

Brighton and Hove City Council

City Environment, South Downs & The Sea Committee

Agenda Item 41

Subject: Weed Management

Date of meeting: 23 January 2024

Report of: Executive Director: Economy, Environment and Culture

Contact Officer: Name: Melissa Francis
Tel: 01273 290697
Email: melissa.francis@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Name: Lynsay Cook
Tel: 07592 103604
Email: Lynsay.cook@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

For general release

1. Purpose of the report and policy context

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update and ask Committee to consider a change in policy regarding the management of weeds in the city. The report and its appendices provide information on how the council has managed weeds on hard surfaces from 2020 to 2023 (Appendix 1) and the weed management methods tested, what has been adopted and what has been disregarded (Appendix 2).
- 1.2 The report presents options to Committee on how to manage weeds on hard surfaces from 2024. Three recommendations are presented to Committee in section 2 below. More information on these is contained in the main body of the report and in appendices 3 to 7.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Committee note the contents of this report and its appendices.
- 2.2 That Committee agrees to continue with the current policy not to use glyphosate in the city's parks and open spaces, as described more fully in paragraph 3.15. The exception to this is when it is used to manage invasive species.

That Committee agrees either:

- 2.3 To continue with the current policy on weed management and instruct the council's City Environmental Management Services to continue to use manual techniques to manage and remove weeds from across the city, as described more fully in paragraphs 3.17 to 3.19. This is until a cost-effective and viable non-glyphosate option is available.

Or

- 2.4 Subject to approval at Budget Council, to amend the current policy to support the use of glyphosate to manage weeds on all hard surfaces and instruct the council's City Environmental Management Services to engage with contractors to use a controlled-droplet application to manage and remove weeds from across the city in 2024, as described more fully in paragraphs 3.21 to 3.24 and 3.28 to 3.29. Further to this, Committee agrees to delegate authority to the Executive Director – Economy, Environment & Culture, in consultation with the Committee Chair, to determine the most effective approach for weed management in future years based on the outcomes achieved in 2024.

Or

- 2.5 Subject to approval from Budget Council, to amend the current policy to support the use of glyphosate to manage weeds on all hard surfaces and instruct the council's City Environmental Management Services to engage with contractors to use traditional glyphosate to manage and remove weeds from across the city in 2024, as described more fully in paragraphs 3.25 to 3.29. This will be subject to a review in winter 2024 to see if there is an option to move to a controlled-droplet application for 2025. Further to this, Committee agrees to delegate authority to the Executive Director – Economy, Environment & Culture, in consultation with the Committee Chair, to determine the most effective approach for weed management in future years based on the outcomes achieved in 2024.
- 2.6 That Committee notes that recommendations 2.4 and 2.5 require Budget Council approval on 22 February 2024, before decisions can be implemented.

3. Context and background information

- 3.1 On 26 November 2019, the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:
- Agreed to end the use of glyphosate by Brighton and Hove City Council's City Environmental Management services with immediate effect, other than in exceptional cases to kill invasive plant species, such as Japanese Knotweed or to kill tree stumps.
 - Agreed that City Environmental Management would not engage with contractors to use glyphosate on any land managed by these departments.
 - Noted that the removal of weeds in parks and on hard surfaces would be undertaken manually as an alternative approach to using pesticides.
- 3.2 Committee was advised it would not be possible to remove all weeds from highways and pavements manually and there would be more visible weeds for longer periods of time. Committee was also advised of the likelihood of damage to the highway infrastructure over time because of weed root

impact. Appendix 1 sets out how the council has managed weeds on hard surfaces from 2020 to 2023.

