DECISION-MAKER:		SCRUTINY INQUIRY PANEL		
SUBJECT:		DRUG RELATED LITTER IN SOUTHAMPTON – THE BARRIERS TO SAFE DISPOSAL AND BEST PRACTICE		
DATE OF DECISION:		23 NOVEMBER 2017		
REPORT OF:		SERVICE DIRECTOR – LEGAL AND GOVERNANCE		
CONTACT DETAILS				
AUTHOR:	**Name:**	**Mark Pirnie**	**Tel:**	**023 8083 3886**
	E-mail:	**Mark.pirnie@southampton.gov.uk**		
Director	**Name:**	**Richard Ivory**	**Tel:**	**023 8083 2794**
	E-mail:	**Richard.ivory@southampton.gov.uk**		

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY
None

BRIEF SUMMARY
In accordance with the inquiry plan, for the second meeting of the 'Reducing Drug Related Litter in Southampton Inquiry,' the Panel will be considering examples of good practice and barriers to safe disposal of drug related litter.

RECOMMENDATIONS:		
	(i)	The Panel is recommended to consider the comments made by the invited guests and use the information provided as evidence in the review.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS	
1.	To enable the Panel to compile a file of evidence in order to formulate findings and recommendations at the end of the review process.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED	
2.	None

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)	
3.	At the inaugural meeting of the inquiry the Panel were informed of the position with regards to drug related litter in Southampton and the approaches employed in Southampton to reduce drug related litter.
4.	At the second meeting the Panel will be provided with an insight into the barriers to safe disposal of drug litter. Guidance and good practice will also be discussed.
5.	A number of guests have been invited to provide the Panel with an insight into the issues: • Carl Nightingale - Carl now works at the Southampton Needle Exchange but also has a history of injecting drug use. He has been invited to provide his unique insight into the challenges of dependent drug use; why some people might not always dispose of their injecting equipment responsibly; and what might help reduce the incidence of

	drug litter. • Nigel Brunsdon - Nigel has over a decade of experience of working within needle and syringe programmes both as a practitioner and a manager. He has been running the harm reduction website, Injecting Advice.com, since the start of 2007. He is passionate about harm reduction approaches to substance use, and is a member of the UK Harm Reduction Alliance and Deputy Chair of the National Needle Exchange Forum. With Nigel's experience and expertise he has been invited to present to the Panel on reducing incidence of drug related litter and the risk of harm caused by drug related litter. In addition, following a scheduled visit to services in the city, he has been asked to comment on the effectiveness of Southampton's approach to reducing drug related litter.
6.	To help inform the discussion on good practice, attached as Appendix 1 is a paper developed by Public Health at Southampton City Council summarising the findings from a review of research evidence relating to what works to minimise drug related litter. The referenced 2005 report from DeFRA, 'Tackling drug related litter', is attached as Appendix 2.
7.	Following a brief discussion at the 19 October 2017 meeting, and reflecting the inclusion of public sharps bins within the guidance and good practice identified within the appendices, some limited research has been undertaken locally on the use of public sharps bins. Findings: • Portsmouth – Circa 12 public sharps bins. Half in public toilets in hotspot areas and half in library toilets where drug related litter was already an issue. • I.OW – No public sharps bins • Southampton - No public sharps bins • Gosport – See Appendix 3
8.	Representatives from Hampshire Constabulary and Southampton City Council – Transactions and Universal Services; Integrated Commissioning Unit; Public Health have been invited to the meeting to contribute to the discussions.
9.	The guests invited to present information at the meeting will take questions from the Panel relating to the evidence provided. Copies of any presentations will be made available to the Panel.
RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS	
Capital/Revenue	
10.	N/A
Property/Other	
11.	N/A

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS		
Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:		
12.	The duty to undertake overview and scrutiny is set out in Part 1A Section 9 of the Local Government Act 2000.	
Other Legal Implications:		
13.	None	
RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS		
14.	None	
POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS		
15.	None	
KEY DECISION	No	
WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:		None directly as a result of this report

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION			
Appendices			
1.	Drug Related Litter – Literature Review Summary		
2.	Tackling Drug Related Litter – DEFRA, October 2005		
3.	Public toilets in Gosport – Newspaper article		
Documents In Members' Rooms			
1.	Draft – Drug Related Litter, Literature Review		
Equality Impact Assessment			
Do the implications/subject of the report require an Equality and Safety Impact Assessments (ESIA) to be carried out?			No
Privacy Impact Assessment			
Do the implications/subject of the report require a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) to be carried out?			No
Other Background Documents: Equality Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:			
Title of Background Paper(s)		Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)	
1.	None		