

EXECUTIVE

Tuesday, 17 June 2025

6.00 pm

Committee Room 1, City Hall

Membership: Councillors Naomi Tweddle (Chair), Donald Nannestad (Vice-Chair), Rebecca Longbottom, Lucinda Preston, Callum Roper and Joshua Wells

Officers attending: Angela Andrews, Kate Ellis, Jaclyn Gibson, Democratic Services, Daren Turner, Simon Walters, and Carolyn Wheeler

A G E N D A

| SECTION A | Page(s) |
|---|---------|
| 1. Confirmation of Minutes - 02 June 2025 | 3 - 16 |

2. Declarations of Interest

Please note that, in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, when declaring interests members must disclose the existence and nature of the interest, and whether it is a disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI) or personal and/or pecuniary.

QUALITY HOUSING

| | |
|-----------------------|---------|
| 3. Warm Homes Project | 17 - 22 |
|-----------------------|---------|

REMARKABLE PLACE

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------|
| 4. Paper and Card Recycling Options | 23 - 40 |
|-------------------------------------|---------|

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|
| 5. Exclusion of the Press and Public | 41 - 42 |
|--------------------------------------|---------|

You are asked to resolve that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items because it is likely that if members of the press or public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information'.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, notice is hereby given of items which will be considered in private, for which either 28 days' notice has been given or approval has been granted by the appropriate person specified in the Regulations. For further details please visit our website at <http://www.lincoln.gov.uk> or contact Democratic Services at City Hall, Beaumont Fee, Lincoln.

This item is being considered in private as it is likely to disclose exempt information, as defined in Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. No representations have been received in relation to the proposal to consider this item in private.

SECTION B

QUALITY HOUSING

6. Disposal of Housing Land Adjoining 2 Brattleby Crescent

[Exempt Para 3]

43 - 50

Present: Councillor Naomi Tweddle (*in the Chair*),
Councillor Donald Nannestad, Councillor
Rebecca Longbottom, Councillor Lucinda Preston,
Councillor Callum Roper, and Councillor Joshua Wells

Apologies for Absence: None.

1. Confirmation of Minutes - Previous Meetings
2. 20 March 2025 - Extraordinary Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of Executive held on 20 March 2025 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a true record.

3. 24 March 2025

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2025 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a true record.

4. 15 April 2025 - Extraordinary Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of Executive held on 15 April 2025 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a true record.

5. 19 May 2025 - Extraordinary Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of Executive held on 19 May 2025 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a true record.

6. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

7. Residents Parking Scheme Extension

Purpose of Report

- To seek Executive's approval to make a formal request to the County Council as Local Highway Authority for the extension of the recently introduced Residents Parking Scheme in Sincil Bank.

Decision

- That a formal submission to the County Council requesting an extension of the current RPS zones into zones 5E and F in Sincil Bank be approved.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

- None. Not requesting the County Council pursue the RPS extension would mean that residents on these streets continued to suffer with undue commuter parking pressure. This could also lead to a loss in the sense of community ownership and pride of the street when parking was dominated by non-residents that changed day to day, preventing residents from parking close to their home.

Reasons for the Decision

The provision of adequate and efficient parking in the City was crucial in helping ensure Lincoln successfully continued in its role as the key urban centre for Lincolnshire and the wider area. Resident Parking Schemes (RPS) provided a key component to balancing the requirement to provide visitor parking whilst safeguarding adequate provision for residents of a number of our more central wards.

This report identified areas where there was evidence for the extension of the Resident Parking Scheme in the Sincil Bank area. It set out the process for pursuing this, and the costs involved.

In 2018 the City of Lincoln Council sought to create an RPS scheme in Sincil Bank. This originally included zones 5B, C, D, E and F. Following engagement with the County Council they determined that at that time the scheme was too large to implement in one go. Consequently, zones 5B, C, D were implemented on the understanding that it was likely to expand into zones 5E and F post implementation.

Since implementation, several enquiries from both Ward Members and local residents regarding the potential extension of the scheme had been received, citing increased non-resident parking on the streets within zones 5E and F. The City Council therefore commissioned survey work on the remaining zones 5E and F to understand the impact on these areas now the earlier zones had been operating for some time.

As could be seen in the survey results at Appendix 1, officers considered there was sufficient an impact on the streets within the proposed zones 5E and F to make a formal request of the Highway Authority to consider expanding the RPS to include these areas. This evidence would appear to substantiate the anecdotal feedback received from Ward Members and a number of residents within these zones regarding commuter parking.

The results had been shared and discussed with the Council's Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth who agreed that the evidence supported pursuing the RPS expansion. Officers at the Highway Authority had therefore been informally contacted with the survey results and had raised no objections at this stage.

If a formal request to extend the RPS was submitted to the County Council they would conduct a local referendum covering the affected zones and would need at least 51% of responding residents to vote in favour of the scheme before it could be implemented, and ultimately the formal decision would be made by the relevant committee within the County Council.

Members requested that in the event residents in these areas had the opportunity to vote on the RPS extension should the County Council conduct a local referendum of the affected zones; all groups of people should be included in the consultation taking into account the diverse make-up of the local community and any potential impacts of language barrier.

8. Housing Asset Management Strategy

Purpose of Report

- 1. To present to Executive the Directorate of Housing and Investment's Asset Management Strategy.
- 2. To propose that Executive resolves to adopt the strategy attached as 'Appendix A' to this report.

Decision

- That the adoption of the Housing Asset Management Strategy attached as 'Appendix A' to this report be approved.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

- None.

Reasons for the Decision

In November 2023, the Council adopted its 30-Year HRA Business Plan, which sets out a series of core objectives, including:

- Developing and improving core landlord services
- Providing additional affordable housing
- Regenerating our estates and neighbourhoods
- Reducing our carbon emissions

Alongside development of the Business Plan, the Housing Assets directorate had also developed a series of policies to support effective delivery of its services. There remained a gap in the directorate's governance 'golden thread', between the Business Plan and these policies; a Housing Asset Management Strategy had been identified as a means of bridging this gap, and would help ensure the Council met the requirements of the Regulator of Social Housing's Consumer Standards that were introduced in April 2024.

The Strategy had four key outcomes:

- Health and safety compliance
- Planned investment
- Decarbonisation
- Responsive repairs (including aids and adaptations)

This Housing Asset Management Strategy set out how the Council would effectively maintain tenants' homes. A separate 'Land and Property Strategy' was also being developed that would complement this Strategy, and would propose how the Council would acquire, dispose of, and make the most effective use of Housing land assets including garage sites and other types of under-utilised land.

The Strategy had been developed with tenants as its primary audience, with a more visual format and simplified content. It addressed all relevant parts of the Regulator's Consumer Standards, and each of the four outcomes was accompanied by an action plan that set out key activities the directorate would undertake to further enhance and improve the quality of Council's homes and how it engaged with tenants throughout. The action plan also identified key activities the Council needed to undertake to ensure it continued to meet the requirements of the Building Safety Regulator.

Lincoln Tenants' Panel had been briefed on the Strategy and had given its support to the content and format.

9. Housing Tenancy Fraud Policy

Purpose of Report

- To present the reviewed Housing Tenancy Fraud Policy document.

Decision

- That the Housing Tenancy Fraud Policy be approved.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

- None.

Reasons for the Decision

As a Registered Provider of social housing, we had obligations under the Prevention of Social Housing Fraud Act 2013 to identify and prevent tenancy fraud.

It was also a requirement of the Regulator's Tenancy Standard that we make every effort to identify and prevent tenancy fraud.

The policy provided the legal and regulatory context for managing tenancy fraud.

It made clear reference to measures we would take to identify, prevent, and minimise the risk of tenancy fraud occurring.

It reflected a clear intent that we would take decisive action where we had evidence that fraud had taken place, including supporting prosecutions.

LTP had been consulted on the content of the policy. They had confirmed that they found the policy easy to read and provided a clear understanding of preventing, identifying, and acting on tenancy fraud.

