

OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP

Minutes of a meeting of the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership held at Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury on Friday 26 January 2007 at 9.30am.

Present: Councillor Kieron Mallon (in the Chair) (CDC)

Councillors Tony de Vere (VWHDC), David Dodds (SODC), Jean Fooks (Oxford City) and David Harvey (WODC).

Apologies: County Councillor Roger Belson (OCC)

Officers: Wayne Lewis (OWP Co-ordinator), Mike Mackay (VOWHDC), Richard Dudding (OCC), Phil Dunsdon (Oxford City), Eileen Edwards (CDC), Gina Coupar (SODC), Ed Potter (CDC), Anna Robinson (SODC), Jenny Walden (OCC), Fay Dashpar (OCC), Phil Page (WODC), Sally Warner (SODC) and Mark Recchia (CDC).

In attendance for part of the meeting: David Buckle (Chief Executive – SODC).

166 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2006 were received.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of 12 October 2006 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

167 MATTERS ARISING

None.

168 OXFORDSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP GOVERNANCE AND FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Partnership considered a report prepared by Eileen Edwards (CDC) providing an update on the governance and financial arrangements. Eileen Edwards explained that a lot of detailed work had now been carried out both on the new governance and the new financial arrangements. A new partnership agreement had also been drawn up and this was being submitted to all partner authorities for approval in order that arrangements could be made to constitute the OWP as a formal Joint Committee from 1st April 2007. The new financial arrangements would commence in 2009 and replace the existing recycling credits. A small task group led by Michael Jaques from South Oxfordshire District Council had been working on the detail of this, to be completed around the end of February. This would be brought to the Strategy Group on 6 March before being submitted to the next OWP.

Richard Dudding (OCC) commented that the substance of the legal documentation underpinning the governance arrangements was very much in the form approved by the Leaders' Group in October 2006, with just minor tidying up having been done at the request Legal Officers.

RESOLVED that it be noted that very acceptable progress was being made with the governance and financial arrangements and the Partnership's thanks to all officers involved be recorded.

ACTION BY

169

OXFORDSHIRE JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY UPDATE

ACTION BY

The Partnership considered a report prepared by Jenny Walden (OCC) advising that the new Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy had now been agreed by all partner authorities with only very minor amendments being requested. These were to delete the reference to abandoned vehicles as they were not mentioned in any other part of the document (requested by SODC) and to make the deadline for writing individual authority action plans the 31st March 2007 (requested at OWMSSG).

It was proposed that the Strategy and its annexes would only be made available electronically, via each Local Authority website, with no hard copies of the Strategy printed to reduce cost and paper usage. An A5 summary leaflet would however be designed and targeted at residents to raise awareness of the Partnership and the Strategy, to be distributed through libraries, council reception areas, events, Community Action Groups, the Wild Waste Show etc. The summary leaflet would be simple to understand and relevant to Oxfordshire's residents. Its content would include: Introduction to the OWP (including vision); The importance of waste (including the waste hierarchy); The strategy process (including the need for a strategy); Oxfordshire's Strategy highlights (including objectives and policies) and further details (contacts and how to view the Strategy in different forms).

In response to a suggestion from Councillor Harvey that all partners be afforded an opportunity to check the content of the leaflet, Eileen Edwards undertook to bring it before the next meeting so that the OWP could sign off the final version. It was noted that the draft should be sent out in good time to enable any comments to be fed back to officers so that they could be taken on board prior to the meeting.

E Edwards

Jenny Walden (OCC) confirmed that each Local Authority Action Plan, once completed, would be put into the same format as the main strategy, and would also be made available electronically through websites.

RESOLVED that the amendments made in the Strategy document; the need for a strategy summary leaflet; and production of the Strategy as a web based document only, be approved.

**J Walden/
W Lewis**

170

DRAFT BUDGET FOR 2007/08

Andrew Pau (OCC) advised that the OWP needed to set a budget for 2007-08 in accordance with the provisions of the new Partnership Agreement, and a draft had been circulated with the report. The Partnership agreement provided for the budget to be split between 'core' and 'development' funding. Added together these constituted the OWP's gross budget. The net budget was this total, net of grant or other third party income. OCC were required to fund 50% of the net budget and each district 10%.

Normally the budget would be set by the joint committee each October, for three years ahead. The second and third year would be subject to revision in subsequent budget setting. For 2007-08, the Agreement had a transitional clause whereby the budget would be set by the existing informal OWP.

The core funding section of the budget would pay for the Partnership Officer and administration and accounting support. These costs were likely to be in the region of £74,000 per year. The development budget would pay for appropriate projects undertaken by the OWP.

