



LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP

A MEETING OF THE LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP
WILL BE HELD ON THURSDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2016 AT 10.30 AM
IN COMMITTEE ROOM FIVE, COUNTY OFFICES, NEWLAND, LINCOLN LN1
1YL

AGENDA

- LEAD**
- 1 PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT ISSUES**
- 1a **Apologies for Absence**
- 1b **Declaration of Interests**
- 1c **Minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2015** (Pages 3 - 12)
- 2 STRATEGIC ISSUES**
- 2a **Future of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership**
- i. LARAC Presentation*
 - ii. Members Vision for the LWP*
 - iii. Ambitions of the LWP (10 year strategy)*
 - iv. Recyclables*
 - v. Fly Tipping Enforcement*
- 2b **Waste Budget Proposals**
(To receive a presentation which provides information in relation to the proposed budget for Waste and Recycling services)
- 3 OPERATIONAL ISSUES**
- 3a **Partner Updates**
(To provide partners with an opportunity to update the rest of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership on any developments within their areas which may affect or be of interest to the Partnership as a whole)

- 3b **Waste Collaboration Project Update**
(To receive a presentation from Mark Taylor, North Kesteven District Council on progress being made with the Waste Collaboration Project)
- 3c **Energy from Waste Update**
(To receive an update on the working of the Energy from Waste facility at North Hykeham)
- 3d **Officer Working Group Update**
(To receive an update on the work of the Officer Working Group)

3 February 2016

Rachel Wilson
Democratic Services Officer
Lincolnshire County Council
County Offices, Newland, Lincoln LN1 1YL
Tel: 01522 552107
Email: rachel.wilson@lincolnshire.gov.uk



**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE
PARTNERSHIP
19 NOVEMBER 2015**

**PRESENT: COUNCILLOR R A SHORE (LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL)
(CHAIRMAN)**

Councillor Anthony Herbert Turner MBE JP	(Lincolnshire County Council)
Sean Kent	(Lincolnshire County Council)
District Councillor Michael Brookes	(Boston Borough Council)
George Bernard	(Boston Borough Council)
District Councillor Mrs Sandra Harrison	(East Lindsey District Council)
Victoria Burgess	(East Lindsey District Council)
District Councillor Fay Smith	(City of Lincoln Council)
District Councillor Richard Wright	(North Kesteven District Council)
Mark Taylor	(North Kesteven District Council)
District Councillor Roger Gambba-Jones	(South Holland District Council)
Glen Chapman	(South Holland District Council)
District Councillor Nick Craft	(South Kesteven District Council)
District Councillor David Cotton	(West Lindsey District Council)
Ady Selby	(West Lindsey District Council)
Simon Mitchell	(Environment Agency)
Ian Taylor	Environmental Services Team Leader (Waste)
Simon Cotton (Communications)	Strategic Communications Lead
Rachel Wilson	Democratic Services

61 PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT ISSUES

61a Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Emily Spicer, South Holland District Council.

61b Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest at this point in the meeting.

61c Minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2015

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on the 10 September 2015 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the last sentence of minute 60b be

amended to read 'There would be an ongoing need to look at other processes.....'

61d Terms of Reference

The revised Terms of Reference were presented for consideration and it was requested that the nominated representative for West Lindsey be double checked, and also that the date of the Annual General Meeting of the Partnership be set after the AGM of each district and the County Council had taken place to ensure that all representatives would have been appointed.

It was requested that these changes be made and the Terms of Reference be brought back to the next scheduled meeting of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership.

RESOLVED

That the changes highlighted above be made.

61e Revised Meeting Dates

RESOLVED

That the revised meeting dates as presented be agreed.

61f Partner Updates

Members of the Partnership were provided with the opportunity to update the rest of the Partners on any developments within their individual districts which may be of interest, and the following was reported:

Boston Borough Council – a consultation on green waste charging had just been completed, and would be going through the committee process in the next month. There had been a massive response to the consultation, with over 1200 questionnaires returned. Initial indications showed that 88% of respondents were in favour of continuing to pay for the service, an exact charge had not yet been agreed, but was likely to be £25 per year;

South Kesteven District Council – an update on the waste policy document was currently going through the Committee process.

