

**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL  
9TH NOVEMBER 2021**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)

Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe, Needham and Parton

Councillor Harper-Davies (Cabinet Lead Member for Community Support and Equalities)

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces  
Democratic Services Officer (EB)  
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: None

The Chair stated that the meeting would be livestreamed and recorded and the recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

1. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY AND PERSONAL INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

2. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

3. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

*Councillor Needham arrived at the meeting at 6.09pm.*

4. SCRUTINY SCOPE DOCUMENT

Considered and discussed, the scrutiny scope document for the Panel, agreed by Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 11th October 2021 and updated to list Panel membership and meeting dates.

Matters suggested to look at/list on the scrutiny scope document were confirmed as matters for the County Council decision as waste disposal authority (provision of recycling and household waste sites, use of incinerator). These were excluded from scrutiny by the Panel, but this did not preclude making representations to other bodies. Confirmed that parties worked together, illustrated by forthcoming draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy. Whether the Council's fleet would be

suitable given the changes proposed by Environment Bill was appropriate for consideration under item 7 in the agenda.

## **AGREED**

1. Scrutiny scope document be noted;
2. Panel to consider forthcoming draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy at a later meeting. This included modelling of performance/carbon impact of different recycling arrangements/options and would be useful to Panel's scrutiny.

## 5. COUNCIL'S WASTE AND RECYCLING DATA AND COMPARISONS

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, a breakdown and analysis of the Council's waste and recycling data, benchmarked against similar local authorities, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Noted, downward trend in percentage recycled, particularly in 2016, reason not known, could be affected by change in regulations/categories.
- (ii) Increase in Charnwood garden waste charge over time had not adversely affected subscriber numbers.
- (iii) Current 50% recycling target set by EU Waste Directive in 2009. New Environment Bill proposed 65% (by 2035).
- (iv) Composition of waste important. Reference to significant effect of garden waste on percentage recycled.
- (v) Noted, peak performance in percentage recycled in 2011/12 for all authorities listed, reason not known. Reference to dry summers affecting garden waste tonnage. Some fluctuations could be due to factors not within Council's control.
- (vi) Noted, percentage recycled excluding garden waste, NWLDC significantly lower, only authority listed that did not have co-mingled collection (separation/sorting by residents required). Concern that the latter system being proposed in Environment Bill.
- (vii) Noted, gradual decline waste sent for composting since 2016/17. Difficult to know whether that had been impacted by any increase in home composting. NWLDC performed best, only authority listed with free of charge garden waste service.
- (viii) Noted, Charnwood collected most tonnage residual waste due to being biggest district and uptick of 10% due to Covid, but residual waste per household comparatively low in Charnwood, positive.
- (ix) Noted, comparatively, Charnwood recycling rates reasonably good, concern that 65% proposed by Environment Bill would be difficult to achieve.

## **AGREED**

The presentation and discussion be noted.

6. ENVIRONMENT BILL - WASTE MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS AND CHANGES REQUIRED

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, the proposals in Environment Bill regarding waste management and changes this would necessitate, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

In advance of the meeting, members of the Panel had been asked to read: DEFRA – Consultation on Consistency in Household and Business Recycling in England May 2021 (included at item 7 on the agenda).

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Noted, likely to have considerable impact, including in respect of costs.
- (ii) Noted, problem of over-consumption increasing, importance of establishing a more circular economy, better that was done, less new raw materials needed.
- (iii) Reference to Council being in the middle, between manufacturers/Government and waste disposal authority (County Council). Limited impact Charnwood as waste collection authority could have. Unable to decide type of packaging being produced or disposal facilities. Noted, this Council could have influence, work to play its part, ensure residents had opportunity to manage waste in a responsible way.
- (iv) Noted, effect of waste and how it was managed on carbon emissions.
- (v) Noted, Environment Bill included proposals to encourage packaging that was easier to recycle, Extended Producer Responsibility, to be explained later in presentation.
- (vi) Difficult to find out how much recycled material was being used in packaging.
- (vii) Waste hierarchy outlined, better to prevent waste or reuse items than to recycle, including in respect of carbon footprint. Recovery of, for example, energy from waste better than disposal. Noted, around 70% Leicestershire's residual waste incinerated for energy/heat recovery. No revenue to Charnwood from that, cost to County Council.
- (viii) Noted, Environment Bill expectation/legal obligation was improved recycling rates despite the ideal being prevention or reuse of items first, difficult for waste collection authority. Better to consider how much waste a household produced than how much was being recycled? View that correct to consider prevention and reuse of items, even if that adversely affected recycling rates.
- (ix) Currently, Charnwood recycling at around 43%, step change would be needed to achieve 65% proposed in Environment Bill. Significant change had been affected in the past, had started with one bin that all waste went in.
- (x) Proposed Deposit Return Scheme and likely issues for Council outlined. Hopefully assist people in understanding value of packaging. Understood that promised burden funding from Government would not cover loss of revenue from receiving less materials via household waste collection. Noted, this was more a risk for the County Council. View that proposal was good idea, despite likely impact on Charnwood's recycling rates, better that recycled than not.
- (xi) Proposed Extended Producer Responsibility outlined, "polluter pays". Levy for hard to recycle items. Noted, most of recycling collected was packaging, could be significant source of income to Council, offset increased costs anticipated

from other elements of Bill. Not much detail yet on how payments would be decided/made, possibly based on what collected and its composition. Confirmed that Council already recorded this information via sample checks. Unclear how what manufacturers were producing would be recorded.

- (xii) How much recyclable material was within the residual waste was known, although not monitored as frequently/not required by DEFRA. Done every few years, wagon of residual waste examined, was cost involved. Results of last exercise (about 2 years ago) could be shared with Panel. Better prevention of that could assist recycling rates. Noted that residual waste, 30-40% by weight was food, did get small amount of recyclable materials, garden waste, nappies. Concern that charging for garden waste meant it ended up in residual waste, this was not the case based on analysis of its composition.
- (xiii) Noted, Environmental Bill did not support co-mingled collection of recyclables, rather sorting/separation by residents. Reason, prevention of fragments of glass causing problem for paper mills. Exemption would be possible (TEEP). View that proposal was more complicated for residents and would result in lower recycling rates, however considered that materials would be cleaner/better quality. Considerable debate on issue. Better to address paper mill issue than change way 100s local authorities collected recycling in a significantly more resource efficient way (co-mingled). Re: burden funding, understood that would be for food waste/garden waste, not this proposal, so Council likely to have to meet cost of new receptacles, vehicles, training. Concern that cost would be considerable, must be case for economic exemption. Noted, significant waste likely in form of existing bins that may no longer be fit for purpose. Concern that harder system was, less likely that residents would do. Twin stream option easier than multi stream.
- (xiv) Re: when Bill would be effective, some elements would require secondary legislation, contact with DEFRA had suggested 2023/24 originally, anticipated may get pushed back to 2025, but that was an assumption/not certain. Considerable work needed to introduce.
- (xv) Re: core set of recyclables that would need to be collected, Council already collected all of those. Positive, but did mean the task to increase recycling was more difficult. Some scope if materials were added to collection, those would be counted in recycling performance, for example textiles, batteries, small electricals, specialist items such as toothbrushes. Noted, worth considering potential to do this.
- (xvi) Proposed weekly separate collection of food waste outlined. Already stated, 30-40% of residual waste. Considerable cost for the Council, both revenue and capital estimated in presentation. Burden funding would apply, but unclear if in full and ongoing. Concern that proposal might legitimise food waste when progress had been made in people considering the matter more. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces' previous experience with food waste collection suggested the opposite, that seeing food waste separately increased awareness and resulted in action to reduce it. Important that any food waste collection was accompanied by information campaign, principal aim should be to prevent. Concern that food waste might be transported some distance for processing.
- (xvii) Re: whether residual waste collection could be reduced if 30-40% food waste was collected separately and those resources transferred, may not be an option, achieving all of that 30-40% in the food waste collection rather than residual

