



Name of meeting	Project Integra Strategic Board	
Date of meeting	Tuesday 5 th July 2022, 10-12	
Venue	Online Meeting via Teams	
Attendees	<p>Councillors:</p> <p>Cllr Robert Mocatta (RM) Cllr Steve Davies (SD) Cllr Alan Oliver (AO) Cllr Steve Leggett (SL) Cllr Dave Ashmore (DA) Cllr Kelsie Learney (KL) Cllr Rob Hylands (RH) Cllr Lulu Bowerman (LB) Cllr Phil North (PN) Cllr Ian Bastable (IB) Cllr Hayley Eachus (HE)</p> <p>Officers:</p> <p>Abigail Cooke (AC) Linda Bratcher (LBr) Stevyn Ricketts (SR) Gary Squire (GS) Olivia Longley (OL) Campbell Williams (CW) Zoe Coote (ZC) Mark Bowler (MB) Gareth Roberts (GR) Trevor Pugh (TP) Mark Grey (MG) David Emmett (DE) Sam Horne (SH) Paul Wykes (PW) Tara Cartledge (TC) Chris Noble (CN) Paul Naylor (PNa) Helen Taylor-Cobb (HTC) Sarah Robinson (SR)</p>	<p>East Hants District Council New Forest District Council Hart District Council Southampton City Council Portsmouth City Council Winchester City Council Gosport Borough Council Havant Borough Council Test Valley Borough Council Fareham Borough Council Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council</p> <p>Project Integra Southampton City Council Gosport Borough Council Fareham Borough Council Project Integra Winchester City Council Hampshire County Council Fareham Borough Council Hampshire County Council East Hants District Council Veolia Portsmouth City Council Southampton City Council Test Valley Borough Council Hampshire County Council New Forest District Council Eastleigh Borough Council Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council</p>
Apologies	<p>Cllr Edward Heron (EH) Cllr Nick Adams-King (NAK) Ruth Whaymand (RW)</p>	<p>Hampshire County Council Test Valley Borough Council Rushmoor Borough Council</p>

Project Integra – Strategic Board Minutes

		Actions
1.	Introductions and Domestic Arrangements Cllr Kelsie Learney taken over from Cllr Martin Tod for WCC Cllr Steve Leggett taken over from Cllr Rob Harwood for SCC Cllr Edward Heron taken over from Cllr Jan Warwick for HCC Cllr Steve Hammond taken over from Cllr Lesley Meenaghan for GBC	
2.	Apologies Cllr Heron from HCC Cllr Adams-King from TVBC, Cllr Phil North attending instead Ruth Whaymand	
3.	Declarations of Interest	
3.1	There were no declarations on interest.	
4.	Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising (report 112)	
4.1	The minutes of the last meeting are for the last PI Board meeting which took place on 15 th February 2022.	
4.2	Point 6.1 – action for SH to ask DEFRA about a timetable for consultation responses. SH has been in touch with DEFRA, there are no confirmed dates for consultation responses but there are indications that the responses will be released just prior to the summer parliamentary recess in July and will be accompanied by a short consultation on statutory guidance.	
5.	JMWMS Approval Update	
5.1	Since PI Board in February the JMWMS has been approved by all partners. Some approvals are in principle whilst awaiting the confirmation of the financial arrangements.	
5.2	PN asked for an update on the MRF. SH outlined that the planning application has been submitted and a regulation twenty-five notice has been received requesting further information. There has been an objection from the National Air Traffic Services (NATS) in relation to the proximity of the facility to their beacon at Southampton Airport, HCC has produced a technical solution to this and is in discussions with NATS but is finding it challenging to get a written agreement. The plan is to submit the Regulation 25 response which will then requires a 30 period of consultation within which NATS will be required to respond to the proposed mitigation to the issue with	