- 3.3 There are significant biodiversity and sustainability benefits to ending the use of glyphosate, including increasing habitats for insects and other pollinators, and reducing the risk of chemicals entering the water system. The adverse impacts of glyphosate are greater when using a traditional glyphosate application, compared to a controlled-droplet application.
- 3.4 However, it is recognised that the current approach to weed management is leading to major issues for the city and this is why a report is being presented to Committee seeking a decision on how to manage weeds from 2024. The current budget of £0.189m covers six full-time staff to tackle weeds. During 2023, 701 roads were manually weeded once, out of 2048 roads across the city. This represents 34% of the city but does not take into account the volume of weeds on each road or the different lengths of road.
- 3.5 After five years of not using glyphosate and relying on manual weed removal, it is not possible to remove the majority of weeds from the highway in a timely manner. This is because manual methods predominately result in foliage being removed and not root systems.
- 3.6 This has become a cause of concern for residents who have complained about the look of the city. Some residents with mobility issues have raised concerns stating they are not able to leave home for fear of tripping. The council's biodiversity duties need to be balanced against the equality duties and the duty to keep the city's highways clear and free of obstructions.
- 3.7 There is a backlog of highway maintenance required due to damage caused by weeds and it is not possible to manage the volume of remedial work. It has also increased the cost of repairing the highway. This is covered in some detail in Appendix 3.
- 3.8 There has also been a proliferation of basal tree sprouts. Glyphosate applications previously suppressed this growth. Contractors remove basal tree sprouts on behalf of the council; however, this is an additional unbudgeted cost. The work is not completed at a pace that keeps the tree sprouts under control and, as a budget is not available for this work, it is not possible to remove them any quicker.
- 3.9 Since the council stopped using glyphosate, City Environmental Management has continued to research, test and trial cost-effective alternative methods of weed removal, without the use of glyphosate. Appendix 2 details the weed management methods tested, what has been adopted and what was disregarded. Any successful trials of machinery have been adopted. Some trialled methods may have been effective in a small area but are not viable and/or cost-effective to be used on large areas of public highway.

- 3.10 City Environmental Management has not been able to find another local authority that has managed its weeds on the public highway without the use of glyphosate for as long as Brighton and Hove City Council.

Glyphosate

- 3.11 Glyphosate is the active substance in many herbicides (weed killers) and is widely used around the world. It is a non-selective, systemic herbicide and was first used in the UK in 1976. Glyphosate is effective in controlling most weed species, including perennials and grasses in many situations, including amenity, forestry, aquatic and industrial situations. Since it is approved for use in many countries, it has been subjected to extensive testing and regulatory assessment in the EU, USA and elsewhere and by the World Health Organisation.
- 3.12 Section 11 of the report sets out the biodiversity and sustainability implications of using glyphosate.
- 3.13 There is conflicting evidence on the public health implications of the use of glyphosate. This is detailed in section 13.
- 3.14 If the decision is to reintroduce the use of glyphosate as the council's policy for weed management, officers will continue to seek alternative, cost-effective equipment and technologies that can be used to effectively remove weeds over the city's extensive highways.
- 3.15 This report is recommending the continuation of the current policy not to use glyphosate in the city's parks and open spaces where leisure activities and dog walking are undertaken and where there are playgrounds. The exception to this is when it is used to manage invasive species. This will protect a substantial habitat for wildlife and pollinator insects. It will also mean more weeds will be visible in the city's parks.

Options for weed management moving forward

- 3.16 As indicated in the recommendations in Section 2, there are three options for weed management moving forward: manual removal, a controlled-droplet application and a traditional glyphosate application. Appendix 3 sets out the benefits and disbenefits of each option. This should be read in conjunction with:
- Appendix 4: Equality Impact Assessment
 - Appendix 5: sustainability implications – controlled-droplet application and traditional glyphosate application
 - Appendix 6: sustainability implications – manual removal

Manual removal of weeds

- 3.17 If Committee agrees to recommendation 2.3, the approach to weed removal will be the same as the approach in 2023 and with the limited resources available. This will be the traffic light system to identify hot spot 'red zones' based on access, trip hazards and damage to highway infrastructure.

Highway Inspectors will continue to notify the Street Cleansing Team of issues, in addition to feedback from street cleansing staff, Councillors, and members of the public. Upon being notified of an issue, Street Cleansing Supervisors will make a site visit to assess the area. If the weeds are categorised as 'red,' the weeds will be removed. There could be other weeds present but not causing a hazard, which will not be removed.

