

**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE
PARTNERSHIP
2 MARCH 2017**

PRESENT:

COUNCILLOR DISTRICT COUNCILLOR D COTTON ((WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL)) (CHAIRMAN)

Councillor Reginald Alan Shore (Vice-Chairman)	(Lincolnshire County Council)
Sean Kent	(Lincolnshire County 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)
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)
Ady Selby	(West Lindsey District Council)
Neil McBride	Environment and Economy
Simon Mitchell	Environment Agency
Rachel Wilson	Democratic Services

Councillors: attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

10 PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT ISSUES

10a Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Brookes and George Bernard (Boston Borough Council) and Emily Spicer (South Holland District Council)

10b Declaration of Interests

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

10c Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2016

RESOLVED

**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP
2 MARCH 2017**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2016 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

Officers were thanked for sending the draft minutes to members of the Partnership shortly after the meeting and also for including comments made by Councillor R Gambba-Jones.

10d Action Notes from the meeting held on 24 November 2016

The action notes as presented were noted.

10e 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 noted:

Lincolnshire County Council – most of the issues would be covered by items already on the agenda. There were no further updates at this time.

North Kesteven District Council – it was reported that Mark Taylor would be retiring at the end of May 2017. Members wished to acknowledge the work he had put into this Committee and the Officer Working Group, and thanked him for all his work over the years.

West Lindsey District Council – some work was being carried out in relation to the One Public Estate initiative on how the authority could best utilise and collaborate more on use of public buildings. The Chief Executive of WLDC was the Chair of the Greater Lincolnshire Board. One aspect which was being examined was how better use of depots could be made, and there were 3-4 opportunities where a feasibility study was being carried out. It was noted that people were very enthusiastic and findings would be reported back to the One Public Estate Board.

(Cllr R Wight (NKDC) declared an interest as he worked from One Public Estate buildings)

It was also noted that this would be Councillor Shore's last meeting as he would not be standing for re-election in May 2017. The Chairman wished to record his thanks for all the work Cllr Shore had done on behalf of the Partnership and also in his role as Portfolio Holder for Waste and Recycling at Lincolnshire County Council.

South Holland District Council – it was reported that the Environmental Team at South Holland District Council had recently won a Team of the Year award, which was a peer award. It was requested that congratulations from the Partnership be passed onto the team at SHDC.

A second purchase of green bins had taken place, and the introduction of charging was not discouraging members of the public from signing up to this service. There were still people signing up for this service. The Partnership was advised that South Holland was just moving into the renewal phase of the first year of the green waste service, and officers should soon be able to carry out some calculations on how many people had re-

subscribed. It was requested that officers report back on in June on the renewal rates for the Green Waste service.

South Kesteven District Council – in relation to green waste, it was reported that the authority had now moved to an online solution with direct debits. Last year there had been a 70% take up of the direct debit option. It was noted that this was a good solution and was very easy to implement. Officers were able to help if any other districts were considering the implementing a similar system.

City of Lincoln Council – the Fixed Penalty officer had completed his first year, and as income had exceeded cost the contract had been extended.

A report would be shared with district colleagues shortly in relation to legislation which could be used to tackle contamination in recycling.

11 CORE BUSINESS

11a Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership with the first update on the preparation of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) and the expected timetable for its production.

It was hoped that this report would give the Partnership confidence that work had started on the Strategy, and it followed on from the audit recommendations which came to the Partnership in 2016. A dedicated resource had been put in place from the beginning of February 2017, and so a month had now been spent working on the Strategy. The first task was to produce a draft scoping report around the objectives that the Strategy should incorporate. This was almost completed and it was hoped that it would be shared with district colleagues shortly. The timeline and project plan was to have the Strategy in place by July 2018.

