential to save up to £800 per year per household.

4.44 Bringing the service in-house would add to service delivery costs in the region of c.17% and would present significant operating risk, lost economies of scale, and management complexity.

Recommended Approach to Household Waste and Recycling Collections

4.45 It is recommended that from May 2028 the Council provides a service that delivers the following:

4.45.1 Revised Approach to Household Waste and Recycling Collections:

- Alternate weekly residual waste collections.
- Alternate weekly dry mixed recycling collections in a wheeled bin.
- Separate weekly food waste collections.

4.45.2 Other Household Collection Arrangements:

- Retention of bespoke arrangements for communal collection points (e.g. flats), as well as households with specific requirements for non-standard collections.
- Continuation of charged fortnightly garden waste collections from March to November.
- Continuation of clinical waste collections from households on request.
- Continuation of bulky waste collections from households on request.

4.45.3 Other Service Requirements:

- Management and operation of the Bursom site (Beaumont Leys) as a Waste Transfer Station.

4.46 Other recommendations include:

- A review of the suitability and cost-efficiency of existing bring bank provision, with pricing comparisons to be requested from bidders for options to either i) continue servicing bring banks, or ii) replace bring banks with kerbside collection of textiles and / or small electrical items.
- Provision of a blue recycling bin.

Benefits of Recommended Approach - Impact on Households / the Council

4.47 The solution would result in minimal change for households with recycling continuing to be deposited in a single container (mixed) - placed in a bin rather than single use bags.

4.48 Households will receive two collections per week. These will consist of a weekly collection of food waste and alternate weekly collections of residual waste and recycling. In practice this means that residents will continue to receive a weekly bin collection.

- 4.49** Maintaining a simple mixed recycling solution and introducing a bin to replace single use bags, along with the introduction of alternate weekly residual waste collections, will encourage recycling at kerbside. This is essential to maximise recycling rates.
- 4.50** Removes the issues with obtaining recycling bags, as reported by households in the engagement survey.
- 4.51** With no increase in the number of bins to be presented at kerbside each week (as residual waste and recycling will be collected alternate-weekly), street scene issues should be reduced as single use bags will no longer be in use.
- 4.52** Adopting the recommended approach means that operating costs of delivering the service - including the weekly food waste collection service – are expected to be broadly similar to current service delivery costs.
- 4.53** The solution as modelled will reduce carbon emissions (CO₂e) by almost 5,000 tonnes per annum.
- 4.54** As the approach is supported by providers in a city environment, it is therefore anticipated to be attractive to the market and result in a competitive procurement process.
- 4.55** The approach aligns with that of other authorities across England, with neighbouring authorities in Leicestershire, and with similar cities, as alternate weekly residual waste collection is evidenced to be influential in reducing residual waste volumes.
- 4.56** As the total number of collections will remain unchanged (two each week), the approach is not expected to adversely impact fly tipping rates across the City and will complement the Fly Tipping Strategy by maintaining a simple-to-use approach for residents.

Service Delivery Model / Procurement

- 4.57** It is intended that the Council proceeds with a competitive procurement on the open market using the Competitive Flexible Procedure under the Procurement Act 2023.
- 4.58** A contract term of 8 years - with an option to extend for a further 8 years - is recommended to align with the lifecycle of waste collection vehicles, as new vehicles will be purchased as part of the new service arrangements.
- 4.59** The Competitive Flexible Procedure provides mechanisms to allow dialogue with providers to explore the flexibility needed within the contract to allow for innovation, future legislative reform / change in law, and to account for the requirement for increasing provision – including collected waste volumes and waste transfer station provision. This is in line with household growth set out in the Local Plan, i.e. a target of 1,296 additional dwellings per annum until 2036 and the potential expansion of the City boundary proposed under local government reorganisation.

4.60 The procurement will consider how maximum carbon reduction (and adaptation, where relevant) can be secured through the specification and quality evaluation process.

4.61 It is proposed that the provider will undertake the procurement of the vehicles and containers, and that the Council pays the provider at the start of the contract, rather than annually over the life of the contract. This avoids the provider having to access expensive loan facilities, the cost of which would be passed back to the Council. It is estimated that the cost of vehicles and containers for the proposed recycling and residual waste arrangements will cost up to £9.8m, and this report seeks to add this sum to the General Fund capital programme, to be financed from Prudential Borrowing.

4.62 Procurement of waste processing and treatment services will commence in the future, with delivery to align with household waste collections services.

Service Considerations / Risk

4.63 Exception processes and bin policies would remain in place and be regularly reviewed to ensure that they continue to support vulnerable residents, those with access or capacity issues and / or other special requirements.