- 3.18 Weed removal operatives will continue to use tools, including strimmers, hoes, shovels and weed rippers. Barrow staff will also undertake weeding as part of their role.
- 3.19 City Environmental Management will continue to look at opportunities to use the Tidy Up Team and Community Payback to help manage weeds across the city.
- 3.20 To fully weed hard surfaces in streets annually, additional budget would be required. Based on the proportion of roads cleared in 2023 (34%), additional resources of at least approximately £0.369m would be the minimum required to clear weeds once per year only. Visiting only once is unlikely to be sufficient to manage and remove weeds effectively. This figure does not take into account the volume of weeds on each road or the different lengths. It also does not take into account the additional capital cost of the vehicles and equipment required to support the additional resource. This approach will continue to remain ineffective in managing weeds as manual techniques predominantly remove the foliage and not the root system. Therefore, it is highly likely that weeds will continue to grow back and there will be further damage to highway infrastructure.

Controlled-droplet application and less glyphosate application

- 3.21 Controlled-droplet applications are available for weed management and use less glyphosate than the traditional approach. The glyphosate is mixed with an oil which allows the droplets to adhere to the plant. The application is applied in large droplets released under gravity (unlike the traditional method of glyphosate application, which is a pressurised mist). This reduces drift and the likelihood of the application adhering to non-target items. It does not produce breathable droplets. Torbay Council and Walsall Council use a droplet-controlled application to manage weeds.
- 3.22 Based on the soft market research completed to inform this report, three applications are recommended for Brighton and Hove. However, because it is untried and untested on a large scale and because weeds have not been treated for five years, more or fewer applications may be required. It is likely the first application will be in April/May, with the city taking six-to-eight weeks to complete. It is not possible to say when the second application will take place as this will depend on the impact of the first application and weather conditions. It is likely to be May/June once the first application has been completed. The third application will be in September/October, but this will be dependent on the weather. The application will not be blanket across the city; it will only be applied where weeds are visible.

- 3.23 The estimated cost of the three applications is £0.266m. This does not include the cost of the equipment required, which is estimated at £0.035m. Therefore, the total cost for this application in 2024 is estimated to be at least £0.301m. These are high-level costs and through the soft market testing, contractors commented that because this is untried and untested on this scale and because weeds have not been treated for five years, costs could be higher than this. If the costs increase substantially, the approach will be reviewed.
- 3.24 This approach will be subject to a review in winter 2024 to consider its effectiveness.

Traditional glyphosate application

- 3.25 Based on the soft market research completed to inform this report, three applications of traditional glyphosate are recommended. It is likely the first application will be in April/May, with the city taking six-to-eight weeks to complete. It is not possible to say when the second application will take place as this will depend on the impact of the first application and be weather dependent. It is likely to be May/June once the first application has been completed. The third application will be in September/October, but this will be dependent on the weather. The application will not be blanket across the city; it will only be applied where weeds are visible.
- 3.26 The estimated cost of three applications is £0.110m. These are high-level costs and through the soft market testing, contractors commented that because weeds have not been treated for five years, costs could be higher than this.
- 3.27 This approach will be subject to a review in winter 2024 to see if there is an option to move to a controlled-droplet application for 2025. There may be a financial implication that would require a committee decision.
- 3.28 For both controlled-droplet and traditional glyphosate applications, the treatment will be subject to the weather and can only be completed in dry conditions and when rain is not forecast for six to eight hours.
- 3.29 Both controlled-droplet and traditional glyphosate applications will be applied in line with the [Control of Pesticides Act 1986](#) and any new legislation introduced during the contract duration. Risk Assessment Method Statements (RAMS) will be prepared by the contractor and agreed with the council, which will set out mitigations to reduce the risk posed to residents and biodiversity. Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) assessments will also be completed. Pesticide application will only be carried out by trained, qualified operatives who hold the relevant NPTC PA1 and PA6 certification. Those undertaking the weed application will be expected to wear full and appropriate Personal Protective Equipment (PPE).