South Holland District Council – approval had been received for a pilot on green waste collection. There was also a working party looking at the benefits of collecting 4 days per week instead of 5. This would require slightly earlier starts.

It was commented that there had been rumours that there were plans to reduce the opening hours at the household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) in Spalding and also to reduce the supplementary collections. It was requested that the green waste collections be allowed to 'bed in' and for people to have time to sign up to before any changes were made to the HWRC. It was thought that people would quickly realise the inconvenience

of using the HWRC for green waste and would sign up to the collection service instead once they realised the benefits.

The Partnership was advised that the County Council would need to save another £90m, and the amount of 'wiggle room' left in budgets was diminishing. It was noted that any activity that was not part of statutory policy would be a target.

In relation to the comments regarding HWRC opening hours, it was noted that it was expected that there would be very little change, but it could be an area which was vulnerable.

The charging regime that South Holland was considering implementing was £49 per year for 24 collections (fortnightly throughout the year) and a £15 initial fee for the green bin delivery.

Environment Agency – the risk of fires at waste sites was being examined, and was very much high on the agenda. Officers were looking to identify sites which could be high risk and then arrange for visits from the fire service.

Officers were very conscious that these sites were providing services for local people, and they were required to comply with their permits. It was useful to include something in contracts for waste sites, that the operator was required to certain level of compliance with permits. It was noted that the Group Manager Environmental Services (LCC) would be meeting with Simon Mitchell (EA) to look in more detail at some of these issues, particularly around contracts.

Concerns relating to operators who allowed piles of waste to grow too high and then went out of business were highlighted. It was queried whether there was any way to strengthen the process. In relation to the Bowman's site, where this had occurred recently, it was reported that planning enforcement officers were taking action, but there was a due process to follow as well as a need to gather evidence.

Fire prevention guidance had recently been reviewed nationally, and the Environment Agency was in the process of going out to sites and updating their fire prevention plans.

It was reported that a deregulation and downward turn in markets was starting to be seen, which was causing some of these issues, such as operators going out of business. It was expected that there would be a 30% reduction in the grant in the Autumn Statement. It was also noted that Defra had been granted new powers allowing the Environment Agency to be able to serve notice ordering an operator to take no further waste.

There would be a risk based approach in which sites were examined, such as where they were located, what materials they handled and operator behaviour. The Environment Agency worked very closely with the planners, and would be looking to undertake a joint case in regards to Mid-UK.

It was queried what safeguards were in place to safeguard against a Great Heck type situation. There was a need for vigilance, on behalf of the public as well, as the budget

for dealing with these things was reduced. There was a large percentage of the waste industry had a criminal background. It was commented that this could be where districts could help, as they could be the 'eyes and ears', and encourage residents to report it if they hear about something which concerns them.

All the mechanisms existed for operators to comply with permits, but the issues arise when people have no intention of complying with permits. However, if people supplying the waste were aware of what legitimate operators should do, this would be a start. There was need to work together to stop those with criminal intent.

East Lindsey District Council – the authority was constantly looking at the services it was providing, and there may be something to bring to the partnership in the coming year.

An update on the potential for a HWRC at Mablethorpe was requested. It was reported there were three locations – Stamford, Long Sutton and Mablethorpe which were outside of a HWRC area, and were areas where the County Council had been examining the possibilities of a supplementary service. It was emphasised that there was no money left in the capital fund to build any new HWRC's. It was considered important that a situation where people had to travel more than 12 miles to a HWRC was not created.

