



## LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP 24 NOVEMBER 2016

### PRESENT:

Councillor Reginald Alan Shore (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair)	(Lincolnshire County Council)
District Councillor Michael Brookes	(Boston Borough Council)
George Bernard	(Boston Borough 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)
Emily Spicer	(South Holland District Council)
District Councillor Nick Craft	(South Kesteven District Council)
Ady Selby	(West Lindsey District Council)
Becky Allen (Communications)	Communications
Neil McBride	Environment and Economy
Ian Taylor	Environmental Services Team Leader (Waste)
Ian Yates	South Kesteven District Council
Rachel Wilson	Democratic Services

### 7 PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT ISSUES

#### 7a Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D Cotton (WLDC), Mrs S Harrison (ELDC) and A H Turner MBE (LCC).

An apology for absence was also received from Steve Willis, Chief Operating Officer, LCC.

#### 7b Declaration of Interests

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

7c Minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2016

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2016 be signed by the Vice-Chairman as a correct record.

Note: It was requested whether the minutes could be circulated to the Partnership at an earlier point than with the agenda pack. Officers agreed to work out a time scale for this.

7d 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:

Lincolnshire County Council – most of the issues would be covered by items on the agenda. There was nothing further to add at this point.

East Lindsey District Council – Nothing to report

North Kesteven District Council – Tenders for the new depot had come back, and they would be evaluated in the next few days.

Boston Borough Council – the first full year with chargeable green waste collections had been completed, and it was reported that 82% of customers had signed up for the next year.

South Holland District Council – there had been 2700 subscriptions so far for the green waste collection, and 75 had been received in the previous week. The scheme had been very successful and the £49 charge plus £15 delivery fee had not put people off.

City of Lincoln Council – 8 prosecutions were being taken to court for fly tipping, with one successful prosecution so far for £440. Over 700 fixed penalty notices for littering had been issued in and around Lincoln High Street area in the last year.

South Kesteven District Council – had started to use fixed penalty notices, and the charges could be up to £400. Work was being carried out to determine a suitable level of charge.

West Lindsey District Council – an enforcement officer had recently been recruited, whose work would be focused on environmental enforcement such as fly tipping.

8      STRATEGIC ISSUES

8a      Lincolnshire Waste Partnership Audit Report

Consideration was given to a draft report which contained an action plan outlining the risks identified during the audit of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership, as well as findings, implications and recommendations for addressing each risk. The findings from the audit were presented to the meeting of the Partnership held on 15 September 2016

It was reported that there was now an agreed management action against each of the 12 findings, along with a proposed completion date and a responsible staff member. There was also an overall management response regarding the audit with the report.

Members were advised that the actions would be added into a tracker system and monitored every quarter, which would pick up every action and progress which had not been completed by that point. If the action has been completed, it would be closed, and if not the completion dates would be adjusted.

RESOLVED

1. That the updated audit report be received
2. That the actions, timeframes and management response provided be agreed
3. That the final report be agreed.

8b      Lincolnshire Waste Partnership Governance Arrangements

The Partnership received a report which provided guidance and a recommendation for a new governance model for the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership (LWP) based on the considered opinions of the LWP Officer Working Group (LWPOWG).

It was reported that the LWPOWG met on 7 October 2016 to consider the issues and reach a consensus view on a governance model that it felt would provide a way forward, even if it could not meet the requirements of all the respective authorities at this time.

Six options were identified for further consideration. The option which was eventually agreed to be recommended to the LWP was Option 4 which had no decision making powers, but was formalised as a joint consultative body for all strategic waste decisions before WDA/WCA's considerations. It would have a formal role in reviewing progress against the Waste Strategy and provide advocacy on behalf of Lincolnshire. The partnership would establish a clear strategy for the county's waste and assess progress against the many strands of the Strategy. The LWP would also have a formal role where all partners agreed to refer strategic waste decisions for review, before any decisions were made on implementation. The Partnership would work collaboratively to share and support partners actions.

