

**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE  
 PARTNERSHIP  
 7 SEPTEMBER 2017**

**PRESENT: COUNCILLOR E J POLL (CHAIRMAN)**

District Councillor David Cotton	(West Lindsey District Council)
Sean Kent	(Lincolnshire County Council)
District Councillor Michael Brookes	(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)
Steve Bird	(City of Lincoln Council)
District Councillor Richard Wright	(North Kesteven District Council)
District Councillor Roger Gambba-Jones (Vice-Chairman)	(South Holland District Council)
Emily Spicer	(South Holland District Council)
District Councillor Nick Craft	(South Kesteven District Council)
Nina Camm	North Kesteven District Council
Councillor Dr Peter Moseley	South Kesteven District Council
Councillor Edward John Poll	
Neil McBride	Environment and Economy
Councillor Anthony Herbert Turner MBE JP	
Rachel Wilson	Democratic Services
Steve Leary	West Lindsey District Council
Ian Yates	South Kesteven District Council

14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from George Bernard (Boston Borough Council) and Ady Selby (West Lindsey District Council).

15 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

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

16 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6 JULY 2017

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2017 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

17 ACTION NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 6 JULY 2017

## RESOLVED

That the action notes from the meeting held on 6 July 2017 be noted.

18 PARTNER UPDATES

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

In reference to the Terms of Reference it was highlighted that West Lindsey was a fourth option authority and would try and bring as much executive power to the Partnership as possible, although this may be limited for some actions. The Chairman acknowledged these potential restrictions and requested that the district do what it could.

It was suggested that in order for Partners to be able to provide feedback to their individual districts as soon as possible, minutes should be made available at the earliest opportunity. It was considered important that there was a written record to refer to when providing briefings back to respective councils to help ensure that there was a consistent message.

Further to the previous meeting, when it was suggested by East Lindsey District Council that information on the types of fly-tipping collected could be circulated, Partners were provided with a document which set out this information for 2016/17. Victoria Burgess advised that she would be happy to collate information from all districts into one document if the Partnership thought it would be helpful. It was commented that it would be useful to see the fly-tipping picture across the districts and it was requested whether this information could be supplied to Partners electronically so it could be shared with their own members.

It was commented that the majority of fly tips appeared to be carried out by people who would go door to door offering services such as laying driveways, clearing green waste, shed clearances etc.

It was queried whether consideration could be given to including references to the weights of various fly-tips as construction waste only made up 7% of the total collected, but it was likely that if measured by weight it would be a higher proportion. This was particularly relevant as construction materials needed to be taken to landfill, a more expensive form of disposal.

Partners were advised that the public were not aware of their duty of care in relation to waste disposal, and it was queried whether there could be a campaign with adverts that all partners would support, highlighting that a £30 cost for someone to take away the waste could become a £600 bill for the local authority and therefore the taxpayer.

It was also commented that the press liked to run stories regarding prosecutions for fly-tipping. However, caution was expressed regarding districts revealing too much information about how fly-tippers were caught, as this could make people more aware of how to avoid prosecution in the future.

Most districts did collate some kind of data regarding fly-tipping, and it was suggested that the officer working group agree on the criteria for the information to be collected. The City of Lincoln identified where their fly-tipped waste came from, and the majority was landlord properties. There was also a need to be clear on what the action point would be and what would be done with the data. There was support for a Lincolnshire wide approach to tackling fly-tipping, as there was a need to identify hotspots and a lot of people who would deliberately dump waste would not respect district boundaries and were likely to cross district borders if one area was having a campaign.

North Kesteven District Council reported that they had received positive feedback following the introduction of proposals to align policies for the collection of different categories of waste. It was noted that so far this was only being applied to commercial waste.

In relation to the standardisation of charges for waste collection, it was reported that it had been through the Cabinet at Boston Borough Council and charges had been introduced for village halls, church halls and charity shops etc. The standard residual and recycling bins would be collected free of charge, but anything additional would be charged for. It was also noted that the charges would be introduced in April 2018 and would be set during the budget process.

Boston Borough also reported that there were four prosecutions underway for fly-tipping in laybys, and two of these were commercial operations. The cases had not yet gone to court. However, the perpetrators had admitted the offences.

3GS had been appointed to issue fixed penalty notices for littering. So far 348 notices had been issued. This was being trialled with a one year contract and so far seemed to be successful. Discussions were currently being held with South Holland District Council who was keeping a watching brief on how the scheme progressed. Partners were also advised that the reaction to this scheme had been positive and had been welcomed by the public.

South Kesteven District Council reported that they were considering introducing a similar enforcement scheme and in response to a question, it was reported that the collection rate was currently 85%. It was reported that SKDC had invested a lot of money in the Big Clean Project which was having a massive across the district. In terms of penalty notices for littering, there was a need to be mindful of the legalities. It was noted that this was being considered by the Street Scene Committee, and a one year trial was being suggested. It was emphasised that this would not be a profit making exercise, but was about improving the street scene and there would be a need for a strong message to this effect.