Members 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 included the following:

- It was suggested that there would be three key elements – the total volume, cost, and actual percentage. There would need to be some early decisions on what percentage of recycling it would be hoped to achieve, as this would be key to the direction of the Strategy.
- It was queried whether the 50% recycling target remained, and whether it would stay in place following Brexit. The Partnership was advised that these sorts of questions would come out in the scoping document, and suggestions around what the target should be would be open to debate with the Partners. It was commented that the target needed to be aspirational not just achievable.
- There would be a need for the merging of the reality of financial pressures and the impact of trying to achieve these targets, along with the political issue of how important districts believed they were to the electorate on whether there was a move away from or an increased drive to recycle. The majority of people still

believed that Lincolnshire was ambitious with its recycling, as well as people also being confused by what could be recycled.

- If there was uniformity across the county in terms of recycling mix, some districts would lose some of their mix, whilst others would increase it.
- There was a need to look at the long term business plan, and it was suggested whether there was a need for a second and larger Energy from Waste facility as a recycling/recovery facility, as authorities were collecting larger amounts of materials, and it was queried how much this would cost.
- It was queried why recycling was always considered by weight, and suggested that it should be based on the percentage that was removed from the waste stream.
- There was a need to understand the difference between recycling and recovery.
- It was commented that WRAP would have a major impact on targets, for example, the inclusion of food waste. There was a need for input from the WRAP project before recycling targets for the county were set.
- Whilst the scoping document was being prepared, there would be a need to consider how things would be recycled in the future as things changed all the time, for example there was now a method for building roads with plastics.
- It was acknowledged that 55% was an aspirational target for recycling, but at one point the County's recycling was at 53%. The EU target was 50% by 2020, Lincolnshire reached this target in 2006, but it dropped in 2012. It was reported that if Lincolnshire could include Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) in its recycling the amount of waste recycled would increase to more than 50%. The increased green waste being collected in Boston would also contribute.
- It was acknowledged that there were unintended consequences to changes to the recycling collected as the EfW was designed to have food waste included within the residual waste, and if this was removed, this loss would need to be mitigated.
- It was commented that it was very positive that Partners wanted to aspire to be as effective as they could be for the public of Lincolnshire.
- It was queried whether the target was about quality or quantity, and that whichever it was there was a need for clarity. Would it be better to add to the mix to increase the weight to reach the target, or to have the quality, which may make the material collected more valuable.
- It was queried whether the Partnership felt that it had much influence in reducing waste, such as engaging with retailers to reduce the packaging of products. It was reported that several years ago the County Council had 3 full time staff to address the issue of excess packaging, and they did manage to get some prosecutions, and they also did work which was tied in to the Love Food Hate Waste campaign. However, with increasingly austere times a lot of the resources for this work were lost.
- It was suggested whether some retailers could be invited to the Partnership to discuss the issues around packaging, and work in partnership rather than through enforcement. However, it was noted that previous research on this matter had indicated that the public wanted their products in this type of packaging. It was reported that customers did have the legal right to leave any excess packaging in the store when they had paid for their goods.

- It was noted that all issues which had been raised had been captured in the scoping document, and this gave comfort that officers were progressing in the right direction.
- It was suggested that maybe it was the manufacturers who needed to be engaged with, as the retailers would accept the stock as it came. It was commented that manufacturers had a part to play, and there was a need for some national legislation.
- A big difference could be made by companies such as Amazon, who had a reputation for delivering small products in large boxes.
- There had been a suggestion regarding a scheme to put a deposit on glass bottles, however, ministers had not been supportive. It was queried whether this could be pursued with local MP's.
- In relation to the quality vs quantity issue, it was noted that the weight of the recyclables did not tell a lot about the material. If it was to be collected based on quality, there would be a need to study the markets so that authorities were doing meaningful recycling.
- It was queried whether someone from Trading Standards could attend a future meeting to provide a trading standards point of view about activities to reduce excess packaging.

RESOLVED

1. That the progress made to date be noted.
2. That further progress reports be brought to each meeting of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership.