The Partnership was provided with the opportunity to discuss the options as outlined in the report and determine whether Partners could support Option 4, and some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP  
24 NOVEMBER 2016**

- Officers commented that Option 4 was welcomed, as it was believed that the LWP was originally set up for this purpose, and it had drifted from this over a number of years. There was a need to get back to this before other options could be considered.
- It was suggested that the name of the Partnership should remain as the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership, as there had been positive engagement with the public, and changing the name could cause confusion.
- The frustration of some authorities was that the Partnership was seen as little more than a 'talking shop'. At the last meeting it became apparent that there was not a proper connection between members of this Committee and the Leaders and Chief Executives. There was a need for clear lines of communication.
- It was commented that references to 'trusting partners' had no place in a public document, all partners were publicly accountable bodies, and should use a sound evidence base when making decisions. There could only be trust if there were open discussions.
- It was commented that the Districts would probably suggest that the only certain relationship with residents would be around waste, as residents knew that the Districts emptied the bins, unless residents had had any specific contact with the Council with other services. This provided councillors with a connection with their residents, and consequently it was important that a good service was provided. Any option that suggested that control of this was given away would not be supported.
- One member commented that the key tension which existed was between the County as the disposal authority and other partners as the collection authorities. It was acknowledged that the County Council had numerous other budgetary pressures, with waste disposal being just one of them. It was noted that lower tier authorities often found that when asked, their residents could only easily associate their council with one service, emptying their bins. This meant that local politicians tended to be protective of their local waste services, and extremely defensive when anything threatened to undermine these, or reduce control over them. It was commented that there was a need for the County Council to acknowledge and respect the importance of waste collection services to its lower tier partners otherwise it was felt that tensions within the partnership would continue and its capacity to make progress on other issues would be reduced.
- Boston Borough Council commented that the options had been discussed with the Leader. It was felt that Option 4, working towards Option 3 was something the Borough could live with, but could not support anything further up than that. There was a need to build up confidence in the Partnership.
- It was commented that Option 4 was a compromise, and the Partnership should be working towards Option 3. There was a need for the Partnership to work together, but Partners did not need to give up control of what they did as Authorities. There was a need to work towards a common approach on collective issues such as recycling and contamination. Authorities could work independently but collectively towards what it was felt they should be trying to achieve.
- It was felt that Option 4 was something that was achievable, and the Terms of Reference going forward would be essential in preventing the Partnership from slipping back into old ways.

- The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy that Authorities would be signing up to would be very important, and would set out what the Partnership was working towards.

#### RESOLVED

1. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership determine a governance model based on Option 4, as outlined in the report.
2. That the name 'Lincolnshire Waste Partnership' be retained
3. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership request the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership Officer Working Group to develop a new Partnership Agreement/Terms of Reference based on the chosen option, including notes in cluster working and inclusion of neighbouring authorities.
4. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership ask the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership Officer Working Group to develop and propose a new Standard Agenda for Lincolnshire Waste Partnership.

#### 8c United Communications Strategy relating to Nappies

Consideration was given to a report which outlined a proposed approach to educating the community in respect of what could and could not be recycled in order to tackle the continued increase in the contamination of recycling bins across Lincolnshire.

It was reported that the focus would be on common items placed in recycling bins that could not be recycled and were causing problems by contaminating the items which could be recycled, rather than trying to communicate a lengthy list of what could be recycled as the items were not the same in all Council areas.

Partners were advised that the marketing campaign would be delivered in a number of phases – each three months and each focusing on a different item of contamination. It was suggested that the first three month period focused on nappies.

The Lincolnshire Waste Partnership was 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:

- It was commented that Christmas would be the perfect time to tackle food waste. Only 3% of the population would be affected by a campaign for nappies, and it was suggested that anyone that could argue that nappies were recyclable did not care about recycling. Disappointment was expressed at the decision to tackle nappies first.
- It was noted that there would be different categories of people that could be tackled in terms of food waste.
- It was noted that South Holland would not have the same process in terms of checking bins, as residents still used bags.
- It was suggested that residents should be helped to understand why they were being asked not to put particular things in the recycling bin. A more positive approach should be taken rather than just telling people what they can and cannot do. For example, tell residents how much it costs when a load was contaminated, and that it was not the Council's money that was being spent, but it was the

residents' money. If something was found in a recycling bin that should not be there, the bin was tagged and not taken. The public needed to be informed of the reasons why their bins were not taken.

