

JOINT WASTE DISPOSAL BOARD
22 SEPTEMBER 2009
(9.30 - 11.30 am)

Present: Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Councillor Mrs Dorothy Hayes MBE, Vice-Chairman
Councillor Iain McCracken

Reading Borough Council
Councillor Deborah Edwards
Councillor Paul Gittings

Wokingham District Council
Councillor Rob Stanton, Chairman
Councillor Simon Weeks

Officers Oliver Burt, Reading Borough Council
Janet Dowlman, Bracknell Forest Council
Kevin Holyer, Reading Borough Council
Graham Hunt, Wokingham Borough Council
Steve Loudoun, Bracknell Forest Council
Mark Moon, Wokingham Borough Council

Apologies for absence were received from:

Peter Butler
Dave Fisher

1. **Election of Chairman**

RESOLVED that Councillor Stanton be re-elected Chairman of the Board for the next year.

2. **Appointment of Vice-Chairman**

RESOLVED that Councillor Mrs Hayes be re-appointed Vice-Chairman of the Board for the next year.

3. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

4. **Minutes of the Joint Waste Disposal Board - 23 July 2009**

Subject to the attendance record being corrected, the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Waste Disposal Board held on 23 July 2009 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. **Urgent Items of Business**

There were no urgent items of business.

6. Project Update

The Board considered the Project Director's latest project update which covered the following topics:

- Joint Working Agreement
- Finance and Performance
- Risk Register
- Lakeside
- Proposed Sutton Courtenay Energy from Waste Facility
- Vehicle Livery

The main points made during the discussion when the Project Manager answered a number of questions were that:

- The revised Joint Waste Agreement was going to the three constituent councils for endorsement.
- There was a projected underspend for 2009/10 but as the figures only related to the first three months of the year, the Board was advised to treat the scale of the underspend with caution.
- There was some concern about the delay in performance reporting from WRG, although the contract only required quarterly reporting.
- Future finance reports should, where possible, indicate the proposed spend against actual spend.
- Future reports on performance indicators should show comparator figures from previous years.

The Board also discussed in more detail an extension of the existing temporary arrangements to ensure that any further delay in commissioning of the Lakeside energy from waste plant would not adversely affect the three councils. Whilst there was no reason to believe that there would be a further delay, the Board was anxious that WRG should take steps to protect its interests. A further goodwill visit To Grundons was proposed.

The Board also discussed concerns about performance reporting caused by 85% of the waste intended for the Lakeside energy from waste plant coming from Longshot Lane, which did not handle Reading's waste. Although the partnership was based on the three authorities paying their fair share, pooling of targets was not currently possible under the existing regime. As a result, the present position resulted in Reading appearing to send a disproportionate amount of waste to landfill. A number of options to achieve a greater balance between the authorities were possible but at greater cost in both financial and environmental terms. In the circumstances, the Board agreed that DEFRA should be advised of the situation and asked to suggest an auditable solution which did not require the unnecessary physical movement of waste.

The Project Manager agreed to investigate whether other authorities had encountered similar problems and whether they had found a solution. In addition, the Chairman agreed to write to DEFRA on behalf of the Board.

The Board also considered whether to add the councils' logos to WRG's vehicles but agreed not to proceed with this.

RESOLVED that

- 1 The Project Manager seek monthly performance reports from WRG to enable members of the Board to monitor spending more closely at their meetings;
- 2 The Project Director provide an update to Board members on progress regarding the Lakeside contractual arrangements and any response from DEFRA on the possible pooling of targets to avoid Reading being disadvantaged in terms of performance reporting;
- 3 The Project Director seek a further meeting/goodwill visit to Grundons.
- 4 The Chairman write to DEFRA seeking a solution to lack of pooling arrangements which currently resulted in Reading's performance appearing poorer than Bracknell Forest's and Wokingham's despite working in partnership.
- 5 No action be taken regarding the proposed application of council logos to the partnership's bulk haulage vehicles as this was not considered necessary.

7. LATS Policy

The Board received a presentation from the Project Manager on the development of a LATS Policy.

The Board noted that the officers were working up a voluntary policy in order to achieve a known basis on which to work together. LATS trading had yet to take off as permits were little more than worthless but, by establishing a policy, if the LATS acquired a worthwhile value, the councils would be in a position to trade without delay if they so wished.

The Project Manager undertook to report back regularly on LATS developments.

8. Waste Acceptance Policy

The Board considered a report seeking approval for a Waste Acceptance Policy to cover both household waste recycling centres. The Board was advised that it was both good and common practice for waste disposal authorities to have a published Policy on the types and amounts of household waste that could be accepted at household waste recycling centres.