4. Analysis and consideration of alternative options

- 4.1 The main body of the report and the appendices set out the information on the options available for Committee to consider in order to make a decision.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 This report presents the options available to Committee to manage weeds in Brighton and Hove. Based on experiences to date, a manual approach to weed removal is not sufficient to keep weeds under control across the whole city. This has impacted on the council's ability to keep the highways clear and free of obstructions. It affects the council's ability to meet its equalities duties.
- 5.2 Alternatives to manual weed management are controlled-droplet and traditional glyphosate applications. As stated in the report and appendices, the controlled-droplet application is untried and untested on this scale, particularly as the weeds have not been treated for five years. It is more costly than the traditional application. The traditional application is proven to work and continues to be used by many local authorities across the country.
- 5.3 Following Committee's decision, City Environmental Management will continue to review new equipment and technologies available to remove weeds without the use of glyphosate.
- 5.4 It is recommended that the council continues with the current policy not to use glyphosate in the city's parks and open spaces where leisure activities and dog walking are undertaken and where there are playgrounds. The exception to this is when it is used to manage invasive species. This will protect a substantial habitat for wildlife and pollinator insects. It will also mean more weeds will be visible in the city's parks.

6. Community engagement and consultation

- 6.1 No direct community engagement or consultation has taken place in relation to the report's recommendations.
- 6.2 A Weed Working Group was set up and met in October 2023 to carry out a 'vertical slice' consultation, with stakeholders from every aspect and at relevant level to form part of the working group. The stakeholders included councillors, officers from Cityclean, City Parks, Highways and Biodiversity, plus Pesticide Action Network UK and a local resident. The range of perspectives and experiences from this meeting was extremely useful. The outcome of this Working Group is this report to Committee to make a decision on future weed management.
- 6.3 Since 2019, the council has received:
- Six compliments to the Customer Feedback Team about the new approach to weed management, including:
 - "I love seeing more wildflowers and long grasses in my neighbourhood".
 - "there are many of us who love seeing such an abundance of plant life thriving in our city".

- Five Stage 1 complaints, specifically mentioning the decision not to use pesticides, and suggesting the manual approach to weed removal is not effective.
 - 51 Stage 1 complaints about the state of pavements / highways and overgrown weeds, suggesting the council is not doing enough to manage weeds.
 - One Stage 1 complaint about weed removal as it was “providing miniature nature reserves”.
- 6.4 A [2023 survey by the National Highways and Transport Network](#) stated that public satisfaction with *weed killing on pavements* was 28% in Brighton and Hove. This was a 3% reduction on the previous year and 11% less than the average score of 39%. For *weed killing on roads*, the satisfaction was 35%, which was 4% less than last year and 9% less than the average of 44%.
- 6.5 In addition, two insurance claims, relating to slips, trips or falls due to weeds, have been made to the council since 2019 to the time of writing. Of these two claims, one was settled, and the claimant was awarded £210. For the other, council liability was denied.

7. Financial implications

- 7.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from recommendation 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 or 2.6.
- 7.2 The options of recommendation 2.4 and 2.5 have different financial implications and may contain additional risks as set out in the report.
- 7.3 Agreeing option 2.3 will continue to use the limited resources available and manual techniques to manage and remove some weeds from across the city. Staffing costs and equipment for continued manual techniques will be contained within existing Street Cleansing budgets. Any significant variation to budgets will be reported as part of the council’s monthly budget monitoring process.
- 7.4 Agreeing option 2.4 of use of a controlled-droplet application is estimated to cost at least an additional £0.266m per annum for three applications and capital costs of equipment of £0.035m as outlined in paragraph 3.23. These are high level costs and could be significantly higher as weeds have not been treated for five years. There is currently no budget available for these additional costs. Service pressures for £0.266m ongoing expenditure and £0.035m one off capital have been requested as service pressures for 2024/25 budget setting. The 2024/25 budget will be agreed at Budget Council on 22nd February 2024. Should recommendation 2.4 be agreed, and service pressure funding not awarded, Street Cleaning budgets would have an estimated £0.266m revenue overspend at the start of the new financial year or there may be a need to revisit the decision made by Committee. Any significant variation to budget will be reported as part of the council’s monthly Targeted Budget Monitoring process.