would be difficult and number of households not static. Food waste collection would required separate/new fleet.

- (xviii) Reference to NWLDC food waste collection trial, taken to plant in Warwickshire. Were capacity issues in respect of anaerobic digestion facilities. Re: transport distances, local transfer stations may be needed. Government wanted food waste collection due to methane it generated in landfill, but waste in Leicestershire mostly incinerated.
- (xix) Confirmed, Charnwood had responded to consultation on Bill proposals, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces happy to share those responses with the Panel. Many questions had required yes/no answers, but concern expressed regarding costs and inability of Council to fund if Government didn't fully cover costs long-term.
- (xx) Proposed free of charge garden waste collection outlined. Substantial loss of income given Council currently charged. Government had indicated contribution to costs, but not for loss of income, adverse effect on those already providing. Re: concern that county councils already in difficult funding position for higher priority services such as adult social care, clarified that for food and garden waste proposals, costs would be to collection authority, disposal authorities likely cost saving as disposal of residual waste most expensive and should be less of this. Financial benefit to recycling more, but this would not be shared by collection authorities. Question as to whether the Government understood the financial position of local authorities? Likely costs to Council of implementing proposals was a significant concern. The Cabinet Lead Member for Community Support and Equalities advised that Jane Hunt MP for Loughborough was a member of a Government Waste Management Panel, it might be useful to raise the concern on this with her. It was understood that representations to MP had been made, also reiterated that Council had made its views known. Reference to forthright response of LGA on the matter.
- (xxi) Discussion regarding use of sanctions, encouragement, information to improve recycling rates, whether evidence of effectiveness elsewhere. Noted, Fixed Penalty Notices no longer available to Council, increasing awareness, effective communication, incentives such as competitions were options, could be cost effective, particularly social media. Council did refuse to collect bin if aware contaminated. Noted, important to explore this, not sure residents always aware of all the items that could be recycled via co-mingled collection, for example various soft plastics. Important to communicate a positive message. Related to key task for Panel, "identifying barriers and ways to overcome them".

## **AGREED**

1. The presentation and discussion be noted.
2. The Council's responses to the consultation on the Environment Bill be sent to members of the Panel.
3. Further to (xii) above, results of the most recent examination of a wagon of residual waste be sent to members of the Panel.

4. Further to (xx) above, Jane Hunt MP for Loughborough be invited to attend a meeting of the Panel to discuss the concerns regarding the Environment Bill outlined above, particularly the cost implications for the Council.

7. FURTHER PANEL MEETINGS AND KEY TASK PLANNING

Considered and discussed, the key tasks in the scrutiny scope document to be considered at the next meeting of the Panel and any work members of the Panel would undertake in advance of that meeting.

**AGREED**

1. Key tasks to be considered at next Panel meeting on 14th December 2021:

*“Investigate other local authorities that are considered to be leaders in waste management and look at ways to apply to Charnwood Borough Council, taking into account demographics” – via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.*

*“Investigate new research, technology and methods that could help improve our recycling rates” – via investigation by members of the Panel prior to the meeting, the Chair would provide guidance on what was required in this respect.*

2. A visit by members of the Panel to the Casepak Materials Recycling Facility be arranged as soon as possible.
3. Draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy be scheduled for consideration at Panel’s meeting on 2nd February 2022 – via presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.
4. Further scheduled meetings of the Panel, as set out on the agenda, be noted.

NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.

**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL  
2ND FEBRUARY 2022**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)

Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe and Needham

Councillor Harper-Davies (Cabinet Lead Member  
for Community Support and Equalities)

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces  
Democratic Services Officer (SW)  
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: None

The Chair stated that the meeting would be livestreamed and recorded, and the recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

8. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY AND PERSONAL INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

9. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

10. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 9th November 2021 were confirmed as a correct record.

11. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

12. LOCAL AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED TO BE LEADERS IN WASTE MANAGEMENT

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, other local authorities considered to be leaders in waste management and ways to apply to Charnwood, taking into account demographics, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Presentation set out top 5 performing authorities 2020-21 (England), percentage recycled, collection methods, whether weekly food waste collection, whether

garden waste collection and any charge. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces proposed to provide further information to next meeting on performance of audit family of authorities like Charnwood.

- (ii) Noted, none of top 5 were hitting 65% recycling target proposed by Environment Bill, although some close. Authorities ranked 2 and 4 had shared service element, and authorities ranked 1 and 3 located next to each other.
- (iii) Noted, all top 5 had weekly food waste collection, all had charged for garden waste collection, all had comingled collection (top performer separated paper/card). Environment Bill was proposing separate not comingled collection of recyclables. Expected that top performers might provide free garden waste collection, not the case, all charging at approximately median price. Would be interesting to know if lowest performing authorities were more likely to require separation/sorting of recycling by residents, noted that authorities with lower recycling tended to be urban, city.
- (iv) Noted, authority ranked 3 collected recycling weekly, residual waste fortnightly, gave an importance to the recycling element. Size of that district (area/population) not known, would need to investigate.
- (v) View that Charnwood garden waste collection service excellent, good value. Also, collection of food waste might reduce contamination of recycling.
- (vi) What was preventing Charnwood from achieving performance at this level? Multiple factors. No food waste collection (approximately 40% of residual waste was food). Top 5 all appeared to be more affluent, leafy, larger properties, bigger gardens, therefore more garden waste. Charnwood not super urban, but also not very green/affluent.
- (vii) Reason Environment Bill proposed separate collection of recyclables, prevention of fragments of glass causing problems for paper mills. Charnwood's current fleet single compartment so difficult to separate, cost of changing diminished as fleet got older.
- (viii) More specific information would be useful, characteristics of areas concerned, percentage of recycling total that was food waste. Latter might illustrate how much Charnwood could improve recycling performance by collecting food waste. In response, thought that data available was material sent for composting/anaerobic digestion combined (garden and food waste). Development of draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy had involved high level modelling of options, all included food waste collection as Government likely to mandate in 2024 or 2025, provided prediction of recycling rates likely to be achieved. Strategy programmed for consideration by Panel at next meeting.
- (ix) Potential cost of implementing food waste collection, or a trial of? In response, had been cost analysis done with other Leicestershire authorities approximately 5 years ago, now old information. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces estimated the cost of food waste collection with residual waste collection continuing fortnightly at in excess of £1m per annum. Top 5 performing authorities were doing so, how? In response, residual waste most expensive for County Council (waste disposal authority) to dispose of, food waste approximately a quarter of that cost. Some waste collection authorities may have arrangements with their waste disposal authority to share the benefit of increasing food waste disposal and reducing residual waste, affected a subsidy of the cost of collection. There was no such arrangement in Leicestershire, so all costs would fall to the waste collection authority. Reference intention of Government to make food waste collection mandatory, had indicated it would