Andrew Pau added that the Government had agreed a 2 year funding programme for local authorities called the WPEG. This started in 2006/7 and continued for 2007/8. Each local authority received its own share of this grant in 2006/7 and agreed that this money should be ring fenced for waste management and partnership working. The Waste Authorities in Oxfordshire relied on the WPEG grant to fund the OWP core funding and projects. The Government had announced that for 2007/8 the WPEG money (approximately £1.5M) would be paid to OCC and only released on a basis agreed by the Public Service Board. OCC was proposing to ask the PSB that they should delegate this task to OWP so that the WPEG funding could be seen to support implementation of the 'No Time To Waste' action plans. It would then be for OWP to agree how the funding was used.

It was therefore suggested that:

1. the first tranche of WPEG funding should be paid towards OWP's direct costs, with the consequence that the OWP will have a nil net budget and no separate funding requirement from partner authorities;
2. the remainder should be paid to partner authorities on a basis to be agreed by OWP, but in the case of 2007-08 with a distribution broadly equivalent to what would have applied if the grant had been paid direct to those authorities;
3. for later years the OWP to consider a different approach, dependant on development of the Partnership.

The new partnership agreement also made provision for a New initiatives Fund 'to help meet the capital and one-off costs of waste management initiatives.' This would be funded by reward grant, in the first place from PSA1, and stand separate from the OWP's own budget, but the OWP will need to agree ground rules for the release of this funding. It was proposed that the Officer Steering Group should be asked to prepare proposed ground rules for the next OWP meeting, so that bids could be invited.

During the course of discussion on this item it was acknowledged that for the sake of transparency any interest received by OCC on funds it held on behalf of OWP needed to be separately identified. It was also accepted that the format of the draft budget could be tidied up so that it could be presented in a clearer fashion.

RESOLVED

- (1) that the Draft budget for 2007/8 be agreed;
- (2) that the PSB be asked to delegate to OWP the release of WPEG funding for 2007/8;
- (3) that the first tranche of WPEG funding be used to meet the direct costs of the OWP budget, and that remaining amounts be released

ACTION BY

**Waste
Strategy
Group**

**R Dudding/
A Pau**

A Pau

to partner authorities on a basis which supports OWP objectives but is broadly proportionate to previous WPEG direct funding; and

- (4) that proposals be made to the next OWP meeting for use of the 'New Initiatives Fund'.

171 **TOP SLICING RECYCLING CREDIT FUND STATEMENT**

Andrew Pau (OCC) stated that there was £22K unallocated in the fund.

172 **JOINT PROCUREMENT STUDY (JOINT WASTE COLLECTION)**

A recent Audit Commission Inspection highlighted the potential for savings and further efficiencies that could be gained from joint procurement. As a result, partner authorities that wished to review their contractual arrangements in line with the recent waste review were working together to determine potential synergies. The desired outcome was to identify areas that could result in economies of scale that would not be achieved by individual authorities working in isolation. The timescale of the project coincided with the conclusion of the current contracts for Vale, South and West Oxfordshire in 2009/2010.

The Partnership had been successful in securing some external support for this project and had been granted £50,000 of consultancy support from Defra to provide technical advice for this study.

Mike Mackay (VOWH) explained that he would act in the role of Project Manager for the duration of this project and would report back to the OWP at future meetings on the progress of the project. The structure of the associated project groups had been set so as to ensure that it had both senior officer and political input and also a working group of Officers to carry out the individual tasks.

The Chairman commented that CDC had some concerns about the project and that it had caused some problems for the two Councils that operated the service using their own DLOs. The bid documentation had come through quite late in the day, and he personally had been surprised to see all 5 Districts named in it rather than just the 3 with contractual deadlines to meet. Anna Robinson (SODC) acknowledged this and explained that, to secure the funding, the bid had to be supported by the partnership as a whole. However, this did not mean that each authority had to participate fully in the project and partners were free to decide to what extent they wished to be involved depending on their individual circumstances.

Eileen Edwards (CDC) added that there was no problem with signing up to a joint project to investigate the value for money aspects of a single collection contract. However, the current paper seemed to have moved beyond that stage, into the procurement process, before a business case had been made out. Mike Mackay assured partners that there were two distinct aspects to the project and it was simply that for those authorities with contractual arrangements set to expire in 2009 the timescales meant that the procurement side had to be run in tandem.

RESOLVED that the project documentation, structure and reporting mechanisms be re-examined to see if there is scope to further clarify the position regarding the two distinct aspects of the project.

