



**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE
PARTNERSHIP
14 JULY 2014**

**PRESENT: COUNCILLOR J SMITH (SOUTH KESTEVEN DISTRICT COUNCIL)
(CHAIRMAN)**

Sean Kent	(Lincolnshire County Council)
George Bernard	(Boston Borough Council)
Councillor Fay Smith	(City of Lincoln Council)
Councillor Richard Wright	(North Kesteven District Council)
Mark Taylor	(North Kesteven District Council)
Councillor R A Shore (Vice-Chairman)	(Lincolnshire County Council)
Councillor M Brookes	(Boston Borough Council)
Councillor A H Turner MBE JP	(Lincolnshire County Council)
Ian Taylor	(Lincolnshire County Council)
Councillor Mrs Bardsley	(West Lindsey District Council)
Ady Selby	(West Lindsey District Council)
Ian Yates	(South Kesteven District Council)
Councillor A Casson	(South Holland District Council)
Emily Spicer	(South Holland District Council)
Ian Fytche	(North Kesteven District Council)

The Chairman welcomed the members of the Partnership to Sleaford and thanked North Kesteven District Council for allowing the meeting to be held at their offices.

48 PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT ISSUES

(a) Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S O'Dare and Mark Humphreys (East Lindsey District Council); Councillor R Gambba-Jones (South Holland District Council); Councillor Mrs I Parrott (West Lindsey District Council) and Simon Mitchell (Environment Agency)

It was noted that Councillor A Casson was in attendance on behalf of Councillor R Gambba-Jones and Councillor Mrs Bardsley was in attendance on behalf of Councillor Mrs I Parrott.

(b) Minutes of the meeting held on 17 October 2013

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 October 2013 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to it being noted that Emily Spicer (South

Holland District Council) and Ady Selby (West Lindsey District Council) were in attendance at the meeting.

In relation to minute number 43, it was noted that there was no further update available at this time.

It was queried whether there was any update to minute number 42, in relation to district heating schemes. It was reported that discussions had been taking place with companies around the Teal Park area. However, they were still at a commercially sensitive stage, but a paper would be brought to the Partnership at a later date, once details had been firmed up.

It was clarified that at the time that Siemens had moved to Teal Park, the heat energy provided by the energy from waste facility had not been available, and also Siemens did not have the capacity required to make use of the heat, as it would need to be used continuously. It was confirmed that the connections were in place for a district heating scheme.

It was commented that it was the intention of the County Council to ensure that the heat produced was used.

49 STRATEGIC ISSUES

(a) Dry Recycling Contract

The Partnership welcomed Ian Fytche, Chief Executive of North Kesteven District Council to the meeting, who presented a report in relation to a dry recyclables contract which would cover all Waste Collection Authorities (WCA's).

It was reported that three WCA's made their own arrangements for the recycling of dry recyclable materials, and received recycling credits payments from the County Council. The material from the four remaining WCA's was handled through contracts arranged by the County Council as the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA), these WCA's did not receive recycling credit payments. The County Council contracts were due to come to an end in March 2015, and following discussions between all member authorities of the LWP it was intended that new arrangements should be put in place to include the dry recyclable material from all 8 WCA's. It would therefore be necessary to undertake a tendering exercise in order to ensure that arrangements were in place from 1 April 2015 onwards.

The Partnership was advised that there was a defined timeline for the procurement process in order to ensure that a contract would be in place from 1 April 2015. The Waste Officers had been working together to ensure that the specification for the tenders satisfied all of the partners. It was noted that authorities in Lincolnshire had been very successful in terms of recycling performance and minimising the amount of waste which was collected.