fund any new commitment, certainty that this would be at 100% of cost and ongoing would be welcomed. Concern if funding subsequently withdrawn, particularly given position of local authority finances. Suggestion that Jane Hunt, MP be asked to put that request to Government, confirmed that those representations had been made.

- (x) Home composting should be encouraged, noted that this would not assist Council's recycling rates, but was more environmentally friendly than collecting food waste. County Council scheme for reduced cost composters referenced, this could be promoted. Home composting would reduce weight of residual waste. Disappointing that Government targets did not reward reducing waste in such ways, prevention better for environment/correct focus.
- (xi) Reference to a key task not yet considered/scheduled "identify barriers and looking at ways to overcome them". Challenges posed by flats/communal bins. Stated that recycling rates not available by ward but were available by collection round listing streets covered. Noted, useful to receive that breakdown when panel considered that key task, also to incorporate engagement of residents as part of that.
- (xii) Noted, indication of composition of residual waste had been provided at last meeting.

## **AGREED**

1. The presentation and discussion be noted.
2. Further consideration of this key task be scheduled for the next Panel meeting on 15th March 2022, via a further presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces to provide information on performance of audit family of authorities like Charnwood, noting also (i) above query as to whether lowest performing authorities were more likely to require separation/sorting of recycling by residents and (ii) useful to know characteristics of areas.
3. Note paragraph (xi) above for when Panel considers key task "identify barriers and looking at ways to overcome them".

## 13. NEW RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY AND METHODS THAT COULD HELP IMPROVE RECYCLING RATES

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, new research, technology and methods that could help improve recycling rates, via proposals/suggestions from members of the Panel (item 7 on the agenda details these).

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Suggestion - take part in/promote campaign to prevent contamination of recycling by nappies. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces noted, could get more involved/look into that (also County Council work to promote reusable nappies, waste minimisation campaigns). Possibility of promoting campaign on side of fleet and via social media. Nappies could be large proportion of residual waste for some families, also significant contaminant in recycling bins.

- (ii) Suggestion – visual display of waste items and what bin they go in. View that good visual, easy to understand, no language barrier. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces suggested good for street bins in key locations, could look at cost. Currently looking at trial of compaction street bins, less frequent emptying, indicated when needed to be, positive carbon impact. Noted, panel may wish to recommend trial of suggested visual display bin, prevention of contamination of recycling in street bins. Noted, anticipated less recycling in street bins once deposit return schemes introduced, also less littering. Visual display could be more useful to educate/inform than a paper leaflet, help use of correct bin both out and at home. Also, increase awareness of what could be recycled in Borough.
- (iii) Suggestion – publicity. Importance recognised. Key messages, effective methods. Did not wish to add to waste in doing so. Understanding psychology of what persuaded different people to participate. Possible use of fleet lorries and social media channels already highlighted. Information events, videos, competitions, work with schools particularly important. Suggested that a recommendation of the panel could be that resources were committed to produce effective strategy around increasing recycling and reducing residual waste. Contract with Serco provided £10k per annum for communications and some staff time could be allocated from Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces team. Noted, had been in business continuity mode over past couple of years, hoped to focus more on communications moving forward. Recognised, challenging environment over past couple of years, how hard Council and Serco staff had worked in that time. Suggested, Borough wide schools recycling challenge. Example given of zero residual waste challenge. Developing communications was supported.
- (iv) Suggestion – scrap store and library of things. Reduced residual waste and consumption, could also be more affordable. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces advised both would require partnership with suitable organisation in social/voluntary sector to progress. Possible partners discussed, initial enquires could be made, Councillor Ward could do so with Transitions and Men/Women in Sheds, Councillor Forrest could do so with John Storer House. Noted, investigating only at this stage, to assist the panel with any recommendations it might wish to include in its report. Reference to repair shops (previously run by Transitions, Fearon Hall, similar group in Leicester City referenced by Councillor Needham, Leicester Hackspace, she could pass details to the Chair).
- (v) Suggestion – items not collected in household recycling. Small electricals, paint, printer cartridges, batteries, terracycle items. Was there scope for household recycling sites to accept such items? Only 2 currently accepted paint, Hamilton and Whetstone, distance to travel. Donated nearly new paint could be purchased at Exaireo paint shop in Loughborough, but nowhere to donate if had surplus paint. In response, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces, paint longstanding issue for residents, raised with County Council over many years, hazardous waste, special storage arrangements, therefore at limited sites, issue would be raised again. Some paint offered for reuse. Small electricals were already accepted at household recycling sites. As part of draft Leicestershire Waste and Recycling Strategy work, considering whether batteries, small electricals and textiles could be added to household collections. Regarding terracycle items, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces would investigate whether facilities might be provided at County Council's household recycling sites and

was therefore viable recommendation for Panel to make? Noted, harder to recycle packaging should reduce with Government's proposed Extended Producer Responsibility, outlined at last meeting.

- (vi) Suggestion – package free shops, assist provision of. Zero waste shop already existed in Loughborough (Baxter Gate). Should promote. Query as to whether work being undertaken with markets to encourage less plastic, not known at this meeting. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces had met pre-pandemic with Surfers Against Sewage regarding Plastic Free Towns, might be useful to speak to again. Understood there was a village in Charnwood that had taken up challenge, not known at this meeting, possibly Rothley.
- (vii) Suggestion – Olio app. Should promote. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces stated this had been considered before, some conflict with Council's food hygiene enforcement role. Reference to other apps and sites that could reduce waste that might be appropriate for Council to promote/share information on. Too Good To Go, Freecycle, Freegle, Preloved.
- (viii) Suggestion – food waste recycling using fly larva. Suggested that anaerobic digestion would be more beneficial, produced compost and energy.
- (ix) Suggestion – publicity and suggestions from public. Considered under (iii) above.
- (x) Suggestion – education/publicity regarding recycling, particularly in student areas. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces outlined partnership working on this with aim of minimising problems, enforcement was undertaken where appropriate. Could be information overload for new students, first time householders, no easy solutions, ongoing effort. Local councillors would be involved in plans, particularly for end of year.

