



**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP  
11 JULY 2022**

**PRESENT:**

**COUNCILLOR D MCNALLY (LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL) (CHAIRMAN)**

District Councillor Deborah Evans (Boston Borough Council), District Councillor Bob Bushell (City of Lincoln Council), District Councillor Martin Foster (East Lindsey District Council), District Councillor Mervyn Head (North Kesteven District Council), Councillor Mark Anthony Whittington (South Kesteven District Council), District Councillor Owen Bierley (West Lindsey District Council) and Councillor Richard Wright (Greater Lincolnshire Leaders and CX's) (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor J Tyrrell attended the meeting as an observer

Officers in attendance:-

Steve Bird, Victoria Burgess, David Steels (North Kesteven District Council), Matthew Michell (Waste Strategy Manager), Charlotte Paine, Mike Reed (Interim Head of Waste), Rachel Stamp (LWP Programme Manager) and Rachel Wilson (Democratic Services Officer)

**1 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR 2022/23**

It was proposed, seconded and

**RESOLVED**

That Councillor D McNally be elected as Chairman of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership for the year 2022 – 2023.

**2 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR 2022/23**

It was proposed, seconded and

**RESOLVED**

That Councillor R A Wright be elected as Vice-Chairman of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership for the year 2022 – 2023.

**3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Anne-Marie Coulthard and Alan Robinson (South Kesteven District Council).

**2**  
**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP**  
**11 JULY 2022**

**4**      DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

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

**5**      MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3 MARCH 2022

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2022 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

**6**      PARTNER UPDATES

Partners received a report which provided an opportunity to share any information that may be of interest to the rest of the Partnership. Written updates from each of the Partners had been provided.

**7**      THE ENVIRONMENT ACT AND EMERGING NATIONAL POLICIES

The Waste Strategy Manager presented a report which provided partners with an opportunity to consider the emerging national policy in relation to The Environment Act and how this might impact on Lincolnshire. Consultations had been carried out by the government in 2020 and 2021, and formal responses were still awaited from two of the three consultations that were held. In responding to the consultations, the LWP was generally supportive of the proposals but did express concern on a number of the details.

Partners were guided through the report, and some of the points highlighted included:

- Working together, Lincolnshire was already collecting the majority of the dry recyclables that would be required, however there may be a need for the Partnership to consider the collection of plastic films in the future.
- There was a specification in the Act that each material must be collected separately, however there could be some exceptions. With the introduction of twin stream collections for paper and card, it was currently believed that it would be acceptable to collect metal, plastic and glass together.
- There was a proposal that garden waste collections would become free for householders, and this was likely to create a funding gap for collection authorities.
- There was also a proposal that food waste collection would become mandatory from all households and businesses, and it was likely that these collections would be weekly and be separate from other recyclables. This waste must then be either recycled or composted. Confirmation on a number of details, including the start date for these collections, was still awaited from government.
- Funding to support consistent recycling collections from households may come through a producer responsibility scheme instead of new burdens funding.

- The Environment Act had specified that there would be secondary legislation which required the payment of sums in respect of the costs of disposing of products and materials, which would be good news for local authorities. However, there would be conditions attached to that which could include targets or benchmarking.
- Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) currently had a start date of 2024, but this would be introduced on a phased basis. Sampling of packaging would also be required to establish what funding would be due, and LCC was currently in the process of putting this in place with sampling available at all the waste transfer stations. It was noted that business waste was currently being excluded from this system until 2028.
- Further guidance was awaited in relation to the deposit return scheme. The Environment Act did allow for secondary legislation to establish deposit return schemes. The impact on the LWP would be the diversion of materials from the dry recycling scheme. The scheme for England would be All-in and would include plastic bottles and metals cans, but not glass bottles. There would be some differences across the UK, for example the Scotland and Wales scheme had been specified as including glass bottles.

It was noted that, in light, of these changes, it was important that the LWP's strategic thinking going forward took account of the impacts of these emerging policies, and therefore there may be a need to consider undertaking a deep review of the existing waste strategy for Lincolnshire and possibly the need to start work on the development of a new Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS).