	<p>the beacons.</p> <p>It is likely this delay will mean that the July planning committee will be missed and instead the application will be taken to the next meeting in September. Detailed design work has been started alongside this to make up any delay. PN asked whether the planned opening date is still 2024. SH confirmed that they are still looking to open the facility in 2024.</p>	
6	<p>National Update</p> <p>6.1 AC presented an update on national government, and other local authorities. Including information on consultation responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Targets Consultation – PI submitted a response; it was decided that this consultation was most relevant to PI. • EPR response was released in March, details were limited awaiting the appointment of a scheme administrator. • Still waiting DRS response but it was confirmed in EPR response that it would be an all-in system but would not include glass. • Other consultations included HWRC charges, digital waste, trade emissions (proposes adding energy from waste emissions into the scheme). 	
7.	<p>PI Annual Report (report)</p> <p>7.1 The report was circulated prior to the meeting. AC reminded Board that the data has not yet been validated and can't be used publicly. RH highlighted that GBC have problems with getting residents to understand what can and cannot be recycled so the social media statistics were of particular interest. Asked how partner involvement works. AC confirmed that a table of partner engagement was included in the report, a monthly social media calendar is sent out to partners to encourage consistent messaging, but individual authorities can decide whether and how much to use it.</p> <p>The recommendations of the annual report were agreed.</p>	
8.	<p>Fly-Tipping Report (report)</p> <p>8.1 The Fly-Tipping report was circulated prior to the meeting. GR summarised the key points which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCC continues to sit on the National Fly-Tipping prevention group (NFTPG). • There is a strong social media output which has seen 140,000 engagements on twitter and google. A radio campaign was run recently across the county which reached 20,000 people, this resulted in increased web-page traffic. Social media is shared with the partners to use if they would like. • Support for partners continues with Free motion triggered and infra-red cameras are available. • The number of reported Fly-Tipping incidents showed an increase 	

<p>8.2</p> <p>8.3</p>	<p>of 6.86% to 26,024 however this is below the national average of 16% increase and less than the 10% increase seen in previous years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tonnage increased 52% from 19/20 levels into 2021. This is for several reasons but most significantly in April 2020, the disposal contract was changed and the litter and fly tip codes at weighbridges were combined, resulting in an increase in reported tonnages. These codes have now been separated and tonnage is being recorded more accurately for both fly tipping and litter. • Acknowledged that there has been an increase in Fly-Tipping incidents but alongside that there has been an increase in actions taken against fly-tippers in the county. June 2021-June 2022 546 actions were taken including seventy-four prosecutions where fines were issued, and four offenders sent to prison. • Household waste is the most commonly tipped material. • Highways, public footpaths, and bridleways are the most popular locations for Fly-Tipping. • Fly-Tipping data for each authority was discussed, it was highlighted that SCC had issued the largest amount of fixed penalty notices at 259 and in contrast EBC had not taken any action but were in the process of creating an enforcement team. • Earlier in the year a WRAP grant fund was run for Fly-Tipping interventions. It was noted that three PI authorities were successful in their bid for funding, BDBC received £48,000, WCC received £27,250 and EBC £25,154 together this made up £101,204 of the total £450,00 available. <p>RM asked about the relationship between the different approaches' partners are taking and the levels of Fly-Tipping, highlighted that NFDC issuing FPN and TVBC are contrasting approaches, would be interested to know if there have been improvements in both areas following these strategies. GR highlighted that the immediate impacts are unclear but there has been a reduction in incidents and tonnages in these areas year on year. Each authority has a different approach and the impacts they see vary.</p> <p>SL asked if any authority that uses prosecutions has a 'name and shame' policy once a prosecution has gone through, aware of similar schemes in London. Also highlighted that private land is an issue in urban areas, unadopted alley ways are a particular problem in SCC. GR confirmed that each time there is a successful prosecution the corresponding authority will issue a press release with the name of the offender, rough location of where they live and area of where they fly-tipped, occasionally they will also release an image. The information becomes public record after any conviction at court. Offenders who are issued FPN are not named publicly. Aware of problems with fly tipping on private land in urban areas, have CCTV cameras available. If there is a fly tip on private land and there's evidence within it, they will look to take an investigation forwards to get compensation for landowner despite not having a statutory obligation to remove the waste. Acknowledged that unadopted land is more difficult and recognised that it is something</p>	
-----------------------	---	--