4.64 Increasing recycling rates at kerbside is essential to mitigate cost increases and maintain future recycling rates in line with recent levels. A communications plan will be developed to set out future resource requirements to deliver transition and to engage, support and encourage households to reduce residual waste, segregate food waste and increase good quality recycling on an ongoing basis. These revenue costs are anticipated to be covered by DEFRA's new burdens funding.

4.65 Whilst robust modelling and benchmarking has been undertaken, it should be noted that future costs are subject to competitive procurement.

4.66 It is possible that implementation of weekly food waste collections will be delayed beyond the 2026 target date.

4.67 Future legislative change / waste reform may have an impact on collections approach and service delivery costs in future.

4.68 Whilst future arrangements will build in flexibility of provision to allow for a growth in City households, there is still some uncertainty in relation to Local Government Re-organisation (LGR) proposals. Whilst this has the potential to add complexity to a range of service arrangements in the future, the government consultation period on final proposals is due to close in April 2026 – eight months before planned contract award – meaning that LGR proposals can be incorporated into the dialogue with providers during the procurement process.

4.69 It is recognised that there is an inherent risk of a procurement challenge given this is a high value contract, using a complex procurement process under the

new Procurement Act 2023 in a competitive market of suppliers with legal resources. However, with proactive risk management and a developed risk register identifying suitable mitigations such as a robust procurement procedure, the development of a precise specification/contract and a rigorous evaluation process should ensure the likelihood of a successful challenge is minimised.

4.70 The government is moving forward with plans to expand the UK Emissions Trading Scheme (UK ETS) to cover waste incineration and energy-from-waste (EfW) plants from 2028, whilst considering mechanisms to reduce the cost burden for local authorities. Financial implications in relation to cost of treatment contracts and potential new funding streams are therefore uncertain at this stage.

5 Financial, Legal, Climate Emergency, Equalities, and Other Implications

5.1 Financial implications

The value of the waste collection and disposal contracts are some of the highest in the Council, costing £25m per year, and are therefore critical to wider Council finances. The current arrangements for the collection of domestic waste include the Council receiving £2.5m in PFI Credits from government each year; this credit will cease from 2028 and creates an unavoidable budget pressure which will need to be included in the revenue budget.

As set out in the report, cost modelling was undertaken on 10 different options. Aside from the impact of losing £2.5m of PFI Credits (which applies in all scenarios), the underlying cost to the Council of the preferred option is anticipated to be broadly in line with current costs. This is despite the new contractual arrangements including the collection of food waste. The overall cost to the Council of the new contractual arrangements for the collection of food, recycling and residual waste will only be known following the completion of the procurement process.

This report seeks the addition of £9.8m to the General Fund Capital Programme, for payment to the successful provider for procurement of vehicles and containers for recycling and residual waste. This will be financed from Prudential Borrowing and will save the Council money by utilising preferential borrowing rates available to the Council, whilst also avoiding margins which would likely be added by providers. The annual revenue cost of this borrowing over 8 years is estimated to be £1.5m, and this has been included in the modelling of forecast future costs. The alternative would be for providers to finance these costs themselves and recharge the Council annually for a much higher amount.

The implementation of food waste collections may or may not feature in the proposed procurement; they may instead be implemented with the current provider. As such, the addition to the capital programme of the costs associated with food waste implementation (including vehicle and food caddy costs) will need to feature as a separate decision.

The Council is anticipating receiving a new burdens grant associated with the collection of food waste, but this has yet to be confirmed and is of an unknown amount. This will help to offset the £2.5m budget pressure.

Signed: Stuart McAvoy – Head of Finance

Dated: 20 July 2025

5.2 Legal implications

The recommendations in this report will ensure that the relevant legislative requirements are met. As described earlier in the report, Defra's 'Simpler Recycling' policy paper provides both guidance and flexibility in relation to collection frequency and systems and this recommendation is in line with this policy. It is permissible to collect mixed, dry recycling together where it is either not technically or economically practicable to collect such waste separately or where such separate collection would have no significant environmental benefit (section 45A(6) Environmental Protection Act 1990 as amended by Environment Act 2021). From 31 March 2026 the Council will be required by statute to separately collect food waste on a weekly basis (section 45A(8) Environmental Protection Act 1990 as amended by Environment Act 2021).

Although there is no direct statutory duty to consult the public on the development and implementation of waste management services, in arriving at the recommended option for the delivery of future waste services, the Council has carried out three rounds of early market engagement, engaged with similar local authorities and completed a 6-week public engagement exercise.