During discussion of the report, the following points were noted:

- Concerns were raised regarding the secondary legislation and where funding would initially come from in relation to the extended producer responsibility, as the incentive payments may not be in place immediately.
- There were concerns about the impact the deposit return schemes could have on Lincolnshire's carbon footprint if vehicles were driving around the county to collect from deposit points.
- It was hopeful that TEEP requirements would continue, where there was an environmental advantage.
- Confirmation was sought that as a Partnership potential means of disposal of garden waste and food waste were being explored, possibly through anaerobic digestion.
- In terms of the requirements relating to plastic films, a lot of these would be attached to food containers and so could be heavily contaminated, and assurance was sought that disposal of these items were being explored. It was noted that plastic films could not currently be collected as they could be recycled by the current provider.
- There would be a need to work together as a partnership in order to minimise costs resulting from the Environment Act, as it was suggested that it should explore how the Partnership could work together as one authority.
- In terms of garden waste and anaerobic digestion (AD) it was noted that market engagement had identified that food and garden waste should be treated differently.

Officers were not aware of any facilities which handled both materials a co-mingled waste due to issues with efficiency.

- Officers would be taking the requirements for plastic film and food waste to market to see what options were available. Caution was expressed that a new Strategy would need to be built around what options were actually available. Officers would be engaging closely with existing partners and commercial operators about what was possible.
- It was suggested that development of a new JMWMS was something which could be discussed further by the Officer Working Group.
- It was queried when it was likely that there would be a move to separate collections, including the weekly 'free' collections of green waste, as this was likely to have cost implications for collection authorities. It was highlighted that whilst households would not be required to pay separately for a green waste collection, these costs would need to be factored into taxation.
- It was queried how it was envisaged that the deposit return scheme would work, and also why glass had not been included in this scheme.
- It was clarified that the Scottish deposit return scheme would go live in August 2023. The decision to not include glass within the English scheme, was a decision which had been taken by government, and it was possible that this was at the request of the glass industry.
- Concerns were raised regarding the cost impacts on collection authorities, in particular the loss of income from charging for green waste collections. It was positive that some funding would be available from the producers, but it was not believed that this would fully cover the additional costs. It was queried what could be done as a Partnership to raise the issue of funding and costs of this.
- In relation to the green waste collection, it was highlighted that the charge was not an additional tax but a recovery of costs for a service.

#### RESOLVED

That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership authorises:

1. The inclusion, in the 2021/22 Annual Report and initial review of the impacts of emerging national policies on the LWP's current strategic objectives.
2. Officers to begin, through the LWP's Strategic Officer Working Group (SOWG), a more detailed review of these policy impacts with a view to proposing to the next LWP meeting the extent on the work required – i.e. whether it was necessary to start work on developing a new JMWMS.

#### 8 PERFORMANCE UPDATE & DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT

Consideration was given to a report which presented an update on the suite of key performance indicators which measure progress against the vision and objectives set out in the LWP's Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS). It was highlighted that as this was the

Partnership's AGM, the update had been provided in the form of notes to accompany the draft LWP Annual Report for 2021/22, and the appendices of this included performance reporting.

It was highlighted that two documents were presented for consideration, the first was the Annual Review document which was a public facing summary and would be published on the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership's web page on the LCC website. The second document was the appendices, which contained the detailed data and was open to any additional feedback, and had been circulated separately.

(NOTE: Councillor D Evans joined the meeting at 3.07pm)

A presentation was shared which provided further details in relation to the key performance indicators including:

- Overall performance – recycling performance had fallen over the past two years. This seemed to be due to a change in behaviour due to the pandemic. However, the good news was that less waste was being received overall, and the Partnership was below the 1000kg per household target. Whilst rates were starting to increase again, they were not back to the pre-pandemic level. A proposal was being put forward in the report that the targets were revised, as although the rate of 50% was aspirational, it would be difficult to achieve with the current rates. However, this was something for further discussion by the Partnership.
- Kerbside recycling contribution to KPI's – this had fallen slightly compared to the previous year. Also, less non-recyclable material was being received in these collections. In terms of the targeted recyclables, when added to the twin stream paper and card collections was consistent with the previous year, and better than it was pre-Covid.
- Composting – contribution to KPI's – this was consistent with the previous year, although there seemed to be a slight downward trend.
- Kg per Household by Final destination – the amount of waste going to the energy from waste and landfill had increased, and the amount of waste going for recycling/composting had reduced slightly.
- Proposed contamination KPI – non-recyclables in kerbside recycling collections – there had been a significant reduction in contamination, both in terms of percentage and in terms of kg per household. Contamination was now below 28% and this had been achieved through the Right Thing Right Bin campaign and also by rejecting which contain non-recyclable material.