- 7.5 Agreeing option 2.5 of use of traditional glyphosate is estimated to cost an additional £0.110m during 2024/25. Recommendation 2.5 also sets out this will be subject to a review in Winter 2024 to see if there is an option to move to controlled-droplet application for 2025. As highlighted in paragraph 7.4 there is no budget available for the estimated £0.110m in 2024/25 or the ongoing costs of controlled droplet application if this is the preferred option from 2025/26. £0.266m recurring revenue service pressure for 2024/25 budget setting has been requested as part of future weed management options. The 2024/25 budget will be agreed at Budget Council on 22nd February 2024. Should recommendation 2.5 be agreed and service pressure funding not awarded, Street Cleaning budgets would have an estimated £0.110m revenue overspend at the start of the new financial year or they may be a need to revisit the decision made by Committee. Any significant variation to budget will be reported as part of the council's monthly Targeted Budget Monitoring process.

Name of finance officer consulted: John Lack Date consulted: 10/01/2024

8. Legal implications

- 8.1 The Council is required to comply with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 in relation to the procurement and award of contracts above the relevant financial threshold for services, supplies and works.
- 8.2 The Council's Contract Standing Orders (CSOs) will also apply to the procurement of good and services.
- 8.3 As noted in the body of the Report, where a service Committee seeks to make a decision committing the Council to expenditure in relation to which there is no/ insufficient budgetary provision, then the decision can only be made subject to such provision being made by the relevant body. In this case, if this Committee decides to approve either recommendation 2.4 or 2.5 then the authority to incur the relevant expenditure will be sought from budget Council in February 2024.

Name of lawyer consulted: Eleanor Richards and Victoria Simpson
Date consulted: 10/01/2024

9. Equalities implications

- 9.1 An Equality Impact Assessment is contained in Appendix 4.
- 9.2 The council has a duty to keep the city's highways clear and free of obstructions. As stated in the EIA, "this EIA has been prepared to help inform the decision making of the CESS Committee in relation to weed management. The EIA has identified some disproportionate negative impacts and some possible positive impacts that should be read in conjunction with Weed Management Report presented to CESS Committee on 23 January 2024. If the decision is to use herbicide / glyphosate, then the limitations of manual weed removal may be mitigated and all areas could widely be weed-free potentially leading to less slips, trips, and falls or other

risks and hazards for those who may be elderly, disabled, wheelchair and pushchair users or be impacted in another way due to the presence of weeds on pavements and other areas.”

10. Procurement implications

10.1 If recommendation 2.4 or 2.5 is agreed, the procurement process will comply with Contract Standing Orders and the council’s procurement policies.

10.2 Soft market research was completed to inform this report and to understand better which recommendation would be suited to Brighton and Hove.

Notable points of this research are:

- The reduction in chemical use in the controlled-droplet products is offset by the cost, compared to traditional glyphosate.
- The general impression from contractors is that controlled-droplet applications have been developed for, and are typically utilised, in small areas e.g. shrub borders and car parks. They are effective and have their place, but it is not considered an economically viable substitute for conventional methods over large areas.
- Because Brighton and Hove has not received chemical weed treatment for five years, it is likely the perennial weeds have become established and may be difficult to treat, in particular bramble, ivy and buddleia. The opinion is that controlled-droplet applications would be the least effective for controlling this type of plant.
- The topology and diverse environment of Brighton and Hove may require a mixed application approach, including a combination of handheld and vehicle-based droplet control systems and other techniques, including conventional methods.
- Contractors recommended an outcome-based specification to allow contractors to offer the best possible, lowest glyphosate option, rather than being too prescriptive. This will help continue the council’s commitment to keeping glyphosate usage low and support the biodiversity and sustainability objectives of the council.

