



## REPORT TO EXECUTIVE

### PORTFOLIO AREA: ENVIRONMENT, HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE & TRANSPORT

---

Date of Meeting: 20 February 2006

---

Public

---

Key Decision: No

Recorded in Forward Plan: Yes

---

Inside Policy Framework

---

**Title:** CUMBRIA STRATEGIC WASTE PARTNERSHIP  
**Report of:** DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES  
**Report reference:** CS 04/06

#### Summary:

Appended are the draft minutes of the Cumbria Strategic Waste Partnership meeting held on 12 January 2006, for information.

The Executive's attention is drawn to item 4 which relates to the County Council's procurement process for a waste disposal partner. It is suggested that consideration be given to ensuring that City Council Members have the opportunity to understand potential new technologies for waste treatment and their implications.

Item 9 of the minutes is covered by a separate report on this meeting agenda.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended that the draft minutes be received.

**Contact Officer:** Michael Battersby **Ext:** 5005

**Note:** in compliance with section 100d of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 the report has been prepared in part from the following papers: None

## CUMBRIA STRATEGIC WASTE PARTNERSHIP

Minutes of a Meeting of the Cumbria Strategic Waste Partnership held on Thursday 12 January 2006 at The Frenchfield Pavilion, Carleton, Penrith, commencing at 1.00 pm.

### PRESENT

Mr J R Richardson (Chairman)

Mr J Askew – Allerdale Borough Council  
Mr R Bloxham – Carlisle City Council  
Mr A Holliday – Copeland Borough Council  
Mr D Kendall – North West Waste Forum  
Mr B Metz – Eden District Council  
Ms A Thomson – Barrow Borough Council  
Mrs B Woof – South Lakeland District Council

### Also in Attendance:

Mr M Battersby - Carlisle City Council  
Ms J Carrol - Copeland Borough Council  
Mr N Christian - Cumbria County Council  
Mr R Denby - Allerdale Borough Council  
Mr J S Donaldson - Government Office North West  
Mr M Gardner - Carlisle City Council  
Mr G Harrison - Cumbria County Council  
Mr I F Laird - Barrow Borough Council  
Mr C Pickering - Cumbria County Council  
Mr J Storey - Cumbria County Council (Secretary)  
Mr P Turner - South Lakeland District Council  
Mr A Yates - Eden District Council

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence had been received.

### 2. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Cumbria Strategic Waste Partnership meeting held on 30 November 2005 were confirmed as a correct record, subject to it being noted in relation to Minute 8 that there were no links between the Cumbria Waste Management Forum and the North West Market Development Initiative and the amendment of references to pooling Waste Performance and Efficiency Grant to make it clear that this had only been agreed 'in principle'.

### 3. REPORT FROM GOVERNMENT OFFICE NORTH WEST (GONW)

Mr Donaldson referred to the Planit Waste training scheduled to be held on 15 February 2006 at the Civic Centre in Carlisle and advised that the starting time should be brought forward from 1.00 pm to allow time for the training sessions. Mr Donaldson also invited expressions of interest in further Planit Waste training sessions.

It was agreed that the Partnership Board would meet at 10.00 am on 15 February 2006.

Mr Donaldson also reported on progress with the North West Market Development Initiative, which the Partnership Board had agreed to support at its previous meeting. It was noted that one of the Initiative's priority markets for recycled materials would involve organic materials. Mr Donaldson undertook to keep members of the Partnership Board informed of future developments.

### 4. WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIC SERVICE PARTNER UPDATE

Graham Harrison circulated a report, which was to be considered at the 19 January 2006 meeting of Cumbria County Council, concerning the evaluation of bidders' Invitation to Negotiate submissions for the Waste Management Strategic Service Partner and the outcome of that process.

It was explained that the submission from Shanks was seen as the better one in relation to partnership working, but the Waste Recycling Group (WRG) submission was a stronger technical solution and more robust in financial terms. The following aspects had been assessed as part of the evaluation process:

- Affordability
- Flexibility
- Early years LATS solutions
- Planning issues
- The extent to which local markets and contractors were being considered and the planned involvement of the community and not for profit sector
- Recycling performance

It was hoped that a new waste management strategy could be produced, based upon action plans and the development framework. The report also proposed that the County Council should now invite the bidders to submit a Best and Final Offer.