*Councillors Harper-Davies and Howe left the meeting prior to the conclusion of this item.*

## **AGREED**

1. The suggestions and discussion be noted.
2. Further consideration of this key task be scheduled for the next Panel meeting on 15th March 2022, to enable the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces and councillors to report back on the investigations/enquiries agreed above, with a view to establishing suggestions that are viable as panel recommendations.

## 14. FURTHER PANEL MEETINGS AND KEY TASK PLANNING

Considered and discussed, the key tasks in the scrutiny scope document to be considered at the next meeting of the Panel and any work members of the Panel would undertake in advance of that meeting.

A verbal update was given on the invitation to Jane Hunt, MP to attend a meeting of the Panel. Panel had requested having been advised that she was a member of a Government Waste Management Panel, wished to discuss concerns regarding Environment Bill, particularly cost implications to Council. Jane Hunt, MP had responded, she was not a member of such a panel, but was happy to attend if that would assist. Panel asked to consider if still wished Jane Hunt, MP to attend meeting.

## AGREED

1. Key tasks to be considered at next Panel meeting on 15th March 2022 (in addition to those agreed earlier in meeting):

*“Draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy”* - via presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces. Presentation to be emailed to panel members as soon as possible so that they could consider in advance of meeting. Panel advised to look at 11 pledges in the Strategy and the collection options appraisal. Noted, Panel may wish to submit written response to consultation on Strategy.

2. A further meeting of the Panel be scheduled to follow the last meeting currently scheduled in April. A panel meeting in December 2021 had been cancelled and the further meeting was needed to ensure the work set out in scrutiny scope document was completed, including engagement with residents/Serco.
3. Democratic Services Officer (LS) to meet with Chair and Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces following meeting to provisionally schedule remaining key tasks and engagement work by the Panel into remaining meetings, for agreement at next meeting.
4. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces to arrange date for visit to Casepak Materials Recycling Facility as soon as possible, recommended to panel members if able to attend.
5. Engaging with Members of Parliament was best way of ensuring concerns heard by Government. This could be achieved by way of written submission setting out Panel’s concerns and would enable remaining meetings to focus on other work still to be done. Therefore, no need for Jane Hunt, MP to attend panel meeting.
6. Further scheduled meetings of the Panel, as set out on the agenda, be noted.

## NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.

**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL  
31ST MARCH 2022**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)  
  
Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe and Needham  
  
Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces  
Democratic Services Officer (EB)  
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: None

The Chair stated that the meeting would be recorded and the sound recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

15. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY AND PERSONAL INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

16. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

17. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 2nd February 2022 were confirmed as a correct record.

18. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

19. LOCAL AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED TO BE LEADERS IN WASTE MANAGEMENT

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, other local authorities considered to be leaders in waste management and ways to apply to Charnwood, taking into account demographics.

Consideration of this key task had been commenced at Panel meeting on 2nd February 2022 (top 5 performing authorities 2020-21 (England) considered). To be completed at this meeting via further presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces to provide information on performance of audit family of authorities like Charnwood, noting also (i) query as to whether lowest performing authorities were more likely to require separation/sorting of recycling by residents and (ii) useful to know characteristics of areas.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Noted, presentation set out top 5 and bottom 5 performing authorities for recycling 2021 (East Midlands) because Government database no longer enabled audit family comparison. Had looked at collection authorities only, ie. borough/district. Top performer recycled 63.5%, bottom 25.4%. Charnwood at 43.5%. Top performer (South Northamptonshire) close to hitting proposed Government target 65% by 2035. Had food waste collection, co-mingled recycling and free garden waste collection. Planned to charge for latter from April 2022, would be interesting to see how affected performance next year. Performance of other authorities listed was briefly outlined against what collected and how, whether charged for (garden waste, food waste, co-mingled).
- (ii) Noted, top performer 63.5%, second top 57.6%, difference could be due to garden waste collection being charged for by latter. Also, glass not being collected seemed to be significant factor when looking at bottom performers.
- (iii) Question, advantage to collecting garden and food waste together? Advantage was one mixed collection, one vehicle, although likely fortnightly as per garden waste, separate food waste collection usually weekly. Mixed garden and food waste required different treatment to just garden waste, briefly outlined. Estimated cost of treating just garden waste approximately £22 a tonne, mixed garden and food waste (most of which would be garden waste) approximately £35 a tonne. Both provided compost, anaerobic digestion treatment could also provide energy via biogas. Noted, mixed collection did mean fewer collections, lower carbon emissions. However, Government was proposing separate food waste collection. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces would not advocate, but mixed garden and food waste collection was a choice available to Charnwood.
- (iv) Briefly outlined, previous arrangement whereby this Council had made own arrangements for processing of recycling and was paid by waste disposal authority for doing so (recycling credits). County Council stopped permitting around 5 years ago, had resulted in loss of income to Charnwood of approximately £880k per annum. Garden waste collection charges introduced to try to balance that loss.
- (v) In response to question, Government likely to mandate food waste collection, asking for that to be weekly. Council had choice as to how to collect, examples and challenges of options briefly outlined. Advice was separate collection, separate vehicle, weekly. Re: separation of paper/glass, Environment Bill proposed separate collection for prevention of fragments of glass causing problems for paper mills, but exemption available. Previously noted data suggested that comingled collections achieved higher recycling performance, easier for residents, higher participation.

**AGREED** the further presentation and discussion be noted.

20. NEW RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY AND METHODS THAT COULD HELP IMPROVE RECYCLING RATES

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, new research, technology and methods that could help improve recycling rates.

Consideration of this key task had been commenced at Panel meeting on 2nd February 2022 (suggestions from members of the Panel discussed). To be completed at this meeting via the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces and members of the Panel reporting back on agreed investigations/enquiries (see Waste Management Scrutiny Panel Minute 13 – 2nd February 2022).

