



St Edmundsbury  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

# C234

## Cabinet 23 November 2011

### West Suffolk Waste and Street Scene Services Joint Committee: 28 October 2011 (Dec11/06)

*(The following is a summary of the decisions taken by the Joint Committee.  
This is for information only and no decisions are required by the Cabinet at this  
stage)*

*Cabinet Members:  
Cllrs David Ray and Peter Stevens*

*Chairman of the Joint Committee:  
Cllr Peter Stevens*

#### 1. Procurement of Waste Transfer and Recycling Services (Report C185)

**RESOLVED:- That**

- (1) a joint approach to procurement of waste transfer and recyclate marketing services for all of the Suffolk Waste Partnership authorities, led by Suffolk County Council, be supported;
- (2) the recommended approach to procurement, as detailed in Appendix 1 and within the timescales outlined in paragraphs 18 to 23 of Report C185, which recommends two lots each procured as countywide contracts, let either individually or in combination where a further discount can be offered: 1 - Waste transfer & residual waste haulage, 2 - Recyclate haulage and processing, be supported; and
- (3) commencement of the recommended process with Suffolk County Council as the lead authority and that delegated authority be given to the Strategic Director (FHDC) and Corporate Director Economy and Environment (SEBC) in consultation with the relevant Member Champion/Portfolio Holder to agree terms and conditions that best protect the Councils' interests.

The joint procurement of waste transfer and recycling infrastructure services was proposed based on the recommendation of the Suffolk Waste Partnership as being the best approach to delivering value for money and optimum solutions for the Suffolk authorities from April 2014. The details contained within this report were also being considered by all authorities in the Suffolk Waste Partnership, and support was being sought from each of the partner authorities to commence the proposed procurement process.

It was proposed that the procurement be carried out using a Competitive Dialogue process, which meant that the authorities could negotiate the best solution with bidders. During October and November 2011, all eight partner authorities would be seeking approval to commence the procurement exercise. As the lead authority providing the procurement resources, Suffolk County Council was beginning preparation in October 2011 in order to meet the deadline for the issue of tender documents at the beginning of February 2012. The interest of all eight authorities would be represented throughout the process with governance and financial arrangements to be agreed separately. Dialogue with bidders would take place during 2012, with evaluation by representatives of all authorities taking place in December 2012 to select the preferred bidder. Approval to close the contract with the preferred bidder would be sought from all partner authorities in April 2013. Construction, if necessary, and mobilisation to incorporate collection route/round reorganisation and the possible introduction of additional material to the recycling system would take place between April 2013 and March 2014, with the new contracts becoming operational from April 2014.

## **2. Results of the Residual Waste Compositional Analysis 2011 (Report C186)**

The Joint Committee received and noted Report C186 (previously circulated) that detailed the key findings of the residual waste compositional study.

Suffolk Waste Partnership directors had approved that a Residual Waste Compositional Analysis (RWCA) be undertaken in Suffolk. The aims of the analysis were to determine the following:-

- (1) the types and qualities of household waste collected in the residual bin and subsequently landfilled;
- (2) the potential for increasing the diversion of household waste to recycling and composting;
- (3) the relationship between household waste and social economic profiles using the ACORN classification (A Classification of Residential Neighbourhoods); and
- (4) the gross calorific value of the residual waste.

The information would also aid the evaluation of future waste management initiatives, and inform the development of future schemes to maximise recycling and composting through kerb side collections, bring sites and Household Waste Recycling Centres. All borough/district councils in Suffolk took part in the analysis.

The analysis illustrated that there were considerable opportunities to increase the diversion of residual waste to recycling and composting using the current waste collection infrastructure. The reasons for the inability to currently capture this waste was probably linked to residents' perception of the boundaries to recycling, whether conscious or unconscious.

### **3. Controlled Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (Report C187)**

The Joint Committee received and noted Report C187 (previously circulated) that provided the potential implications and impact of the introduction of the new Controlled Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011.

Under the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) 1990, Forest Heath District Council (FHDC) and St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) were waste collection authorities. The Controlled Waste Regulations 1992, made under the EPA, defined the categories of household waste for which the collection duty applied and also detailed household waste for which a collection charge could be made, such as for heavy or bulky items, garden waste, asbestos or dead domestic pets. Also included was waste from specified premises such as hospitals and nursing homes, residential hostels, educational premises, caravans, camp sites and prisons. These types of premises were under no obligation to use local authority waste services. However, private companies would charge for both the collection and the disposal of waste, whereas the current arrangements allowed both Councils to offer these premises lower rates for waste collection given that the County Council were responsible for paying the disposal costs. This provided waste collection authorities a competitive advantage over commercial waste operators and had historically allowed the Councils to retain a high proportion of waste collection business.