Members discussed the submissions' proposals for composting green waste in the context of the overall costs of the bids and expressed some concern at the implications for the future of District Councils' existing composting schemes. There was also concern that the proposals contained in the submissions for new Household Waste Recycling Centres and upgraded Civic Amenity Sites could have an impact upon contracts to be let by District Councils. Clive Pickering advised that costs and proposals contained in the submissions should not be seen as indicative of the costs or solutions to be agreed at the end of the procurement process. The Best and Final Offer stage of the process would provide an opportunity to develop a new waste management strategy and to clarify the technology and

financial aspects of the bidders' submissions before reporting back to the County Council's Cabinet and full Council meetings in June.

Members also drew attention to the political sensitivity of the process for identifying potential waste treatment sites. In response to this Mr Pickering suggested that another element could be included in the recommendations to the County Council to stipulate that discussion and agreement with District Councils should be involved in this process.

Members of the Partnership Board accepted the report for submission to the 19 January 2006 meeting of the County Council.

## **5. COMPOSITION ANALYSIS OF HOUSEHOLD WASTE IN CUMBRIA**

Nigel Christian gave a presentation, prepared by the environmental consultants ENTEC, outlining findings and recommendations from a household waste compositional analysis of Household Waste Recycling Centre and kerbside collected waste, which had been funded by DEFRA's Local Authority Support Unit (LASU) and conducted by ENTEC. The results of the kerbside and HWRC studies were set out in detail in an accompanying report.

The kerbside study had provided an indication of the waste composition, recovery performance, set out and participation levels for both the Winter and Summer surveys in 2005. It had been noted that the composition of waste was very similar to the national average data reported by the Strategy Unit. Waste composition was similar between Waste Collection Authorities, but with a greater quantity of organic non-catering (garden waste) found in the more rural areas. The waste composition for both the Winter and Summer surveys was similar.

For the HWRC study the data collected was consistent with national reported Civic Amenity Site data sets, with inert, miscellaneous, timber and metal being the dominant categories. The main exception was the lower levels of garden waste found in Cumbria. A site user survey had indicated that users were fairly satisfied with the operation of the Civic Amenity Sites, although Members commented on some shortcomings in the management of certain sites.

Members were also advised of the recommendations arising from the kerbside and HWRC studies. Reference was made in the recommendations from the kerbside study to the statement that all authorities, excluding Barrow, achieved in excess of 70% participation on their kerbside recycling schemes. The member representing Copeland Borough Council advised that participation rates were not as high as this in Copeland. Members also queried a recommendation that collection crews should check garden waste wheeled bins for contamination prior to unloading. This was seen as unworkable in practice.

The report was noted, although Members wished it to be recorded that they were unable to support its recommendations.

## **6. CONSULTATION ON CHANGES TO THE RECYCLING CREDITS SCHEME**

Detailed responses to the questions within this DEFRA consultation document were submitted for members' information following the decision at the Waste Partnership Board's previous meeting that officers should redraft the intended response to one of the questions within in, It was noted that the response to Question 4 had been altered and that Eden District Council had sent a separate reply requesting a later introduction to any new scheme.

## **7. PARTNERSHIP TARGETS FOR REDUCING TOTAL WASTE ARISING AND FOR DIVERSION FROM LANDFILL**

Mike Gardner presented a report on behalf of the Cumbria Strategic Waste Partnership Officers' Group which proposed achievable and realistic targets for reducing total waste arisings and for diversion from landfill. The report also highlighted the need for the Waste Partnership to agree and appropriate funding mechanism for both the capital and revenue costs associated with reaching the proposed targets.

Members were reminded of the significant role of the Waste Collection Authorities in helping Cumbria to stay within its LATS allocations. This had also been emphasised by the Audit Commission's recommendation that the Cumbria Strategic Waste Partnership 'agree challenging but realistic Partnership targets for reducing total waste arisings and for diversion from landfill'. The report set out provisional targets for each of the six Waste Collection Authorities and the measures required in order to achieve them.

The targets proposed by the Officers' Group were set out in an Appendix to the report (reproduced as Appendix 1 to these Minutes) and were set against the performance achieved by each Waste Collection Authority (WCA) in 2004/05. Particular attention was drawn to the following elements in the proposed targets:

- An increase in the amount of household waste recycled by the WCAs from 56,629 tonnes in 2004/05 to projected 83,614 tonnes in 2007/08 (an increase in the recycling rate from an average of 23.60% in 2004/05 to 36.26% in 2007/08).
- A decrease in the amount of household waste disposed to landfill by the WCAs from a total of 183,296 tonnes in 2004/05 to 146,998 tonnes in 2007/08.
- A decrease in the overall amount of waste collected by the WCAs from 239,925 tonnes in 2005/06 to 230,612 tonnes in 2007/08. A corresponding decrease in the average BV84 figure (kg of waste per head of population) for the six WCAs from 491 kg in 2004/05 to 472 kg in 2007/08.

