INTEGRA

135

Project Integra – Strategic Board Minutes

Name of meeting	Project Integra Strategic Board	
Date of meeting	Tuesday 29th June 2026, 10am-12pm	
Venue	Online Meeting – MS Teams	
Attendees	Councillors:	
	Cllr Ian Bastable (IB)	Fareham Borough Council
	Cllr Stuart Brown (SB)	Portsmouth City Council
	Cllr Steve Cramoysan (SC)	Winchester City Council
	Cllr David Drew (DD)	Test Valley Borough Council
	Cllr Christine Guiness (CG)	Rushmoor Borough Council
	Cllr Rupert Kyrle (RK)	Eastleigh Borough Council
	Cllr Kirsty North (KN)	Hampshire County Council
	Cllr Alan Oliver (AO)	Hart District Council
	Cllr Stevyn Ricketts (SR)	Gosport Borough Council
	Cllr John Savage (JS)	Southampton City Council
	Cllr Netty Shepherd (NS)	Havant Borough Council
	Officers:	
	David Allister (DA)	Eastleigh Borough Council
	Ian Collins (IC)	Fareham Borough Council
	Gregory Cox (GC)	Southampton City Council
	David Emmett (DE)	Portsmouth City Council
	Sam Horne (SH)	Hampshire County Council
	Toni Johnson (TJ)	Eastleigh Borough Council
	Paul Laughlin (PL)	Hampshire County Council
	Olivia Longley (OL)	Project Integra
	Sean Magee (SM)	Southampton City Council
	Dan McCartney (DMC)	Fareham Borough Council
	Chris Noble (CN)	New Forest District Council
	Sonja Reames (SR)	Havant Borough Council
	Nicola Reay (NR)	Havant Borough Council
	Kaylee Shaw (KS)	Winchester City Council
	Helen Taylor-Cobb (HTC)	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
	Richard Tebbutt (RT)	East Hampshire District Council
	Sharon Watson (SW)	Gosport Borough Council
	Paul Wykes (PW)	Test Valley Borough Council
	Abigail Wylde (AWy)	Project Integra
Apologies:	Cllr Geoffrey Blunden (GB)	New Forest District Council
	Cllr Chris Tomblin (CT)	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
	Rob Harbour (RH)	Southampton City Council
	Ruth Whaymand (RW)	Rushmoor Borough Council

		Actions
1.	**Vote for Chair and Vice Chair**	
1.1	The Board was asked to elect a Chair in accordance with the Project Integra Constitution. Members were invited to put themselves forward. **RESOLVED** Councillor Drew was elected as Chair of the Project Integra Strategic Board.	

    1.2	The Board was asked to elect a Vice Chair in accordance with the Project Integra Constitution. No nominations were received. **RESOLVED** Councillor North, as the HCC representative, to continue to act as Vice Chair of the Project Integra Strategic Board as per the constitution.	
2. 2.1	**Introductions and Domestic Arrangements** Cllr Drew opened the meeting and round-the-room introductions were given.	
3. 3.1	**Apologies** Apologies as above.	
4. 4.1	**Declarations of Interest** There were no declarations of interest.	
5. 5.1 5.2	**Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (Report 133)** There were no outstanding actions from the last meeting. SC highlighted several minor errors in the previous minutes, including the incorrect use of his initials. AWy confirmed that these have been amended and that an updated version of the document will be circulated.	
6. 6.1 6.2	**PI and Board Introduction** AWy delivered a presentation on Project Integra for new members, covering: • Background to the partnership • Partnership aims. • How the partnership operates, including meeting cycles, working groups, and governance arrangements • The Strategic Board • National context • Available resources Questions: SC asked about Project Integra's role in developing a waste disposal strategy during the interim period between the dissolution of the current authorities and the establishment of a new arrangement under the unitary authorities, noting that there is likely to be a transitional gap between the two. AWy outlined that work had been carried out over the past year to update the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS). She emphasised that the revised strategy has been deliberately written at a high level to go beyond LGR, in order to provide continuity for the new unitary authorities in the early stages following vesting day. SC asked what Project Integra's role will be in terms of managing boundary changes	

