



INTEGRA

087

## Project Integra – minutes of meeting

Name of meeting	Project Integra Strategic Board– Minutes of Meeting	
Date of meeting	Tuesday 26 <sup>th</sup> February 2019	
Venue	Hampshire County Council	
Attendees	Councillors:	
	Hayley Eachus (HE)	Basingstoke and Deane BC (Chair)
	Jan Warwick (JW)	Winchester City Council
	Alan Oliver (AO)	Hart District Council
	Alison Hoare (AH)	New Forest District Council
	Rupert Kyrle (RK)	Eastleigh Borough Council
	Tony Ward (TW)	Test Valley Borough Council
	Simon Martin (SM)	Fareham Borough Council
	Gary Hughes (GH)	Havant Borough Council
	Piers Bateman (PB)	Gosport Borough Council
	Jacqui Rayment (JR)	Southampton City Council
	Maurice Sheehan (MS)	Rushmoor Borough Council
	Officers Attending:	
	Mark Bowler (MB)	Fareham Borough Council
	Colette Hill (PCC)	Portsmouth City Council
	Ruth Whaymand (RW)	Rushmoor Borough Council
	Stevyn Ricketts (SR)	Gosport Borough Council
	Dave Tyrie (DT)	Southampton City Council
	Carl Mathias (CM)	Havant Borough Council/East Hants DC
	Sarah Robinson (SR)	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
	Paul Naylor (PN)	Eastleigh Borough Council
	Paul Wykes (PW)	Test Valley Borough Council
	Sam Horne (SH)	Hampshire County Council
	Chris Noble (CN)	New Forest District Council
	Steve Tilbury (ST)	Winchester City Council
	Simon Larbey (SL)	Veolia
	Martyn Cole (MC)	Hampshire County Council
	Campbell Williams (CW)	Hampshire County Council
	Chitra Nadarajah (CN)	Hampshire County Council
	Zoe Coote (ZC)	Hampshire County Council

Abigail Cooke	(AC)	PI
Vicky Beechey	(VB)	PI
Betsy Reed	(BR)	Kin&Co

**Actions**

**1 Introductions**

**2 Apologies**

2.1 Member apologies:  
 Cllr Graham Stallard (TVBC – Cllr Tony Ward deputising)  
 Cllr Adam Jackman (RBC Deputy)  
 Cllr Rob Humby (HCC)

Officer apologies:  
 James Duggin (RBC – Ruth Whaymand attending)  
 Claire Hughes (EHDC)  
 Nicola Watts (EHDC)

**3 Declarations of Interest**

3.1 None declared.

**4 Minutes of the last Board meeting held 11 October 2018 (Report 083)**

**4.1 RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the previous board meeting were agreed and signed by the **AC** Chair.

**5 Matters arising from the minutes**

5.1 All items completed, or to be discussed during the meeting.

**6 National updates in Resources and Waste (incl Strategy, Consultations and PI Action Plan)**

6.1 VB presented an update of the slides from October 2018 Board, updated with information on the Resources and Waste Strategy and the four consultations:

1. EPR – deadline 13<sup>th</sup> May
2. DRS – deadline 13<sup>th</sup> May
3. Consistency – deadline 13<sup>th</sup> May
4. Plastic Tax – deadline 12<sup>th</sup> May

VB will circulate the slides. **VB**

6.2 PI will draft and submit responses for each, but all Partners are urged to submit their own responses, as the PI response will only count as one.

6.3 GH commented that the most frequently littered item in HBC is McDonalds packaging and asked how they would pay for littering. VB responded that they will have to contribute, but how that mechanism will work, and the money redistributed is not yet clear and what the EPR consultation is looking to clarify. VB also highlighted a campaign in 2018 by Kent Resource Partnership which placed tall angled bins at service stations to enable lorry drivers to be able to throw their rubbish away more easily.

6.4 A workshop was held to get the Strategic Board's thoughts on two key consultation questions, a summary of the responses is as follows:

1. Views on the free garden waste collection proposal. What might the impacts be for local authorities.
  - Loss of income
  - If the government provide funding, how are costs collected and agreed
  - Disincentivising home composting
  - Disproportionate approach – more money will be spent on those with gardens than those without
  - Implications on disposal capacity and HWRCs
2. What circumstances may prevent separate collection of paper, card, glass, metals and plastics?
  - Issues with space for bins both in the home and on the kerbside
  - Increased cost of collection
  - Round times would be increased
  - Health and safety concerns with crews having to lift several bins
  - It will be hard to get resident buy-in.