- A reduction in education programmes had been seen across several districts. There was a risk of mixed messages if there was a focus on food waste. However, if people could be reminded that contamination was an issue it may make them think about what else could be contamination.
- It was suggested that education was difficult for householders, and there was a need to target schools, as children were more likely to take these things on board, and they did have an influence on parents.
- There was support for educating people about recycling and contamination, but it was suggested whether a more targeted approach for nappies would be beneficial, such as distributing information at ante-natal classes, and those places where new parents might visit.
- It was suggested that a pictorial campaign might be more successful.
- It was commented that Christmas was the one time of year when food was on everyone's mind and so a campaign on food waste could be effective. Then the campaign on nappies could be rolled out.
- It was queried whether supermarkets had been contacted, as they may be able to help to get the message out that waste nappies were not recyclable. It was thought that if the 'Big 4' supermarkets could support this, a campaign could have a significant impact.
- It was suggested that it would be better to have one campaign across Lincolnshire. It was noted that work had previously been carried out with Lincolnshire Co-op, and it was suggested that their communications department should be contacted to see if they could give any support.
- It was suggested that if the messages could be conveyed through pictures, people were more likely to see nappies as a contaminant. It was also commented that as Lincolnshire had a very diverse population, with some residents who did not have a good grasp of the English language, a pictorial campaign would be vital.
- A number of graphics for Christmas had started to be produced, along four themes, and these would be distributed out to Districts.
- In relation to recommendation 3, it was queried whether the Districts would be prepared to put a token amount forward to contribute to this campaign. There was general agreement for this proposal.
- It was suggested that a number of images for use in the campaign should be circulated to the Partnership for information.
- It was reported that a Christmas campaign around waste was planned, which would specifically include Christmas food waste. It was agreed that the materials for the campaign would be circulated to officers for agreement due to the timing of the next meeting of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership.

#### RESOLVED

1. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership supports the marketing approach set out in the report.
2. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership supports the proposal to sticker/tag any bins identified as contaminated during the campaign.

3. That the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership recognises that marketing activity would require a budget allocation, and that the proposal for each district to contribute a token amount be supported.

#### 8d Dry Recycling Collection Methodology

Consideration was given to a report which set out the new guidance from the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP). The Partnership was informed that WRAP had recently issued two new guidance documents relating to recycling:

- A Framework for Greater Consistency in Household Recycling in England (Consistency Guidelines)
- Wrap Recycling Guidelines

It was reported that the Consistency Guidelines set out a vision where every household in England would recycle a common set of dry recyclable material and food waste, collected in one of three different ways. The vision also included a move to a nationally consistent colour scheme for containers to simplify communications. It was noted that the guidelines were not binding on local authorities and there was no current indication that they would be made binding in the future.

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:

- The national guidance seemed like the right thing to do
- The food waste issue needed to be part of the strategic consideration going forward
- All recycling was currently co-mingled, and there was a need to be aware of this. There may be a need to think about whether authorities continue to collect co-mingled recyclables, as Districts may fail TEEP assessments in future if the current levels of contamination continued.
- WRAP needed to support authorities to assess business cases for implementing recycling collection services in line with the framework. It was reported that West Lindsey District Council was working on an expression of interest for support from WRAP on behalf of the LWP. It was hoped that there would be member buy-in, as it was felt that the business case would have more weight if it came from a group such as the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership.
- It was queried what the implications of failing a TEEP assessment were. Members were advised that to enable districts to collect co-mingled recycling there was a need to demonstrate that they could not do it any other way. The worse the quality of the recycling collected gets, the harder it would be to justify the continued collection of co-mingled recyclables.
- In relation to the vision for consistent colour schemes for bins, it would not be possible for districts to change bins, as the costs would be prohibitive. It was suggested whether a county wide sticker to put on recycling bins would work.
- It was commented that there were internationally recognised signs for recycling.
- There had been a lot of research about stickers on bins carried out, and it had been found that the information needed to be in the house to have the greatest effect.

**LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP  
24 NOVEMBER 2016**

- Recycling contamination cost the County Council approximately £1million per year, and it was suggested that if there was any reduction in contamination the authority could look at sharing any savings with the districts.
- The long term benefits of reducing contamination would be a reduction of costs to the residents of Lincolnshire.
- It was easier to reinforce a message when it was consistent.
- There was also a need for consistency in timing.
- If everyone in the Country had the same recycling mix it would be possible to communicate the message on a national basis, as there would only be one message to promote.
- The biggest concern in relation to recycling and levels of contamination was that no operators would want to deal with the County Council, and so the only place to take the material would be out of county. There was a need to carry out soft market testing with industry providers as soon as possible.
- It was proposed to hold a 'Challenge Workshop' on tackling contamination in the New Year.