The representative for East Lindsey District Council commented that they had believed that there was money available for a new HWRC. The Group Manager Environmental Services offered to write to the District Council to explain the situation. It was noted that there had been a capital fund of £15m available to all directorates of the Council to bid for, but money would only be released from this fund following the submission of business cases. It was also noted that there was no definite site available in Mablethorpe for a HWRC at the moment. It was queried whether if a suitable site could be identified, could the County Council look at putting together a business case. It was commented that that was possible, but there was no guarantee it would be successful.

City of Lincoln Council – enforcement activity had been increased, with an initiative that had gone live this week. There would be an enforcement officer walking the streets of Lincoln, who was able to issue on the spot fines and fixed penalty notices for littering and dog fouling. This scheme would be evaluated after 6 months, it was hoped that it would be self-funding, and a report would be brought back to the Partnership at a later date.

62 STRATEGIC ISSUES

62a Feedback from Task and Finish Group/County Recycling Campaign

The Partnership was advised that a meeting had taken place, as agreed at the last meeting, between Councillor R Shore (LCC), Sean Kent (LCC), Simon Cotton (LCC), Councillor F Smith (City of Lincoln) and Steve Bird (City of Lincoln) to hold initial discussions on producing a standardised message for a county recycling strategy which could be included in a future edition of County News, which set out what should be placed in green bins, waste bins and recycling bins.

It was suggested that the group look at what items were common to all authorities and a diagram showing this was produced by Steve Bird and circulated to the Partnership. It was commented that it had been a very successful meeting. It was noted that the success of this campaign would rely on the co-operation and support of all members of the Partnership.

The aim of the campaign would be to increase recycling, both by ensuring that the right materials go into the right bins, and also by reducing contamination within recycling. This would be achieved by improving the householders knowledge of what can go into the recycling bin, and how important it is for that material to be placed in there clean, as well as what the implications were for putting things in the wrong bin e.g. putting items that were not recyclable into the recycling bin.

It was suggested that the best way to achieve this would be to simplify the message across all districts and possibly to simplify the streams in the short term. The main issue would be how this was communicated. It was also noted that this would create the potential for savings or income generation, and it was thought that if this was the case, they should be shared by all authorities.

Members of the Partnership were provided with the opportunity to discuss the document which had been circulated and also ask questions to the officers present, and some of the points raised during discussion included the following;

- One message to get out would be that the HWRC would accept items such as textiles, metals and electronic equipment;
- It would also be beneficial to include information relating to the duty of care in relation to fly-tipping;
- There was also a need for further discussion in relation to enforcement and rewards for information which led to prosecutions for fly-tipping;
- Concerns were raised regarding the simplifying of the recycling streams as it could be seen as a backwards step. There was a need for caution when suggesting removing materials from the recycling stream;
- It was highlighted that the purpose of this exercise was to remove some of the confusion from the public and having a consistent message regarding what recyclable material was collected;
- The Partnership was advised that not many of the tetrapaks which were collected had been recycled. It was noted that there had been a national scheme to recycle tetrapaks, however, they were difficult to recycle as they needed to be broken down into their separate parts;
- Ultimately, the industry would drive which materials were collected for recycling;
- There was a need to make a decision as a partnership regarding the materials which should be collected for recycling;
- An ambition could be for the county to have its own MRF. The quality of the product for recycling had to be high;
- One of the biggest contaminants which needed to be removed from the recycling stream was plastic bags;
- It was noted from the analysis that there were a lot of materials that all districts did collect;

