

Public Document Pack

1

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 18 September 2025

Attendance:

Councillors
Pett (Chairperson)

Brophy
Bennett
Latham

Latham
Lee
Miller

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors Power and Westwood

Deputy Members:

Councillor Eve (deputy for Councillor Westwood)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Cramoysan (Cabinet Member for Recycling and Public Protection)

[Full Video Recording](#)

1. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

Apologies were noted as above.

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Lee made a personal statement that he was a Trustee of WinACC, should any discussion arise in this respect during the consideration of items.

Councillor Pett declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of agenda item 8 (Nature Improvement Plan) due to being a member of the South Downs National Park Authority. However, as there was no material conflict of interest regarding this, he stated that he had a dispensation granted by the Monitoring Officer that enabled him to speak and vote on these matters.

3. **CHAIRPERSON'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements made at this meeting.

4. **MINUTES**

The Chairperson reported that in respect of Item 8 (Nature Improvement Plan) reference was made to Ecosystems Services and enhancements for inclusion at section 2.27 of the Nature Improvement Plan. This had been accepted and acknowledged by officers.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meetings held on the 3 July 2025 be approved and adopted.

5. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Ian Tait addressed the committee regarding item 6 and 7 and his comments are summarised under the relevant minute below.

6. **FUTURE OF WASTE PROJECT (PRESENTATION)**

Ian Tait addressed the committee, and a summary of his comments are set out below.

1. He expressed frustration at the limited availability for items that could be recycled, leading him to place items he considered recyclable into the general waste. He would utilise existing facilities at the Cattle Market, Winchester for other recyclable waste if this was available.
2. As a single person, he created little food waste and therefore questioned whether the new service was necessary in terms of recycling priorities. He produced more plastic and other types of waste than food.
3. He raised concerns regarding the anaerobic digestion plants, including the distances involved for farmers transporting of maize to the Three Maids Hill facility. Tractors transporting also negatively impacted air quality.
4. Regarding food waste produced by restaurants and other food outlets, he inquired whether the new service would be available to smaller food retailers.

The Cabinet Member for Recycling and Public Protection (Councillor Cramoysan) responded to the points raised including that the council, as a collections authority; continued to work closely with Hampshire County Council who was the disposal authority. Changes and improvements were proposed as to what waste was able to be collected for recycling and he reminded that it was a legislative requirement for arrangements to be in place for food waste collection by April 2026. The council was ahead of schedule, and rollout of the service had commenced.

The Corporate Head of Service: Place then gave a presentation and several questions were asked, including the following:

1. A question was asked regarding food waste bins and their durability and whether residents would be required to pay for replacements if bins were damaged, and was the contractor was responsible for its care when on the street.
2. What were the arrangements for commercial food waste collection for restaurants and retail establishments?
3. Clarification was sought on whether the carbon savings from the commercial service were factored into the council's life cycle costings related to greenhouse gas targets.
4. A question was asked regarding the anticipated participation rates for the food waste service, as evidenced by the experiences of other councils.
5. A question was asked regarding the response that should be given to residents who currently composted their food waste.
6. Would there be penalties for residents who chose not to participate in the scheme?
7. Would Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) be provided to show the number of kilograms of waste per household.
8. Clarification was sought on whether data analysis would allow the identification of routes performing better than others, enabling recycling officers to focus their efforts.
9. A question was asked regarding resources, either on the council website or elsewhere, that residents could be signposted to, to help them reduce needlessly wasting food.
10. An inquiry was made as to what would happen if people did not use bin liners, given the cost of living crisis and the requirement for residents to purchase them. What was the necessity of using compostable bags if the bags were extracted and incinerated later at the anaerobic digester?
11. Clarification was requested on whether the use of non-compostable bags meant that residual microplastics could end up on fields, within the fertiliser end product.

The Cabinet Member and the Corporate Head of Service: Place responded to the questions asked.

The Corporate Head of Service then gave a further presentation regarding 'Extended Producer Responsibility' (EPA) and several questions were asked, including the following:

1. A question was asked concerning whether there was any identified 'pushback' from the packaging industry against the new legislation and whether there was a risk of delays to implementation.
2. Clarification was sought regarding the potential financial implications for the council: whether increased success by packaging producers in achieving lower rates might lead to reduced income for the authority.
3. A question was asked concerning potential alignment issues with Hampshire waste recycling centres and whether messaging needed to be aligned across the authorities.
4. Clarification was sought on the risks and opportunities identified as packaging changes became more innovative. This included a specific query relating to multi-component packaging (such as a cardboard tray containing plastic film) and the risk of the public incorrectly placing such items in recycling.
5. A question was asked about the steps being taken to prepare for infrastructure changes (such as the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) build) particularly as this coincided with local government reorganisation.
6. What was the future intent and timeline for electrifying the waste vehicle fleet, given that the current vehicles were running primarily on Hydrotreated Vegetable Oil (HVO).