10. Future of Neighbourhood Working

Purpose of Report

- 1. To update Executive on the progress of commissioned work delivered by Rose Regeneration, in relation to regeneration and neighbourhood working in Sincil Bank/Park Ward.
 2. To note that the Corporate Management Team had endorsed the Rose Regeneration report (Appendix A), which evaluated the impact of Neighbourhood Working in Sincil Bank.
 3. To propose the next steps that would inform the future direction of Neighbourhood Working, including the key principles for a managed and sustainable withdrawal from Sincil Bank/Park Ward over a 12-month

period starting in Summer 2025, and proposals for future workstreams for the team.

4. To propose accommodation for the Neighbourhood Working Team from Summer 2025 onwards, including contingency plans if Investors in Lincoln's plans to purchase 22 – 30 Portland Street did not come to fruition and the Council's lease was terminated.

Decision

- 1. That the report produced by Rose Regeneration and attached as 'Appendix A' be noted.
 2. That a managed withdrawal from neighbourhood working initiatives in Sincil Bank over a 12-month period, starting in Summer 2025 be approved.
 3. That the managed withdrawal from Sincil Bank be undertaken so it coincided with building neighbourhood working capacity in Ermine be approved.
 4. That, subject to a formal decision being made on the next phase of Neighbourhood Working, the final decision on the Neighbourhood Team's accommodation be delegated to the Housing Strategy Manager.
 5. That the Neighbourhood Team's co-ordinated development of an Ermine Partnership Board and delivery of key recommendations as highlighted in the UKSPF-funded Ermine Place Shaping Framework be approved.
 6. That the Neighbourhood Team be fully based at Ermine from 2026 until March 2030, with a review to be commissioned at that time be approved.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

- To do nothing – this was not a viable option as the current neighbourhood working project at Sincil Bank was coming to an end. Next steps for the team were therefore required, including meeting the team's accommodation needs.

- To enact the other recommendations set out in 'Appendix A' and discussed in the accompanying presentation – this approach was feasible, however for the reasons set out in this report, it was considered that focusing the Neighbourhood Team's efforts in one part of the city would deliver the greatest outputs and outcomes.

To focus the Neighbourhood Team's work on a different part of the city – other parts of the city, including Moorland, Glebe, and Birchwood wards, were also significantly impacted by deprivation. The evidence presented in section 4 of the officer's report (supported by the detailed presentation), which included statistical evidence provided a basis for why Ermine had been proposed and coincided with UKSPF-funded work to develop a place shaping framework that the Neighbourhood team could build upon.

Reasons for Decision

- Members received a detailed presentation on the background, proposals, and reasons for the preferred option for the future of neighbourhood management

with a managed withdrawal from neighbourhood working initiatives in Sincil Bank over a 12-month period, starting in Summer 2025, to coincide with building neighbourhood working capacity in Ermine from 2026 until March 2030.

In January 2024, the Council commissioned Rose Regeneration to work with partners to:

- a) Measure the impact of the Council's intervention in Sincil Bank since 2018
- b) Review what measures were needed to ensure the ongoing sustainability of partnership working in the area and recommend an effective exit strategy for the Council.
- c) Identify any lessons learnt that could inform the next phase of neighbourhood working in the city.

The Neighbourhood Team had co-ordinated the delivery of substantial and measurable improvements to the Sincil Bank area since 2018. Rose Regeneration had supported the evaluation of this work, and an updated version of its evaluation report was attached as 'Appendix A.' Decisions were now needed to inform the next steps for neighbourhood working in the city, including where the Neighbourhood Team would be based and what the priorities for the team would be.

The evaluation report detailed several key achievements during the Neighbourhood Team's time working in Sincil Bank. Examples which included:

- For every £1.00 invested in Neighbourhood Working, £3.20 of social value had been generated.
- Neighbourhood Working had a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of £2.48/£1. The Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government appraisal guide (2023) ranked BCR, with anything above £2 as offering 'high' value for money.
-

Other notable achievements referenced in the evaluation report included:

- Implementation of a residents' parking scheme
- Redevelopment of Hermit Street Garage site to deliver 11 new family homes for social rent
- Introduction of restrictions on 'to-let' boards
- Implementation of one-way traffic system
- Green corridor for cyclists and pedestrians
- Cleaner and safer streets and open spaces, including enhanced CCTV and improvements to public realm
- Formation of a local community land trust
- Improved access to services
- Enhanced community spirit, supported by community events and activities

The preferred option enabled the Neighbourhood Working Team to undertake a managed withdrawal from Sincil Bank and begin working in another area of the city with appropriate support and collaboration with partners.

An opportunity had arisen in Ermine to pilot this proposal, focusing resources on one area of the city and gaining the commitment of key partners at the outset.

Open Plan, who co-ordinated the Sincil Bank place shaping framework, was undertaking a similar exercise in Ermine using UKSPF funding. This place shaping framework was nearing completion. A board had been created to oversee this work, of which the Neighbourhood Manager and Housing Strategy Manager were members.

In addition, other funding streams had been secured in Ermine as detailed within the officer's report.

Ermine was very different to Sincil Bank and presented an opportunity to pilot a different approach to neighbourhood working. The Council was the majority landowner in Ermine and therefore had more influence in the area in terms of land uses, regeneration opportunities and environmental improvements, presenting an opportunity to build on this place shaping exercise and deliver meaningful benefits to a community in one of the city's deprived areas.

Population data supported the need to focus the next phase of neighbourhood working on Ermine. Current Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) data from 2019 highlighted that parts of Ermine East (OO1D) and all of Ermine West (001A & 001B) fell within the top 10% of deprived areas in the country. These three Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA's) also featured in the top ten deprived neighbourhoods in the city. IMD data also indicated that deprivation increased in Ermine East (LSOA OO1D) between 2015 and 2019, moving from being the city's tenth most deprived neighbourhood to the city's sixth most deprived.

Whilst the primary focus of the Neighbourhood Team would be on Ermine, the team would be able to continue to support initiatives in other neighbourhoods across the city as it had done in recent years with UKSPF-funded projects and community connectors.

Members had carefully considered and debated the proposals placed before them this evening in detail.

The risk associated with the proposed approach was low and was likely to deliver greater benefits to local residents due to existing partnership working in Ermine.

11. Lease Disposal - Sobraon Barracks

Purpose of Report

- To seek approval to accept the surrender of the existing lease of Sobraon Barracks Cricket field and pavilion with Lincoln University and agree terms for a new 25-year Lease and management agreement with Lincolnshire Cricket Ltd.

Decision

- 1. That a surrender from Lincoln University of its existing Lease for the Sobraon Barracks cricket facilities be accepted by the Council.
 2. That a new 25-year lease and management agreement for the land and pavilion be granted to Lincolnshire Cricket.
 3. That the new lease to Lincolnshire Cricket Ltd at a peppercorn rent on the basis that the proposals for use and development of the site as detailed in

this report were considered to contribute to the promotion or improvement of economic, social, or environmental wellbeing be granted.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

To keep the existing Lease with Lincoln University. This would leave Sobraon Barracks unused for physical and recreational activities and would prevent the development of a women's, girls and disabled cricket and recreational hub.

Reasons for Decision

In 2012 the City Council agreed a 25-year lease at a peppercorn rent and management agreement with Lincoln University to manage and operate the Sobraon Barracks cricket field and pavilion, adjacent to the Territorial Army Barracks near Yarborough Leisure centre to promote cricket to University students and members of the local community. As part of this lease agreement significant improvements were made to the cricket field and cricket square. In addition, a completely new pavilion was opened in 2013 funded by the City Council, the University of Lincoln, and the ECB (England & Wales Cricket Board).

Since 2012, despite the significant improvements made to this site, the use of the cricket pitch and pavilion had not proved as popular as expected. Each year since this lease was first signed, the use of these facilities had reduced, the necessary income needed to maintain this site had not been generated and as a consequence, two years ago, the University took the decision to mothball the site.

This new Lease would enable Lincolnshire Cricket Ltd to deliver a high quality, centrally located facility with the capacity to deliver significant impact across a number of target areas, including girls and ladies' cricket, women and girls' recreational activities and female coach education.

Lincolnshire Cricket's development plan featured a three phased approach to reinstating the Sobraon barracks cricket ground in a sustainable manner an estimated total cost of £140k to £160k.