- In relation to public perception, it was thought that this would give out a mixed message of why material was recycled, in that these things were only recycled to make money, rather than for environmental reasons. It was queried how it would be explained to the public that there were particular items which the authority no longer wanted to recycle;
- It was agreed that there was a need to identify materials in relation to the contract, but a lot of recycling was collected in line with what the legislation stated;
- It was noted that there were companies which would not recycle particular materials as in some instances it cost less to make new ones than recycle;
- There was a need to choose what could be recycled meaningfully;
- It was noted that the Partnership in 2006 had tried to bring uniformity to the recycling stream. It was believed that there was a need to move on. It was suggested that one way to do this was through reducing packaging. It was commented that people did not create waste, they bought it;
- Further concerns were raised regarding taking items out of the recycling mix that councils already collected;
- There was also a need for companies to stop putting on plastic packaging labels that it was recyclable, as just because the type of plastic was recyclable did not mean that every authority had the ability to recycle it;
- It was commented that most people did not recycle well, and there were often problems with which plastics could be recycled. Although, people did think they were doing the right thing. This was why there was a need to ensure there was a clear message across the county;
- There was agreement that all districts would continue to collect paper, cardboard, plastic bottles, cans, glass and garden waste;
- It was suggested that it would be useful for the Partnership to visit a MRF and a waste transfer station. It was commented that some of the contamination rates were up to 30%;
- It was commented that this was a very complicated issue, but there was some support towards moving to a waste stream that could be collected by all. However, it should not be believed that just putting an article in county news would make a difference to what ended up at the MRF;
- NKDC had previously run campaigns to tackle the issues of ordinary waste, such as nappies, being put into recycling bins;
- It was queried what the financial implication of hard plastics going into the residual waste stream would be;
- It was agreed that there was a lot of confusion regarding what was recyclable, and it was suggested that people should be advised to stick to the basics, and if that message could be got out, it would be a start;
- Contamination was another big issue to deal with, and it was suggested that if people could not clean the tin/bottle/jar etc. before it went in the recycling then it should go in the residual waste stream;
- It was commented that this would be a gradual process, but that overall it could increase recycling rates;
- It was believed that a lot of people would come on board with this once they understood the message which was being delivered;

- There were two aspects to this, the first being that anything put in the recycling should be put in clean, and secondly, that there would be a contract which would state what would and would not be recycled;
- There were a lot of things to think about, and any changes would need to go through the due process, and it was suggested that putting any message out now could cause some problems, as a new contract would not be implemented for another 18 months – 2 years;
- It was agreed that all partners thought it was a good idea to have a consistent message, but it was not yet agreed what that message should be. However, it was positive that a start had been made and it was suggested that this be passed to the Officer Working Group to produce an options paper;
- It was suggested there was a need to concentrate on what contamination meant to the districts financially, such as what the cost was, as it was thought this would be more meaningful to the public;
- There would be a need to make some difficult decisions, and referring it to the Officer Working Group was supported;
- It was suggested that the public be given a better description of what glass could be put in the recycling e.g. specifically bottles and jars (not broken window panes etc.);
- There would also be a need for members to get this message back to their own councils, and get them on board with the message as well;
- It was noted that County news was just one channel that this message could be communicated through, there were others such as websites, internal communications, social media etc.
- It was important to emphasise that the people who would benefit from this would be the tax payers.

RESOLVED

That this matter be referred back to the Officer Working Group to produce an options paper to be brought back to the Lincolnshire waste Partnership at a later date.

62b Fly Tipping Enforcement

The Partnership received a presentation from Mark Taylor, North Kesteven District Council in relation to Waste and Fly-Tipping – the North Kesteven Approach, which provided further information in relation to the following areas:

- Fly Tipping – Lincolnshire Context
- NK Commitment
- Approach in Practice
- Publicity
- Opportunities Available
- Future Activities

Members were provided with the opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the presentation, and some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP
19 NOVEMBER 2015**

- The City of Lincoln was undertaking a new initiative and were looking into the opportunities of providing a 'Crimestoppers' type reward;
- One district had seen a reduction in fly-tipping following the introduction of an enforcement officer three days per week;
- It was queried whether the Enforcement seminar scheduled for spring 2016 could be delivered to the LWP. It was noted that this was intended for practitioners, but an update could be provided to the Partnership;
- It was noted that the courts could award costs and compensation following a successful prosecution for fly-tipping;
- In terms of evidence collected for a prosecution, it needed to be strong to ensure that it was beyond all reasonable doubt;
- Some members were not in favour of offering a reward for information relating to fly tipping, and it was suggested that it was better for this activity to be seen as socially unacceptable rather than financially beneficial;
- It was thought that that in some areas, people must see something, but did not want to come forward. therefore offering a financial incentive was a last resort;
- It was requested that partners share this with their own authorities and gather opinions regarding the implementation of a reward system, and that the issue be discussed again at a future meeting.