In order to implement the recommendations, the Council will procure replacement contractual arrangements for services currently under the PFI contract. These arrangements will contractually mandate the delivery of services in accordance with the legislative requirements for waste collection. The procurement of new arrangements will be carried out under the Procurement Act 2023.

The new contract for collection services will be drafted to take into account prospective expected change, e.g. future waste reform, property/population growth and local government reorganisation. Where details of these prospective expected changes are not capable of being fully addressed during procurement, there are residual risks associated with entering into contract while these details remain outstanding. However, the inclusion of dialogue/negotiation in the Competitive Flexible Procedure will enable the Council to agree allocation of such risks with bidders, within a regulated yet competitive environment.

External legal advisers Sharpe Pritchard LLP are advising the Council on the re-procurement.

Signed: Kevin Carter, Head of Law – Commercial, Property & Planning

Dated: 01 August 2025

5.3 Climate Emergency implications

Dealing with Leicester's solid waste and wastewater is estimated to generate about 100,000 tonnes of carbon emissions each year. Waste also adds to the city's carbon emissions arising from the consumption of goods, packaging and raw materials where opportunities to reduce and reuse are missed. Decisions about future household waste management arrangements and associated communications therefore provide a key opportunity to cut carbon in line with our Climate Ready Leicester Plan.

The recommendation for procuring a new household waste collection service is estimated to reduce carbon by around 4,900t (nearly a quarter) per annum compared to the current arrangements. The majority of this estimated reduction is the result of more waste being recycled and more food waste going to anaerobic digestion.

The recommendation that treatment/disposal (including haulage) is procured separately to the collection service may be positive from a carbon point-of-view as it gives the council more ability to look for options and suppliers offering greater reductions and to benefit from any competition between suppliers to offer a lower carbon service. It will therefore be the responsibility of the Council to ensure that the lowest carbon solutions are explored, assessed and implemented in adherence to the waste hierarchy and proximity principal. This could be through shorter haulage distances for example, enhanced treatment systems and technologies which can segregate waste streams more efficiently and effectively or (in the slightly longer term) suppliers using lower carbon technologies for running treatment plants or haulage vehicles.

In addition to the carbon implications of the new service configuration itself, the importance of the associated communications to the public for which the Council will be responsible needs to be emphasised. This will be critical not just to maximising recycling/composting and minimising contamination through the new service, but also to promoting waste reduction and reuse which are equally important to reducing carbon.

In addition to the carbon implications of this project, the council should also consider whether there are any significant risks or implications for the new service arising from current and future climate change impacts, such as the increased risk of heatwaves, storms or flash-flooding. If any are identified, they should be addressed in the service specification.

Signed: Duncan Bell, Change Manager (Climate Emergency), Ext 2249 & Phil Ball, Sustainability Officer, Ext 372246

Dated: 22 July 2025

5.4 Equalities implications

Under the Equality Act 2010, public authorities have statutory duties, including the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) which means that, in carrying out their functions, decision makers must pay due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act, to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected

characteristic and those who don't and to foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't.

Protected Characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation.

The report provides an overview of the current household waste collection service and the recommendation to approve the recommendations for procuring a new household waste collection service. An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken (Appendix 1) and includes the survey outcomes. The survey highlighted residents preferred methods of communication and we need to ensure these are taken into consideration as this area of work is progressed. We also need to ensure that communication is accessible and targeted at residents as appropriate and this includes taking into account the city's changing demographic profile and emerging communities.

The EIA has highlighted that we will continue to provide assisted collection services, and these are generally used by householders with limited mobility, a disability and / or medical conditions. Any guidance needs to be clear and concise, with accessible materials being provided as appropriate, this will be included in the communication and engagement plan as it develops. The EIA will be updated as work progress on the household waste collection service.

As the work progresses on the recommended approach, we need to ensure equality considerations continue to be taken into account, and as the PSED cannot be delegated, the responsibility remains with the authority to put in place mechanisms by which these statutory duties can be stipulated as a requirement and monitored as part of the procurement of the new household waste collection service.

Signed: Sukhi Biring, Equalities Officer

Dated: 01 August 2025

5.5 Other implications

None

6 Background Information and Other Papers:

None

7 Summary of Appendices

Appendix 1 - Equality Impact Assessment

Appendix 2 - Household Waste Engagement Findings

Appendix 3 - Household Waste Composition Analysis Summary Findings

Appendix 4 - Options Appraisal

8 Is this a Private Report (If so, please indicate the reasons and state why it is not in the public interest to be dealt with publicly)?

No

9 Is this a Key Decision? If so, why?

Yes

This report seeks to add more than £1m to the General Fund capital programme and the impact of the decision will be city-wide – across all wards.