Project Integra – Strategic Board Minutes

Name of meeting	Project Integra Strategic Board	
Date of meeting	20th October 2026, 10am-12pm	
Venue	EII Court, Hampshire County Council	
Attendees	Councillors:	
	Cllr Stuart Brown (SB)	Portsmouth City Council
	Cllr Steve Cramoysan (SC)	Winchester City Council
	Cllr David Drew (DD)	Test Valley Borough Council
	Cllr Christine Guinness (CG)	Rushmoor Borough Council
	Cllr Robert Mocatta (RM)	East Hampshire District Council
	Cllr Kirsty North (KN)	Hampshire County Council
	Cllr Alan Oliver (AO)	Hart District Council
	Cllr Stevyn Ricketts (SR)	Gosport Borough Council
	Cllr Netty Shepherd (NS)	Havant Borough Council
	Cllr Chris Tomblin (CT)	Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
	Officers:	
	Rebecca Adams (RA)	Portsmouth City Council
	Vanessa Cheung (VC)	Test Valley Borough Council
	Gregory Cox (GC)	Southampton City Council
	Mark Gray (MG)	Veolia
	Sean Herdman-Grant (SHG)	East Hampshire District Council
	Sam Horne (SH)	Hampshire County Council
	Toni Johnson (TJ)	Eastleigh Borough Council
	Olivia Longley (OL)	Project Integra
	Sean Magee (SM)	Southampton City Council
	Dan McCartney (DMC)	Fareham Borough Council
	Liz Mockeridge (LM)	Southampton City Council
	Chris Noble (CN)	New Forest District Council
	Sonja Reames (SR)	Havant Borough Council
	Sharon Watson (GBC)	Gosport Borough Council
	Ruth Whaymand (RW)	Rushmoor Borough Council
	Ashley Wild (AWi)	Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council
	Campbell Williams (CW)	Winchester City Council
	Abigail Wylde (AWy)	Project Integra
Apologies:	Councillors:	
	Cllr Ian Bastable (IB)	Fareham Borough Council
	Cllr Geoffrey Blunden (GB)	New Forest District Council
	Cllr Rupert Kyrle (RK)	Eastleigh Borough Council
	Cllr John Savage (JS)	Southampton City Council
	Officers:	
	David Allister (DA)	Eastleigh Borough Council
	David Emmett (DE)	Portsmouth City Council
	Rob Harbour (RH)	Southampton City Council
	Colette Hill (CH)	Porstmouth City Council
	Paul Laughlin (PL)	Hampshire County Council
	Stephanie Lucking (SL)	Gosport Borough Council
	Richard Tebutt (RT)	East Hampshire District Council
	Paul Wykes (PW)	Test Valley Borough Council

		Actions
1.	**Introductions and Domestic Arrangements**	
1.1	Introductions were given.	
2.	**Apologies**	
2.1	Apologies as above.	
3.	**Declarations of Interest**	
3.1	There were no declarations of interest.	
4.	**Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (Report 133)**	
4.1	No outstanding actions.	
4.2	The minutes were agreed to be a true record.	
5.	**PI Annual Report**	
5.1	AWy gave a presentation on the 2025/26 Annual Report. She noted that the presentation did not cover the entire report but included all the key information. The full report will be circulated with the minutes. The presentation included: • Service changes • A summary of key data • Recycling rate data – PI & individual authorities (including 2026/27 Q1 data) • Residual waste data • Municipal waste sent to landfill • Food waste data – monthly tonnages per authority and average kg collected per household • Contamination data • Hampshire Recycles social media key data • Partnership accident and health & safety data • PI accounts summary The recommendations of the report were agreed.	
5.2	Questions: SB thanked AWy for the presentation and asked whether it is known what is causing the increased contamination rates and what individual authorities can do to help reduce contamination. AWy explained that the reason behind the increase is not known but that the change in sampling regime and introduction of simpler recycling elsewhere in the country may be contributing factors. SH noted that the new sampling regime is much more granular than the previous sampling methods, suggesting that it is providing a more accurate picture of	

contamination. He said that whilst simpler recycling is likely having an impact that large amounts of other non-target materials e.g. food waste, glass and nappies are also being found in the recycling stream. All authorities are provided with contamination data and there are consistent themes across the partnership in terms of the composition of contamination.

SB asked whether engagement rate was measured for the Hampshire Recycles social media accounts.

AWy confirmed that engagement rate is monitored and that full details on Hampshire Recycles' social media performance can be found in the annual report.

AO advised that both BDBC and HDC have introduced mixed plastics bring banks, which have proven to be very popular with residents. He noted that it's very hard to educate residents not to put mixed plastics in their recycling bin, citing a combination of simpler recycling messaging and packaging labels. He suggested that this will continue until the new MRF is completed but that it was interesting to hear other items are also being found in contamination. He indicated that the new MRF will present a good opportunity to run a large comms campaign to tackle contamination.