This proposal provided the opportunity to invest in the facility to allow the re-introduction of cricket on the site. It would contribute to the range of sports offer across the city. The area would also be maintained as general recreational space for the local community, to contribute to the promotion and improvement of economic, social, and environmental wellbeing.

12. Treasury Management Stewardship and Actual Prudential Indicators Report 2024/25

Purpose of Report

To consider the annual Treasury Management stewardship report, a requirement of the Council's reporting procedures under regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003. The report covered the treasury management activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2024/25.

The report met the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities.

Decision

1. That the actual prudential indicators, as contained within Appendices A and B to the report be noted and recommended to Full Council for approval.
2. That the annual Treasury Management report for 2024/25 be approved.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

None.

Reasons for the Decision

During 2024/25 the Council complied with its legislative and regulatory requirements. The key prudential indicators for the year with comparators were detailed at paragraph 2.1 of the officer's report, together with other prudential and treasury indicators found at Appendix A and B.

The Chief Finance Officer had confirmed that borrowing had only been undertaken for a capital purpose and that the statutory borrowing limit, (the Authorised Limit) had not been breached.

The Council had adopted the CIPFA Code of Practice for Treasury Management in the Public Sector and operated its treasury management service in compliance with this Code and the above requirements. These required that the prime objective of treasury management activity was the effective management of risk, and that its borrowing activities were undertaken in a prudent, affordable, and sustainable basis.

This report fulfilled the requirement of the Prudential Code to ensure adequate monitoring of the capital expenditure plans, prudential indicators (PIs) and treasury management response to these plans. It included a review of compliance with Treasury and Prudential Limits in 2024/25 and showed the status of the Prudential Indicators at 31st March 2025. For the 2024/25 financial year the minimum reporting requirements were that members should receive the following reports:

- an annual Treasury Management Strategy in advance of the year (Council 27th February 2024)
- a quarterly treasury update (Executive Q1 27th August 2024 & Q3 24th February 2025)
- a mid-year treasury update report (Executive 18th November 2024)
- an annual report following the year describing the activity compared to the strategy (this report)

The regulatory environment placed a greater onus on members for the review and scrutiny of treasury management policy and activities than in previous years. This report was important in that respect, as it provided details of the outturn position for treasury activities and highlighted compliance with the Council's policies previously approved by members.

In compliance with the Prudential Code treasury management reports were scrutinised by Performance Scrutiny Committee and reviewed by the Executive prior to reporting to Full Council if required. Member training for the Performance

Scrutiny and Audit Committees was undertaken on 4th February 2025 in order to support their roles in scrutinising the treasury management strategy and policies.

Key Issues to Note from Activity during 2024/25 were detailed at paragraph 4.2 of the officer's report.

13. Q4 2024/25 Operational Performance Report

Purpose of the Report

To present an outturn summary of the Council's operational performance in quarter four of 2024/25.

Decision

1. That the achievements and challenges identified in the Quarter 4 2024/25 operational performance report found at Appendices A and B be noted.
2. It be confirmed that the format of the performance report continued to meet requirements.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

None were considered.

Reasons for the Decision

Regular monitoring of the council's performance was a key component of the Local Performance Management Framework. This report covered the key strategic performance measures identified by members and Corporate Management Team (CMT) as of strategic importance.

The outturn summary report detailed performance against a total of 87 measures across the directorates Chief Executive's, Communities and Environment, Housing and Investment and Major Developments. In total 64 performance measures out of the 87 were monitored against targets, of which 13 were below target; 11 were within target boundaries; 33 had met or exceeded a higher target; 23 measures were recorded as volumetric, and 7 measures recorded as data not available for this quarter.

Out of the 87 performance measures monitored during the quarter with 64 targets allocated to them, 44 (68.7%) were within or exceeding the targets set.

It was important to note that the performance statuses of measures DMD 1–5 were determined by an external partner working alongside the Major Developments Team, rather than by comparing performance measure outturns against set high and low targets, and when determining the performance measure statuses, a range of factors impacting on programme delivery were taken into consideration such as milestone performance, financial performance and associated risks, amongst other factors.

Appendix A contained a wider range of performance information, including qualitative data in the form of case studies and service highlights. These were grouped into seven themes, namely the five Vision Priorities and the two inward

looking portfolios 'Our People and Resources' and 'Customer Experience and Review.'

The more detailed performance data tables were grouped together in Appendix B, including the suite of corporate measures. Performance data was grouped by directorate, and a colour coding system was used to make it simpler to identify which portfolio each measure related to. Appendix B also included a quarterly Communications update.

When read together, Appendices A and B aimed to enhance the range of performance information presented via the quarterly reporting process and make it easier to assess and scrutinise the performance of each priority/portfolio.

Key highlights of some of the positive work of the Council and its impact during the quarter were summarised at paragraph 4, a brief summary of areas which required monitoring were detailed within paragraph 5, and corporate measures reported at paragraph 6 of the officer's report.

14. Financial Performance - Outturn 2024/25

Purpose of Report

To present the provisional 2024/25 financial outturn position on the Council's revenue and capital budgets, including the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account, Housing Repairs Service and Capital Programmes.

This report provided the Executive with a summary of actual income and expenditure compared to the revised budget and how any surpluses had been allocated to reserves.

Executive should note that the financial outturn was still subject to Audit by KPMG, the Council's external auditors.

Decision

1. That the provisional 2024/25 financial outturn for the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account (HRA), Housing Repairs Service (HRS) and Capital Programmes as set out in sections 3 - 7 of the officer's report, and in particular the reasons for any variances, be noted.
2. That the General Fund carry forward requests and transfers to earmarked reserves as detailed in paragraphs 3.10 and 3.11 of the officer's report be approved.
3. That the HRA carry forward requests and transfers to earmarked reserves, and the Major Repairs reserve detailed in paragraph 4.8 and 4.9 of the officer's report be approved.
4. That the changes to the General Investment Programme and Housing Investment Programme as approved by the Chief Finance Officer detailed in paragraphs, 7.6, and 7.14 of the officer's report be noted.

5. That the changes to the General Investment Programme and the Housing Investment Programme, having already received Executive approval detailed in paragraphs 7.3 and 7.11 of the officer's report be noted.
6. That the changes to the General Investment Programme and the Housing Investment Programme that were above the limit delegated to the Chief Finance Officer, as detailed in paragraphs 7.5, 7.12 and 7.13 of the officer's report, be approved.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

None.

Reason for Decision

During the last quarter of 2024/25, the position on the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account and Housing Repairs Service had remained positive with budget surpluses/additional contributions to reserves achieved across both the General Fund and HRA at the end of the financial year.

Despite this positive outturn position the Council continued to face escalating cost pressures in future years, above those already factored into the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The positive outturn in 2024/25 had been largely driven by reduced borrowing costs and investment income with interest rates continuing above the levels assumed within the MTFS, alongside other overachieved income in the General Fund, predominantly car parking and property rental income. This would not be the case in 2025/26 with budgets adjusted to reflect the base rate forecast, as such strong financial discipline and delivery of the significant savings targets underpinning the MTFS would remain critical in ensuring the Council maintained a sustainable financial position in the medium term.

A summary of the financial position of the Council for the financial year 2024/25 was outlined at paragraph 2.4 of the officer's report, together with the detailed financial position shown in sections 3-7 and accompanying appendices to the officer's report, covering the following areas:

- General Fund Revenue Account
- Carry Forward Requests
- Transfers to Reserves
- Towards Financial Sustainability Programme
- Housing Revenue Account
- Carry Forward Requests
- Transfers to Reserves
- Housing Repairs Service
- Earmarked Reserves
- Capital Programme
- General Fund Investment Programme
- Housing Investment Programme

15. Strategic Risk Register - Quarterly Review

Purpose of Report

To provide a status report on the revised Strategic Risk Register as at the end of the fourth quarter 2024/25.

Decision

That the Council's strategic risks as at the end of quarter 4 2024/25, be noted.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

None were considered. The Strategic Risk Register contained the key strategic risks to the delivery of the Council's medium and longer term priorities. A failure to monitor the action that was being taken to manage those risks would undermine the Council's governance arrangements.