The City of Lincoln reported that following the introduction of their street enforcement officer, over 1000 tickets had been issued. They had been approached by different companies offering to run this scheme, but it was thought that the authority would instead be able to run this in-house. The scheme was now self-sustaining and the enforcement officer post had now become a permanent position. There was currently an 85% collection rate, and there were no targets in terms of tickets issued.

A need for caution was emphasised in relation to street enforcement and fixed penalty notices as following work by South Holland, there were some significant legal issues which would need to be looked at before a scheme could be introduced. It was acknowledged that it was a positive scheme, but there would be some legalities which would need to be overcome if carried out by a private company.

The County Council reported that in relation to the ongoing issue with the clearing of roads following road traffic accidents, a meeting had been held with the Highways Authority and officers were in the process of negotiating with Kier to remove debris at the scene. It was hoped to bring a further paper to the officer working group and then to the next partnership meeting for endorsement.

The bulk haulage contract was also in the process of being re-tendered, and would be in place from 1 April 2018 on 5 + 2 year basis. Partners were reassured they would see no difference in their service.

In relation to trade waste, an agreement had been made with West Lindsey and Boston Borough to charge £85 per tonne. The Waste Strategy was still 18 months from launch and a letter would be going out to all districts advising that the £85 cost would continue until the end of 2019, and it was planned to tie this in with the Strategy. It was confirmed that this rate was open to all partners until March 2019.

#### 19 UPDATE TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consideration was given to a report which asked the Partnership to amend its Terms of Reference to have three formal meetings per year, with a series of informal workshops to accompany these meetings. It was clarified that the Partnership had agreed to this change during the last meeting, and the aim of this report was to formalise that agreement.

It was noted that Councillor P Burley would be taking over from Councillor R Wright as the representative for North Kesteven District Council shortly, but they would both be attending for the next couple of meetings. The Partnership welcomed the new representative from North Kesteven.

#### RESOLVED

1. That from 2018 the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership meet three times per year
2. That the Terms of Reference be amended to reflect this change.

#### 20 UPDATE ON WASTE AND RECYCLING ACTION PROGRAMME (WRAP) CONSULTANCY WORK CONSIDERING GREATER CONSISTENCY IN HOUSEHOLD WASTE RECYCLING

The Lincolnshire Waste Partnership received a report which provided an update on the Waste and Recycling Action Programme (WRAP) consultancy work into greater consistency in Household Waste Recycling.

It was reported that all Partners had now inputted their data, and a meeting with officers was planned for the afternoon to go through the findings. A report would be brought to the meeting of the Partnership at the end of November. It was reported that Boston Borough would not have a representative at this session and it was requested whether one of the other officers could feedback the outcome of the meeting. It was agreed that someone would report back to Boston on the outcome of the meeting. It was also noted that comments from Boston's officer representative had been received in advance of the session and would be included in the discussion.

## RESOLVED

That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership considers the output from the WRAP project in determining the structure and viability of any food waste trial in Lincolnshire.

## 21 JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The Lincolnshire Waste Partnership received a report, as agreed at the March meeting, which provided an update for councillors regarding progress in developing the new Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS).

The Partnership was guided through the report and updates were given in relation to the Partnership workshops held during July, proposals for the analysis of residual waste composition, the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and the planned upcoming work.

Councillor Dr Moseley from South Kesteven reported that he had been unable to attend the second workshop, but noted that the first workshop came up with a great vision, and then the objectives were set at the second workshop. It was felt that there should be a specific objective about being innovative and that it should be one of the longer term ambitions to keep up to date with new technologies, and this should be included within the Strategy. It was suggested that this should be a reference rather than an objective, and it was felt that it should be reflected as a thread throughout all objectives.

It was commented that one of the biggest criticisms of the old strategy was its use of 'woolly' and vague terms, and this time it was aimed to have a more concrete approach. There was concern that the objectives did not fully reflect the vision in terms of innovation. The Chairman advised that all of the objectives should reflect the vision. It was confirmed that a discussion had taken place about this at the workshop, and it had been suggested that there was also a need for day to day innovation, not just embracing new technologies, but also trying things which were new to Lincolnshire e.g. food waste collection.

In terms of the waste analysis which was to be carried out, it was queried whether that data would be available for all authorities to use, as this data could be used by districts for supporting local campaigns as well as countywide ones. It was confirmed that once the sampling had been undertaken, the data would be available after about 1 month. It was highlighted that when the waste was taken from the Waste Transfer Station, care

**6**

**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP**

**7 SEPTEMBER 2017**

would need to be taken to ensure that it was known exactly where the waste was collected from, so that the data collected was meaningful.

It was suggested that in relation to the request for an additional objective, it should read – 'To consider appropriate innovative solutions in the delivery of our waste management services'.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the ongoing work on the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy be noted.
2. That reference to the need to consider innovation be included as an additional objective as follows – 'To consider appropriate innovative solutions in the delivery of our waste management services'

The meeting closed at 12.20 pm