NS agreed that plastics continue to present a significant challenge, noting that many residents are under the impression that all plastic items can be recycled through their household recycling collections. She added that HBC has also introduced mixed plastics banks, which have been well received by residents and are already contributing to a reduction in residual waste tonnage.

NS asked whether the reduction in recycling tonnages at HWRCs could be attributed to factors other than lower garden waste tonnages, such as a decrease in visitor numbers. SH advised that visitor numbers had remained stable and that site utilisation was currently at peak levels across the network. However, he noted that there had been significant fluctuations in garden waste tonnages and, given the tonnage that this material represents, even relatively small changes could have a notable impact on recycling rates. He further highlighted that wood was also a contributing factor, as challenging market conditions have limited the availability of recycling outlets for the material.

DD asked if it were true that HCC is only required to have one HWRC per district. SH explained that the guidance states that residents should be in reasonable distance of a HWRC which HCC has interpreted as a twenty-minute drive. SH noted that work was done to assess HWRC provision when the decision paper was put together on whether to close any HWRCs in the network.

SC commended NFDC on its significant increase in recycling rate and asked whether this was due solely to the introduction of food waste collections or if other factors had also contributed. Noting that best practice should be shared amongst the partnership.

CN explained that NFDC had implemented several significant service changes simultaneously, including the introduction of alternate weekly collections, wheeled bins, and weekly food waste collections. He noted that these changes reduced residual waste capacity to a 180L wheeled bin, compared with the previous service, which effectively provided residents with unlimited residual waste capacity through sack collections. As a result, NFDC have seen an increase in both recycling and

	food waste participation. Overall, it was the combination of all the changes alongside a strong comms campaign that has resulted in the increase in recycling rate. DD asked how the group can help resolve the increase in health and safety accidents. AWy explained that PI has a health and safety working group who regularly look at the accident data to identify any areas of improvement. SHG asked whether the accident data had been normalised to account for the increase in collections and the resulting number of vehicles on the road. AWy advised that this had not previously been factored into the data but could be included in future reporting.	
6.	**MRF Update and Disposal Contact Extension**	
6.1	**Disposal Contract Extension:** SH gave a presentation on the disposal contract extension, which included: • Confirmation that the disposal contract has been extended to 31st March 2036 and that this has now been approved by HCC, PCC and SCC. • Key rationale for the extension • Key aspects of the extension – including contract expiry and hand back provisions, biennial waste compositional analysis, an annual comms plan, a bulky waste diversion programme, and ETS preparation. SH advised that the Deed of Variation with Veolia is currently being finalised and is expected to be signed within the next month, but officially the contract started on the 1st of October. Questions: CT asked how the contract will work post LGR. SH explained that the contract will novate to the new authorities and that they will be bound to the contract until it's end date in 2036. The new authorities will be able to make decisions about procuring a new contract, although SH noted that the procurement process takes around six to seven years. AO asked if there's any provision through the circular economy for the disposal of nappies and absorbent hygiene products. SH advised that there is currently no producer responsibility scheme in place for these materials, although the waste sector has called for one to be introduced. He noted, however, that following the implementation of Extended Producer Responsibility for packaging (pEPR), there has been significant resistance from producers regarding the additional financial burden of the scheme. Currently the government doesn't seem to be advocating for additional schemes and it's important to consider the national picture when planning future infrastructure capacity in Hampshire. SHG asked whether the contract included a break clause and whether the procurement process had involved testing the market. SH advised that the contract does not contain a break clause. He explained that HCC had undertaken a market-testing exercise and worked with an external consultant to develop a counterfactual model to assess what a competitively tendered solution might look like. The conclusion of this work was that the likely outcome would be broadly similar to	

extending the existing arrangement.

SHG then asked whether there would be any further opportunity to extend the contract. SH confirmed no further extension options are available beyond 2036.

SC asked why the procurement process was expected to take six to seven years. SH explained that the timescale reflects the complexity of the contract and the need to establish an appropriate procurement strategy before progressing to market engagement. He noted that the current arrangement is a fully integrated contract, with Veolia managing the waste system throughout the entire process. However, more recent contracts are often disaggregated into separate elements, such as DMR processing, energy-from-waste (EfW), and HWRC operations. Once a preferred approach has been identified, market testing would be required, followed by the formal decision-making process and the procurement itself, which could involve two rounds of competitive dialogue. He added that a significant mobilisation and transition period would also be required, with a minimum of 12 months and ideally around 18 months to ensure a smooth handover. While some stages could potentially be shortened, HCC, PCC and SCC's assessment was that a six-to-seven-year timeline would provide sufficient time to complete each stage of the process effectively.

DD asked about the overall value of the contract. SH said that it was between £60-70 million per year.

CT asked whether the contract includes provision for the ongoing management of difficult materials e.g. fridges or solar panels. He also asked who will manage the additional elements of the contract e.g. the comms plan after LGR. SH advised that the additional elements of the contract will initially be managed by the HCC Waste Disposal Team. He noted that responsibility for these elements is expected to transfer to the new unitary authorities following LGR.