Reasons for the Decision

An update of the Strategic Risk Register developed under the risk management approach of 'risk appetite,' was last presented to Members in February 2025 and contained fifteen strategic risks as detailed within paragraph 3.1 of the officer's report.

Since reporting to Members in February, the Strategic Risk Register had been refreshed and updated by the Risk Owners and Corporate Management Team which had identified some positive movement in the Risk Register.

The updated register was contained with Part B of this agenda as a restricted document.

16. Exclusion of the Press and Public

RESOLVED that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business because it was likely that if members of the public were present there would be a disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

17. Strategic Risk Register - Quarterly Review

Purpose of Report

To receive the revised Strategic Risk Register as at the end of quarter 4 2024/25.

Decision

That the Council's strategic risks, as at the end of quarter 4 2024/25, be noted.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

None were considered. The Strategic Risk Register contained the key strategic risks to the delivery of the Council's medium and longer term priorities. A failure to monitor the action that was being taken to manage those risks would undermine the Council's governance arrangements.

Reasons for the Decision

The reasons for the decision were set out at Minute 15 above.

18. Write Outs of Irrecoverable Non-Domestic Rates, Sundry Debtors and Council Tax

Purpose of Report

As detailed in the exempt report to the Executive.

Decision

That the recommendation to the Executive, as set out in the exempt report, be approved.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

As detailed in the exempt report to the Executive.

Reasons for the Decision

As detailed in the exempt report to the Executive.

19. Technology to Monitor Alarms and Sensors

Purpose of Report

As detailed in the exempt report to the Executive.

Decision

That the recommendation to the Executive, as set out in the exempt report, be approved.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

As detailed in the exempt report to the Executive.

Reasons for the Decision

As detailed in the exempt report to the Executive.

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| SUBJECT: | WARM HOMES PROJECT |
| DIRECTORATE: | HOUSING AND INVESTMENT |
| REPORT AUTHOR: | MATTHEW HILLMAN, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, ASSET MANAGEMENT |

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To obtain approval to undertake a Warm Homes project to delivery low carbon heating and insulation works to properties within the Housing stock that have a SAP rating of Band D or below.

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 The Housing Directorate has an obligation to ensure all its Housing portfolio has a minimum SAP rating of Band C or above by 2030.
- 2.2 By delivering a Warm Homes low carbon heating and insulation project, this will be reducing properties from fuel poverty resulting in healthier homes for households. It will also reduce the number of properties within our stock below band C by 44%.
- 2.3 The total overall Council funded budget required for the project is £3,252,262 to improve 200 properties. This includes 60 fully funded properties and 140 co-funded by the Warm Homes Social Housing Fund Wave 3 (WHSHF) grant.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Government set a target of 2030 for social landlords to ensure all our properties have an SAP rating of band C or above by 2030.
- 3.2 Within the 30 Year Business Plan (6.4 Addressing Climate Change), we have reaffirmed our committed to ensure our remaining properties will reach Band C or above by 2030. Additionally, we have committed to improve the environmental performance of our homes as we deliver planned improvement works and ensure we undertake surveys on our archetypes to produce a fit for purpose investment programme, that includes what is required to retrofit our properties during the next five years (2024-2029).

We currently have 450 properties that are band D or below. Warm Homes Funding is available to properties falling into this category.

- 3.3 During the summer of 2024, the Council awarded a contract to Equans to carry out sample retro fit assessments to some of our lower energy rated stock along with energy data modelling work and support with the preparation of our Warm Homes grant application.

- 3.4 We submitted an application for Warm Homes Social Housing Fund Wave 3 grant funding of £1,929,411 to deliver our proposed programme of works to 200 properties.
- 3.5 The WSHF Wave 3, was oversubscribed and therefore our maximum scaled grant funding award is £1,338,332 (Subject to requirements in Section 4.4). This will enable the City of Lincoln Council's housing directorate to deliver a programme of work to 140 properties within the housing stock using the co-funded grant. The work will include low carbon heating and insulation works to reduce the number of households living in fuel poverty and increase the SAP rating of these properties to band C or above.

4. WSHF Wave 3 Project

- 4.1 The co-funded grant project to improve the SAP ratings of 140 properties will include the following works:
- 134 Solar PV with battery storage
 - 60 Ventilation improvements
 - 57 Replacement windows
 - 48 Loft Insulation top ups
 - 12 Air source heat pumps
 - 4 External wall insulations
 - 2 Cavity wall insulations

The delivery model submitted within our application will see the following works carried out:

| Period | Year | Number of Properties |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Quarter 2 | 2025-26 | 35 Properties |
| Quarter 3 | 2025-26 | 35 Properties |
| Quarter 4 | 2025-26 | 35 Properties |
| Quarter 1 | 2026-27 | 35 Properties |

- 4.2 Initially an outline programme of addresses identified with an SAP rating of band D or below will receive a Retro Fit assessment. This will clarify if the SAP rating of the property meets the WSHF Wave 3 criteria to be placed into the programme. The addresses will be batched in groups of 35 addresses, these will then be submitted to DESNZ for approval before works can commence. Therefore, this project is time critical to ensure we maximise our grant funding allocation.
- 4.3 The Council had applied for funding for 200 properties, but due to oversubscription our co funded grant was reduced to (69%)140 properties. However, the proposal is to still deliver works to 200 properties. This additional work will make significant inroads into our 2030 deadline for ensuring all our properties are band C or above. In addition, this work will support Housing's Decarbonisation plan.

Low carbon heating measures and insulation works as set out in 4.1 above will be included within the delivered works. These additional 60 self-funded properties will be delivered in addition to the co-funded WSHF Wave 3 work.

- 4.4 The Council has submitted a revised scaled grant application on the 27th March as requested by the Department for Energy, Security and Net Zero. The Council will receive notification of grant and grant fund agreements in April. These agreements will need to be signed and returned in May 2025.
- 4.5 Our WHSHF Wave 3 grant is £1,338,332.

The grant spend profile which grant recipients must adhere to, is as follows:

| Financial Year | Grant spend profile |
|----------------|---------------------|
| 2025-26 | £1,070,665 |
| 2026-27 | £267,666 |

- 4.6 The Council will require additional project resource to manage and monitor this project. This will include pre-mobilisation, data analysis, consultation, monitoring delivery, submitting grant applications and asset data management. Within section 6.1 is the budget requirement for Project resource.
- 4.7 Additional revenue costs in relation to annual checks of the 191 Solar PV's is expected to cost in the region of £100 per device, so £19,100 per annum. It is expected that these costs can be met from existing HRA Electrical Testing budgets within the HRA Repairs programme so no additional budget provision is required.

5. Strategic Priorities

5.1 Let's Reduce All Kinds of Inequality

Households will live in homes with improved energy efficiency resulting in improved health, wellbeing, and comfort.

5.2 Let's Deliver Quality Housing

The WHSHF-Wave 3 works programme will tackle fuel poverty and provide affordable, warm, energy efficient properties, therefore delivering one of the Council's vision 2030 strategies.

5.3 Let's Address the Challenge of Climate Change

This Project will deliver low carbon heating and insulation works, reducing carbon emissions and improving energy efficiency and improved SAP ratings of the properties contained within the programme of work. The works will contribute towards Net Zero, along with delivering Housing's Decarbonisation Improvement Plan contained within the Housing Revenue Account 30-year business plan.

6. Organisational Impacts

6.1 Finance

Capital

WHSHF Wave 3 Grant Project 140 Properties (Section 4.1)

| | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | Total |
|---|------------|----------|------------|
| WHSHF Wave 3 grant | £1,070,665 | £267,666 | £1,338,331 |
| Council co-funding from Major Repairs Reserve | £1,472,443 | £368,111 | £1,840,554 |
| Project cost | £2,543,108 | £635,777 | £3,178,885 |

Which equates to an average total investment of per property of £22,706.