ACTION BY

**E Edwards/
A Robinson**

173

LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT - CLEAN AND GREEN INITIATIVE

ACTION BY

David Buckle (SODC) attended the meeting for this item and presented a paper introducing the Clean and Green agenda to the OWP. It identified the relevant stretch targets incorporated into the LAA and the work already in hand to deliver these. The key issue for the OWP was the extent to which it wished to develop an agenda on this subject that went beyond meeting the stretch targets.

David Buckle explained that the Oxfordshire Community Partnership had established a Public Service Board (PSB) to oversee the development of Oxfordshire's LAAs. An LAA Programme Board had also been established with the remit to undertake the detailed development work and a lead officer had been given responsibility for co-ordinating proposals with partners.

One of the LAA priorities was 'Cleaner and Greener Environment' – a strategy to improve the street scene and create a cleaner environment. In order to progress the LAA work the PSB created an officer working group - the Clean and Green Group. It was this group that now needed to be brought under the governance of an already existing, Member level body to be responsible for taking on the delivery of the LAA targets. It made sense for that body to be the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership.

Pump priming of £120,000 was available to be spent on Clean and Green initiatives by the end of 2008/09. A proportion of this was already committed to undertake a street cleansing audit and market research. There was a potential reward grant of over £1million payable on delivery of the agreed stretch targets, 50 per cent of which could be held for further work to deliver the targets of OWP.

The Clean and Green stretch targets, which have been signed off by the PSB, were:

- to reduce by 9 per cent the proportion of relevant land and highways assessed as having combined deposits of litter and detritus falling below acceptable standards. From 2004/05 data the Oxfordshire average was 20 per cent. In other words, the Oxfordshire councils collectively wished to achieve a figure of no more than 11 per cent against BVPI 199a by the end of the financial year 2008/09. For 2005/06 the Oxfordshire average was 16 per cent, so progress was already being made in moving towards the target of 11 per cent.
- BVPI 89 was the percentage of people satisfied with cleanliness standards in their area and a target had also been set to increase this from the 2003/04 average across the county of 62.6 per cent to 69.58 per cent in 2009/10. The measure of BVPI 89 was a survey that took place every three years. The 2006/07 results were now coming in and would be reported on shortly.

With regard to current projects David Buckle explained that Encams were undertaking an audit of street cleansing practice across the county, in order to assess performance in relation to BVPI 199a (litter and detritus) to achieve the figure of no more than 11 per cent. The cost of this project was £20,637 and the timescale for completion was the end of

January 2007. A further piece of work currently underway was a market research project on attitudes to cleanliness in relation to the BVPI 89 target. The cost of this project was £20-£25,000 and the deadline for completion was March 2007.

Councillor De Vere (VOWHDC) expressed the opinion that, whilst he would be happy to see the OWP take on the governance role as proposed, the OWP should not look to broaden out its remit to the wider clean and green agenda, but should concentrate its focus on the LAA stretch targets. The Chairman concurred, considering that the OWP already had a big agenda to tackle, but other elected members felt there was a need to look more closely at what else could be achieved without over-burdening the OWP.

RESOLVED that the OWP is willing to adopt the over-arching governance role for delivery of the Clean and Green stretch targets but considers that further discussions are needed on the extent to which it should look to go beyond this remit.

174

LOCAL AREA AGREEMENTS – PROGRAMME INITIATION DOCUMENTS

Andrew Pau (OCC) reported that, in addition to Clean & Green, the LAA covered two further waste related targets, Municipal Waste Recycling and Commercial Waste. He circulated Project Initiation Documents (PIDs) for these targets.

The LAA target for municipal waste recycling was:

‘To increase recycling and composting county wide to 38% in 2008/9 and to recycle 4,875 extra tonnes of non-biodegradable waste accumulatively from 2006/7 to 2008/9 inclusive.’

This included a stretch target to divert additional non-biodegradable waste and therefore attracted a pump-priming grant of £78K. It was suggested that this grant be spent over the next two financial years (£43K in 2007/8 and £35K in 2008/9). This project would run simultaneously with the WRAP ‘Recycle for Oxfordshire’ campaign in 2007/8. The two projects had been designed to compliment each other rather than create duplication.

The LAA target for commercial waste was:

‘By 2008/9, 60 businesses take part in a programme of awareness raising and support to achieve 60% recycling rate.’

This target was not a stretch target and therefore did not have a pump-priming grant or a performance reward grant. The work detailed in the PID already formed the core areas of work undertaken by the County Council’s Commercial Waste Reduction Officer.