11. Sustainability implications

11.1 There is evidence that glyphosate has an adverse impact on biodiversity and sustainability as it affects nature conservation, including habitats for insects and other pollinators and presents a risk of chemicals entering the water system. As an example, [research published in Science in June 2022](#) highlighted the impact glyphosate has on bumblebees.

11.2 Conversely, the [Health & Safety Executive](#) says “the responsible use of pesticides in amenity areas as part of an integrated programme of control can help deliver substantial benefits for society. These include: management of conservation areas, invasive species and flood risks; access to high quality sporting facilities; and safe public spaces (for example, by preventing weed growth on hard surfaces creating trip hazards), industrial sites and transport infrastructure”.

- 11.3 Appendices 5 and 6 set out the sustainability considerations of the options presented using the guidance to support officers when assessing projects for their sustainability and climate impacts.
- 11.4 Appendix 5 indicates that using a controlled-droplet or traditional glyphosate application will have some positive and some negative impacts. Primarily, the negative impacts relate to the *biodiversity and nature conservation* theme as this approach does not support the council's objectives relating to the climate and biodiversity emergency. Positive impacts are identified in relation to the *health, safety, wellbeing and local communities* theme by reducing noise in communities and having less of an impact on manual workers. However, there are some negative impacts in relation to this theme too, due to the potential risk to public health which is detailed further in section 13.
- 11.5 Appendix 6 indicates that continuing with manual techniques will have some positive and some negative impacts. Primarily, the positive impacts relate to the *biodiversity and nature conservation* theme, with this approach supporting the council's objectives relating to the climate and biodiversity emergency and being the lead partner in The Living Coast UNESCO Biosphere. The negative impacts primarily relate to *health, safety, wellbeing and local communities* theme, with this approach creating noise for residents and impacting on staff wellbeing due to the intense, manual nature of the work. It also means not all weeds can be removed, leading to obstructions on the highway.
- 11.6 The Pesticide Action Network (PAN) UK has published information on the [effects of glyphosate on the environment](#).
- 11.7 In October 2022, the council sought the Environment Agency and Southern Water's views on the impact / risks of using herbicides / glyphosate on highways and in parks. Particular questions were asked on whether herbicides / glyphosate would permeate through the aquifer and contaminate drinking water and the sea or would this only occur if using the chemical near to open water. Their feedback is contained in Appendix 7.

12. Corporate implications

- 12.1 The Council Plan has several commitments which may be impacted by the decision on weed management, including:
- Ensure our streets, public spaces and facilities are well-maintained, clean and attractive.
 - Ensure that all decisions made by the council take into account the climate and biodiversity crises.
 - Provide a safer, more accessible and attractive environment that enables people to walk, wheel and cycle more.
 - Conserve and manage habitats and spaces where plants and animals can thrive, and biodiversity is restored.
 - Increase biodiversity, tackle water pollution and work towards carbon neutrality through the implementation of the City Downland Estate Plan.