RESOLVED

That the presentation and points highlighted be noted, and this issue be brought back to a future meeting for further discussion.

62c North Kesteven District Council Waste Policy

The Lincolnshire Waste Partnership received a copy of North Kesteven District Council's Residual, Recycling and Composting Collection Policy, following a request at the previous meeting where it was agreed that their approach would be shared.

Members commented that they had found the policy to be an excellent document, and requested permission to emulate some aspects of it for their own authorities.

RESOLVED

That North Kesteven District Council's Residual, Recycling and Composting Collection Policy be received.

**62d Waste Collaboration Project - Update
(12.30pm – Boston Borough Council and South Kesteven District Council left the meeting)**

The Partnership received an update from North Kesteven District Council in relation to the Waste Collaboration project. It was noted that the report set out the work which had been completed, what was still being worked on and what work still needed to be completed. The Partnership was advised that a more detailed report would be brought back to the meeting in February 2016.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted and a further report be brought back to the meeting in February 2016.

62e District Heating Update

The Partnership received a verbal update in relation to the District Heating project. It was reported that the first stage of the mapping work had been done. The County Council was working very closely with the City of Lincoln Council and North Kesteven District Council. The next phase was to identify a masterplan and look at what scenarios were possible.

A decision on the next phase would be made by the Executive Councillors for Waste and Recycling, and Economic Development, Environment, Planning and Tourism on 15 February 2016.

It was noted that the project was progressing and there were one or two scenarios which had potential.

RESOLVED

That the update be noted.

63 OPERATIONAL ISSUES

63a Energy from Waste Plant Update

Consideration was given to a report which provided an update in relation to the recent planned shutdown for annual maintenance of the Energy from Waste facility in North Hykeham. It was reported that the shutdown had gone well, and following ultrasonic thickness testing (UT) it was found there was not quite as much wear on some of the equipment as had been expected.

The Partnership was also advised of FCC's intention of achieving R1 status for the EfW. It was noted that there were very few EfW's in the UK with this accreditation in the UK, and was only likely to be achieved by modern facilities where energy generation had been a part of the plant from design rather than as a retro-fit.

It was highlighted that achieving R1 status would be particularly significant following an announcement at the recent LARAC (Local Authority Recycling Advisory Committee) conference, where a speaker stated that as part of the circular economy package under development in the EU, a ban on disposal of key recyclates such as paper, cardboard, and plastic by any means other than recycling was under consideration. The implication of this was that waste collection authorities would need to keep all of these materials out of the residual waste bin. Partners were advised that the one exception currently considered appropriate to relax that requirement, would be if those materials were going to an EfW plant with R1 status.

10
LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP
19 NOVEMBER 2015

RESOLVED

That the update be noted.

63b Officer Working Group Update

The Partnership received an update on the work of the Officer Working Group. It was reported that the Officer Working Group was working really well.

Following legal advice in relation to the clearing of the highway after road traffic accidents (RTA's) it was believed that it was a district council function to do this. However, there was still a need for clarification on what was expected from the highways authority. A draft agreement would be going out to all district officers.

In relation to the collection of clinical waste from GP surgeries, there was a need for a business case to be put to Public Health.

It was noted that it was the responsibility of the Highways Authority to ensure than the highway was safe, but it was queried who had the legal responsibility to close highways following an accident. Partners were advised that this would be the Police in the first stance, but the highway authority would also be called out. The Police and highway authority would work together to ensure that the road could reopen and it was safe.

RESOLVED

That the update be noted.

The meeting closed at 12.45 pm