Andrew Pau explained that whilst the PSB had overall responsibility for the delivery of the LAA, individual targets needed to be governed by an appropriate body. It was proposed that the OWP assume responsibility for all three waste targets. This would require the OWP to monitor and manage progress towards the targets and regularly report to the PSB.

ACTION BY

D Buckle

With regard to the target for municipal waste recycling, some members retained concerns about the possibility of duplication with the WRAP bid if the pump-priming grant was used in the manner proposed in the PID (i.e. for further advertising). Fay Dashpar (OCC) commented that the advertising campaign planned through the pump-priming grant would run on beyond the end of the WRAP campaign and would also include things not part of the WRAP bid, such as lamppost advertising. A discussion then took place about whether this form of advertising sent out the right messages when part of the aim of the group was to reduce fly-posting and it also added to the general advertising clutter. It was acknowledged that the results of a waste compositional analysis for Oxfordshire would shortly be available. It was agreed that the PID for municipal waste would be revised as appropriate in light of these findings, thus allowing the project to be better targeted to the requirements of each local authority.

ACTION BY

F Dashpar

RESOLVED that the OWP agrees to:

E Edwards

- (1) become the governing body for the three waste LAA targets; and
- (2) the Project Initiation Documents for Commercial Waste LAA target.
- (3) Consider a revised proposal for the Municipal waste LAA target at its next meeting

175 **FOOD WASTE AND WASTE TREATMENT PROJECT UPDATE**

Andrew Pau (OCC) reported that the County Council had now formally agreed to go ahead and procure food waste processing capacity. This project was being lead by County Procurement. The timescale for delivery of food waste processing remained as March/April 2009.

With regard to the Waste Treatment Project, Andrew Pau added that unfortunately Frankie Upton, OCC Waste Project manager, had been taken ill and this had meant a delay to the project. However, three external advisors had now been formally engaged; Entec – Technical, Ernst & Young – Financial and Trowers & Hamlins – Legal.

Members stressed the importance of delivering the food waste project on time, and preferably earlier than currently projected. To this end it was suggested that the £22K unallocated in the Top Slicing Fund might be utilised for buying in additional support to help progress the project.

RESOLVED that the position be noted and that the £22K unallocated in the Top Slicing Fund be utilised for buying in additional support to help progress the food waste project.

A Pau

176 **WRAP RECYCLE FOR OXFORDSHIRE CAMPAIGN UPDATE**

Jenny Walden (OCC) reported that the OWP had been awarded a total of £435,719 from WRAP to embark on an 18 month recycling campaign, to raise awareness and increase participation in recycling schemes across the county. The project would run until March 2008. Cherwell District Council was the lead authority for the campaign, and a project manager based at Cherwell was managing the campaign. The project commencement had however been delayed due to issues in getting

WRAP's Funding Agreement signed and the majority of the work for year one would now have to be concentrated between January and March. All year one projects had to be completed and paid for by 31st March 2007. The immediate work would be on collection container stickers, new residents packs, WODC's collection calendar and bring site stickers.

ACTION BY

A design agency had also been chosen, DNA, and work was starting on the design elements of the campaign. WRAP funded the campaign as 'Recycle for Oxfordshire' and as agreed when the bid was submitted, the Recycle for Oxfordshire logo formed the central part of the campaign design. As such it would be the only logo appearing on the majority of things produced. This was a requirement of WRAP in order to get the funding. However, a press release template had been drawn up and approved by WRAP and press releases contained all six council logos. Therefore, whilst council logos would not appear on everything produced, the link between a residents' Local Authority and the campaign would still be evident.

Whilst recognising that it was a condition of the WRAP funding that the 'Recycle for Oxfordshire' logo be used predominantly, Members felt that this was not helpful when Districts were the collection authorities. It was acknowledged that the 'Recycle for X District' logo could still be used on elements of the campaign that were District specific.

RESOLVED that the position be noted.

177

WRAP HOME COMPOSTING SCHEME 2007 UPDATE

Jenny Walden (OCC) reported that the 2006 home composting scheme subsidised by Thames Water had been very successful, selling over 7,600 composters, despite supply problems during the summer. The scheme had ended on 31st December 2006. Initially the Thames Water scheme did not extend into 2007. Therefore, a bid was submitted to WRAP for the OWP to become a partner in their 2007 home composting scheme. The bid was successful and the scheme had been running since 1st January 2007.