13. Public health implications

- 13.1 In July 2023, an [European Food Safety Authority assessment](#) of the impact of glyphosate on the health of humans, animals and the environment did not identify critical areas of concern. Some data gaps were reported in the conclusions as issues that could not be finalised, or outstanding issues for the European Commission and Member States to consider in the next stage of the renewal approval process.
- 13.2 On 16 November 2023, European Member states did not reach the required qualified majority to renew or reject the approval of glyphosate during a vote at the Appeal Committee. In the absence of the required majority in either direction, the Commission was obliged to adopt a decision before the previous approval expired on 15 December 2023. The Commission, based on comprehensive safety assessment carried out by the European Food Safety Authority and the European Chemicals Agency, [proceeded to renew the approval of glyphosate for a period of 10 years](#), subject to certain new conditions and restrictions.
- 13.3 A [report from the International Agency for Research on Cancer in March 2015](#) found that the herbicide glyphosate was classified as “probably carcinogenic to humans (Group 2A)¹”. The report also stated “there was limited evidence of carcinogenicity in humans for non-Hodgkin lymphoma”. The evidence was based on, mostly agricultural exposures, in the USA, Canada and Sweden. The report goes on to say “the general population is exposed primarily through residence near sprayed areas, home use and diet, and the level that has been observed is generally low”.
- 13.4 In February 2020, the [United States Environmental Protection Agency](#) (EPA) “found that there are no risks of concern to human health when glyphosate is used in accordance with its current label... that glyphosate is unlikely to be a human carcinogen. The interim decision also identified potential ecological risks to non-targeted organisms, primarily non-target plants through spray drift”.
- 13.5 The [Health & Safety Executive](#) provides guidance on the use of glyphosate in public spaces: “legally enforceable conditions of use are imposed on the way products can be applied, to ensure the public are not exposed to levels of pesticides that would harm health or have unacceptable effects on the environment. It is important that users (or those who cause or permit others to use pesticides) not only comply with the authorised conditions of use but also use products in a responsible and sustainable fashion”. If Committee agrees to recommendation 2.4 or 2.5, appropriate monitoring arrangements will be put in place with the contractor. This will include, for example,

¹ “Group 2A means that the agent is probably carcinogenic to humans. This category is used when there is limited evidence of carcinogenicity in humans and sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity in experimental animals. Limited evidence means that a positive association has been observed between exposure to the agent and cancer but that other explanations for the observations (called chance, bias, or confounding) could not be ruled out. This category is also used when there is limited evidence of carcinogenicity in humans and strong data on how the agent causes cancer.”

ensuring the contractor complies with the [Control of Pesticides Act 1986](#) and any new legislation introduced during the contract duration.

Supporting Documentation

Appendices

- Appendix 1: weed management on hard surfaces 2020 to 2023
- Appendix 2: weed management methods
- Appendix 3: benefits and disbenefits
- Appendix 4: Equality Impact Assessment – weed management
- Appendix 5: sustainability implications – controlled-droplet application and traditional glyphosate application
- Appendix 6: sustainability implications – manual removal
- Appendix 7: feedback from the Environment Agency and Southern Water on the use of glyphosate

Background documents

1. [City Environment Improvement Programme Update Report](#) to City Environment, South Downs & The Sea Committee on 19 September 2023 (item 18)
2. [City Environment Improvement Programme Update Report](#) to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 14 March 2023 (item 88)
3. [City Environment Modernisation Update Report](#) to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 15 November 2022 (item 46)
4. [City Environment Modernisation Update Report](#) to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 22 June 2022 (item 8)
5. [Managing weeds and verges](#) presented to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 15 March 2022 (item 97)
6. [City Environment Modernisation Update Report](#) to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 21 September 2021 (item 41)
7. [City Environment Modernisation Update Report](#) to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 16 March 2021 (item 80)
8. [City Environment Modernisation Update Report](#) to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 29 September 2020 (item 29)
9. [Pesticide reduction and weed management](#) presented to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 16 March 2021 (item 81)
10. [Pesticide Reduction Plan](#) presented to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 26 November 2019 (item 48)
11. Glyphosate impairs collective thermoregulation in bumblebees at <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abf7482>
12. Issues associated with the use of the herbicide (weedkiller) glyphosate: Frequently Asked Questions About Glyphosate available at <https://www.hse.gov.uk/pesticides/using-pesticides/general/glyphosate-faqs.htm>
13. IARC Monographs Volume 112: evaluation of five organophosphate insecticides and herbicides available at <https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/MonographVolume112-1.pdf>

14. Glyphosate: no critical areas of concern; data gaps identified available at <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/news/glyphosate-no-critical-areas-concern-data-gaps-identified>
15. Glyphosate (US EPA) available at <https://www.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/glyphosate#:~:text=Glyphosate%20is%20a%20widely%20used,in%20the%20U.S.%20since%201974.>
16. Glyphosate available at <https://www.pan-uk.org/glyphosate/>
17. No qualified majority reached by Member States to renew or reject the approval of glyphosate available at https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_23_5792