11b Provision of Future Countywide Waste Services

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership with an update on the progression of the Mixed Dry Recycling (MDR) contract, including the Waste Collection Authorities (WCA) proposal to reduce the contamination levels.

It was confirmed that LCC had extended the present MDR contract with Mid UK to the 31 March 2020, due to the tight contract timescales, little opportunity to reduce the contamination before tendering, no guarantee of any responses to a new tender, the soft market testing needing to be more strategically outcome focused and to be considered in tandem with the developing Waste Strategy considerations.

Members were advised that this decision allowed the LWP more time to collaboratively manage the MDR and to achieve the best outcomes for the people of Lincolnshire.

Partners 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:

- Concerns were raised from a partnership angle, as it was believed that the Partnership had agreed a process where strategic decisions would be discussed by the LWP before going back to individual authorities. However, it was commented that the Partnership had a long discussion at the last meeting, where it was concluded that it would be better to delay the tender for a new contract. At

this time, the districts still had a problem with contamination and the County Council was required to deal with the waste as presented.

- The longer that no action was taken on contamination, the harder it would be to change people's behaviour in the future.
- The costs associated with disposing of contaminated recycling and how they were calculated was discussed. It was requested that a report be brought to a future meeting which explained what all the fees were and how they were calculated.
- Concerns were expressed regarding the possibility that the approach of the LWP to contamination in dry recycling might be seen to be driven by short-term financial implications and EfW capacity issues rather than the need to optimise recyclable material quality. In the longer term, when re-tendering the contract, unless contamination levels were significantly reduced there was a significant risk in two areas – the likelihood of attracting tenders at all and the potential for a very high gate fee.
- Partners were advised that the decision regarding the MDR contract was an operational decision, and now the Partnership had 3 years to look at the issues around contamination and start to deal with them.
- It was noted that mixed dry recyclables did not go to the Energy from Waste facility.
- There was an increased drive towards commercialisation. South Holland had a partner council whose view of the world was very different to theirs and were a commercially minded council, and the danger was that they could become so focused on money that the bigger picture was lost. There was a need to find a balance.
- There was a need for caution regarding the WRAP report, as although it was a positive thing and would provide some useful information, it would have limited scope and would not provide answers to some of the questions raised previously.
- It was suggested that the main focus of the meeting in June should be around the waste strategy and how it could be implemented.
- It was queried what happened to contaminated loads, and partners were advised that it was turned into solid derived fuel as Mid UK had a policy to send zero waste to landfill.
- It was queried if the contamination rate was going up, were Mid UK making more money from converting the contaminated recycling into fuel. Partners were advised that an independent assessment had been carried out with an agreed methodology which officers had observed.
- It was commented that there was strategy on one side and operational contracts on the other. The end date for the strategy to be completed was summer 2018. However, East Lindsey's new fleet of collection vehicles would come in in 2019. The collection arrangements would be dependent on what was set out in the Strategy. There was a need for there to be vision alongside the Strategy, as the districts would need to ensure they had the right infrastructure in place to deliver it.
- There was a need to get the timescales fixed and there may be an opportunity to do some joint procurement.
- Representatives from South Kesteven had taken reports back to their authority regarding the need to sort out the contamination issue, by lifting bins lids and not collecting contaminated bins, but it was queried whether this was still the right thing to do.

- It was queried whether if contamination was reduced if this would mean that more waste went to the EfW which would then cost the county council more in gate fees. It was suggested that this would be discussed further through the Officer Working Group.

RESOLVED

1. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership notes the issues detailed in the report.
2. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership acknowledges the LCC decision to extend the MDR contract to 31 March 2020.
3. That a report be brought back to a future meeting in relation to the costs associated with disposal of contaminated recycling loads.

12 DISCUSSION ITEMS

12a Clearance of road debris following a road traffic collision

The Partnership received an update on the situation in relation to the clearance of road debris following a road traffic collision.

