

**FOREST HEATH DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**ST EDMUNDSBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**WEST SUFFOLK WASTE AND STREET SCENE SERVICES JOINT COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of a meeting held on Friday 28 October 2011 at 10.00 am**  
**in the Conference Chamber West (F1R09), West Suffolk House, Western Way,**  
**Bury St Edmunds**

PRESENT:            Forest Heath District Council  
                         Councillor Roman (Vice-Chairman)  
                         Councillor Simmons

St Edmundsbury Borough Council  
Councillor Ray  
Councillor Stevens (Chairman)

IN ATTENDANCE:    M Christie, Environment and Waste Service Manager (FHDC)  
                         P Clifford, Fleet and Technical Manager (SEBC)  
                         D Linguard, Operations Manager (FHDC)  
                         K Marley, Head of Environmental Services (FHDC)  
                         N McCurdy, Strategic Director (Services) (FHDC)  
                         S Pell, Corporate Director for Economy and Environment (SEBC)  
                         C Silverwood, Operations Manager (SEBC)  
                         M Walsh, Head of Waste and Street Scene Services (SEBC)  
                         P Weller, Legal Executive (FHDC)  
                         S Lincoln, Committee Services Manager (SEBC)

**14. Substitutes**

No substitutions were declared.

**15. Apologies for Absence**

No apologies for absence were required.

**16. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2011 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**17. Declarations of Interests**

Members' declarations of interests are recorded under the item to which the declaration relates.

**18. Procurement of Waste Transfer and Recycling Services**

The Joint Committee considered Report C185 (previously circulated) which sought approval for a joint approach to procurement of waste transfer and recycle marketing services for all of the Suffolk Waste Partnership authorities and led by Suffolk County Council.

Tabled at the meeting was a paper which amended recommendation C in paragraph 40 (c) of the report.

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 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.

The cost of the contracts would be met through the collective Suffolk waste budgets. The exact cost of the proposed new transfer and recycling infrastructure would not be known with certainty until bids were returned, however, the procurement process had been designed to encourage the most competitive bids. In broad terms, the new system was not expected to be more expensive than the present system, with savings possible through more efficient and joined up contracts.

In responses to questions the Joint Committee was informed that:-

- (1) costings had been undertaken in the eventuality that no transfer stations were located at Mildenhall and/or Haverhill;
- (2) transfer stations used by both Councils could be located across the county boundary;
- (3) the suggested locations for transfer stations were based on need, and took into account population, where waste was arising and the road network; and
- (4) transfer stations were currently owned and operated by contractors, but in the future a local authority could own the site which could then be operated by a contractor.

RESOLVED:- That

- (1) a joint approach to procurement of waste transfer and recycle 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.

## **19. Results of the Residual Waste Compositional Analysis 2011**

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.

As part of the project 100 households were sampled in both Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council from a variety of ACORN Groups, which were detailed in Table 1. The waste was categorised into 15 primary and 48 secondary categories based upon the guidance issued by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and Appendix 1 detailed the range of categories used in the analysis.

Charts 1 and 2 illustrated the breakdown of primary waste found in the District and Borough Councils' black bins. Tables 2 and 3 outlined the top three ranked waste materials that could be potentially recycled through the current kerbside collection scheme. Tables 4 and 5 identified the top two materials that could be potentially composted through the current kerbside collection scheme. Tables 6 and 7 indicated the top two materials that could be potentially recycled at local recycling centres.

Appendix 2 attached to the report outlined, in ranked order, the quantity of the different waste types disposed off in the black bin for both Councils, including the estimated annual quantity collected based on the residual waste collected in 2010/2011.

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.

The Joint Committee recognised that the analysis represented on 'snapshot' and there may be seasonal variations. The Joint Committee also recognised that there was an opportunity to improve recycling rates through continued education and encouragement of the public. It was noted that further work was required to interpret the results of the analysis to identify possible further improvements to recycling.

## **20. Controlled Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011**

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 trade waste collection services provided an important source of income to both Councils.

The Joint Committee agreed that it was important for both Councils to prepare for the legislation in order to mitigate the situation. It was considered that initially the Councils should inform these organisations about the likely introduction of this legislation and its potential impact upon their budgets and fully explain the reasons. It was also considered important to notify these organisations as soon as possible as they would be starting their budget setting cycle. The next step would then be to develop a tactical plan that would ensure that the Councils retain as many of these organisations as trades waste customers as possible. This would include helping them to mitigate cost increases by increasing the amount of waste that they could recycle and could also include a transitional costing structure by moving them more gradually to the full cost of collection and disposal.

The Committee considered that it would be more cost effective to spend effort retaining existing customer than trying to find new ones, and the resources should be allocated accordingly to minimise any result in decline in trade waste revenue.

## **21. The Government Review of Waste Policy 2011**

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.

The review took into consideration related issues such as climate change and energy policy, however the review had also been guided by the waste hierarchy, which was both the guide to sustainable waste management and the legal requirement in the Revised European Union Waste Framework Directive, and this was illustrated in Figure 1 in the report. Summary of the main parts of the review was attached as Appendix 1 to the report. Appendix 2 set out the key implications of the Review of Households, the Environment, Business and Local Authorities. Appendix 3 was the response to the review from the Local Authority Recycling Advisory Committee (LARAC).

An action plan had also been developed listing the actions required from the various partners to deliver the review objectives.

The Government was keen to work in partnership with local authorities and businesses in all parts of the economy to encourage and spread best practice in waste prevention and resource management.

The Joint Committee recognised that it was crucial that the right balance was reached between customer service, the environment and cost.

## **22. Progress on delivering the 2011/2012 Joint Waste Service Plan and Review of Performance**

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.

Table 2 in the report outlined the service indicators that related to waste and street scene services. Appendix 1 detailed the current profiled waste recycling progress against the same period in 2010/2011 for both Councils. In terms of municipal waste, the trend for the generation of household waste formed a similar profile between 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 and there was a consistency in the profile between both Councils. From April to September 2011 the percentage of waste that was recycled and composted had increased in comparison to the same period last year for both Councils.

In terms of street scene, there was ongoing consistency with the performance of both Councils with regards to managing environmental cleanliness.

The Joint Committee recognised that with the recent decisions of both full Councils that there was to be a shared officer structure incorporating a single Management Team between both authorities that work would now progress on appointing a single Head of Waste Management Services.

The Joint Committee was aware that the household recycling centre at Ingham had been closed by Suffolk County Council and that implications needed to be assessed in respect of waste collection by the Borough Council in particular.

### **23. 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.

### **24. Dates of Future Meetings**

The Joint Committee confirmed the following dates for future meetings in 2012:-

27 January; and  
23 March.

Both meetings would be held on Fridays to commence at 10.00 am.

\*\*\*\*\*

**EXEMPT INFORMATION – EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC  
TERMS OF FORMAL RESOLUTION**

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Act.

\*\*\*\*\*

**25. Options for Diverting Organic Waste**

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 amended version of exempt Appendix 3 was previously circulated.

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 meeting concluded at 12.16 pm.

**CHAIRMAN**