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Councillor Ward had spoken with Men in Sheds and Transitions re: whether they would be willing to engage with Council on repair/reuse activities, both had been keen to have conversation with Council on that. Contact details had been passed to Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.
- (ii) Councillor Forrest had spoken with John Storer House re: possible scheme to enable borrowing of items used occasionally (library of things), unfortunately centre did not have space, particularly now it operated community shop. Possibility of hiring room upstairs for purpose, would need to fund that, find volunteer staff to run.
- (iii) Suggested that Sofa (Nottingham Road) might be a possibility for the above, already did furniture upcycling, had space upstairs, might be worth contacting them.
- (iv) Councillor Needham's contact at Leicester Fixers no longer active, it had had a network of groups across County but activities affected by pandemic. Harborough branch still operating, partly due to person leading and it was well supported by local council, might be useful to look into further, Councillor Needham would do so.
- (v) Noted, any of the initiatives discussed likely to need financial support to be successful.
- (vi) Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces reported that plans re: end of year student waste still being finalised, would share those by email in due course. Proactive, partnership approach. Re: promotion reusable nappies on sides refuse vehicles, could do so, budget available, initial outlay in changing image expensive. Could use same method to promote various waste minimisation and recycling messages, perhaps on 2 or 3 vehicles to start. View that a useful message would be information on what could go in recycling bins, residents not always aware, recognised that continual messaging in that respect. Noted, sides refuse vehicles already used to promote various other Council activities and messages.
- (vii) Discussion re: use of bin stickers to inform of materials that could go in green bins for recycling that residents might not be aware of, how that might be best worded, communicated, perhaps highlight a particular item such as soft plastic, rather than a long list of all items. Operatives did not have time on rounds to apply stickers, had used agency staff in past to do so, message aimed at reducing contamination. Could consider repeating with different message. Reference to previous market place event to educate on this, successful, useful to repeat, incorporate competitive element/challenge.
- (viii) Noted, when Panel made recommendations it would have lots of ideas to put forward.
- (ix) Noted, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces still working via County Council to secure visit to Casepak, hoped that would be possible end April.

**AGREED** the reporting back and discussion be noted.

## 21. DRAFT LEICESTERSHIRE RESOURCES AND WASTE STRATEGY

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, the draft Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy 2022-2050, via a presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

In accordance with the Panel's request, the presentation had been emailed to panel members following the last meeting on 2nd February 2022, so that they could consider in advance of this meeting. Panel had been advised to look at 11 pledges in the Strategy and the collection options appraisal.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Noted, over 3,000 responses to the consultation from members of the public to date. Panel may wish to submit a response following its discussion.
- (ii) Pledge 1 - purchasing and internal waste management. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (iii) Pledge 2 – support and encourage waste prevention activity. Confirmed authorities already worked together, strategy would galvanise, have action plan, implement strategy. View that campaigns needed to be continuous to be most effective. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (iv) Pledge 3 – continue delivering reuse services and expand where practicable and signpost. Reference to County Council looking to put reuse provision at some recycling and household waste sites and whether any currently existed. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (v) Pledge 4 - implement and promote separate food waste collections subject to confirmation Government policy, legislation, funding and procure anaerobic digestion capacity. In response to question, how likely to operate outlined, not yet known where anaerobic digestion facility would be. Noted, likely to be much increased demand for such facilities, gap in market. Government had recognised new burden on local authorities and that it would fund. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (vi) Pledge 5 – explore use alternative fuels for collection/transportation waste, reduce carbon/improve air quality. This Council's collection vehicles currently all diesel, when purchased viable alternatives had not been available (were looked at, considerable difference in cost outlined), pledge would mean looking to better options as replaced. View that unfortunate that the fleet needed renewing when it did. Question re: whether purchasing together with other councils would reduce cost? In response, procurement framework used to assist competitive price. Noted, fleet replaced only couple of years ago, depreciate over 8 years, view to running for up to 10, 2030 Carbon Neutral Plan would require different option, fleet significant proportion of Council emissions. Trial was planned in next year or two and working with Energy Saving Trust to undertake green fleet audit. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces not aware of any waste collection authority operating fully electric fleet, some trialling 1 or 2. Hoped that better, viable options available from manufacturers as soon as possible, also that Council would be able to benefit from others' experiences. Reference to some councils using hydrogenated vegetable oil in lieu of diesel, zero carbon, but adverse environmental impact, deforestation. More expensive. Energy Saving Trust did



not support use. Likely hydrogen would be preferred fuel in future. Panel agreed with pledge.

- (vii) Pledge 6 – continue garden waste collection system as Government guidelines subject to legislation and total Government funding, procure composting capacity. Currently unclear whether Government funding would just be to extend provision to all or would also offset loss of income if Council had to provide for free, Council's income from garden waste service £1.4m in current year (overall Council budget around £20). Noted, significant cost to Government if all local authorities required compensating for loss. Question, what happened to compost created? Used for agricultural purposes and land restoration, not thought to still be available for public to purchase as in the past. No income for this Council, net cost to County Council to process. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (viii) Pledge 7 – full range of recyclables collected as specified by Government and subject to funding. Noted, Charnwood already collected full range. Question, trade waste collections, all other Leicestershire local authorities collected mixed recyclables from businesses, plans to start doing so here? Would it count towards recycling performance? In response, currently surveying residual waste business clients to establish appetite for, if wanted and viable/could cover costs, would introduce. Already collecting recycling from Loughborough town centre businesses that were part of BID, BID was funding. Hoped to complete survey within next few months, did not count towards recycling performance, but correct to provide if able to do so. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (ix) Pledge 8 – explore viability of adding extra materials to recycling collections. If collection authority decided to collect, County Council would need to make disposal arrangements. View that examples given in pledge, batteries, small electricals, clothing all items which were relatively easy to recycle elsewhere, such as in supermarkets, other retailers, charities, clothing banks, although this recycling would not count towards Council's performance. More welcome/useful would be including items that were more difficult for residents to recycle, such as items processed by Terracycle, coffee pods, crisp packets. Noted, some such items may no longer be produced under Extended Producer Responsibility proposals in Environment Bill. Panel agreed with pledge, but would like to see items that were more difficult to recycle included in it.
- (x) Pledge 9 – collection systems to contribute to national 65% recycling target, may include restricting residual waste capacity. Noted, restricting residual waste capacity meant smaller black bin or less frequent collection. Reference to changes in packaging that should result from Extended Producer Responsibility proposals, should mean more could be recycled, less capacity needed in residual waste bin. Noted, no restriction on volume of recycling or food waste that would be collected. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (xi) Pledge 10 – continue to allocate a communications budget. View that joint communications strategy needed across authorities, sharing of message. View that strategy in general ambitious, huge undertaking, not wish to duplicate existing recycling provision, not wish to over promise, under deliver. In response, strategy was for period up to 2050, many targets part of national strategy that Government had promised funding for. Was significant change. With sufficient resourcing, could be delivered. Charnwood not doing alone. Panel agreed with pledge.
- (xii) Pledge 11 – County Council reduce waste sent to landfill to less than 5% by 2025 in advance of 10% national target by 2030. Collection authorities'

performance in reducing residual waste could assist. Alternative to landfill likely to be energy from waste (incineration). Question, percentage currently sent to landfill? Approximately 40-50% across County. Not much of Charnwood's residual waste went to landfill, most incinerated. Therefore, pledge represented considerable reduction in less than 3 years, considered likely that County already had plans in place to achieve. Noted, incineration capacity used may not be within County. Currently, sites in Coventry and Stoke on Trent used. Panel agreed with pledge.