	under LGR, for example the Waterside area currently in NFDC. DD acknowledged that there will be challenges for Project Integra to address in the lead up to LGR. He emphasised that the primary priority will be to maintain service continuity for residents, noting that collaboration through Project Integra will be in everyone's best interest to achieve this.	
7. 7.1 7.2	**Annual Report** AWy presented the 2024/25 Annual Report, noting that it would ordinarily have been presented the previous year but that the data had not been ready in time. She apologised that some of the data is now slightly out of date. AWy clarified that the key performance data presented is not Defra-validated; however, it is unlikely to differ significantly from the final validated figures. She confirmed that the report will be circulated shortly after the meeting with the validated data included. She also acknowledged that a number of issues had contributed to the delay and confirmed that, in future, all data presented will be fully up to date. The Annual Report included: • Project Integra performance data, including recycling, landfill, and contamination rates. • Hampshire Recycles social media activity and performance. • PI waste prevention data, including residual waste per household. • CASH accident data. • PI expenditure • Recommendations The recommendations of the annual report were agreed. Questions: DD asked whether residual waste figures were per household or per authority. AWy explained that both were included, data per authority is shown in figure 10 and data per household is shown in figure 11. AO asked when the Board could expect to receive the 2025/26 data, noting that it would be disappointing if there continued to be a significant delay. AWy explained that, going forward, the Annual Report will be presented in line with the usual timetable, without delay. She noted that the report is typically presented in June using unvalidated data, as Defra validation is not normally completed until the following March. AO suggested that it would be helpful to receive the most up-to-date data, even if unvalidated, for authorities to use internally. AWy agreed and confirmed that the data would be shared as soon as possible. SC, agreed with AO's comments and said that having up to date management data	

	is more important than having validated data a year late.	
8. 8.1 8.2	**MRF Update** PL presented an update on the MRF, including: • Project background • Details of the Chickenhall Lane site • The proposed development • An update on project progress • Plans for the transition to a twin-stream system Questions: JS thanked PL for the presentation and noted the challenge of explaining to residents why some common items (e.g. yoghurt pots) are not recyclable in Hampshire, despite being accepted in other areas. PL explained that the MRF specification was developed based on what was most viable to collect and recycle at the time. He noted that materials such as plastic pots, tubs and trays have only become widely recyclable within the past 5–10 years. He added that Hampshire's MRFs are highly effective at sorting the materials they do accept, which has historically resulted in higher recycling income compared to other areas due to the quality of the output material. SC asked when the MRF is expected to become operational, noting that previous information suggested early 2028, whereas the presentation indicated a timeline of mid-2028. He also asked about the process for scheduling the transition to the new MRF, highlighting that WCC is keen to be ready as soon as possible and therefore needs to begin making decisions imminently. He requested that the transition process is as transparent as possible. PL agreed, noting that HCC, as the WDA, will work with authorities to coordinate the transition and maintain material flows. While HCC is happy to align with local plans, material will be required from the MRF's opening date, and running three MRFs simultaneously will not be practical, so careful planning will be required. NS noted that HBC had planned to include transitional costs in its 2027/28 budget, but as the MRF opening now falls after the LGR vesting date, she asked whether these costs are expected to be the responsibility of the new unitary authorities. PL explained that it is likely that authorities will run their own collection services for a time post LGR and as a result will need to make plans for the transition to the new MRF. He noted that the change in operational date was due to unforeseen legal delays. AO asked whether HCC is making contingency plans for authorities who do not accept the twin stream proposal. PL said that no plans were being made at this time, explaining that the twin stream MRF is in line with Simpler Recycling legislation however he is aware of discussions around TEEP assessments. AO noted that waste disposal is being discussed as though it will become a centralised function following LGR but highlighted that this may not align with the views of the new collection authorities. PL acknowledged that broader discussions will be required regarding the future management of waste disposal post-LGR but advised that services will continue to operate in line with existing contractual arrangements in the interim.	

9.	**Disposal Contract Extension**	
9.1	SH gave a presentation on the disposal contract extension, which included: • Background on the disposal contract. • The work programme for a potential extension • Key considerations • The contract extension proposal • Timelines. SH outlined that HCC and PCC have both formally approved a contract extension until March 2036 but that this is subject to approval from SCC who is looking to take the decision through their processes over the next few months.	
9.2	Questions: AO asked whether the contract extension includes commitments from Veolia regarding novation post-LGR. SH confirmed that the existing contract and any extension would novate to the new authorities after LGR, explaining that Veolia would be under contract to the new authorities until the end of the contract. IB asked about the scope of the contract and whether it includes the new MRF. He also asked the future of the site scheduled for closure. SH explained that the contract covers all existing services and that the new MRF will be incorporated on an operate-and-maintain basis. He added that, once closed the new authorities will need to determine the future use of the Alton site. SH noted that one option could be to purchase the site, which may be advantageous given the challenges associated with securing planning permission for waste facilities, although this will be for the new authorities to decide.	
10.	**Any Other Business**	
10.1	SR asked whether it would be possible to hold at least one meeting per year in person. AWy responded that, subject to securing a suitable meeting room, there would be no reason one meeting per year could not be held in person. DD agreed that this would be beneficial.	
11.	**Date of Next Meeting** Proposed date: Tuesday 20th October, 10am-12pm	