6.5 VB sent out an action plan working group email on the 25<sup>th</sup> February. A meeting will be setup shortly, if anyone else is interested in being a part of the working group please let VB or HE know. **ALL**

## **7 Hampshire Waste Partnership Project Update (Report 084)**

7.1 CW presented slides based on the summary of the Eunomia report which was circulated with the papers for the meeting.

7.2 SH updated on the fifth work package not part of the Eunomia work, the new MRF (sMRF). Work was paused on the sMRF whilst waiting for updates from the government. Work has now recommenced, and approval is being sought for Veolia to complete a more detailed design and quote. Glass will not be included in the DMR stream as it has negative impacts on the quality of the other material and doesn't fit with government updates. Once approval has been gained, the work by Veolia will take three to six months, so should be completed by early winter.

7.3 PB highlighted his concern that plans for the sMRF are being progressed ahead of the national strategy and responses to consultations. CW responded that enough information is known from the Resources and Waste Strategy and information

provided in the consultations to be able to progress with the sMRF. Additionally, Veolia will design the sMRF with enough flexibility for changes.

- 7.4 PB asked if the designs for the MRF will be presented to PISB for approval. SH replied that the design will be shared with the PI board, but not for approval. The final decision for the sMRF will be made by the Executive Member at HCC as the disposal contract sits with HCC. SH also highlighted that infrastructure takes time to deliver, so even if the sMRF was approved immediately it would still take three years before coming onstream.
- 7.5 RK asked if the specification for the sMRF includes having an Anaerobic Digestion (AD) plant on site to give local authorities capacity for food waste collections and potentially generate clean energy to help power the sMRF. SH replied that this is being considered, however it would require a very large site to co-locate the two and give space for vehicle movements. Options for using AD capacity outside of Hampshire are also being considered.
- 7.6 SM expressed his disappointment at the Eunomia report, describing it as theoretical and favouring systems that Eunomia advocate, without recognising key issues. Eunomia don't mention any innovations like converting plastics back to oil. CW replied that the Eunomia report looked at whole system costs, including disposal and collection authorities.
- 7.7 AO asked if by the conference that CW mentioned in his presentation (proposed Autumn 2019), there will be a presentation on how food waste collection and disposal will be provided for, or whether local authorities will expect it to be added on to their existing service and contracts. CW replied that the report suggests quick wins so instead of setting up twelve individual food waste services, setup one county-wide service. HE asked if it would be worth the PISB commissioning HCC to look into a food waste collection. SH replied that HCC are happy to work with all partners but doesn't see a county-wide system being viable. PN added that EBC are happy to share their approach to food waste if helpful.
- 7.8 GH commented that although the public would like to recycle PTT so it will be designed into the new sMRF, should the focus be more on higher weight items like textiles. SH agreed that this was a valid point, and the waste composition analysis has shown how much recycling is still being put in residual waste. Getting recyclables out of residual would boost the recycling rate and increase income. VB added that this also increases capacity in residents' residual bins, and that the issue of cross contamination is something that PI Strategy Officers group has been focusing on.
- 7.9 JR is glad that the sMRF is being unpaused - a comment echoed by many, but also expressed her disappointment at the contents of the Eunomia summary report. CW replied that this is now HIOWLA taking the lead, and the planned conference will set the direction of travel.
- 7.10 GH commented that incinerator bottom ash (IBA) is included in the recycling rate of some authorities, if we could do the same it would increase the recycling rate without

doing anything. VB responded that IBA will not count towards the UK recycling rate going forwards.

*To resolve that the public be excluded from the meeting during the following items of business, as it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during these items there would be disclosure to them of exempt information within Paragraph 1 or Paragraph 3 of Part I Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, and further that in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons set out in the report.*

## **8 Behavioural Insights (Confidential Report 085)**

## **9 Waste Composition Analysis Update (Report 086)**

9.1 VB presented slides showing the results of the waste composition analysis, highlighting in particular the amount of recyclables still being placed into residual waste bins.

9.2 JW noted that if the contamination rate could be brought down it would significantly increase the recycling rate and asked if there are any recommendations PI should be taking to HCC/HIOWLA with regards to what should be included in the sMRF (i.e. textiles, food). SH replied that HCC have all the same information and have already discussed textiles and small WEEE to ensure that all opportunities for the sMRF are being considered. However, in reality the sMRF will only deal with DMR. SH asked if there anything authorities would like to do to let HCC know. VB suggested that this can be picked up in the action plan.

9.3 It was agreed that the PI Report for the waste composition analysis could be put on the PI website for public information.

## **10 Any Other Business**

10.1 HE advised that given the frustrations expressed during the meeting regarding progress, that this is an opportunity to go back to individual authorities and use those frustrations to move forwards positively.

## **11 Date of Next Meeting**

11.1 Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> July 2019 at Fareham Borough Council.