

**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE
 PARTNERSHIP
 8 MARCH 2018**

**PRESENT: COUNCILLOR E J POLL ((LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL))
 (CHAIRMAN)**

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 Peter Burley	(North Kesteven District Council)
David Steels	(North Kesteven District Council)
District Councillor Roger Gambba-Jones (Vice-Chairman)	(South Holland District Council)
Emily Spicer	(South Holland District Council)
District Councillor Dr Peter Moseley	(South Kesteven District Council)
Ian Yates	(South Kesteven District Council)
Ady Selby	(West Lindsey District Council)
Councillor Anthony Herbert Turner MBE JP	

Councillors: attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

34 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D Cotton (West Lindsey District Council)

35 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

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

36 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 NOVEMBER 2017

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2017 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to it being noted that Councillor P Burley (NKDC) was in attendance.

37 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The following was raised by the Chairman:

- The Partnership felt that the informal member only meetings were working well. However, the importance of members passing feedback of the discussions back to the relevant officers in their districts was emphasised to ensure that everyone was aware of how issues needed to be progressed going forward. It was highlighted that this was particularly important if some members were unable to attend. It was suggested that it would be useful if some notes were taken to capture any action points which could then be circulated to all officers so all were clear of what had been agreed.
- There was a need for the Officer Working Group (OWG) to take a more strategic development approach due to the future issues which would need to be considered as well as continuing an operational one. It was important that the officers attending the strategic meeting were of the required management level to action any strategic decisions.
- Logo – it was considered essential that the partnership needed to have some up to date branding to represent a collective partnership approach. Therefore there was a need to refresh the existing logo to ensure it was eye-catching and reflected the work of the Partnership. This would be important for the issues that the Partnership would be supporting and progressing in the future, such as the Food Waste Trial. It was important to show that an initiative was not just being carried out by the collection authority, or the disposal authority, but that it was supported by the whole Partnership.
- There was a WRAP report which was modelling three weekly bin collections. However there was agreement from the Partnership that this was not something that the districts would want to consider at this time.
- It was queried whether prior to the next meeting of the Partnership which was scheduled for 12 July 2018 the Partnership would be interested in visiting an MRF, as one of the biggest issues facing the Partnership was the continued high levels of mixed dry recyclables contamination. It was agreed that this visit would be useful to the Partnership, particularly as there were some new members and officers on the Partnership. A visit to an operational MRF site would be arranged.
- There was a need for the Partnership to discuss its approach to trade waste, as this was something that should be approached from a partnership perspective. The Chairman apologised for a letter which was sent out in the autumn of 2017 regarding trade waste which did not make it clear that the current charge was only applicable to Boston, South Holland and West Lindsey (as agreements had been formed with those authorities) and not the other authorities. It was hoped that if capacity could be increased at the EfW, this could be opened to other authorities.

A general discussion followed and some of the main issues highlighted by the Partnership included the following:

- In terms of capacity at the EfW, it was commented that the biggest issue for West Lindsey was around housing growth, and the amount of trade waste was minimal compared to this. However, the district had a duty to provide a disposal route for

businesses and an early decision in relation to trade waste was urged. It was suggested whether this was something which should be dealt with through the Strategy, and it was important to have a consistent approach throughout the County.

- One of the aims of the Partnership was to create capacity at the EfW. There was a need to reduce throughput, and this would form part of the Strategy. In the interim, the facility was not able to accept any extra tonnage. It was accepted that eventually more capacity would be needed.
- It was estimated that if food could be taken out of the residual waste stream, this could free up to 20,000 tonnes of capacity.
- South Kesteven reported that they had recently launched a trade waste service which was proving successful. However, it emerged that discussions would need to take place outside of the meeting with LCC regarding where this waste would be disposed of.
- It was queried whether an approach had been agreed in relation to implementing the government's proposal to reduce plastic bottle waste.
- It was commented that the focus on implementing the food waste trial had distracted the Partnership from the concerns around the materials in the waste stream which should be in the recycling scheme. It was suggested that there was a need to consider both of these issues alongside each other.
- It was suggested that there was a need to remove as much glass and metal from the residual waste stream as possible due to the negative effect it could have on the running of the EfW as they required higher temperatures to allow them to burn and also left additional residue that was difficult to remove.
- It was suggested that glass, metal and plastics should be a separate co-mingled collection. There would be no requirement to change the vehicles or collection routes and these were also 3 materials which could not cross contaminate.
- It was suggested that the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy should be the document that influences the service provision that the Partnership provided.
- It was commented that there was still a lot of work to do back at members' individual authorities to gauge the appetite to different approaches.
- A discussion was held regarding the advantages and disadvantages of 'institutional memory' when trying to develop new approaches to waste management through 'blank paper' exercises. It was suggested whether this was something which should be considered by the OWG.
- There was a need to ensure that strategic objectives were maintained. One of the main issues for the Partnership to deal with should be how to reduce the amount of waste produced, rather than looking for ways to increase capacity to deal with increased amounts of waste.
- Some of the things being discussed could be categorised as short, medium and long term objectives. The long term objectives should inform the thinking of the Partnership and outline the long term vision and could be updated and refreshed as necessary. It was suggested that getting metals and glass out of the waste stream should be a medium term objective and in the short term there should be a focus on enforcement and education. It was noted that a report had been produced by the District Officers on this a few years ago but it had not reached the Partnership. It was suggested that this could be refreshed by the Officer Working Group if it was thought that would be helpful. There was a need for people to put

the right materials in the right bin and it was noted that taking some action on this could be a quick win for the Partnership. It was requested that the OWG look into how straight forward this would be to implement as well as any cost implication.