SH explained that fridges are covered by the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations and, as a result, producers are responsible for funding the costs associated with their collection, treatment and disposal. He noted that producers are required to register with a compliance scheme and meet recycling obligations for the products they place on the market. Each producer must either collect, or fund the collection and recycling of, an equivalent tonnage of material to that which they have placed on the market during the relevant compliance year. SH indicated that there are two main problems with the scheme. The first is the limited capacity of reprocessors and other offtakers responsible for managing and recycling materials. The second is the lack of sufficient funding within the scheme. This results in situations like the one seen over the summer where there aren’t sufficient outlets for the number of fridges being disposed of which then has an impact on the whole system. SH explained that in Hampshire at the peak there was approximately 2,000 fridges in the network waiting to be taken to a reprocessor and that as a result HCC is looking into alternative disposal routes.

RM asked how flexible the contract would be in adapting to the requirements of ETS over the next ten years. SH said that the contract allows for renegotiation with Veolia, but the contract could not cover changes in law or legislation so the cost of complying with new legislation will fall on the new unitary authorities. He noted that no contract would underwrite changes in law.

	MRF Update	
6.2	SH gave a presentation update on the new MRF, which included: • The project is still working towards a completion date of summer 2028 • Civils contract details • Processing contract details – including the work being done to ensure power to the site through temporary generators. • The transition programme. SH handed over to CW who reinforced to authorities the important of engaging with the transition programme. He highlighted the need to work as a partnership and emphasised that the new MRF will be the biggest change to waste that residents have experienced in a long time. He acknowledged that authorities would have different priorities but reiterated that working collectively will help to produce the best results.	
6.3	Questions: NS highlighted that HBC is facing significant challenges in managing the volume of ongoing change, particularly given the uncertainty surrounding legislative changes such as DRS. She noted that until it's clear what the impacts of these will be, that it will be hard to determine what their transition to the new MRF will look like. SB raised concerns about delivery of power to the MRF site and asked whether SSE are taking responsibility for the impacts of this. SH shared that the chief executives of HCC, PCC and SCC have written to the CEO of SSE to raise their concerns and urge them to take accountability. He indicated that when the contract was signed with SSE it was for full provision of power to the site and there was no mention of upgrades to the network causing problems. Other projects in the Hampshire area are also being impacted, and local MPs have been involved with the issue. SH outlined that this is the biggest challenge facing the MRF project and that the long-term date for full provision of power is 2036. The air traffic beacon at the nearby airport means that solar panels are not currently an option but may be in the future. SH confirmed that everything is being done to resolve the issue. KN thanked authorities for taking the time to meet with her last week around HCC's decision to issue a power of direction for twin stream collections. She outlined that the decision papers will be published on Friday and circulated to all authorities. The paper will contain all the options, but KN noted that the officer recommendation is to issue a power of direction to everyone in terms of moving to twin stream collections.	
7.	**Action Plan**	
7.1	AWy explained that the PI Constitution requires the partnership to have an action plan, although one has not been in place for several years. She suggested that the items identified as part of the contract extension, such as the waste composition analysis and communications plan, would provide a good foundation for the action plan, rather than developing a new document from scratch. AWy proposed putting together a draft document ready for the next meeting in February. She noted that the usual protocol for the action plan is that it's taken through individual authority decision making.	

	DD asked whether authorities were happy with the proposed approach. Authorities confirmed that they were happy to proceed on this basis.	
8.	**JMWMS Approvals**	
8.1	DD noted that the JMWMS had been circulated for approval some time ago and suggested it would be useful to receive an update on each authority's progress in approving the strategy. He reported that TVBC approved the strategy in June, taking the view that it is a high-level strategic document and did not raise significant concerns. The following authorities confirmed that they had already approved the JMWMS: • EBC • FBC • GBC • PCC • TVBC • WCC LM shared that SCC is taking the JMWMS to their scrutiny panel on Thursday and cabinet for approval next week. CN outlined that NFDC will take the JMWMS to cabinet in a few weeks and full council in December. CT shared that BDBC will wait for the details from HCC on a power of direction before starting to take the JMWMS through the approval process. AO indicated that HDC is the same position to BDBC and want to have a better understanding of the costs of a twin stream service before signing up to the JMWMS. RW explained that RBC is also in a similar position to BDBC and HDC and has not yet progressed the JMWMS through its formal approval process. NS indicated that HBC is also waiting for details on a power of direction and is not expecting to approve the JMWMS until the beginning of next year.	
9.	**Any Other Business**	
9.1	DD expressed the Board's appreciation to RM for his long-standing service as Chair and thanked him, on behalf of all members, for his contribution to the group over many years.	
10.	**Date of Next Meeting** Proposed date: Tuesday 23rd February 2027, 10am-12pm	