Achieving the projected targets was estimated to have a maximum "LATS value" of £3,702,396 per annum. However a substantial fraction of this "value" related to waste that would be displaced from the WCA collection to the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) through Civic Amenity (CA) sites. In theory this could represent the entire reduction in the total amount of household waste collected by the WCAs being displaced to the Civic Amenity sites run by the WCA (a figure projected to be 9,313 tonnes, which represented a "LATS value" of £949,926 per annum. However, evidence from other parts of the country

suggested that in practice this did not happen and that the overall amount of waste could be expected to decrease. Even if all of the 9,313 tonnes were to be displaced to the CA site network, it was likely that a significant percentage of that figure would be recycled. Therefore, assuming the worst case scenario of all the displaced waste being landfilled via the CA sites, it was suggested that the minimum "LATS value" of the 07/08 targets and measures (when compared against the 2004/05 figures) would be in the region of £2.5-£3m per annum. This should be viewed against a predicted LATS fine for 2007/08 of £6.5m if no additional waste reduction and recycling measures were implemented.

The measures proposed by each WCA in order to achieve the above projections were outlined in the report (as listed in appendix 2 to these minutes). Attention was drawn to the implications of these measures in terms of revenue and capital expenditure, which would vary greatly from one authority to another through differences in their waste collection arrangements. Members were reminded of the funding mechanism for the household waste collection arrangements in Cumbria. Members were also reminded, in relation to future revenue funding, that the existing Recycling Credit regime was currently under review and that the Partnership had responded to the consultation carried out as part of that review with a proposal that any future Recycling credit payments should be based on the actual costs of recycling. It was therefore suggested that the revenue costs of the proposed measures should help to identify the "actual costs of recycling" and help shape the future payments made by the WDA to the WCAs under the revised Recycling Credit regime.

In terms of future capital funding on waste collection it was recognised that the measures outlined would require a further significant injection of capital. The recently announced Waste Performance and Efficiency Grant could provide some of this but was unlikely to fund all of the measures required to achieve the stated targets.

**AGREED,** that

- (1) the report be noted;
- (2) officers be instructed to provide fully costed details (both capital and revenue) to support all of the measures required to achieve the projections given in appendix 1 and that these costings be reported to a future meeting of the Cumbria Strategic Waste Partnership Board;
- (3) the targets listed in appendix 1 be accepted as a significant development in defining the contribution of the Waste Collection Authorities towards meeting Cumbria's LATS obligations and that they should be reviewed in the light of future Partnership funding agreements.

## **8. CONSULTATION ON OPTIONS FOR STATUTORY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

Nigel Christian reported that DEFRA had issued a consultation document seeking the Strategic Waste Partnership's views on options for statutory performance standards for recycling and composting in 2007/08. It was explained that, in 2000, the Government had

set statutory performance standards for recycling and composting in 2003/04 and 2005/06. The standards for Cumbria, which were expected to be comfortably met, were set out in an appendix to the report with the actual and expected performance. As part of a review of the national waste strategy, the Government was consulting on options for statutory performance standards in 2007/08. Four options had been outlined in the consultation paper:

- (1) Do not set standards.
- (2) Set the 2007/08 standards at the same level as the 2005/06 standards.
- (3) Set the 2007/08 standards at the same level as the 2005/06 standards, except for those authorities with targets of 18% in 2005/06 which would be raised to 20% (Allerdale and Barrow). This was the Government's preferred option.
- (4) Set the 2007/08 standards as in option 3 and remove the 30% cap on the highest targets which were imposed in December 2004.

The report set out the effect of each of these options upon the local authorities in Cumbria. Members were advised that, given the need to increase recycling and composting rates and that, overall, higher standards than those proposed by DEFRA were both practical and realistic for Cumbria, there was no objection to options 1, 2 or 3. There was not seen to be any particular advantage to the Partnership in having the 30% cap removed as set out in option 4.

A role for "pooling" the performance standards had also been proposed. This would allow the Partnership the flexibility to change the levels of recycling and composting required of each authority, providing that the tonnage of waste recycled and composted by the Partnership as a whole exceeded that which would have been achieved by the authorities acting independently. Mr Donaldson advised that a pooled target would have to meet the minimum target for each authority involved. The report concluded that, given the proposals that had been drawn up to meet LATS targets, it could be in the interests of the Partnership to take advantage of pooling arrangements.