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:

- Members were advised that there were still detailed issues around incentivisation to be resolved before an agreement was reached;
- The principles of how the recycling contract would be dealt with was something the officers had spent a lot of time discussing. However, the main issue would be how the transition to the new arrangements took place;
- How risk was shared between the authorities would be an important area;
- It was commented that there were some big savings which could be made due to the Energy from Waste plant, and districts were keen to ensure that they received their share of the income. All authorities would be facing further financial restraints and difficulties in the coming years;
- The end result of the contract had to be a better service for residents of Lincolnshire;
- There was optimism that a solution would be found by 1 April 2015, but it would be essential that all eight partners worked together to find a solution;
- It was noted that most members of the Partnership had not been involved in the discussions around this contract, as most of the discussions were taking place at Leader and Chief Executive level;
- The new contract could have a big effect on those authorities who would no longer receive recycling credits, and it was hoped that having the right incentives in the agreement would help to find a way forward;
- There was some caution around the table, and it was noted that the consensus was that there was a need for the best solution for the tax payer. It was thought that the strong commitment to this principle would be of benefit when discussing the financial arrangements;

The Partnership was informed that this contract still needed further consideration and it was possible that a special meeting of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership would need to be held. It was hoped that by the time the Partnership met again there would be some further details to consider. It was commented that this could be an opportunity for the Partnership to become much stronger and work as a more strategic body.

RESOLVED

That the update provided and comments made be noted.

50 OPERATIONAL ISSUES

(a) Making Sense of the Waste Regulations 2011 (12 and 13)

The Partnership received a report and presentation from Ian Taylor (Lincolnshire County Council) and Emily Spicer (South Holland District Council) in relation to the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 which transposed the Waste Framework Directive into English law and imposed duties on waste collection authorities and waste

disposal authorities to follow the waste hierarchy in relation to the collection of waste and the handling of collected waste.

Regulation 13 had previously stated that comingled collection of waste paper, metal, plastic or glass (being separate from residual waste) could be regarded as separate collection, however, it was amended to read:

From 1 January 2015 recyclable items would need to be collected separately, provided this was 'technically, environmentally and economically practicable'.

The Partnership received a presentation which provided more details in relation to this, and covered the following areas:

- Background
- Commission Guidance
- European Commission Guidance
- What does TEEP mean?
- Transposition and Challenge
- English Guidance
- Route Map
- What does it help us to do?
- When do Local Authorities need to act?
- Route Map Overview
- High Quality Recycling
- Why is quality important?
- Practicability (TEEP) Test Breakdown
- Practicability (TEEP) Test
- Conclusions

It was reported that the waste officers group had looked at these regulations as part of the work on the dry recyclables contract. It was expected that the contractors would support local authorities achieving TEEP, and discussions had taken place with MRF operators for the countywide recycle contract that clarified that this would be a contractual requirement. All the MRF operators confirmed they would support Local Authorities in their efforts to achieve and maintain compliance with TEEP. The Environment Agency would be the enforcing authority.

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 presentation, and some of the points raised included the following:

- It was likely that questions regarding quality would be raised, considering the levels of contamination experienced;
- Most things that were thrown away were recyclable, but it depended on how they were processed whether they could be collected as part of the recycling;
- Quality recycling referred to material which could be re-used for its original use e.g. glass bottles being recycled and processed back into glass bottles;
- It was not just about what materials could be recycled, but what materials operators were willing to accept;

- The current performance targets which were in place for recycling were put in place to drive volume, and certain high value recyclables were collected. It was noted that if a material could not be recycled then it could still be recovered;
- Concerns were raised that if not as many recyclables were collected as the focus was on quality, would there be more residual waste, and therefore more cost?
- It was suggested that it could be advantageous to make more money out of the recyclable materials which had a high value. Anything which could not be recycled would go to the Energy from Waste plant;
- Carrier bags could be a problem, as some operators accepted them as part of the waste stream and others did not;
- It was thought that the issue of TEEP was something the Partnership would need to coming back to;

RESOLVED

That the comments made in relation to the report and presentation be noted.

(b) Energy from Waste - Progress Update

The Lincolnshire Waste Partnership received a report which provided an update from the Head of Environmental Management (LCC) in relation to the Energy from Waste facility. Members were advised that everything was working as it should and ownership had been handed over to the County Council, and it was being operated by FCC. The plant was also now generating electricity.