It was noted that two other themes had been identified from the Strategic Objectives, one of these was carbon, and new data was available which would give more accurate results, and work was underway on this. The other theme was Customer Friendliness. Customer engagement continued to be a focus of services, including working with the Recycling Panel of residents, seeking views through County News. However, in terms of measuring this, it did not seem to be an appropriate time to benchmark customer satisfaction due to the changes to services, introduction of twin stream collections, and coming out of the Covid-19 pandemic.

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

- This was the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership, but the Partnership began with working with householders.
- The Covid pandemic had impacted on the work of the Partnership for longer than anyone could have imagined, and it was likely that impacts would continue to emerge.
- There were clear indications of the benefits being derived from the twin stream collection. In West Lindsey, this was the first fundamental change in around 14 years to the waste and recycling service. There were a few initial issues, but these had been successfully dealt with, which were largely due to the work of the Waste Partnership and Projects Manager and her team, as well as the communications in general.
- It was suggested that when considering setting realistic targets, it may be useful to benchmark against other similar rural local authorities. It was also important to keep residents informed of successes and the role they play in those successes.
- One partner commented that recycling on the doorstep was making excellent progress, they were not ready to approve this document as they considered that there was more to be done to improve the Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) as they were not separating plastics or providing recycling sheds where people were able to take things away and recycle/upcycle them.
- It was acknowledged that there had been a lot of disruption in the last couple of years and officers did try and inform the public when there was disruption, but the authority was reliant on the commercial sector to provide the service. In terms of separating materials, the HWRC's were able to accept 27 different types of materials, but space was finite. It was also not practical to collect materials separately if they would be treated as one by the disposal facility.
- It was noted that there was composition analysis carried out for the waste and recycling collected, this could be looked at further by the Strategic Officer Working Group, and an update brought to a future meeting of the Partnership.
- It was commented that the twin stream collection needed to be included in the headlines of the annual report, as it was a success story and needed to be highlighted.
- In relation to the infographics, it was queried whether a foot note could be included which states what the figures are benchmarked against.
- It was noted that the twin stream roll out had changed people's attitudes, and generally residents in these areas had embraced the change.
- In terms of the recycling target, one partner commented that they would like to see the 50% target remain as there was a need to have something to aim for. Once the twin stream collections had been rolled out to all districts, it was likely that the recycling rate would increase significantly and the full impact of this was not yet being seen.
- In terms of non-recyclables, it was commented that the 'Right Thing Right Bin' campaign had been very successful. It was highlighted that the Waste Projects and Partnerships Manager and her team had done a great job with this, and the majority of people were disposing of waste correctly. It was commented that this was a success story and it was suggested that this success would be reflected in the figures in around 18 months' time.

- In terms of the reduction in use of the HWRC's it was queried whether there was local data available on these figures, and what effect that had had on fly tipping. It was also queried there was a need to understand why people were not using the sites which were available to them, for example did they feel they were not accessible.
- It was whether there was any localised data available so that Right Thing Right Bin campaigns could be targeted to specific communities. It was reported that this data was being worked on, and data regarding the sampling of kerbside collections would be shared going forward.
- In terms of customer satisfaction, it was commented that it could be useful to gather this data in order to understand where the issues were, and it was queried whether some sample surveys could be carried out.
- It was emphasised that in terms of fly tipping there was no proven correlation between HWRC accessibility and fly tipping, and it was noted that there had been an increase in fly-tipping nationally. This was mainly due to an increase in illegitimate waste disposal businesses.
- In terms of the waste which went to landfill (between 2 – 4%) it was noted that if there was disruption in the supply chain, there was still a need for the waste to be disposed of. This would be addressed in the future by increasing the number of different providers who were able to take material.
- In terms of the reduction of waste through the HWRC, it was highlighted that throughput was down 27,000 tonnes. This was a greater volume of waste than the increase in fly tipping, which indicated a change in behaviour, although some was going into kerbside collections.
- Concerns were raised that fly tipping was occurring due to closures of the HWRC at Boston, and people were being turned away. There had also been issues with people trying to dispose of mattresses at this site. Officers clarified that there had not been any disruption at Boston since 25 June 2022. It would be useful to see the information that the borough council was collecting about the waste which was being left. The service needed to be data driven.
- It was also noted that sites which had not had any disruption had still experienced fly tipping.
- The opening times and materials which could be collected was well publicised.
- In terms of people not being able to dispose of particular items, it was acknowledged there had been haulage issues, and so it was important for people to check what containers were available, as if they were full, people would be asked to put those particular materials in the general waste.
- There was a need to pursue prosecutions for fly-tipping as no matter the reasons people may use to justify this action, it was still against the law. It was noted that South Kesteven District Council had recently had three successful prosecutions for fly tipping. The authority would always prosecute where possible, as well as naming the individuals in local publicity. However, it was felt that the courts did not take this as seriously as local authorities as perpetrators had received either small fines or community service.
- SKDC were starting to build data of fly tipping hot spots. There also needed to be a reinforcement of the message to the public of ensuring that businesses were licenced to take away waste.

