

E275

Cabinet 11 February 2014

Report from the West Suffolk Waste and Street Scene Services Joint Committee: 17 January 2014

1. Summary and reasons for recommendation

- 1.1 On 17 January 2014 the West Suffolk Waste and Street Scene Services Joint Committee (WSWSSSJC) considered the following substantive items of business:
 - Update on the Procurement of Waste Transfer and Recycling Facilities; (1)
 - Review of Waste Management Performance 2013; and (2)
 - Suffolk Waste Partnership (SWP) Organic Waste Review Project -(3) Update.

2. Recommendation

The Cabinet is requested to **NOTE** the content of Report E275 being the 2.1 report of the West Suffolk Waste and Street Scene Services Joint Committee.

Contact details Portfolio holder Name Councillor Peter Stevens Portfolio Holder for Waste and Title

Property

Telephone 01787 280284

peter.stevens@stedsbc.gov.uk E-mail

Lead officer Mark Walsh

Head of Waste Management and

Property Services

01284 757300

mark.walsh@westsuffolk.gov.uk

3. Corporate priorities

- 3.1 The recommendation meets the following, as contained within the Corporate Plan:
 - (a) Corporate Priority 2: 'Working together for prosperous and environmentally- responsible communities'; and
 - (b) Corporate Priority 3: 'Working together for an efficient Council'.

4. Key issues

<u>Update on the Procurement of Waste Transfer and Recycling Facilities</u> (Report E231)

- 4.1 Previous reports considered by the Joint Committee since October 2011 have outlined the proposals and developing plans for a joint procurement of waste transfer infrastructure and recycling infrastructure services in Suffolk as recommended by the Suffolk Waste Partnership (SWP).
- 4.2 The last report E27 (exempt), dated 14 June 2013 had outlined the developments and some of the potential risks for the West Suffolk Waste Collection Authorities (WCAs). Specifically, these were associated with the new arrangements for dealing with the county's residual waste, the new Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) procurement and the future provision of transfer station infrastructure. The report had also described how, through the negotiation of a new Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) for waste, many of the risks identified could be mitigated.
- 4.3 Report E231 updated the Joint Committee on the adoption of a new IAA, progress with the MRF procurement and the latest developments concerning transfer station provision in West Suffolk.
- 4.4 The new IAA had been adopted by the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) and WCAs in Suffolk and had superseded the previous Memorandum of Understanding.
- 4.5 The MRF procurement is now underway through an EU compliant process. Prequalification stages had been completed and the qualifying prospective bidders had been invited to submit tenders for the new contract that will begin on 1 November 2014. These tenders are due in January 2014 after which will follow a period of review. The location of the facility is not specified in the tender and could be within the county or elsewhere.
- 4.6 In order that the proposed Rougham Hill Waste Transfer Station would be ready once new waste arrangements commence from 1 November 2014, SCC intend to start developing the site in the early part of 2014. However, at the request of SEBC, SCC has agreed to hold the start of this development pending a new review of alternative larger sites in or around Bury St Edmunds which could potentially co-locate the new transfer station with a future new waste depot. This would potentially facilitate any future development of the Olding Road site in Bury St Edmunds where the current waste depot is located. Future co-located arrangements of this type, which could comprise other services, were likely to offer medium to long term benefits through operational efficiencies. Whilst there are no immediate plans to relocate the current Bury St Edmunds waste

depot, this action would secure an alternative site to relocate the Bury depot, once development proposals and an appropriate business case supported such a move.

4.7 The Joint Committee received and noted Report E231 and requested that a further report be submitted in due course on progress regarding these matters.

Review of Waste Management Performance 2013 (Report E232)

- 4.8 The Joint Committee received and noted Report E232 which was intended to update Members of the key areas of progress and actions, albeit there is no formal Waste and Street Scene Service Plan for 2013/2014. The key performance indicators for quarter one and two are actual results, whilst estimates are used for quarter three. Current progress is also outlined in Table 1 of Report E232.
- 4.9 Officers were asked to continue addressing a difficulty that replacement bags were not always issued at the time when textile recycling collections were carried out.

Organic Waste Review Project - Interim Update (Agenda Item 9)

4.10 Officers gave a presentation on this matter which had also been given to the Suffolk Waste Partnership (SWP) Members Group on 19 December 2013. The presentation outlined the current mixture of collection services and processing sites in operation across the country and put forward nine options for the collection of organic waste, ie. food waste or garden waste, with assessments of the impacts in terms of percentage of recycling achievable and the estimated cost differentials involved in relation to both Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council.

Other potential effects both in transitional terms of implementing changes and in relation to customer satisfaction and environmental impacts were also pointed out. A proposed timescale for considering any proposals was outlined which would include in a further report to SWP Members in March 2014.

- 4.11 The Joint Committee went into private session to discuss the estimated cost implications of the various options and noted that Options 6 and 8 envisaged charges being introduced in respect of the collection of garden waste and that this service was currently offered without a subscription charge. The Joint Committee also discussed the other issues raised in the presentation of whether to increase waste service costs to achieve a higher diversion of food waste from landfill.
- 4.12 It was acknowledged that any proposed increased cost of waste collection services would have to be assessed in relation to the corporate priorities of the respective Councils. There was a consensus view that the Joint Waste Collection Service should be kept as simple as possible and that it should represent value for money rather than it pursuing recycling objectives at any cost. The Joint Committee noted that the matter would be discussed further by Joint Cabinet in due course.

5. Other options considered

5.1 See Reports E231 and E232 to the WSWSSSJC.

6. Community impacts

6.1 See Reports E231 and E232 to the WSWSSSJC.

7. Consultation

7.1 See Reports E231 and E232 to the WSWSSSJC.

8. Financial and resource implications

8.1 See Reports E231 and E232 to the WSWSSSJC.

9. Risk/Opportunity assessment

9.1 See Reports E231 and E232 to the WSWSSSJC.

10. Legal and policy implications

10.1 See Reports E231 and E232 to the WSWSSSJC.

11. Wards affected

11.1 All Wards.

12. Background papers

12.1 Exempt Report E27 and Reports E231 and E232 to the WSWSSSJC.

13. Documents attached

13.1 None.