It was reported that the plant was working very well, and it was suggested that in future an annual report be brought to the Partnership which set out any issues raised and how they were resolved.

Members were invited to ask questions in relation to the update provided and some of the issues raised during discussion included the following:

- In relation to the quantities of waste which could go through the EfW plant, it was reported that the county council had a minimum requirement of 120,000 tonnes for household waste, and 30,000 tonnes for commercial waste, as the contract was for 150,000 tonnes. However, the full 150,000 tonnes was being used for residual waste. It was noted that the County Council was hoping to negotiate an additional contract for take additional tonnage of C and I waste. The facility was burning 150,000tonnes (approximately 19 tonnes per hour), and it was hoped this could be increase to 165,000tonnes, through operational testing over the coming year;
- The first priority for the facility was the 150,000 tonnes per year that the county council was contracted to supply, and there were no commercial contracts set up at this time. It was not permitted for more than the 150,000 tonnes to be supplied, if the facility was to accept more, then the authority would need to reapply for planning permission;
- Each waste transfer station could hold 2-3 days of collected waste, and the bunker at the EfW facility could hold around 11 days waste. A landfill within the county was expected to be opened for the life of the contract

- The waste delivered to the EfW facility was not sorted when it arrived, so there was a chance that something could get through which could disrupt the running of the facility. However, several measures were in place to ensure this didn't happen including regular mixing of the loads as they were delivered, and the bunker was constantly videoed as well as being monitored. Therefore the chances of something going through which could cause damage were considered to be low;
- If the volume of waste burned could be increased from 19 tonnes per hour then the County Council would reapply for planning permission to increase the tonnage which could be presented to the facility. The authority would be working with FCC in relation to this consideration with regards to the future housing growth within the county;
- There had been many enquiries received regarding visiting the facility from groups and schools. However, it was hoped to get the plant officially opened before the visits were arranged. FCC had appointed a centre visitor manager, and a training suite had been included in the facility for this purpose. There was currently a long list of groups interested in visiting and it was hoped that these would be arranged towards the end of the year. It was also suggested that a future meeting of the LWP could be held at the facility, with an appropriate site visit;
- It was noted that members of the Partnership would be invited to the official opening of the facility.

RESOLVED

That the update be noted.

(c) National Framework Home Compost Bin Scheme 2014/15

The Partnership received a report which outlined the national framework home compost bin scheme 2014/15. This was a scheme whereby residents could purchase home compost bins directly from the manufacturer but at a reduced price achieved by supply on a national framework scheme. This scheme was supported by all authorities within the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership and actively promoted it through their websites.

Members were advised that as the current home compost bin scheme with Straight plc was due to end on 31 March 2014, the Officer Working Group had taken the decision to continue the contract for a further two years. It was also noted that in previous years, authorities had had to purchase promotional leaflets, but from April 2014 each campaign would be eligible for a free promotional pack that included 10,000 generic leaflets and 10 posters. No costs would be incurred by any of the authorities.

RESOLVED

That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership endorse the decision of the Waste Officer Group to continue with the National Framework Compost Bin Scheme during 2014/15.

(d) Contamination in Dry Recyclables

The Partnership received a verbal update from the Head of Environmental Management (LCC) in relation to contamination in dry recyclables, particularly carrier bags. It was reported that there had been an article in the last edition of County News about contamination which had raised concerns from districts, as some provide plastic bags for recyclables. It was clarified that the article related to supermarket carrier bags which were being put into the recycling. The County Council apologised to the districts for any confusion caused.

This kind of contamination in the recycling cost all authorities a lot of money, but it was hoped that the introduction of a charge for carrier bags in 2015 would help to reduce this issue. The Partnership needed to continue to work together to address this issue.

It was reported that South Holland District Council had received a number of complaints regarding the article, and it was suggested that another article be put in the next issue of County News to clarify what was stated originally, in that it was supermarket carrier bags which should not be put into the recycling. It was commented that food was also a common contaminant in recycling, and it was suggested whether a county wide article was needed to highlight this issue as well?