The proposed changes in the regulations would mean that FHDC and SEBC would need to start charging these specified organisations both the cost of collection and disposal, as Suffolk County Council would start to charge the Councils the disposal costs as with the case with commercial organisations. This would, therefore, remove the cost advantage that both Councils had enjoyed over the commercial waste operators.

The Joint Committee agreed that it was important for both Councils to prepare for the legislation in order to mitigate the situation.

### **4. The Government Review of Waste Policy 2011 (Report C188)**

The Joint Committee received and noted Report C188 (previously circulated) which updated the Members on the Government Review of Waste Policy 2011, including the key themes, actions and how it related to the provision of waste services in West Suffolk.

In June 2010 the Government announced it would undertake a full review of Waste Policy in England. A joint Forest Heath District Council (FHDC)/St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) response was subsequently submitted, in addition to an overall strategic response by the Suffolk Waste Partnership. The joint response from FHDC/SEBC reiterated the development of the popular and successful waste management collection services in West Suffolk, based upon the three bin alternate weekly collection model.

Following a full review of the available evidence and submissions, the Government had released a number of key documents detailing proposals for management of waste and the connection with wider Government policy, such as the 'Big Society' and Climate Change. The overarching approach was set out in Government Review of Waste Policy in England 2011, which set out the vision and proposals to manage waste successfully and efficiently in the future. Supporting this were three further documents.

The Government's ambition for waste management was 'working towards a zero waste economy'. The Government wanted to ensure that the policies and ways of delivering them were fit for purpose, met society's expectations, while reflecting the Government's ambition to be the greenest ever. To this effect, the Government had set out key guiding commitments within the review, which were summarised in Table 2 of the report.

## **5. Progress on delivering the 2011/2012 Joint Waste Service Plan and Review of Performance (Report C189)**

The Joint Committee received and noted Report C189 (previously circulated) which reported on progress made against the key tasks in the 2011/2012 Joint Service Plan and the related key performance indicators.

The Joint Service Plan was intended to aid the integration of service delivery and enable the Joint Committee to manage a delivery of services in accordance with the partner in agreement. The Service Plan was supported with a range of performance indicators in order to determine if progress was on target and to determine whether further action was required.

Table 1 in the report provided a summary of the interim progress against the Service Plan actions adopted for 2011/2012. The Committee noted key areas of progress which included:-

- (1) street cleansing review;
- (2) vehicle procurement;
- (3) joint municipal waste strategy annual report;
- (4) compositional household waste analysis;
- (5) development of the replacement for National Indicator 195 street cleanliness survey; and
- (6) development of modelling options for the collection of organics.

## **6. Inter Authority Agreement**

The Corporate Director for Economy and Environment informed the Joint Committee that Suffolk County Council was to withdraw from the current Inter Authority Agreement due to affordability. However, following representations from the Suffolk Waste Partnership it would appear that negotiations would be re-opened and a revised Inter Authority Agreement would be negotiated.

## **7. Options for Diverting Organic Waste (Exempt Report C190)**

### **RESOLVED:-**

**That a further report on Options for Diverting Organic Waste be presented to the Joint Committee at its meeting on 27 January 2012.**

The Joint Committee considered Exempt Report C190 (previously circulated) which updated Members on work undertaken by the Suffolk Waste Partnership (SWP) to investigate the costs and benefits of different systems to collect and treat organic waste from residual waste.

The Suffolk Waste Partnership (SWP) commissioned an analysis of the cost savings and performance improvement potential of a number of key aspects of the Partnership's services; organic waste, glass recycling, double shifting on collections and trade waste. On 18 May 2011 the Directors Group received a report and it was agreed to limit the options under further consideration and to commission internal and external resources to refine the analysis. In June 2010 a household waste composition analysis was commissioned by the SWP to identify the different waste types within the residual waste stream. The analysis confirmed the professional view that there was a high proportion of organic waste within the waste stream and further opportunities to increase waste diversion.

Following collation of the relevant information, the model calculated the joint collection and disposal costs of each of the six models and concluded that changes to organic waste services in Suffolk had the potential to increase performance, reduce costs and deliver in line with national waste policy.