- (xiii) Collection options in strategy and evaluation/scoring of those against criteria briefly outlined to Panel, high level modelling for decision making purposes. Most beneficial option was 5A, followed by 5B, what those collection options would comprise set out in presentation. Noted, options 4-8 were all effectively option 3 with variables added. Question, why did option 3 score only 1 on cost, but most subsequent options scored higher for this? In response, option 3 assumed free garden waste collection with no subsidy of lost income, whereas, for example, option 4 assumed retention of the charge for the service. Noted, difference between 5A and 5B, first was residual waste smaller bin, second was residual waste 3-weekly collection. Operational flexibility higher for 5A, due to fortnightly. Importance of restricting residual waste to encourage food waste participation.
- (xiv) Question, any significant preference for particular collection option(s) in consultation responses to date? In response, no, wide variety of opinions. Would be interesting to see when all responses collated.
- (xv) For each option, annual gross collection cost, kerbside recycling rate (%), indicative collection cost increase relative to baseline and collection cost per 1% increase kerbside recycling performance outlined. Very helpful. Noted, none of options reached 65% recycling target, but offered considerable improvement from current. Noted, difference in cost between options 3 and 5A, but recycling difference greater, 3-4%, showed how restricting residual waste capacity forced behaviour change/participation in collection system. Question, were collective authorities leaning towards particular option? In response, for each authority to choose, status quo would not be an option, no requirement to collectively agree one option. No consensus expressed by Panel in terms of preferred option, but two members of Panel of view that either option 3 and 5A were preferable, did not think that 3-weekly collection of residual waste would be acceptable to residents. May be concern regarding smaller black bin, ameliorated by being able to put most waste in other bins provided. Another member of the Panel expressed a preference for option 5A in the first instance, but would like to consider further.
- (xvi) Concern regarding cost involved. Recognised that councils would need Government financial support to implement. Concern that whatever option chosen, would not be effective in all circumstances, for example, particular requirements for student households, communal bins at flats. Acknowledged that that was the case, a challenge, needed to consider those circumstances. Need also for continuous education on how system worked. Noted, Panel planned to consider barriers to recycling at next meeting, students/University should be engaged with as part of that. Reference to there being very few items that would need to go in residual waste if various proposals discussed were implemented and participated in.

(xvii) Efforts of those residents who had responded to consultation recognised. The Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces was thanked for the useful and clear presentation on the matter.

## **AGREED**

1. The presentation and discussion be noted and the presentation slides to be sent to members of the Panel following the meeting.
2. A Panel response to the consultation be drafted by the Chair based on the Panel's discussion and conclusions as summarised above, to be circulated to members of the Panel for their comment/approval before it is submitted, noting that the consultation closes 25th April 2022. In commenting on the draft response, members of the Panel could express a preference for a particular collection option, if they so wished.

## 22. FURTHER PANEL MEETINGS AND KEY TASK PLANNING

Considered and discussed, the key tasks in the scrutiny scope document to be considered at the next meeting of the Panel and any work members of the Panel would undertake in advance of that meeting.

Noted, the next meeting of the Panel had been moved from 26th April 2022 to 11th May 2022.

## **AGREED**

1. Following key task had been covered at previous meetings and can be marked as completed:  
  
*"Research waste prevention activities and organisations both within the Borough and elsewhere that are committed to waste reduction".*
2. Following key task to be considered at next Panel meeting on 11th May 2022:  
  
*"Identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them"* – via report back on engagement with stakeholders on this issue, which will be undertaken informally prior to the meeting. Chair of Panel, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces and Democratic Services Officer (LS) to meet as soon as possible to arrange that engagement, members of Panel to inform Democratic Services Officer of any stakeholder they wish to add to list in scrutiny scope document.
3. Opportunity to visit Casepak Materials Recycling Facility still to be confirmed, update provided earlier in meeting, hoped possible end April 2022.
4. Further scheduled meeting of Panel on 14th June 2022 be noted (currently proposed as final meeting to agree Panel's report, physical meeting).

## NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.

**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL  
11TH MAY 2022**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)  
Councillor Boldrin

J. McGovern (Serco)

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces  
Democratic Services Officer (SW)  
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: Councillor Howe, Needham and Parton

The Chair stated that the meeting would be livestreamed and recorded and the recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

23. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY AND PERSONAL INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

24. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

25. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 31st March 2022 were confirmed as a correct record.

26. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

27. IDENTIFY BARRIERS AND LOOK AT WAYS TO OVERCOME THEM

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them (recycling), via input from J. McGovern of Serco (Council's waste collection contractor) and presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces setting out information on Rejected Loads/breakdown of materials in recycling bin including contaminants.

Noted that J. Ardley, Community Warden, Loughborough University had also been due to attend the meeting to assist Panel's consideration of this key task, but had sent an apology.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Input from J. McGovern – 3 rounds were of concern in terms of contamination of recycling loads, all in Loughborough and collected on a Thursday (confirmed later in discussion as rounds 1, 5 and 6). Individual bins with obvious contamination were left and marked with rejection hanger (identifying the non-recyclables to the householder). Only a cursory inspection (by lifting the lid to view) was possible by operatives (for health and safety reasons) so some contaminated bins did get emptied. A load need only be contaminated by a certain percentage for it to be rejected at the recycling processing facility. Suggested that focus should be on those rounds, barriers preventing correct recycling in those locations (improve rates and reduce contaminants). Area characteristics included communal bins (flats), houses in multiple occupation (HMO), student areas. Was about education/awareness, hoped that residents would wish to recycle for environment, open to all ideas. Reference to video of recycling facility used (Casepak), useful to have link to it on Council website so residents could see what happened to their recycling/assist in knowledge of what could go in green bin? No black plastic. Reference to need to work with University in respect of student areas.
- (ii) Question, what percentage of loads were rejected? In response, quite rare for whole load to be rejected, none last 12 months. More often necessary to reject part load as facility would separate contaminated part when tipped, if possible. Rounds 1, 5 and 6 where whole loads had been rejected in past. Shown on screen by Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces, maps of areas those rounds covered. Round 1 adjacent Loughborough Railway Station, streets listed; Round 6 town centre areas off Ashby Road, Loughborough, streets listed; Round 5 areas off Queens Road, Loughborough, streets listed.
- (iii) Appeared that two of above areas were largely residential with significant number of flats, one largely HMOs. Therefore, two distinct barriers, flats and communal bin stores and HMOs where 4 or 5 individuals sharing bins. Round 5 also largely terraced housing, limited space, bins on pavements.
- (iv) Question, had J. McGovern spoken with operatives on rounds re: ideas in respect of problem? In response, yes, bins rejected for food waste, particularly takeaway food left on packaging, also disposable nappies. Confusion as sometimes recycling logo on packaging. Operatives were vigilant, didn't wish to reject a bin for trivial reason. Reference to in cab technology being in use, individual address and reason for rejection recorded for any bin rejected, live information available should resident ring in. When residents did make contact, perhaps good time to encourage them to use recycling bin correctly in future?
- (v) Brief discussion regarding whether contaminated recycling bin was discussed with resident at time of non-collection. No, residents not always present, policy of boundary collection, also time constraints and need to avoid confrontation. If bin rejected, contact telephone number left.
- (vi) Question, had J. McGovern any further suggestions in respect of matter? In response, residents be encouraged to put recyclables into green bin loose rather than bagged. In particular, black plastic sacks were a contaminant. Suggestion that residents have container in bathroom for recyclable products generated in that room, to prevent them ending up in residual waste. Finally, a suggestion that a wider range of items be accepted as part of the recycling collection. Stated, Charnwood already collected relatively large range of materials for recycling, considered that residents not always aware of all items that could go in

green bin. Reference to possible need to provide up to date information on that in suitable format for residents.