Project for 60 Self-Funded Properties (Section 4.3)

An additional 60 properties, based on an average price of £22,706, will be wholly financed by the Council and funded from the Major Repair Reserve. The profiling of these properties is expected to be in line with the 140 properties above.

| | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | Total |
|--|------------|----------|------------|
| Council funded 60 additional properties (funded through MRR) | £1,089,888 | £272,472 | £1,362,360 |

Project Management Resource (Section 4.6)

| | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | Total |
|--|---------|---------|---------|
| Project Management Resource (funded through MRR) | £39,950 | £10,190 | £50,140 |

Total Capital Cost for Combined Project including 200 Properties

| | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | Total |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| WHSHF Wave 3 grant | £1,070,665 | £267,666 | £1,338,331 |
| Council contribution | £2,562,331 | £640,583 | £3,202,914 |
| Project Management | £39,950 | £10,190 | £50,140 |
| Total Capital Costs | £3,672,946 | £918,439 | £4,591,385 |

Revenue Costs (Section 4.7)

| | 2025/26 | 2026/27 | 2027/28 | 2028/29 | 2029/30 | Total |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Annual Maintenance | £15,280 | £19,100 | £19,100 | £19,100 | £19,100 | £91,680 |

These costs will be funded from existing HRA revenue repairs budgets as outlined in section 4.7 above.

Future replacement components as set out in Section 4.1 will require factoring into future 30 year Asset Management planning and the next HRA Business Plan update. The useful economic life of each component ranges between 15 and 50 years, so the first replacement cycle will need factoring in from 2040 through to 2075.

6.2 Legal Implications including Procurement Rules

The Council are in negotiation with a contractor to award a Framework contract for the delivery of the project works.

6.3 Equality, Diversity and Human Rights

The Public Sector Equality Duty means that the Council must consider all individuals when carrying out their day-to-day work, in shaping policy, delivering services and in relation to their own employees.

It requires that public bodies have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination
- Advance equality of opportunity
- Foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities

We do not perceive there to be any negative impacts that would warrant an Equality Impact Assessment. There are no Equality and Diversity implications.

6.4 Human Resources

Additional resource required to manage and monitor the delivery of the contract and compliance with associated WSHF Wave 3 grant funding criteria and asset data management.

6.5 Land, Property and Accommodation

N/A.

6.6 Significant Community Impact &/or Environmental Impact

We do not perceive there to be any negative community or environmental impacts.

6.7 Corporate Health and Safety Implications

None.

7. Risk Implications

7.1 (i) Options Explored

7.2 (ii) Key Risks Associated with the Preferred Approach

Key Risks Identified:

- Ability to award and mobilise delivery contract
- Ability to deliver works in accordance with yearly grant allocation
- Access to properties to undertake surveys and works
- Properties dropping in and out of the programme.
- Managing customer expectation of those within and excluded from the programme

Project management resource

8. Recommendation

- 8.1 The recommendation is for the Executive to approve the inclusion of a budget allocation of £4,591,385 in the Housing Investment Programme, as set out in section 6.1 of the report, to enable delivery of low carbon heating and insulation works to 200 properties to improve the SAP rating to band C or above.

Is this a key decision? Yes

Do the exempt information categories apply? No

Does Rule 15 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules (call-in and urgency) apply? No

How many appendices does the report contain? None

List of Background Papers: None

Lead Officer:

Matthew Hillman, Assistant Director
Email address: matthew.hillman@lincoln.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE**17 JUNE 2025**

SUBJECT: PAPER AND CARD RECYCLING OPTIONS

DIRECTORATE: COMMUNITIES AND ENVIRONMENT

REPORT AUTHOR: STEVEN BIRD, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, COMMUNITIES AND STREETSCENE

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To make Executive aware of both the request by Lincolnshire County Council for the City Council to adopt separate paper and card recycling, in full or part, and the recent Government mandate under it's 'Simpler Recycling' initiative, to collect paper and card separately as a statutory requirement.
- 1.2 To set out the implications of change, in full or part.
- 1.3 To provide options for consideration.
- 1.4 To provide an officer recommendation to Executive, with rationale.

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 There is a corporate desire to minimise 'contamination,' and maximise recycling, but a recognition that 'contamination' is defined by the Waste Disposal Authority, Lincolnshire County Council (WDA). As a result, the WDA have significant control over a Waste Collection Authority's (WCA) published recycling rate, which in turn affects Lincolnshire's collective overall recycling rate.
- 2.2 In Lincolnshire paper and card broadly makes up around half of the recycling waste stream, and so the WDA have asked all WCAs to implement a separate paper and card collection, collected alternately to the mixed domestic recyclate, in a bid to see reduced reported 'contamination.'
- 2.3 The recent government announcement under 'Simpler Recycling' also mandates this but provides opportunity for authorities to be pragmatic and to be exempt from this if they can show there are Technical Economic Environmental or Practical reasons not to implement this change (TEEP).
- 2.4 There are a number of issues that have a bearing on how realistic bringing in a service change at this time would be, and which consequently have impact on our TEEP assessment. Examples are such as the impact of preparing for new contract implementation, the impending mandate for a new food waste collection service, the advent of Extended Producer Responsibility costs on packaging producers and known issues relating to bins left out on streets.

- 2.5 Factoring in all issues, the TEEP assessment suggests that, given the range of other pressures on this service area, and indeed residents, changes to introduce paper and card collections at this time would not be wise. This report therefore recommends deferring a decision on implementation until at least 2027.
- 2.6 Noting that such a delay would not help to improve 'contamination' or recycling rates, it further suggests that, provided the WDA does not re-define what constitutes recycling and supports increased general efforts to reduce contamination, an education/enforcement programme, to change recycling habits and reduce contamination levels voluntarily should be tried, before an extra paper and card collection is considered again. This could commence this autumn and move to stronger enforcement if required post-Christmas.
- 2.7 It is recognised that in order to drive change, alongside education, ultimately it might be necessary to use formal enforcement action where a household refuses to comply with recycling sortation requirements.
- 2.8 The last significant point of note is that of 'side waste' associated with recycling. It is the WDA contention that as Lincoln takes side waste in bags, this is a source of significant contamination. This report notes this and agrees to an evidence-based review, before any final decisions are taken, with the Portfolio Holder having discretion to bring this issue back to the Executive to seek its withdrawal as an option.

3. Background

- 3.1 The management of municipal household waste in Lincoln requires co-operation between the City Council as the 'Collection Authority' (WCA), and the County Council as the 'Disposal Authority' (WDA). These are designated legal terms.
- 3.2 As the respective names imply, the WCA has responsibilities for collecting waste/recycling, whereas the WDA has responsibilities for managing its disposal/processing.
- 3.3 Across Lincolnshire, authorities cooperate strategically on how waste flows are managed through the auspices of the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership (LWP). This is a body with Member representation, and the Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place is the City Council's representative.
- 3.4 The LWP monitors key performance data, including recycling and disposal rates, with the aim of developing practical proposals for change to deliver performance improvements.
- 3.5 A 'Waste Strategy for Lincolnshire' was adopted in 2019, to which the City Council is a signatory, and it sets out the LWP's vision as being "To seek the best environmental option to provide innovative, customer friendly waste management solutions that give value for money to Lincolnshire".
- 3.6 The LWP agreed 10 Objectives, several of which are directly relevant for consideration in the context of this proposal:

- 3.6.1 Objective 1. Improve the quality and therefore commercial value of our recycling stream.
- 3.6.2 Objective 5. Contribute to the UK recycling targets of 65% by 2035.
- 3.6.3 Objective 10. To consider appropriate innovative solutions in the delivery of our waste management services.
- 3.7 Progression of these aims is also within the context of a constantly changing operating environment, where not only technological changes take place, but also environmental, legal, and financial factors change, as well as market practices/opportunities.
- 3.8 A number of factors in the current operating environment are especially pertinent in considering this as a potential change to service. Not only is there a renewed emphasis amongst the public on recycling generally, but the County Council recycling / disposal contract has seen a cost increase for the disposal of 'contamination.' Despite best efforts through aligned education/promotion, Lincolnshire's 'contamination' rates have remained high, creeping into the area of 20 to 30% at times, so positive action has been, and still is, required. Lincoln's own rate exceeds 15% overall at times, with certain areas of the city showing nearer to 30%. Districts who have implemented separate paper and card collections are seen to have much lower rates.
- 3.9 In simplified terms 'contamination' is anything that, by the terms of the County Council's recycling / disposal contract, is not a 'target material.' That is to say, anything that is collected that is not on the list of designated recyclable materials that the County Council wishes to (or has to by law) recycle.
- 3.10 Most materials can be 'recycled' in some form, but as there are a wide range of materials in a mixed waste stream, some of which are composite, recycling everything would be a complicated task. There are many reasons why a material may be deemed to be 'contamination.'
- 3.11 The list of acceptable materials has changed in the past and will change in the future in response to legislative requirements and the commercial markets' ability to recycle economically, the desire to maximise what can be recycled, and the wish to keep authorities aligned in what they will take as recycling across the county and/or country.
- 3.12 It is important to note here that even where a material is identified as 'contamination' it goes to the Energy from Waste plant to be turned into electricity. Landfill is only ever used as an absolute last resort by the WDA for any materials, which translated into a landfill figure of less than 1% last year.
- 3.13 In recognising both the increasing cost of disposing of 'contaminated' materials and the improving market for good quality recyclate, the County Council has been promoting a move to collecting paper and card in a separate bin to other recycling materials.