- The vast majority of cases for potential prosecution in NKDC were either commercial type waste crimes or “white van man” services advertised via social media. Most of the cases of domestic waste where action was taken was due to households who had paid one of these services advertised on social media to take away their waste, which would then be dumped in the countryside. These residents were usually very remorseful when realising what had happened.
- Partners were urged to continue to promote the message that people needed to ensure they had a waste transfer licence. It was noted that it was very easy for people to check this.
- Partners were also urged to continue to promote the SCRAP campaign, as Lincolnshire was one of the best in the country for working together.

## RESOLVED

1. That the target figure remain at 50%
2. That the publication of the annual review be agreed, subject to the format being reviewed and the changes suggested being included.
3. That the information provided in the Annual Review appendices document be noted.

9 FOOD WASTE COLLECTION TRIAL - FINAL REPORT

The Partnership received the final report following the completion of the Food Waste Collection Trial carried out by South Kesteven District Council which commenced in June 2018. This trial was funded by Lincolnshire County Council until June 2020, and then funded by South Kesteven until March 2022. It had been hoped the national roll out for separate food waste collection would have happened before the end of the trial, but this had not been the case. The report set out the details of the pilot scheme, the collection model, and the results. A cost comparison to roll out food waste collections to all properties in the district was also included.

It was reported that two vehicles had been purchased at the start of the trial, however the maintenance costs were such that if the trial was to be continued new vehicles would need to be purchased. It was noted that 4,500 properties had been included in the trial, in both rural and urban areas, and the food waste had been collected on a weekly basis.

Over the course of the trial the volume of waste collected declined, and it wasn't clear what the reason for this was. It was possible that people had become more aware of food waste and changed their behaviours, or there could have been a boredom factor. However, there was evidence from other trials carried out around the country, that suggested that tonnage did drop off after a period of time, and this could be a combination of factors including behaviour change as people became more aware of the amount of food they were throwing away.

Discussions took place regarding the types of vehicles which may be needed if this was rolled out in future, and it was expected that there would need to be dedicated fleet, fuelling would be critical, as Lincolnshire's infrastructure was not ideally placed for this kind of activity. There would need to be a lot of discussions and negotiations with the commercial sector. The other



main issue would be supply chain and delivery issues, as all authorities would be going out to market at the same time. It would be beneficial for districts to be able to work together in order to find efficiencies for collections.

it was queried if it was possible to calculate the environmental impact of collecting food waste separately and transporting it to an anaerobic digester compared to it being collected and transported to the Energy from Waste facility. As it was highlighted that food waste did have a high calorific value and so was beneficial to the operation of the facility. There was a need to reduce the environmental impact of council activities. The rationale for separate food waste collection seemed to come from the government's perception that food waste went to landfill. It was suggested whether that piece of work could be carried out and brought back to the Partnership. Officers advised that this was something which could fit in to the carbon assessment work which was being carried out by the Sustainability team.

RESOLVED

That the update be noted.

10 LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP FORWARD PLAN

The Partnership's forward plan was considered. It was commented that discussions were taking place with North and North East Lincolnshire, and it was noted that North East Lincolnshire were also carrying out a food waste collection trial, and it was suggested whether representatives could be invited as observers to attend a future meeting, and that they may have data that they would be willing to share with the Partnership. It was noted that a working group had already been set up with North and North East Lincolnshire, which had been very useful. It was suggested that this was something which could be progressed by the Waste Strategy Officers Group.

RESOLVED

That the forward plan, as presented, be noted.

The meeting closed at 4.43 pm

This page is intentionally left blank