It was commented that it was understood that this situation had been ongoing for around three years, and it was important that all partner authorities took the same or similar approach.

The Partnership was advised that this issue had been discussed at the Officer Working Group. County Council officers had been liaising through the Highways Authority to get a definitive answer, as there were variations in actions taken amongst Districts. However, a response has still not been received from highways officers.

It was confirmed that whatever actions District Councils were taking which suited their costs, the County Council was happy for them to continue doing. A lot of work had been done trying to resolve this issue over the last 18 months. However, it was noted that this was a complex issue, as there was a difference of legal opinion.

It was requested that a written report on this issue be brought to the June meeting of the Partnership, and that the Chief Operating Officer should attend to present the report. It was also queried whether the Highways Portfolio Holder could be asked to attend for this item as well.

RESOLVED

That a written report be brought to next meeting of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership scheduled to be held on 8 June 2017.

12b Greater Consistency in Household Recycling - WRAP Support to Lincolnshire Waste Partnership

The Strategic Manager, Trading and Environmental Operations at West Lindsey District Council provided the Partnership with an opportunity to consider the agreement for provision of support to Lincolnshire Waste Partnership by WRAP.

Partners were advised that a bid had been worked up and submitted to WRAP following the last meeting of the Partnership, which had since been approved. It was also noted that the programme had been heavily oversubscribed, but the LWP's bid was complimented by WRAP as the benefit of providing this support to a group of authorities rather than a single authority could be seen.

It was noted that there was no obligation on any Authority to roll out any of the recommendations that were identified.

The Chairman thanked the Strategic Manager, Trading and Environmental Operations for putting this bid together on behalf of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership.

RESOLVED

That the Agreement for provision of support to Lincolnshire Waste Partnership by WRAP be supported and signed on behalf of the LWP

13 MONITORING ITEMS

13a Waste Data

Consideration was given to a report which outlined a proposal for the provision of regular data regarding performance of the waste service at a Lincolnshire level.

It was reported that waste officers had been considering how to keep the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership informed on some of the key areas of waste performance so as to inform debate on strategic waste issues. Two performance indicators had been identified:

1. Total recycling, reuse and composting – this remained a key performance indicator due to the existence of the 50% statutory target (by 2020) and the 55% target in the current Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. It was suggested that it would be useful to break down the performance against this indicator in 2 ways – by waste stream (i.e. reuse/recycling and composting) and by collection methodology (i.e. kerbside collection and HWRC's).
2. Total residual waste – this indicator was considered particularly important in relation to the available capacity for waste disposal. This took account of changes in waste per household and waste growth due to growth in households/population. It was suggested that this information should be broken down into 3 categories – waste disposed of through the EfW; waste disposed of at landfill; and waste disposed of from the dry recycling contract (contamination).

It was suggested that it would be helpful for the Partnership to receive this information every six months. It was commented that the more data that could be fed into the Partnership the better. It would be interesting to know when the recycling rates started to drop and how quickly they dropped. It was also suggested whether it would of benefit to look at if there had been any key events that may have contributed to the drop in recycling.

RESOLVED

1. That the performance indicators presented be accepted
2. That a report be brought to the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership every six months.

13b Lincolnshire Waste Partnership Terms of Reference

Consideration was given to a report which recommended a new set of Terms of Reference (ToR) for adoption by the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership in order to address recommendation 8 from the Audit report.

Members were provided with the opportunity to discuss the revised Terms of Reference and the following points were raised:

- It was suggested that a paragraph regarding a quorum should be included in the new ToR and it was agreed that it should remain at 5 elected members.
- It was thought that only elected members should be able to cast a vote, and it was not appropriate for officers to do this on a member's behalf.

RESOLVED

1. That the revised Terms of Reference be adopted subject to the above amendments.
2. That the amended Terms of Reference be circulated to the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership in advance of the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 12.30 pm