The Board endorsed the proposals but also recognised the importance of publicising the limits. It was proposed to do this in the same way as previous promotional campaigns via the councils' websites and by way of other sources of information for residents and patrons such as signage and leaflets. In response to a question about enforcement, the Board was reminded that it was important to set limits and make them known to users, even if enforcement would not always be possible. The Board was reminded that cameras monitored the sites and that a height barrier had now been installed at Smallmead to bar access to large vehicles which were those most likely to be carrying trade waste.

RESOLVED that

- 1 The limits proposed in the table appended to the Project Director's report be approved subject to the following:

Page 15 – Trailers: Delete "Generally"

Page 16 – Accepted Materials: Define "Green waste".

Page 17 – Restricted Materials: Add a definition relating to kitchen units;

Page 17 – Cement Bonded Asbestos: The size of sheet should be reviewed as it needed to reflect the maximum size of vehicle permitted;

Page 18 – Tyres: Tyres should not be permitted.

Page 18 – Gas Bottles: The guidance should stipulate that gas bottles should be empty;

Page 19 – Animal & Pet Waste: A tighter definition of permitted pet waste was required ideally referring to "domestic household pets";

Page 19 – Fluorescent tubes & light bulbs: The definition should be reviewed;
- 2 A revised copy of the policy taking account of the comments and any other suggested changes be circulated to members of the Board prior to implementation; and,
- 3 The proposed Policy commence with effect from 1 December 2009.

9. **Work Programme**

The Board considered a report proposing the establishment of a formal work programme for the year ahead. The Work Programme would provide some structure to the year ahead, encouraging development and giving an auditable basis upon which to demonstrate how the partnership was progressing.

RESOLVED that

- 1 The establishment of an annual Work Programme for the Joint Waste Disposal Board be approved; and,
- 2 The Work Programme for 2009/10 comprise the following:

Regular Items – for regular review at Joint Waste Disposal Meetings.

- PFI Financial Review
- Council Performance Review
- Communications Review
- Contract Monitoring Review
- Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Review

Specific Items

- Future Relationship with WRG Board

- Food Waste
- Charity Waste (including the WRG proposal in lieu of the Retail Function at Smallmead)
- Mini-MRF at Longshot Lane
- Public and Trade access to Household Waste Recycling Centre's
- Waste Minimisation and Education
- Joint Waste Authority
- Shared Services
- Contamination of Mixed Dry Recyclables (MDR)
- Joint Working Agreement (at AGM)

10. Meeting Dates

The Board discussed the dates of future meetings.

RESOLVED that meetings of the Board be held at 6pm on the following dates with meetings alternating between Smallmead and Longshot Lane:

Thursday 10 December 2009
 Thursday 11 March 2010
 Tuesday 29 June 2010
 Tuesday 21 September 2010 (AGM)
 Tuesday 21 December 2010
 Tuesday 22 March 2011

11. Exclusion of Public and Press

RESOLVED that pursuant to Regulation 21 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) Regulations 2000 and having regard to the public interest, members of the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the consideration of items 13 and 14 which involved the likely disclosure of exempt information under the following category of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972:

- (3) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person.

12. Smallmead MRF Proposal

The Board considered a report informing it of the details of a proposal by WRG to receive and process a total of 8,500 tonnes of Mixed Dry Recyclables per annum from a third-party local authority for up to 14 years at the Smallmead MRF.

The Board was advised that WRG was awaiting a decision from Oxford City Council. The Board accepted that the Project Director had considered the original WRG proposal and identified in his letter to WRG what would be acceptable to the Board. He had, however, not addressed any possible impact on queuing arising from the extra vehicles. Whilst the number of extra vehicle movements would be small, the Board asked that this issue be taken up with WRG.

RESOLVED that:

- 1 The action of the Project Director in accepting the offer from WRG but on the terms set out in his letter to WRG attached to his report be endorsed; and,

- 2 The Project Director be asked to consider in detail the possible implications of additional vehicle movements on queuing at Smallmead and address the issue with WRG, should the company win the contract.

13. **re3 Risk Register**

The Board noted the exempt information detailed in the Risk Register.

The Project Manager advised the Board that there were no changes since the last meeting although risks 4 and 5 were expected to be resolved if the anticipated commissioning of the Lakeside energy from waste plant went ahead as currently scheduled.

The Board agreed that the report was important and ought to be given greater significance in its meetings. In addition, it was suggested that a statement of any changes or comparison with the previous report should be provided in future.

14. **West Berkshire Council - Use of Smallmead Household Waste Recycling Centre**

The Board noted that there had been no progress with West Berkshire Council in relation to the use of the Smallmead Household Waste Recycling Centre by West Berkshire residents.

In the circumstances, the Board agreed that the matter needed to be escalated.

RESOLVED that:

- 1 The Chairman write on behalf of the Board to the Leader of West Berkshire Council seeking a solution to the present problem; and,
- 2 In the event that the matter could not be resolved, the matter be reported to the Berkshire Leaders' Group.

CHAIRMAN