- (vii) Reference to work being undertaken with University, including J. Ardley, re: student waste, particularly as academic year end approached. Last 2 years had focused on business continuity. Planned work for 2022 briefly outlined by Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces, included clothing bring sites, furniture reuse, encouraging landlords to use Council's bulky waste service. Contamination of recycling bins an all year issue.
- (viii) Noted, identified 3 problematic rounds, focus on what could be done in those areas re: educating residents on what should go in green bin. Interesting to monitor effect of any such work. In response, controlled trial possible, needed to be based on complete round as weight data on that basis.
- (ix) Rejected Load information Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces had was in line with position outlined by J. McGovern and referenced above. Shown on screen by Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces, material breakdown recycling loads first 3 months 2022 (composition analysis). Outlined how calculated. Around 12% residual contaminants by weight, food waste by far biggest contaminant, followed by liquid filled bottles. Nappies also significant. Reference to campaign 2017 "no food, no nappies, no textiles", biggest contaminants at time, some short term impact, need for permanent messaging.
- (x) Question, how deal with part filled bottles, for example cooking oil bottle with some product left in it? In response, sent to landfill/incineration. Volume meant not possible to empty/clean at facility, also health and safety considerations, could not be certain what liquid was. Reference to visit for Panel members to Casepak Materials Recycling Facility, Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces was organising, would see volume of materials and how processed, largely automated, some manual elements.
- (xi) Suggestion that food waste contamination be targeted, biggest contaminant. Stated that likely different key contaminants on above identified rounds, based on demographic of areas, for example unlikely to be significant contamination from nappies on round 5 (large student population), might be in rounds 1 and 6. Noted, monthly assessment of load based on random vehicle, not known what round submitted information came from, but reasonable to suggest that certain contaminants would be more prevalent in some areas than others.

The Chair stated that this key task would need to be further considered and completed at next meeting, to enable consideration of Collection Round data and to report back on Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces' discussion with tenant members of the Council's Housing Management Advisory Board (tenant input). Also (stated earlier in meeting), contribution from J. Ardley of Loughborough University either via written submission or attending meeting, if possible (student input).

J. McGovern was thanked for assisting the Panel with its scrutiny. He thanked the Panel for the opportunity to contribute and would feed any additional suggestions from the Serco team back to the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces.

## **AGREED**

1. The submitted information, discussion and suggestions made be noted.

2. The need to focus any recycling education campaign on the areas covered by collection rounds 1, 5 and 6 and their key contaminants be noted in particular.
3. The maps shown at this meeting indicating the streets covered by collection rounds 1, 5 and 6 be circulated to Panel members following the meeting.
4. Further consideration and completion of this key task be scheduled for the next Panel meeting on 20th June 2022, via consideration of Collection Round data, reporting back on Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces' discussion with tenant members of the Council's Housing Management Advisory Board (tenant input) and, if possible, a contribution from J. Ardley of Loughborough University either via written submission or attending meeting (student input).

28. COMPLETION OF SCRUTINY SCOPE DOCUMENT AND FINAL PANEL MEETING

The Chair stated that the next meeting of the Panel on 20th June 2022 would no longer be its final meeting, it would be for the purpose of completing the above key task, as outlined. A final Panel meeting had been scheduled for 27th July 2022, to agree the Panel's report.

**AGREED**

That the further scheduled Panel meetings and their purpose be noted.

NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.



**WASTE MANAGEMENT SCRUTINY PANEL  
27TH JULY 2022**

PRESENT: The Chair (Councillor Ward)  
Councillors Boldrin, Forrest, Howe and Needham

J. Ardley (Loughborough University)  
Councillor Harper-Davies (Lead Member for  
Community Support)

Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces  
Democratic Services Officer (SW)  
Democratic Services Officer (LS)

APOLOGIES: Councillor Parton

The Chair stated that the meeting would be recorded and the sound recording subsequently made available via the Council's website. She also advised that, under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting, and the use of any such images or sound recordings was not under the Council's control.

1. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS, AND OTHER REGISTRABLE AND NON-REGISTRABLE INTERESTS

No disclosures were made.

2. DECLARATIONS - THE PARTY WHIP

No declarations were made.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th May 2022 were confirmed as a correct record.

4. QUESTIONS UNDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE PROCEDURE 11.16

No questions had been submitted.

5. IDENTIFY BARRIERS AND LOOK AT WAYS TO OVERCOME THEM

In accordance with the scrutiny scope document (key tasks), considered and discussed, identify barriers and look at ways to overcome them (recycling).

Consideration of this key task had been commenced at Panel meeting on 11th May 2022 (see Waste Management Scrutiny Panel Minute 27 – 11th May 2022). To be completed at this meeting via input from J. Ardley (Community Warden, Loughborough University), input from Council tenants (agenda pages 7-8) and

presentation of the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces setting out Collection Round data.

Key points of discussion:

- (i) Input from J. Ardley – University focus was education of students re: waste management/recycling, worked very closely with N. Gibson (Charnwood Borough Council) in that respect, ongoing and repeated process as students changed. Students from all over country/world, those living off campus needed to be aware of particular requirements in Charnwood. Report expected by end August 2022 on end of year clear out outcomes, happy for Panel to be sent copy once available, Panel would welcome this. Reference to similar initiative March 2022, more than £2k raised via that, also received impact assessments from charities involved. Had tried to increase reuse and recycling, reduce waste to landfill, would continue to do so. Statutory authority was Borough Council, but University worked to support via education/dealing with any problems. Sustainability increasingly on agenda.
- (ii) Question, what had 2022 end of year clear out event comprised, how differed from previous years? In response, N. Gibson/S. Ritchie (Borough Council) could best outline. Lots of publicity/education. Lessons learnt from event in March 2022, had been quite challenging as items collected for several different charities, detailed. Simpler approach for 2022 end of year, arranged with landlords for them to receive Air Ambulance (AA) charity collection bags for use by students who moved out early, then a main collection event 27/28 June where week before AA delivered bags to every student property for donations, work also undertaken to encourage participation, outlined. Landlords had assisted, particular landlord had put boxes outside each of his properties with list of what could be donated, then taken to food banks or passed to University for AA.
- (iii) Discussion re: problem with end of year clear out in 2022, not occurred previous years, possibly in part due to longer period of time between most students leaving and then additional waste collection by Council on 4 July? Many bags ripped open, witnessed or evidenced in some cases that street homeless were checking through (asked where witnessed if those persons needed help) resulted in large amounts of rubbish in streets, mixing of items previously correctly sorted and bagged. Some members of Panel already aware of these events having spoken with residents/had seen. Difficult to see, made it appear that many students had not acted correctly, but vast majority had. Suggestions welcomed as to how could be prevented. Couple of cases where students had not dealt with end of year waste correctly, firm action taken by J. Ardley and how all students then remedied outlined.
- (iv) Discussion re: difficulty in choosing best date for additional waste collection by Council, did liaise on that for maximum benefit. Must be on weekend or Monday due to resources being committed on other days, resources only allowed it to be done once. Usually as soon as possible after end of term, aware that some did leave earlier. If too early, additional rubbish likely to be put out after/remain over summer. J. Ardley stated that how students used properties had changed since pandemic, may be more effective for Council to do additional waste collection a little earlier in 2023, see if improved matters? Reference to consultation with landlords, aware when most students leaving. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces happy to discuss. Reference to rejected suggestion that one tip permit

- be provided to each landlord at end of year to allow left waste to be taken, this was County Council matter, limited influence, but could look at.
- (v) Stated, previous Panel discussion had suggested that University and Borough Council should work more closely together in respect of end of year clear out, above input suggested that that was happening. Councillors and residents had noticed better in 2022 than previous years and students had largely acted correctly, assisted by clear message from University that not doing so would not be tolerated.
  - (iv) Question, could there be a collection point for AA bags to prevent them needing to be left on street and then ripped open? In response, more collection banks installed this year (AA and British Heart Foundation). Always happy to consider further locations/accept assistance with securing. Ideal additional location would be car park, Storer Road. Reference to continuous collection of items on campus, charities would be invited to collect regularly once sorted. Permanent operation to assist regular donation of students' unwanted items was being worked towards, assistance from Students' Union. All help from councillors, community and partners to achieve welcomed. Noted, J. Ardley and team worked to personally collect items if needed, but J. Ardley role principally anti-social behaviour. Important to manage waste effectively and sustainably. Suggestion re: additional temporary collection boxes, each would need monitoring. Noted, timing of activities crucial to outcomes. Question, role of University's Sustainability Team? In response, J. Ardley meeting with, team mainly campus focused, hopefully would widen, although off campus lead on waste collection/prosecutions needed to be Borough Council as statutory authority.
  - (vi) Stated, previous input to Panel from Serco (Council's waste collection contractor) and submitted data suggested that contamination of recycling bins was greater in some areas, including those with large student populations. In response, J. Ardley aware of data, streets concerned, did visit properties to educate, ongoing process to do so, no single person in control of recycling bin in such households. Question, what did University do to inform students what was expected of them, particularly beginning of year? In response, social media publicity (J. Ardley could provide examples) and door knocking. Leaflets not considered useful, student properties received many and added to waste. Pictorial information stickers on bins might be helpful, particularly as English was not a first language for some students.
  - (vii) J. Ardley was thanked for assisting the Panel with its scrutiny and she left the meeting.
  - (viii) Reference to bulky waste items, usually landlord responsible for. Noticed considerable reduction in such items left out this year, noted that Borough Council officers had made landlords aware that such items wouldn't be collected as part of additional waste collection and that they needed to arrange for suitable disposal of/that enforcement action would be taken where necessary.
  - (ix) Considered, Council tenant input set out on agenda pages 7-8. Response 1 – many soft plastic items could now be included in green recycling bins, useful to go back to tenant and let them know that. Also, consider how that change could be publicised. Response 2 – Shepshed incinerator would be commercial operation, not known what waste would be taken there, Charnwood residual waste currently incinerated via County Council arrangements with facilities in Coventry and Stoke on Trent. Not known if County Council would use Shepshed

facility. Response 3 – laminated pictures on green bins of items that could be recycled, could be done, quite lengthy list, might mean images quite small. Reverse done previously, items not to put in green bins, key contaminants. “Yes please” items a more positive message.

- (x) Noted, collection round data presented 2 week sample, commencing 1st March 2022. Rounds attributed to vehicle, but may be covered by other vehicle to allow repair/servicing or to complete work, effect on data, but still useful indicator of top and bottom performing rounds, dry recycling compared to residual waste. Did not include garden waste, some areas had gardens some did not, would affect figures considerably. Top 5 (outlined) all recycled more than 40% of recycling/residual combined, bottom 5 where data complete (outlined) recycled between 10-20%. Initial campaign/education might target those areas, see if any improvement as a result. Stated, interesting to see areas where recycling not as high, some highlighted previously to Panel by Serco input, included high student population area. Importance of ongoing education, particularly in areas where residents changed more frequently.

## **AGREED**

1. The submitted information, discussion and suggestions made be noted.
2. The report on 2022 end of year clear out outcomes referenced in paragraph (i) above be sent to members of the Panel as soon as available, for their information.
3. Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces to discuss with J. Ardley issues relating to end of year clear out, including scheduling of the 2023 end of year additional waste collection by Council.
4. Examples of University social media publicity to students re: waste management be sent to members of the Panel, for their information.
5. Council tenant (response 1) be informed of the soft plastic items that can now be included in the green recycling bin and all Council tenants who responded be thanked for their input and made aware of the discussion at this meeting.
6. Collection Round data presented at meeting be sent to all members of the Panel following the meeting, for their consideration and to assist with deciding on any recommendations the Panel might wish to make.

## 6. COMPLETION OF SCRUTINY SCOPE DOCUMENT AND FINAL PANEL MEETING

The Panel confirmed that all tasks set out in the scrutiny scope document had now been completed, although a visit by members of the Panel to the Casepak Materials Recycling Facility had not yet been undertaken. That would be useful and the Head of Cleansing and Open Spaces would continue to try to arrange, but was dependent on facility accommodating.

The Chair stated that a final meeting of the Panel would now need to be scheduled (to agree the Panel’s recommendations and report). This would be a physical meeting,

date/time and venue to be confirmed. Noted that prior to the meeting, the Democratic Services Officer (LS) would draft the Panel's report and then circulate to the members of the Panel for them to include suggested recommendations.

## **AGREED**

That the above position be noted and actioned.

## NOTES:

1. No reference may be made to these minutes at the next available Ordinary Council meeting unless notice to that effect is given to the Democratic Services Manager by five members of the Council by noon on the fifth working day following publication of these minutes.
2. These minutes are subject to confirmation as a correct record at the next meeting of the Waste Management Scrutiny Panel.