It was also noted that DEFRA was reviewing its Engagement and Intervention Strategy for poor performing councils.

The proposed response to DEFRA on the consultation paper was set out as an appendix to the report. The response indicated that option 3 was the Partnership's preferred approach to setting targets in 2007/08.

**AGREED,** that the consultation response to DEFRA set out in the appendix to the report be approved.

## **9. WASTE PERFORMANCE AND EFFICIENCY GRANT 2006/07 AND 2007/08**

Nigel Christian reported the Performance and Efficiency (P and E) Grant allocations for Cumbria announced by the Government. The figures for each local authority in Cumbria

for 2006/07 and 2007/08 were set out in his report and it was noted that the figures stated for Eden District Council should be amended to read 42,708.07 for 2006/07 and 44,733.05 for 2007/08.

It was explained that the Government expected local authorities to deploy their awards in the most appropriate way for their area, in order to meet the challenges of recycling and composting and LATS. DEFRA had indicated that it would prefer to aggregate the awards due to each authority and make a single award to the relevant Partnership authorities. This would be linked to a pooling arrangement to allow the Partnership flexibility to change the levels of recycling and composting required of each authority. Some members expressed reservations about such an arrangement as it would remove individual authorities' control of the grants they had been allocated.

**AGREED,** that officers be instructed to develop a fully costed strategy to enable the County Council's allocation to be directed towards achievement of that strategy in 2006/07 and to develop alternative proposals for 2007/08 for consideration by Partnership members.

**(Mr Richardson left the meeting at this point and Mr Bloxham took the Chair for the remainder of the meeting).**

#### **10. PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO THE RISK REGISTER**

Graham Harrison circulated a chart which set out anticipated risks in delivering the Waste Strategy, their likely consequences for the project and responses to them. Several new risks had been identified. In terms of project delivery these related to the possibility that early LATS targets could not be achieved, that the preferred bidder could not achieve financial close, or the chance that the bidders did not proceed through the Best and Final Offer stage. In political terms the new risks identified covered the possibility that District Councillors did not accept the proposed solutions, or did not conclude recycling levels by the end of the Best and Final Offer stage.

The information was noted and it was agreed that it would be useful for the Partnership to receive updates on the risk register.

#### **11. CUMBRIA BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT NETWORK**

Mike Gardner reported that this organisation had developed from the Carlisle and Eden Business Environment Network and provided free and impartial advice for businesses. The Partnership had now been invited to consider representation at officer level on this body. It was agreed that the Partnership's Officers' Group should decide on representation and report back and that, pending this, the two officers who had previously attended Business Environment Network meetings would continue to represent the Partnership in this capacity.



## 12. WASTE PREVENTION AND COMMUNICATION ACTION PLANS – UPDATE

Graham Harrison presented a report on progress with the Waste Prevention and Communication Action Plans. The report covered the following developments:

- WRAP home composting support
- Recycling rewards for schools pilot incentive scheme
- General schools waste education initiatives
- Cumbria 'real nappy' promotions
- Community waste sector support
- Countywide waste communication campaign
- Cumbria Waste Partnership website
- Cumbria Waste Partnership service provision strategy

The report also referred to the Cumbria waste compositional analysis. Members queried a recommendation that seasonal waste composition analyses should be conducted every year as it was felt that this could prove to be expensive. Mr Harrison undertook to investigate the possibility of a smaller sample being used for these analyses.

**AGREED,** that the action taken since the Partnership's last meeting be noted and the initiatives currently underway be supported.

## 13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

### **SLR Report**

Mr Harrison circulated copies of the SLR consultants' report.

### **Cumbria Scrutiny Network Waste Management Group Report**

Mr Harrison circulated copies of this report and indicated that responses to it had been requested by 20 February 2006.

### **DEFRA Regional Conference**

Mr Donaldson notified Members of a forthcoming DEFRA Regional Conference on the Municipal Waste Strategy.

## 14. DATES AND VENUES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

It was noted that the next meeting of the Partnership would be held on Wednesday 15 February 2006 at The Civic Centre, Carlisle. This would be devoted to Planit Waste training and it was anticipated that it would start at 10.00 am and continue into the afternoon with a working lunch.

It was agreed that the next ordinary meeting of the Partnership would be held on Wednesday 22 March 2006, starting at 1.00 pm and preceded by lunch at 12.30 pm, at South Lakeland District Council Offices in Kendal.