**RESOLVED**

1. That a consistent dry recycling mix of materials, taking account of the Consistency Guidelines should be the aim of the next Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS)
2. That each constituent Council consider adopting the dry recycling mix in the Consistency Guidelines (as expanded by the Recycling Guidelines) as soon as practicable.
3. That the future tendering processes for the processing of Mixed Dry Recycling be based on the dry recycling mix in the Consistency Guidelines (as expanded by the Recycling Guidelines).
4. Subject to discussion with contractors, the Recycling Guidelines be used as the basis for future recycling/contamination publicity and campaigns by all constituent Council's.
5. That the next JMWMS should include consideration of:
  - The implications of separate food waste collections and its disposal
  - The implications of potential changes to collection methodologies
  - The implications of developments in relation to consistent national colour schemes for waste containers
6. That an Expression of Interest be collectively completed and submitted on behalf of the LWP, in order to apply for WRAP funding to develop business cases to work towards implementing changes to collection regimes.

**9      OPERATIONAL ISSUES**

**9a      Mixed Dry Recyclables Contract**

Consideration was given to a report which set out the options for a new mixed dry recyclables contract which would commence in April 2018. It was reported that the existing contract currently sat with a single provider of Mixed Dry Recycling (MDR)

processing services – Mid UK Recycling Ltd. This contract started in July 2015 and was due to expire on 31 March 2018, if contract extensions were not agreed by both parties.

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:

- It was commented that any changes to the presented waste streams would take a while to gain any traction with the public, resulting in lower presented contamination.
- There were concerns that the option to extend the existing contract was being dismissed, as it was suggested that that this option could be used to get the message across to the public regarding reducing contamination. The county would be in a better position to negotiate a new contract.
- Issues around a potential extension to the contract with Mid-UK were discussed by the Partnership.
- It was suggested that if there were other providers interested in tendering for the contract then this would provide an element of competition for the current provider.
- There was concern about the balance of risk, and what was the greater risk – taking the contract extension now which would give Districts another year to get the contamination rates down, or the reputational risk of not being able to find another operator.
- It was commented that contamination levels in East Lindsey were the same as when the previous contract was let, but there had been two bids for the product with the lowest gate fee. This was acknowledged but it was noted that this was due to the fact that East Lindsey's recycling mix did not contain glass.
- It was noted that any contract extension would need to be mutually agreed between the County Council and the contractor.

## RESOLVED

That the Lincolnshire waste Partnership Officer Working Group look in more detail at the recommendations set out in the report.

### 9b Revision of Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy

It was reported that the existing Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) was published in June 2008. Therefore, this strategy had been in place for eight years, and had 10 objectives to achieve, including the delivery of a new residual waste management facility – the Energy from Waste facility which was located in Lincoln. It was reported that there had been varying levels of progression on the other nine objectives. One of these was the target of 55% recycling and composting which had not been achieved, and currently was decreasing due to a number of factors including contamination levels.

It was reported that JMWMS's should be reviewed regularly, typically every five years, and revised to ensure that the overall aim of implementing best practice in municipal waste management on a continuous basis was achieved. It was felt that following the successful delivery of a residual waste treatment facility, the current high levels of contamination experienced in the processing of mixed dry recyclables and the

approaching need for a new MDR contract from April 2018, it was the right time to review the strategy to identify new objectives and set out how they would be delivered.

The Partnership was advised, that it seemed reasonable to run the review of the strategy in parallel with planned works to procure a new MDR contract. Members were advised that the Group Manager Environmental Services would be the accountable officer for the Strategy, with additional identified resource and support, as required.

RESOLVED

1. That a Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy working group be established, with representatives from the County Council and District partners to start the review of the strategy and for this to run in parallel with works being undertaken on a new MDR contract.
2. That the resourcing of the JMWMS working group be confirmed by the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership following engagement with their respective councils and confirming an appropriate resource.
3. That the JMWMS working group regularly report progress to the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership
4. That the strategy be informed by latest best practice guidance, such as the recent WRAP report on greater consistency in household recycling in England.

The meeting closed at 12.20 pm