

<b>REPORT TO EXECUTIVE</b>			
<b>PORTFOLIO AREA: Infrastructure, Environment and Transport</b>			
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	28/1/2002		
<b>Public</b>			
<b>Key Decision:</b>	No	<b>Recorded in Forward Plan:</b>	No
<b>Inside Policy Framework</b>			

**Title:** Additional Resources for Recycling  
**Report of:** Director of Environment and Development  
**Report reference:** EN.007/2002

**Summary:** DEFRA have issued a consultation document regarding a framework for allocating £140 million over two years towards recycling initiatives. Responses were requested by 21<sup>st</sup> January and details of the Council's reply, agreed with the portfolio holder, are included within the attached report for information. This response is brought to the Executive to highlight the opportunities which are likely to arise for the Council and which will be presented to a future meeting once the final guidance is issued.

**Recommendations:** Members are recommended to note the observations on the Consultation Paper and approve that the appropriate Portfolio holder liases with officers to establish the basis for a funding bid.

**Contact Officer:** Richard Speirs

**Ext:** 7325

## 1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OPTIONS

Nil

## **2. CONSULTATION**

1. Consultation to Date. Not applicable
2. Consultation proposed. Nil

## **3. STAFFING/RESOURCES COMMENTS**

Nil

## **4. CITY TREASURER'S COMMENTS**

Not applicable

## **5. LEGAL COMMENTS**

Not applicable

## **6. CORPORATE COMMENTS**

Not applicable

## **7. RISK MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT**

Not applicable

## **8. EQUALITY ISSUES**

Not applicable

## **9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

The potential to attract additional funding to assist the local authority in reaching its recycling targets will have positive environmental benefits in reducing the amount of waste disposed in landfill.

## **10. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

## **11. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Members are recommended to retrospectively approve the response to the consultation paper.

## **12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

The opportunity to apply for additional funding will be beneficial to the City Council in attaining its recycling targets if an application is successful.

### 1. Introduction

1. The Government issued the "Waste Strategy 2000" which placed a requirement on all local authorities to draw up waste management strategies. These would identify how the authority proposed to meet the Government's recycling targets. For Carlisle those targets are to achieve a 22% recycling rate by 2003/04 and a 33% rate by 2005/06. These are based on the rate of 11% achieved in 1999/2000.
2. In developing the "Waste Strategy 2000" the Government identified that additional funding would be made available for local authorities to assist in reaching their targets.

A fund of £140 million has now been identified, spread over the next 2 financial years, and a consultation paper has been issued which suggests ways in which the funding may be allocated.

This report sets out the main issues within the consultation paper.

## 2. Consultation Paper

1. The paper requested responses to a range of options for the structure and distribution of the fund by the 21<sup>st</sup> January 2001. A response has been forwarded following attendance by the relevant portfolio holder and officers at an area presentation on the 16<sup>th</sup> January in Manchester. Consequently this report seeks retrospective approval for the comments submitted. The full list of questions raised is attached as Appendix A to this report.
2. In considering the paper it is recommended that Members support the following Officer comments.
3. Section 3 (Objectives of the Fund)

Any application should be supported by a strategy statement, the quality of which should be a key factor in influencing the level of grant support. Due to the proposed short time scale for applications in 2002 it should be recognised that detailed waste management strategies may not be fully developed by potential applicants. Any approval of funding in the first year could therefore be made conditional on producing a waste strategy by a given date. The initial priority for the fund should be to support recycling and composting. Action on waste growth should not be a factor in determining these grants but should be a factor for any subsequent support.

### 2.4. Section 4 (Approach to funding and priorities)

Funds should be used selectively on the basis of the priorities identified in the paper. Regional funding is not considered appropriate to address the needs. London funding may however benefit from a block allocation to address partnership issues. The proposals for allocation, prioritisation and linking to matched funding are supported.

### 5. Section 5 (Partnership working between authorities)

This authority has identified benefits through partnership working and supports the proposals to build on such relationships. The types of projects and the assessment criteria proposed are supported.

The pooling of targets can bring benefits in urban, more densely populated areas as well as more remote rural areas and can address many of the accounting anomalies currently experienced in attributing recycling target percentages. The proposal is therefore supported where a partnership will lead to Best Value.

## 6. Section 6 (Supporting innovation and helping achieve high performance)

The proposals to support innovation are sensible as are the types and criteria for projects. The number of projects may be pessimistic as much can be achieved through partnership and community initiative working without excessive expenditure on each project.

## 7. Section 7 (Helping turn around low performance)

Supporting poor performers through the approval of specific projects is accepted providing that those authorities which have failed to pursue any pro-active recycling are not seen to benefit at the expense of those who have. Poor performers are already at an advantage in that their targets for subsequent years are less than for those who have attempted to improve their performance beyond what can basically be achieved.