For its part WRAP was delivering a range of initiatives, such as free compost bins for schools and publicity materials for events. The OWP was, amongst other things, funding a Royal Mail door drop to advertise the scheme. This would take place between February and December 2007 and cost approximately £12,000. In response to members questions as to why the door drop was being undertaken over such a long period, Jenny Walden explained that this was the best service that could be obtained from Royal Mail. Members felt that, with hindsight, a tear out page within each Council's own newsletters might have been a better option.

RESOLVED that the position be noted.

178

WASTE SITES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT PROJECT UPDATE

Andrew Pau (OCC) reported that consultants (ERM) had been appointed by DEFRA in December 2006 to assist with work on the preparation of the Waste Sites Development Plan Document, which formed part of the Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework. It would allocate

sites considered appropriate for development of waste management facilities. Allocation of a site gave a presumption in favour of such development being acceptable, with details to be considered through the submission of a planning application. There were presently 179 sites on the long list.

It was important that any site thought to have potential for waste facilities development was included on the list for consultation. Subsequent inclusion of a site that had not been the subject of the initial consultation exercise would likely require further justification. The consultation document would give planning details of the long listed sites. It would be sent to a number of statutory bodies, District Councils, Town and Parish Councils, local interest groups, operating companies, members of the Minerals and Waste Stakeholder Forum and all County Councillors. A copy would also be posted on the County Council website and made available in local libraries. Considerable interest could be expected to be generated by publication of this initial long list and ERM would be recording all relevant comments for consideration at the next stage.

RESOLVED that the position be noted.

179 **THAMES VALLEY WASTE FORUM**

The Thames Valley Waste Forum was a group formed to consider waste issues across the Thames Valley region and was run and operated by ACTVAR (Association of Councils of the Thames Valley Region). All of the Waste Partnerships in the region were represented on it. The Thames Valley Forum met quarterly, with the next meeting scheduled for 23rd March 2007 at High Wycombe District Council at 10.30am.

Eileen Edwards (CDC) reported that traditionally the Chairman of the OWP plus one other member had represented this partnership, however, due to the interest shown, this had been widened to include all Members.

RESOLVED that the OWP support the decision to widen the membership of the Thames Valley Waste Forum and that a list of all Members of the OWP be forwarded to Barry Deller, Director of ACTVAR in order that they can be invited to the next meeting.

180 **CONSULTATION DOCUMENT FROM DEFRA - CONTROLS ON THE HANDLING, TRANSFER AND TRANSPORT OF WASTE**

Eileen Edwards (CDC) introduced the consultation document, for which the consultation period ended on the 30th March 2007. She explained that the Government had been working closely with the Environment Agency and the Local Government Association to develop and implement a Fly-Tipping Strategy to deal with waste crime and illegal waste disposal in a more pro-active, preventative manner. There was a lot of primary legislation and associated regulations involved and these were in need of review to make them easier to understand and ensure they promoted compliance and were simpler and easier for enforcing authorities to use. The consultation document included a range of options to help inform this revision and the outcome of the review would be one set of consolidated and modernised new regulations.

RESOLVED that the Enforcement Group be asked to consider the consultation document and the questions detailed in Annex A and,

ACTION BY

E Edwards

E Edwards

having first copied their response to all OWP Members in advance of being sent to DEFRA, to respond on behalf of the OWP within the deadline set.

ACTION BY

181 **WASTE COLLECTION OPTIONS**

Eileen Edwards (CDC) reminded members that at the last meeting of the OWP Councillor de Vere (VWHDC) had requested an explanation as to why Option I had been chosen as the preferred option when Option A, on evaluation, appeared to offer significant financial savings. It had been agreed that the Officer Strategy Group would consider this and give an explanation setting out the reasons why Option I had been selected as opposed to Option A.

The recycling and composting options assessed and modelled were considered by the OWP on several occasions and the advantages and disadvantages of these were discussed in detail. Unlike other option appraisals it was hard to decide that one was 'the best' as there were a range of issues which impacted on the decision which could not be included in the evaluation model as they affected individual Districts. In the final analysis the deliverability of the options was considered critical. Option I was based on either existing or preferred collection options and hence was much more deliverable than Option A, which had required some Districts to withdraw popular services and go backwards in relation to their level of recycling, both of which were considered unacceptable.

Councillor De Vere thanked officers for providing this explanation.

RESOLVED that the position be noted.

182 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

WEEE Directive

Phil Page (WODC) drew the OWP's attention to the WEEE Directive and its implications for the treatment of waste IT equipment and indicated that he would bring a paper on the issue to the next meeting, if members were agreeable.

RESOLVED that a paper on this matter be submitted to the next meeting.

P Page

183 **END OF MEETING**

The meeting ended at 11.45 am.