<p>8.4</p> <p>8.5</p> <p>8.6</p>	<p>to work on with partners in the future.</p> <p>PN gave some context regarding TVBC’s prosecution process in response to RM previous question. Shared that the prosecutions and subsequent publicization has been received positively by residents who appreciate the initiative-taking approach. Thinks the publicization acts as a deterrent, the key is to publicise prosecutions both through traditional media outlets and on social media.</p> <p>RH asked whether there is data on the split between domestic and commercial fly-tips across the county. GR outlined that unfortunately that data is not available but confirmed both domestic and commercial Fly-Tipping occurs across the county in both urban and rural areas.</p> <p>AO shared that HDC experiences problems with Fly-Tipping of both domestic and commercial waste at their bring sites, asked if there anyone else experiences similar issues or if there is any data on this. Acknowledged that some authorities have reduced the number of bring bank sites. GR indicated that there is not much data, would require exact GPS coordinates to determine as bring sites are just classified as council owned land. Recognised that BDBC decided to reduce the number of bring sites due to issues with fly tipping.</p> <p>SL commented that bring sites are a problem in SCC, previously have not addressed the cause just the problem. The plan is to terminate all the bring sites and replace them with contracted sites with much stricter monitoring where the responsibility will be on the contractor to clear waste rather than SCC.</p> <p>SD indicated that NFDC has had similar problems with commercial waste being tipped at bring sites. CCTV will be introduced at bring sites following a successful trial where a business was caught fly tipping its waste at a bring site.</p>	
<p>9.1</p> <p>9.2</p>	<p>9. Partnering Agreement, Governance and Financial Arrangement Update</p> <p>ZC presented update on the financial arrangements, this included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview of the key principals and aims of the new agreement • Proposed changes to contamination costs and recycling income division • Residual waste target options <p>AC presented two options for the new governance arrangement and provided examples of how they would work in practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 – Joint Committee where authorities delegate decision making powers to members of the joint committee, the committee 	

<p>9.3</p>	<p>acts as a single entity making decisions in the best interest of the partnership as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 – Contractual arrangement where authorities delegate decision making to individuals who make decisions based on the best interest of their own authority. <p>AC noted that PI was originally set up as a joint committee, this was then changed to function as a contractual arrangement although the joint committee was never dissolved.</p> <p>Asked for questions or feedback on both presentations.</p> <p>RM asked AC whether there is any guidance for members on which governance option would be more appropriate. AC indicated that both options have positives and negatives but with either option there would be potential to tighten and speed up the decision-making process making sure everyone is aware of their roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>IB asked ZC about the reduction in recycling income, indicated that it was not clear what the incentive was for authorities. ZC confirmed that some recyclable material still ends up in the residual waste which then reduces income from recycling, the driver behind this reduction is for authorities to improve in this area. The aim of the new financial proposal is to rebalance the arrangement, HCC took on more financial responsibility than was required when PI was set up, but this is no longer sustainable, particularly with investment in the new MRF.</p> <p>KL asked ZC about the residual waste targets and implications, as from the presentation it appears that authorities who have been doing well with their recycling rates will now be punished for their work and investment with higher targets than authorities who have not made any effort to tackle their recycling rates in the past. ZC outlined that HCC thinks the key is to have a Hampshire wide target and authorities should be set realistic targets within this based on where they are now as part of a partnership way of thinking. However, it is worth noting that nothing is set in stone at the moment. KL acknowledged this point of view but remains of the opinion that it is unacceptable for authorities to have different targets, especially with the introduction of twin stream which means that all authorities should be offering a consistent service. RM indicated that there are questions as to whether areas with lower contamination results achieve this through work put in by authorities or if some areas have an easier housing stock or more engaged population, this should be considered when looking at residual waste targets. Being consistent across Hampshire is the most essential element regardless of starting point.</p>	
------------	--	--

	<p>AO indicated that he would like to see the modelling and processes behind the new financial arrangement proposals, at the moment the changes seem unjustifiable. Concerned around residual targets and 50/50 sharing, it seems that if an authority exceeds their residual target that HCC benefits financially when all the work is down to the authority, appears to be a money generating activity on HCC's part without justification. AO thinks 100% of the saving should go to authorities if they beat their targets. ZC confirmed that financial modelling has been done and shared with Strategy Officers although these are still subject to change, and the modelling does not include DRS and EPR at the moment. Fifty percent is to incentivise reduction in residual waste. AO outlined that his view is that in order to be incentivised 100% should be given to the authority. SH explained that the 50/50 split recognises that HCC is investing in the new infrastructure and the full capital and revenue costs for processing recycling, despite HCC having no statutory obligation to do so. There is no legal obligation for HCC to introduce a residual waste target but proposing to do so rather than passing on the cost of recycling as HCC consider it a better way to incentivise recycling performance, it also echo's government thinking on residual waste targets. AO can understand when it is presented as a requirement to pay for infrastructure but do not think it should be tried to be presented as an incentive for authorities. SH recognises this but thinks that the proposals are reasonable and encourage authorities to work on their recycling rates. RM noted that it's interesting to think whether a different approach would have been better and looking at contamination rates it is clear that what has been happening until now has not been working, trying something new may be the answer. AO think that most authorities would agree that the current approach has not been working as well as it should have, but the key reason for this is the limit on what can be recycled. RM agree and hope that new MRF can help to solve this problem.</p> <p>RM highlighted the importance of members regularly communicating with their officers to keep up to date with the situation and decisions that need to be made, ideally need to make a governance decision at the next board meeting and authorities need to be prepared for this.</p>	
<p>10.</p> <p>10.1</p>	<p>Renaming PI (report 115)</p> <p>A report was circulated prior to the meeting outlining the background and options for renaming PI. AC summarised these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A – rename and rebrand PI with new logo • Option B –keep PI name but update logo • Option C – keep PI name and logo the same • Option D – either option B or C but with the addition of a new strapline to help explain what PI is <p>AC explained that the historic PI underspend could be used to</p>	