Again the investment limits and number of projects may be pessimistic, as most authorities should be able to reach 10% without a significant expenditure.

## 8. General Projects – Challenge Fund

The proposal for a General Project fund is strongly supported as many authorities have reached a recycling plateau and require an additional financial input to break through and progress beyond the 10 to 15% barrier. The number of schemes and the criteria proposed are supported

## 2.9. Section 9 (Developing Community Initiatives)

Although the concept is supported the potential number of projects is perhaps too ambitious.

## 10. Section 10 (Application and decision making process)

The timetable, although tight, is supported as being necessary to meeting the recycling target dates. More than one application should be supported where appropriate. An "expert panel" is a suitable way to assess bids.

## 11. Section 1 (Monitoring, review and reporting)

This area is essential to ensure shared learning of success stories and pitfalls.

## 2. Implications for Carlisle

1. The consultation paper gives a good insight into the Government's proposals for additional recycling funding over the next 2 years. Emphasis will be made on recycling and composting with less attention to waste minimisation. Support across the current performance range and the potential acknowledgement of Partnership projects is to be welcomed.
2. Should the final funding proposals reflect the proposals in the Consultation Paper then it is essential that Carlisle considers a bid to further develop the kerbside pilot project currently being finalised with Eden District Council and Cumbria Waste Management.
3. Additional funding could allow the extension of the kerbside collection of dry recyclables and potentially the early introduction of Phase 2 of the pilot project to collect garden waste. Should any funding be granted however, it would have to be recognised and identified that the continuation costs can be met without further external support.

## 3. Recommendation

1. Members are recommended to note the observations on the Consultation Paper and approve that the appropriate Portfolio holder liaises with officers to establish the basis for a funding bid.

M. BATTERSBY

Director of Environment and Development

### **13. Summary of issues for consultation**

You are welcome to comment on all the matters raised in this paper. However, we would especially welcome your comments on the issues that are listed below. The references are to sections in the main body of the text.

#### **Section 3 (Objectives of the fund)**

Do you agree that applications should be supported by a strategic view on what needs to be achieved?

Do you agree that the quality of a strategy should be a key factor in determining grants?

Do you agree that both waste minimisation and recycling work should be supported, but that the priority for the Fund should be recycling and composting?

Do you agree that action on waste growth should be a factor in determining grants?

#### **Section 4 (Approach to funding and priorities)**

In general terms, do you agree that the funds should be used selectively rather than distributed on a formulae basis? If you think it should be on a formula basis, what formula should be used?

If funds are distributed on a selective basis do you agree with the priorities set out above? Are there others?

Do you consider funding should be allocated on a regional basis? Should this apply to the generality of funds or only to funding set aside for partnership funding?

Should funds be allocated to London as a block for administering through a joint venture including the Mayor for London, London Waste Action and the Association for London Government? Should this be in respect of a proportion of the whole fund or just of funding allocated to partnership working?

Do you agree with the possible allocation of funding?

Do you agree with the possible prioritisation between years?

Do you agree with this proposed approach to match funding?

Do you agree with the proposed fit between the Fund and local PSA schemes? How should this work for future local PSAs?

#### **Section 5 (Partnership working between authorities)**

Do you agree that partnership working between authorities should be supported by the Fund?

Do you agree with the type of projects and the criteria we propose to use in assessing applications?

Do you agree with the proposed approach on the 'pooling' of targets as set out in Annex D?

**Section 6 (Supporting innovation & helping achieve high performance)**

Do you agree that we should support projects that seek to facilitate innovation and help achieve high performance?

Do you agree with the type of projects?

Do you agree with the numbers of projects?

Do you agree with the proposed criteria?

**Section 7 (Helping turn-around low performance)**

Do you agree that we should support projects that focus on turning-around low performance?

Do you agree with the proposed approach?

Do you agree with the numbers of projects we identify under this heading?

Do you agree with the proposed criteria?

**Section 8 (General projects)**

Do you agree that some 'general projects' should be supported by the Fund?

Do you agree with the number of projects we identify?

Do you agree with the proposed criteria?

**Section 9 (Developing community initiatives)**

Do you agree that we should support projects that focus on developing community initiatives?

Do you agree with the views on the type of work that might be supported?

Do you agree with the sort of numbers of projects we are looking to support under this heading?

Do you agree with the proposed criteria?



**Section 10 (Application process)**

Do you agree with the proposed timetable?

Do you agree with the proposed approach on:

- More than one application?
- The use of an 'expert panel' to appraise bids?

What other links to initiatives, programmes, responsibilities or funding might be made in guidance for the application process?

**Section 11 (Monitoring, review and reporting)**

Do you agree with the proposed approach to monitoring, review and reporting?