- 3.14 The effect of instigating a separate paper and card collection, if enacted, would be twofold:
- 3.15
- A focus on recycling materials, and keeping paper away from other materials, means less cross contamination.
 - It moves the material from being a commodity that carries a cost to process, to one that can attract an income (saving/income to the County Council as owners of the materials once collected).
- 3.16 At the start of December, the Government announced that, accepting the broad benefits of separate paper and card collections, it was mandating the introduction of such collections from 1st April 2026, alongside the introduction of the new weekly food waste collections.
- 3.17 However, the recent Government announcement under its 'Simpler Recycling' initiative provides opportunity for authorities to be pragmatic and to be exempt from this provided they can show there are Technical, Economic, Environmental, or Practical reasons not to implement this change (TEEP).

4. A Word on Recycling Rates.

- 4.1 It is important to note that 'contamination' rates and recycling rates are not the same thing. As this proposal means asking residents to split the recycling materials that they are already collecting in one bin into two separate bins, in strict tonnage terms, it simply means handling the same materials that would already have been collected differently. Ergo, it is the same material, and so there should be no change to the recycle rate, just a change in quality as the paper and card would be cleaner.
- 4.2 The lower grade material (paper and card mixed with other materials) although still used in low grade recycling options is none the less still recycled, but it is still reported as 'contamination' to represent the lower grade of material as dirty card/paper is not a 'target material' for the WDA contract.
- 4.3 If separate paper and card collection were to be introduced city wide, reported recycling rates would not therefore necessarily be affected directly or significantly. Although it is possible there might be a little improvement by virtue of the publicity/focus on the issue. Reported average contamination levels would reduce though, dropping by an estimated 5 to 8 percentage points (from around 15% to about 7%).

5. Trials and Roll-Out

- 5.1 Recognising the above potential benefits, the County Council undertook a set of trials with some districts, whereby separated paper and card collections were trialled in selected areas of Boston (2969 households), North Kesteven District Council (NKDC) (1781) and South Holland District Council (SHDC) (2408). The SHDC trial was on a different collection system, using bags, and ultimately was stopped because the bags could not be split and separated effectively.

- 5.2 The trials in Boston and NKDC were in areas where they had alternate weekly 240L wheeled bin collections in place. (This means that Mixed Domestic Recyclate -MDR- material is collected one week, with household waste in another bin the next week). The trial alternated the MDR collections with paper and card collections, so that MDR was taken four weekly and paper and card was taken alternately with that. This is referred to nationally as a 'twin stream' collection system.
- 5.3 Since the trials concluded, the twin stream system has been rolled out across Boston, NKDC, East Lindsey District Council (ELDC), West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) and in 2024, South Kesteven District Council (SKDC).
- 5.4 An analysis of Lincoln's waste suggests that paper and card make up about 50% of the recycling waste stream by volume, mirroring that of the other districts. As this is in the order of half of the capacity available, and as most bins are presented with the potential for a little spare capacity subject to good bin management (better packing/flattening etc.), it suggests that twin stream collections might be viable in Lincoln, at least in theory. The findings of the trial have been used to indicate the effects, as set out in 4.3 above.
- 5.5 There are however other important issues that require consideration. These are set out in more detail in the main body of the report.

6. Assessing the Request and Developing a TEEP Assessment.

- 6.1 Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) have previously requested via LWP that the City Council adopt the standard twin stream model used by those other districts in the county that have adopted paper and card collections so far. This is of course now compatible with the new Government mandate. It is important and relevant to note that Lincoln is rather different in some ways to these systems used in these areas. In Lincoln about two thirds of Lincoln's properties have 240L wheeled bins (30,250 properties), with about a fifth on 140L bins due to bin storage space restrictions for the bins (9,160 properties). A much smaller number are on bag collections (880) due to either storage or access restrictions, and some are asked to use communal bins (6,780) due to access issues.
- 6.2 The recent Government announcement to mandate paper and card collections unless a good case can be found not to do so, means that a TEEP assessment has been appropriate to assess viability. The TEEP assessment officers have completed has taken into consideration several key factors:
- a) That many properties in Lincoln would struggle to accommodate an extra bin/s.
 - b) Food waste collections are now mandated to be in place for every residence in Lincoln from April 2026, so more bins will have to be provided and there is a need for extensive planning and preparations to be put in place.

- c) The Extended Producer Responsibility regulations (EPR) mean that the volumes of packaging in the waste stream are expected to reduce significantly as packaging producers will be taxed on their use.
 - d) The Council's Community Services team have to mobilise some of the Council's largest contracts (waste, cleansing and grounds maintenance services) under completely new contract terms and systems, on a strict timetable by September 2026.
- 6.3 To ensure that the TEEP assessment is robust, it has taken into consideration the above in the context of three separate types of property/collection:
 - a) Properties served by 140L wheeled bins or bags
 - b) Properties served by 240L wheeled bins
 - c) Properties served by communal collection systems.
- 6.4 A summary of the outcome of the assessment is that whilst some areas, particularly some of the areas served by 240L bins, could potentially accommodate a paper and card collection, there are good reasons not to do this at this time.
- 6.5 Additionally, not only can we not be certain what the packaging regulations impact will be on the volumes of packaging that will be in the domestic waste stream in the next few years, but also adding extra bins at a time when bins left out on streets is an enforcement issue, would risk enflaming a particular problem. Aside from that, the workload of planning the new contracts' implementation, whilst also adding a new food waste service would overstretch resources and add an unnecessary risk for the delivery of services. Services that currently enjoy a very high level of satisfaction.
- 6.6 Based on the TEEP assessment, there is a clear recommendation to delay consideration of implementation. This is therefore the recommendation to Executive. Critically it should be noted that not having a separate bin does not stop paper and card being recycled. It is still recycled just as lower grade material.
- 6.7 However, delaying the decision, does not mean doing nothing in relation to the issue of 'contamination,' and the recommendation to Executive is to engage with LCC and undertake a renewed concerted education and enforcement campaign starting in the summer and autumn, running through until Christmas. Beyond this, to enact enforcement where appropriate and if required.
- 6.8 The options that have been considered for context in developing the TEEP are:
 - 1) Not to introduce paper and card collections at this time.
 - 2) Introduce paper and card collections in 240L areas only.
 - 3) Introduce paper and card collections in all areas (except areas without wheeled bins e.g. bags collections, those with communal bins).
 - 4) To work with LCC on 'contamination' reduction, through increased education and enforcement.