- In relation to the suggestion for only glass, metal and plastic to be collected for recycling, it was confirmed that the intention, if this was implemented, would be for all other materials to go into the residual waste stream. There were concerns that in relation to paper, this could leave districts as being non-compliant with TEEP. There would be a need to understand all options and implications before any changes to the recycling mix collected were implemented.
- There was a need for a simple message of what recyclables would be collected as residents were confused. If there were just three items, it would help people to focus.
- It was suggested that a lot of glass, metal and plastic ended up in the residual waste as people did not want to wash the items before putting in the recycling.
- It was noted that 'bring sites' and HWRC's were a very effective way of collecting recyclables and it was suggested whether some publicity was needed around them.

38 PARTNER UPDATES

Deferred to the next meeting.

39 FOLLOW UP AUDIT REPORT (LWP & JMWMS)

Consideration was given to a report which set out the progress made since an LCC audit was completed in 2016 which looked at the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership (LWP) and the Waste Strategy. The scope of the Review was to provide independent assurance that there were strong governance arrangements in place for the LWP as well as ensuring that the Waste Strategy was an up to date and relevant document. In 2016, the risks identified were:

- Lack of a fit for purpose strategy
- No approach planned for producing a new Strategy
- Actions and requirements of the Partnership not completed.

Twelve findings were identified during the original audit, and Limited Assurance was provided. However, the follow up work which was carried out in February 2018 recorded that work was well underway for the creation of the Waste Strategy and the majority of findings identified in 2016 had been actioned. There were 3 remaining findings which required action and the level of assurance had been increased to Substantial.

The remaining findings were contained within an action plan which outlined the risks identified as well as the findings, implications and recommendations for addressing each risk. It was noted that the main item to be actioned was the publishing of the Strategy, but it was clear that progress was being made towards this. Management actions had been agreed with Sean Kent and Matthew Michell in relation to the outstanding items.

RESOLVED

1. That the follow up report and good progress made be noted.
2. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership supports the completion of the findings and recommendations presented.

40 JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Consideration was given to a report which accompanied the proposed Engagement Draft of the new Waste Strategy. This version had been prepared following feedback received on the previous two drafts which had been circulated to the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership. It was proposed that the version presented to the LWP at this meeting would be the one presented for public engagement, commencing at the beginning of April.

It was reported that officers had attended a Boston Borough meeting the previous evening where the engagement draft document had been circulated. A power point presentation on the Strategy had also been delivered in order to give members an opportunity to comment on the proposed Strategy. It was noted that the offer for officers to visit other districts to discuss the Strategy was still available. It was requested whether something could be arranged for South Holland District Council. It was considered important that members had the opportunity to submit their comments.

In relation to Objectives 2, 3, 7 and 10 it was suggested that the wording should be amended to give a more definitive action. However, it was highlighted that this was still an engagement draft, and these comments could be taken into account through this process.

The Partnership was advised that officers were looking for confirmation that they could start the engagement process with the document in April 2018. It was recognised that the version presented would not be the final document.

Members at Boston Borough Council advised that the draft Strategy would go through its scrutiny committee during the engagement process. There had been the opportunity for every member of every authority to have been given access to the document through the development process, before it went public. It was also noted that consideration of the Strategy had been timetabled for the scrutiny process and executive process at North Kesteven District Council. The decision making process time table for West Lindsey District Council had been shared with officers at the County Council.

RESOLVED

1. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership approve the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Engagement Draft to commence public consultation in April 2018.
2. That the proposed engagement process be noted, with any specific feedback provided by 15 March 2018 so that the necessary documentation to accompany the engagement could be finalised.

3. That each authority begins preparations for final sign-off and adoption in the autumn of the Waste Strategy through their own political processes.

41 FOOD WASTE TRIAL

The Partnership received a report which set out the proposal for the development of a potential countywide food waste collection and disposal service. It was noted that this was one of a wide range of operational issues which were being considered as part of the development of the Waste Strategy.

It was reported that a proposal had been developed to undertake a food waste trial on behalf of the Partnership in selective locations within South Kesteven to cover urban, rural and semi-rural areas. Members were advised that the trial was scheduled to start on 4 June 2018 and would be complimented with a detailed communications plan. The food waste would be collected with the residual and recycling waste streams and disposed of at the Grantham Waste Transfer Station, where it would be bulked up and hauled to a suitable anaerobic digestion facility by South Kesteven District Council. It was highlighted that the County Council was covering all costs for this trial.

It was queried whether there would be any benefit to running publicity regarding the recycling of glass, metal and plastics alongside the food waste trial material. It was suggested whether it may also be useful to monitor the dry recyclate and residual waste on the trial round to identify whether there was an impact from the publicity both on the recycling quality and movement of recyclate from the residual bin to recycling.

RESOLVED

1. That the proposal for a food waste trial and development of a communications strategy in South Kesteven be approved.
2. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership receive regular progress updates throughout the year trial period.

42 WEST LINDSEY REVISED WASTE POLICIES

The Lincolnshire Waste Partnership received a report which set out the revised waste and recycling operational policies in a document which covered all refuse and recycling related services provided by West Lindsey District Council (WLDC). The Partnership was advised that the aim of this document was to provide a standardised transparent approach, which could be used to manage the wider expectations of the service as well providing a basis for which service standards could be monitored.

It was noted that the policies had been in need of a refresh following the introduction of the Controlled Waste Regulations in 2012 and the launch of WLDC's Commercial Waste Service in 2014 as well as the introduction of charges for garden waste collection in December 2017.

It was confirmed that all of the revised policies would be on the website.

RESOLVED

That the revised Waste Policies for West Lindsey District Council be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.50 pm