The Cabinet Member and the Corporate Head of Service: Place responded to the questions asked.

In conclusion, the committee thanked officers and the Cabinet Member for an informative update.

RESOLVED:

That the presentation be received and the comments raised by the committee, as summarised above, be noted.

7. **AIR QUALITY STRATEGY (PRESENTATION)**

Ian Tait addressed the committee, and a summary of his comments are set out below.

1. He emphasised the importance of air quality for pedestrians and noted the strategy's commitment to delivering the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. He referred to his desired pedestrian improvements to the City Bridge, identifying it as a key route into Winchester.
2. The Council should show political leadership by making it difficult for car drivers to access Winchester city centre. It should promote an emphasis towards walking, cycling, and public transport and away from the private car.

3. He expressed concern regarding the low number of all-electric taxis (two).

The Cabinet Member for Recycling and Public Protection (Councillor Cramoysan) responded to the points raised. Regarding the City Bridge, there was currently no evidence of this being a poor air quality hotspot. He confirmed that the Council was lobbying and had recently signed off funding (CIL money) to help expand walking and cycling infrastructure in the city. The Council had limited direct leverage over bus companies and therefore the focus remained on encouraging changes to reduce traffic. Regarding all-electric taxis, Councillor Cramoysan detailed the challenges faced by taxi drivers and also reminded that installing chargers on ranks would only benefit Hackney Carriages, excluding Private Hire vehicles. The taxi licensing policy did, however, offer an incentive: electric vehicles and hybrids could be registered as taxis three years older than their petrol or diesel equivalents, helping offset costs. Councillor Cramoysan concluded by welcoming the opportunity for interested taxi drivers to meet with him and officers to discuss their challenges and concerns.

Following introduction by the Cabinet member, the Service Lead: Public Protection then gave a presentation on the Air Quality Strategy, and several questions were asked, including the following:

1. Further clarification was sought on whether the delay in the transport policy timeline was attributable to the county council's financial issues and what action could Winchester City Council take to influence.
2. A question was raised regarding how the loss of, or potential threat to, specific local bus services, would fit into the objective of increasing public transport use. An enquiry was made as to whether the council could look at providing funding to maintain specific bus services that served rural communities.
3. A question was asked regarding the rationale for revoking the existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and why the AQMA was not being retained for a longer period, given that the council aimed to meet higher air quality standards than the current national baseline.
4. A question was asked regarding the possibility of integrating actions and awareness related to PM1s (short-lived climate particles and related issues such as bonfires) into the strategy.
5. A question was asked concerning how much credit the council could claim for air quality improvements based on local interventions, versus those improvements resulting from technological advancements, such as electric vehicles).
6. Further clarification was sought on whether the countywide study being undertaken by Hampshire County Council included analysis of the impact of external pollution sources, such as Southampton airport and docks.

7. A request was made to ensure that consideration was given to rural topographical issues, specifically temperature valley inversions, when developing plans for smoke control areas.
8. A question was asked whether the use of mobile air quality monitoring solutions was part of the plans being considered by the council.
9. An enquiry was made regarding how the communications challenge of conveying the positive agenda of cleaner air to the wider public was being incorporated into the strategy.

These were responded to by the Cabinet Member and the Service Lead: Public Protection.

The committee thanked officers and the Cabinet Member for an informative update.

RESOLVED:

That the presentation be received and the comments raised by the committee, as summarised above, be noted.

8. TO NOTE THE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2025/26

The Strategic Director advised that the following additional items would be added to the committee's work programme. Their scheduling would be considered further in consultation with the Chairperson and the officer team.

1. Public Spaces Protection Orders and Enforcement of them
2. Street Scene Operational Delivery
3. Community Resilience and Wellbeing Strategy
4. Leisure Contract - VAT Treatment
5. Building a resilient Waste Service for the future

In addition, the Chairperson proposed two further areas each subject of a task and finish group and that he would discuss their scheduling and specific terms of reference with officers.

1. Identifying current barriers to increasing the availability and accessibility of Electric Vehicle Charging Points across the Winchester.
2. Developing practicable incentives, including indicative costs, for householders off mains drainage to modernise private sewerage systems to reduce the risk of the leaching of nutrients into the surrounding land and watercourses.

RESOLVED:

That the work programme for 2025/26 and items proposed for inclusion as detailed above be noted.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and concluded at 9.20 pm

Chairperson

This page is intentionally left blank