- 6.9 **Option 1** Not to introduce paper and card collections at this time.
- 6.10 The Council's waste services are operating as they have for some years now. They are therefore stable in terms of service provision, and satisfaction with the reliability of recycling services is high (94.1% fairly or very satisfied as at Nov. 2023).
- 6.11 However, whilst the existing service offers reliability of collections (97.6% reliability satisfaction as of Nov 2023), it is not achieving aspirations to reduce contamination rates or improve recycling rates, and so a change of some nature will be required at some point. A footnote to this is that the newly mandated food waste service may have an impact of its own on contamination levels by taking a 'dirty' substance out of the MDR. It shouldn't get into the recycle as a contaminant, but it does as some recyclers are not sufficiently diligent the contamination rates suggest.
- 6.12 The existing City Council contract for waste /recycling services runs until Sept 2026. Although we now know that Biffa have been awarded the next contract, any changes in advance of that would have to be negotiated with Biffa. The extent of any financial impact from this is subject to them being able to demonstrate justifiable costs. It is noted that many aspects of twin stream collections do not impose extra costs (it is the same number of bin lifts overall), but as Lincoln is not all on 240L bins, and collection rounds are mixed in a few cases, there are some additional costs that cannot be avoided.
- 6.13 It is important to remember for context that the Environment Act has recently added another level of complexity to how the Council may plan service changes. The Council is also being mandated to introduce food waste collections for every residence by April 2026, which represents a significant challenge in itself, detracting from the staff resources available for this work.
- 6.14 All of the above means that whilst the 'do nothing at this time' option might not be desirable in terms of aspirations for improved recycling, it would reduce pressures on the services in a period when other changes are also being managed i.e. The transition to a new contract process, and planning for food waste collections to every residence in the city. There is therefore a very real risk that satisfaction rates would be adversely impacted by introducing separate paper and card collections at this time, not only as they are likely to be unpopular as has been seen at other Councils, but because they will add to what may already feel like a turbulent period of change for residents' waste/recycling management.
- 6.15 **Option 2.** 240L areas only
- 6.16 This model is based on making changes at properties with 240L wheeled bins only, which is approximately two thirds of the city. At each property, another 240L bin would be provided. The new bin would be designated the colour purple, as this is not a colour in use in any district to denote anything else and is commercially available. The preference is for black bins with purple lids, as has been used at all other Councils who have adopted separate collections in Lincolnshire. This bin would be explicitly for dry paper and card only.

- 6.17 Collections of separated paper and card would alternate with that of the mixed recyclate (MDR). So, based on the standard 240L wheeled bin model, a household would get one collection each week, on a rotation: Domestic waste / Mixed recyclate / Domestic waste / Separated paper and card – the sequence then repeats.
- 6.18 In this way mixed general domestic waste is still taken fortnightly, but the dry recyclate is split. No extra waste is generated, and the resident has no more or less capacity; they are just required to separate the paper and card into another bin and ensure it is presented on the right day.
- 6.19 It is recognised that although 240L bin residents were initially given this size of bin because they had more space, evidence suggests that some with 240L bins may still have problems storing yet another wheeled bin, so all properties would have to be subject to individual assessment.
- 6.20 **Option 3** To do this in all areas (except areas without wheeled bins e.g. bag collections, those with communal bins).
- 6.21 Under this option the vast majority of the city (all those with 140L or 240L bins) would be included. All would be given a purple lidded bin (as above), but it would be equal to the size already given for other services (140L or 240L).
- 6.22 Historically about one fifth of the city have been given the smaller 140L bins in recognition of the restrictions on the storage space that they have.
- 6.23 The 140L areas operate with a different collection frequency to 240L areas, mindful that they have less capacity in each bin. The adjusted collection frequencies are intended to make the services more equitable, regardless of where a resident lives, be it in a 140L or 240L area.
- 6.24 In 140L areas the general waste (black bin) is taken weekly, with the recycling (brown bin) taken fortnightly.
- The introduction of a purple lidded bin for cardboard would necessitate the service alternating the collection of MDR and paper and card and still being weekly for general waste.
- 6.25 140L areas will, by virtue of them being put on this system in recognition of them having less storage space, have greater difficulty accommodating any extra bins. Again, in a number of 140L areas there is a problem of bins left on street all week.
- 6.26 **Option 4.** To work with LCC on 'contamination' reduction, through increased education and enforcement. This would be in advance of reconsideration of separate paper and card collections at a future date.
- 6.27 Noting that as significant parts of the city will have problems storing another wheeled bin, and that the intention of the twin stream system is principally to

reduce ‘contamination,’ this is an option that gives Members an alternative to doing nothing.

- 6.28 Based on working with LCC colleagues, this option envisages an education and enforcement package being delivered, giving people more information first, but if they refuse to adjust habits to clean up their waste, then increasing the strength of action by way of enforcing. This might be refusal to collect waste until correctly sorted, or ultimately, formal enforcement action if a household refuses to use their bins correctly.

7. The Positive and Negative Impacts for each Option.

- 7.1 The following are general comments applicable to any area where a twin stream system is installed.
- 7.2 It should be noted that learning from the trial and roll-out at other Councils has shown that whilst there is considerable support for the general principles of recycling, the introductions have not been without problems.
- 7.3 Problems have usually been about bin storage space, perceived loss of disposal capacity, or the enforcement/rejection of contaminated bins.
- 7.4 Extensive education/information is required in advance and at introduction, and strict enforcement is also required for the minority who simply refuse to cooperate. Both of these two aspects are extremely resource hungry and would need to be very well resourced for the set-up and given adequate ongoing support beyond that period. It is vital that this is sustained, as early adopters of twin stream have shown that the benefits only remain if the education and enforcement is sustained.
- 7.5 None of the roll-outs have guaranteed to customers that the recycling rate will improve significantly as a consequence of introduction, so that might be an issue for the future as this becomes better understood, although falling residual waste rates may assist by masking this issue (recyclate will be a higher percentage of the overall if recycling continued at the same rate).

| 7.6 | Option | Positive impacts | Negative impacts |
|-----|--|---|--|
| | 1. Not to introduce paper and card collections at this time. | <p>No disruption to services- public satisfaction not adversely impacted.</p> <p>No additional disturbance of services at a time when staff are under pressure planning for other service changes (food and new contracts).</p> | <p>Risk of claims that we would not be compliant with government mandate- but this would be offset by the TEEP assessment.</p> <p>No change in reported contamination rates.</p> <p>Not recycling paper and card separately, may negatively impact EPR</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| | <p>No extra bins on streets, so no additional pressure on enforcement functions for this aspect of work.</p> <p>No increased costs for CoLC</p> <p>No risks from introducing an inequitable service</p> | <p>payments in the future (these are new supplementary payments made to local government by central government as recompense for recycling costs- the funds coming from charges made on packaging producers. The scheme and/or any potential payments have not yet been defined).</p> |
| 2. 240L areas only | <p>Some improvement in reported contamination levels in these areas.</p> | <p>Risk of claims that we would not be compliant with government mandate- but this would be offset by the TEEP assessment.</p> <p>Disruption, but limited to areas more able to take an extra bin. Expected general adverse impact on satisfaction.</p> <p>'Enforcement' in target areas will be required which will include rejection of bins, adding to discontent and impacting satisfaction by those affected.</p> <p>More bins left out on some streets, likely to require significant work, and impact satisfaction scores.</p> <p>Inequitable service.</p> <p>Not recycling paper and card separately, may negatively impact EPR payments in the future (these are new supplementary</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>payments made to local government by central government as recompense for recycling costs- the funds coming from charges made on packaging producers. The scheme and/or any potential payments have not yet been defined).</p> <p>Other financial implications- see finance section below.</p> |
| <p>3. To do this in all areas (except areas without wheeled bins)</p> | <p>Compliance with the government mandate (except areas without wheeled bins)</p> <p>Improvement in reductions in reported contamination levels (greater than option 2)</p> | <p>Significant disruption to all areas of the city. Expected general adverse impact on satisfaction.</p> <p>Enforcement and bin rejections will be required, adding to discontent and impacting satisfaction by those affected.</p> <p>Bins left on many streets likely to require significant work, and impact satisfaction scores.</p> <p>Financial implications- see finance section below.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>4. Increased education and enforcement.</p> | <p>No wholesale disruption to services- only individuals may be affected. General public satisfaction not impacted.</p> <p>No wider/uncontrolled disturbance of wider services at a time when staff are under pressure planning for other service changes (food and new contracts).</p> <p>No extra bins on streets, so no additional pressure on PPASB relating to this specific function.</p> <p>Education might deliver improved public understanding /cultural shift for longer term benefit.</p> <p>Gives public opportunity to change and avoid the need for enforcement/extra bins if it works.</p> <p>No increased costs for CoLC arising from changed collections</p> <p>No risks from introducing an inequitable service</p> | <p>Risk of claims that we would not be compliant with government mandate- but this would be offset by the TEEP assessment.</p> <p>Impact on 'contamination' will be slower than regime change.</p> <p>Does not deliver higher quality recycle quickly.</p> |
|--|--|--|

8. Special Note on Side Waste.

- 8.1 The Council's operational procedures for its waste service are available on the Council's website. Currently the service allows for additional recycling waste to be presented at the side of each bin (but not general waste or garden waste).
- 8.2 In November 2018, the Council approved the Waste Strategy for Lincolnshire and in doing so committed to the fourth Strategic Objective '*To explore new*

opportunities of promoting waste minimisation and of using all waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy’.