10.2	<p>commission a new logo.</p> <p>Members were asked to vote for their preferred option, with option A (rename and rebrand) successful having received the majority (6) of votes, the details of the new name and logo to be decided at a future meeting.</p>	
11.	<p>Member Involvement in Working Groups (report 116)</p> <p>11.1 A report was circulated prior to the meeting regarding the options for members being more involved in working groups going forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A – Board members function as project sponsors for working groups, regularly attending meetings with the group chairs, and monitoring the progress of groups to present back to board. • Option B – Members do not get involved in working groups directly and updates are given on the progress of groups via strategic board meetings. <p>11.2 Members were asked to vote for their preferred option:</p> <p>Option A received seven votes and will therefore be taken forward.</p>	
12.	<p>Transition to Twin Stream</p> <p>12.1 PNa delivered a presentation outlining the work EBC has been doing in preparation for the switch to twin stream recycling. The presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details on setting up a project team • Collection frequency options • A financial breakdown • Procurement timeline <p>PNa asked for any questions on the presentation.</p> <p>12.2 RM asked what areas of work could be shared if other authorities were interested in doing similar work. PN outlined that anywhere there are similar challenges work could be shared, including work around food waste, container sizes, property storage assessments, excess bin removal projects. EBC is happy to share their work, however some aspects will not be useful for other authorities as obviously it is tailored to EBCs specific situation. RM asked if the officer group shares information automatically or if authorities need to ask. PNa replied that going forward as a group Strategy Officers are looking to get better at sharing information automatically.</p> <p>12.3 RH outlined that a change in leadership in GBC means the cabinet is very new, they are looking at a number of challenges but the most pressing one is around resources, GBC is extremely limited financially. Would be interested in knowing how EBC resourced this work. PNa shared that EBC has employed a project team</p>	

	<p>specifically for the switch to twin stream, some of these are internal members of staff and in this situation their posts are being backfilled. There was a reserve of money for waste, so this is being used but realise that not every authority is in this situation, happy to have separate discussions with authorities to go into more detail.</p> <p>RM highlighted the key message for authorities is that planning for twin stream work will be different for each authority but needs to be started now, and the volume of work associated with it should not be underestimated.</p>	
13.	Disposal Contract Update	
13.1	<p>SH provided an update on the disposal contract and flagged some key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The infrastructure remains heavily pressurised, there are significant levels of residual waste which places pressure on the system, particularly at transfer stations. If any authorities are planning to make changes, can they please let HCC know so the waste flow can be managed. • In April, the MRF residue rate tipped over 25% which is the highest contamination rate ever in Hampshire, acknowledged that it does contain PTT and cartons but there is still a significant level of other material too. • Fires in infrastructure remain an issue, especially as we go into summer with BBQs and batteries. Anything authorities can do to get messaging out there is hugely appreciated, SH knows that some authorities have recently introduced kerbside battery collections which is great. 	
13.2	<p>SH outlined that there is also an issue at a government and regulatory level which is worth addressing. There is a new area of concern from the EA around persistent organic pollutants (POPs) which enter the ecosystem and then remain there building up in the tissue of animals, plants, and humans. The only way to dispose of POPs will be incineration, legislation confirming this will come in from November this year. Soft furnishing including sofas have been identified as containing POPs. This is something to be aware of as some bulky waste items including soft furnishings such as sofas are sent to landfill in Hampshire. POPs will also need to be separated from other material in collection vehicles and different mechanisms will need to be brought in to keep items separate at disposal sites.</p>	
14.	Any other business	
15.	<p>Date of Next Meeting Proposed: Tuesday 25th October 2022, 10-12:30pm. To include the PI AGM. Meeting to be held in Winchester.</p>	