RESOLVED

That the update be noted and the Head of Environmental Management draft a further article in relation to the issue of plastic bags in recycling and circulate to the districts and officer working group for approval prior to publication.

(e) 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:

South Kesteven District Council – the amount of waste which was recycled was now 53%, which was an increase on the previous year. It was acknowledged that this was due in part to the green waste collection. Contamination was an issue and the authority was investing in education and marketing campaigns to address this. Door to door campaigns would be used in targeted areas where people did not want to recycle. Officers were also working hard with land lords.

It was reported that fly tipping was still a problem, with 289 fly tips in the first quarter, officers had tried to remove the waste as quickly as possible, but it was all removed within three days of being reported. The authority had had some success prosecuting serial fly tippers. It was reported that there was still more work to be done in relation to the areas where the fly tips took place, but it was not thought that there was a direct correlation between the opening hours of household waste recycling centres and the fly tipping.

South Kesteven District Council had also started a dedicated recycling campaign with the Grantham Journal.

Boston Borough Council – the shared collection rounds with East Lindsey District Council had been very successful and a considerable amount of money had been saved. The arrangement was working well for both authorities.

A partnership was also in place with SHDC and North Sea Camp for the collection of fly tipping.

City of Lincoln Council – green waste collections for households were renewable from 1 July 2014, and a lot of work had been put into making the process run more smoothly. Work had started 6 months previously and there had been a very detailed plan on how to approach customers with a reminder. Therefore there had not been a need to take on additional staff or for existing staff to work overtime. This had also led to a saving on the overall costs of renewals. Only one complaint had been received this year in relation to charging for green waste.

It was reported that an increase in fly tipping had been noticed in recent months, and detailed data was being collected in relation to this such as location, size etc. and a fly tip task force was being developed to respond to this issue.

It was reported that a lot of complaints had been received regarding people leaving bins on the street for excessive amounts of time, and enforcement would be brought in under Section 46. There had been a couple of test cases, and the City Council was in the process of taking someone to court. Officers would report back on the outcome at the next meeting.

South Holland District Council – a green bag lottery had been launched as an incentive to improve recycling, and so far 90 people had been awarded £100 for their good efforts in recycling. 1 person had won £1000. The tonnage of recycling collected had increased by 12%.

It was reported that the authority had received some external funding from WRAP to trial the collection of textiles alongside co-mingled recycling. This had been extremely successful using kerbside collections, and the authority was working with the Salvation Army on this.

A survey had just been released to all households, asking if they would like a green waste collection scheme, and how it would work, as well as whether people would be willing to pay for this service.

A survey was being carried out at HWRC's on behalf of the County Council to determine how far people were travelling to reach the centre.

West Lindsey District Council – recycling was currently at 60% in the district, but it was acknowledged that this was partly due to the green waste collection, which was currently free. The authority was continuing to invest in promotional material for recycling services, and was continuing to prosecute people for fly tipping. Recently, a resident had

been fined £700 for dropping a cigarette (it was noted that most of this fine had resulted from the person not paying the initial on the spot fine).

North Kesteven District Council – the focus of prosecutions had been for fly tipping offences, and the authority had had 11 successful prosecutions in 2013. The garden waste charging scheme was now in its second year, and an additional 1200 people had now signed up. NKDC was also still struggling with the issue of contamination in recycling and the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee had set up a task and group to look at this issue. Officers were always keen to find a new approach.

Lincolnshire County Council – work on the review of the HWRC's had started, as the authority had its own TEEP considerations. Some of the recycling was now very expensive to process, and in some cases would be better and cheaper for some materials to go through the EfW as residual waste.

Planning permission had been granted for the HWRC site at Gainsborough, and the Sleaford site was now open and operating, the vast majority of people using the site were complimentary.

The meeting closed at 3.50 pm

This page is intentionally left blank