- 8.3 The waste hierarchy ranks waste management options according to what is best for the environment. It gives top priority to preventing waste in the first place.
- 8.4 When waste is unavoidably created, it gives priority to preparing it for re-use, then recycling, then recovery, and last of all disposal. Arguably, by allowing the collection of side waste, the Council is not following the waste hierarchy as the first step is to ask residents to consider reducing the amount of waste produced.
- 8.5 Side waste also looks unsightly on the street scene and can add to litter problems as it is susceptible to scatter by wind blow, vermin, and acts of antisocial behaviour.
- 8.6 Finally, LCC have asserted that they consider recycling side waste in bags to be a particular source of ‘contamination.’
- 8.7 In all newly developed paper and card areas in other districts residents have not been able to place additional waste next to their bin. Paper mills have a minimum moisture content which is achieved only through all paper and card they receive remaining as dry as possible. Wet paper and card may be rejected.
- 8.8 Under option 2,3 and 4, as operatives cannot be asked to make judgement calls on how damp paper and card is, and side-waste promotion is not fully compatible with the waste hierarchy, it is suggested that the Council’s policy should, at some point, be reconsidered in light of the above.
- 8.9 However, the timing of such a decision should be evidence based and linked to the preferred option and may be implemented as either a part of the education/enforcement work stream, or when paper and card collections are implemented.
- 8.10 Ongoing work is taking place to either prove or dispute the allegations on contamination to aid the debate.

9. Strategic Priorities

9.1 Let’s Reduce All Kinds of Inequality

A key issue for this introduction would be the extent to which it could be deliverable. Partial delivery would leave some without access to the new format of service. In any event, there will be those on bags/communal bins who would not have access, even if the more comprehensive option 3 was considered palatable.

However, as the existing MDR system is not being withdrawn, strictly speaking, under the proposals no household is disadvantaged, as they would still retain the option to recycle paper and card, albeit through a mixed system.

9.2 **Let's Address the Challenge of Climate Change**

The paper and card initiative is focused on getting the correct materials in their designated bins and thereby reducing rejected materials and low grade recycle rates.

As the proposal would predominantly utilise existing collection rounds, whilst there would be a very small impact on carbon emissions from extra vehicle movements, any increase in carbon footprint would be offset by the improved quality of the recycle.

Any increased activity of any kind would have a larger carbon footprint, but if it had a long-term effect on recycling culture/practice, the negative impacts are mitigated.

10. **Organisational Impacts**

10.1 **Finance**

10.1.1 There are no direct financial implications arising as a result of the recommendations of this report. However, set out below are the estimated financial implications associated with the introduction of separate paper and card collections.

10.1.2 There are two main areas of costs:

- a) Set-up (new bins/publicity/ contract costs for returns/ staff time)
- b) Operating (day to day when the changes have settled)

10.1.3 Set Up Costs

LCC originally stated that they would provide the bins free of charge at set up, and up to 3% of the value of the bins at start up for three years for replacement, as they have for other districts that have adopted twin stream collections. In light of the Government mandate on this issue, that offer has now been withdrawn.

10.1.4 LCC will however still offer to provide staff/education/enforcement/ support to drive home the change until settled (typically 6 months but can be longer).

10.1.5 Operating Costs

The City would incur several new costs. These would be not just in staff time to prepare, support and embed the changes, but also there would be contract costs in the order of £20k p.a. for route changes. The bin set up, given LCC's withdrawn offer, would now be significant. Subject to the areas to be covered, potentially in excess of £1million, with an estimated annual revenue tail of £5k p.a. for new bins for housing growth in the city.

In addition to the above, although difficult to quantify with any accuracy, it is anticipated that any growth in bins provided would lead to a need for additional

staff to address the additional 'bins on streets' enforcement pressures. It is anticipated that two staff would be required at an estimated cost of £96k p.a. The estimated annual revenue cost to the Council of operating a separate paper and card collection service equates to c£121k p.a. The funding of both will be considered as part of future reports on any decision to implement the service.

10.2 Legal Implications including Procurement Rules

- 10.2.1 There is one key item of legislation relevant to this proposal. The Environmental Protection Act 1990 (the statutory obligations to collect, which is placed on WCAs and the responsibility to dispose, which is placed on the WDAs).
- 10.2.2 The recently introduced Environment Act has mandated that food waste collections are made, and also that separate paper and card collections are made, unless a TEEP assessment exempts this.
- 10.2.3 The Environment Act 1990 sets out the relative statutory obligations of CoLC (as WCA) and LCC (as WDA). In simplified terms, S45 sets out the duty of a WCA to collect waste, and S46 identifies the requirements of a WCA to notify residents of its requirements so as to let it make the collections.
- 10.2.4 Any procurement will be undertaken in line with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and the relevant legislation relating to the existing provision (Public Contract Regulations 2015 or Procurement Act 2023).

10.3 Equality, Diversity and Human Rights

- 10.3.1 The Public Sector Equality Duty means that the Council must consider all individuals when carrying out their day-to-day work, in shaping policy, delivering services and in relation to their own employees.
- 10.3.2 It requires that public bodies have due regard to the need to:
 - Eliminate discrimination
 - Advance equality of opportunity
 - Foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities
- 10.3.3 This will be assessed carefully subject to the Executive expressing a clear view on a preferred option, whereby an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) will be completed.
- 10.3.4 An EIA would take into account, amongst other things, accessibility and appropriate formats for any education campaign and the impact of additional bins on pavement access for individuals using wheelchairs or mobility aids or pushchairs.

10.4 Significant Community Impact &/or Environmental Impact

- 10.4.1 Subject to the preferred option chosen, this change in waste/recycling policy has potential to impact communities / environment significantly.

10.5 Corporate Health and Safety Implications

- 10.5.1 This will be assessed carefully subject to the Executive expressing a clear view on a preferred option.

11. Risk Implications

11.1 (i) Options Explored

As set out in paragraph 7.6.

11.2 (ii) Key Risks Associated with the Preferred Approach

It may not bring about the desired change in behaviour, leading to a requirement to revisit this issue in the future.

12. Recommendations

- 12.1 To delay consideration of installing separate paper and card collections in the city until 2027.
- 12.2 To engage with LCC to develop an education and enforcement campaign in support of lowering contamination and improving recycling rates.
- 12.3 The Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place to undertake review work to look into the risks that side waste is causing contamination, and any recommendation to withdraw that service to be brought back to the Executive.

Is this a key decision? Yes

Do the exempt information categories apply? No

Does Rule 15 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules (call-in and urgency) apply? No

How many appendices does the report contain? None

List of Background Papers: None

Lead Officer: Steven Bird, Assistant Director
Communities and Streetscene
Steve.bird@lincoln.gov.uk

This page is intentionally blank.

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| SUBJECT: | EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC |
| DIRECTORATE: | CHIEF EXECUTIVE & TOWN CLERK |
| REPORT AUTHOR: | CAROLYN WHEATER, MONITORING OFFICER |

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To advise members that any agenda items following this report are considered to contain exempt or confidential information for the reasons specified on the front page of the agenda for this meeting.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 It is recommended that the press and public be excluded from the meeting at this point as it is likely that if members of the press or public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt or confidential information.

This page is intentionally blank.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally blank.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally blank.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally blank.