The meeting ended at 3.55 pm.

**DRAFT**

# Cumbria Strategic Waste Partnership

## APPENDIX 1

### WCA Stretch recycling and residual waste targets

WCA	04/05 figures (tonnes unless stated otherwise)					07/08 targets (tonnes unless stated otherwise)					Residual waste per household
	Total waste	BV84	Recycled	BV82 %	Residual	Total waste	BV84	Recycled	BV82 %	Residual	
Allerdale	46641	0.499	9145	19.61%	37496	44172	0.472	15442	34.96%	28730	0.651
Barrow	33846	0.470	6477	19.14%	27369	32245	0.448	10377	32.18%	21868	0.667
Carlisle	50203	0.498	12919	25.73%	37284	47768	0.474	16700	34.96%	31068	0.683
Copeland	32014	0.462	7928	24.76%	24086	30784	0.444	10200	33.13%	20584	0.643
Eden	25368	0.497	8423	33.20%	16945	25775	0.505	10095	39.17%	15680	0.670
South Lakes	51853	0.506	11737	22.64%	40116	49868	0.487	20,800	41.71%	29068	0.574
<b>Total</b>	<b>239925</b>	<b>0.491</b>	<b>56629</b>	<b>23.60%</b>	<b>183296</b>	<b>230612</b>	<b>0.472</b>	<b>83614</b>	<b>36.26%</b>	<b>146998</b>	<b>0.648</b>

**Cumbria Strategic Waste Partnership**

**APPENDIX 2**

12.

<b>WCA</b>	<b>Actual 04/05 Residual</b>	<b>Projected 07/08 Residual</b>	<b>LATS value (£ p.a.)</b>		<b>Displaced or reduced ? tonnes</b>	<b>LATS value (£)</b>		<b>Minimum LATS value of 07/08 targets against 2004/05 figures</b>	
<b>Allerdale</b>	37496	28730	£	<b>894,132.00</b>	2469	£	251,838.00	£	<b>642,294.00</b>
<b>Barrow</b>	27369	21868	£	<b>561,102.00</b>	1601	£	163,302.00	£	<b>397,800.00</b>
<b>Carlisle</b>	37284	31068	£	<b>634,032.00</b>	2435	£	248,370.00	£	<b>385,662.00</b>
<b>Copeland</b>	24086	20584	£	<b>357,204.00</b>	1230	£	125,460.00	£	<b>231,744.00</b>
<b>Eden</b>	16945	15680	£	<b>129,030.00</b>	-407	-£	41,514.00	£	<b>170,544.00</b>
<b>South Lakes</b>	40116	29068	£	<b>1,126,896.00</b>	1985	£	202,470.00	£	<b>924,426.00</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>183296</b>	<b>146998</b>	£	<b>3,702,396.00</b>	<b>9313</b>	£	<b>949,926.00</b>	£	<b>2,752,470.00</b>

## APPENDIX 2

- 6.2.1 *Allerdale Borough Council*: All of Allerdale's 44,100 properties to be provided with a 120litre wheeled bin. Extension of existing kerbside collection of garden waste and dry recyclables. No side waste collected.
- 6.2.2 *Barrow Borough Council*: The introduction of 'Alternate Week Collection', with 240litre wheeled bins for residual waste and the extension of existing kerbside collections of garden waste and dry recyclables. An estimated 975 properties will remain on a weekly sack collection (limited to 2 sacks per property per collection).
- 6.2.3 *Carlisle City Council*: The introduction of 'Alternate Week Collection', with 240litre wheeled bins for residual waste and the extension of existing kerbside collections of garden waste and dry recyclables. An estimated 6,500 properties will remain on a weekly sack collection (limited to 2 sacks per property per collection).
- 6.2.4 *Copeland Borough Council*; Existing 'Alternate Week Collection' scheme (utilising 240litre wheeled bins for residual waste) rolled out to cover 27,000 properties alongside an extension of the existing kerbside collections of garden waste and dry recyclables. An estimated 5000 properties will remain on a weekly sack collection (limited to 2 sacks per property per collection).
- 6.2.5 *Eden District Council*: The introduction to all properties of 'Alternate Week Collection', with 240litre wheeled bins for residual waste and the extension of existing kerbside collections of garden waste and dry recyclables.
- 6.2.6 *South Lakeland District Council*. Existing 'Alternate Week Collection' scheme (utilising 240litre wheeled bins for residual waste) rolled out to cover all 50,600 properties along side an extension of the existing kerbside collections of garden waste and dry recyclables.