

VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

CABINET: 16TH APRIL, 2018

REFERENCE FROM ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE: 15TH MARCH, 2018

“ REVISED WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY: THE FUTURE
COLLECTION ARRANGEMENTS FOR WASTE AND RECYCLING (REF) –

Cabinet had, on 19th February 2018, been advised of the outcome of the Waste Resource Action Programme (WRAP) report and future arrangements for the collection of waste and recycling and had referred the matter to the Scrutiny Committee for its consideration. At the meeting Cabinet had resolved that a public consultation exercise to capture the views of residents in respect of the methods used to participate in a source separated dry recycling collection service be approved and that the restriction of black bags, based on two per household per fortnight from 1st September, 2018 with provision for large families and other certain circumstances, be agreed. The development of a new seven year Municipal Waste Management Strategy (MWMS) to reflect changes in service delivery and to achieve statutory recycling targets up to 2024/25 be approved.

The Operational Manager for Waste Management and Cleansing, in presenting the report to the Committee, also introduced Mr. Iwan Pierce (representative from WRAP Cymru) who he advised had been invited to provide an overview presentation following the WRAP review that had been undertaken.

Committee was further advised that the Collection's Blueprint statutory guidance attached at Appendix A to the report that had been introduced by Welsh Government recommended the service profile for the collection of recycling from households via kerbside sort to ensure compliance to the revisions of the WFD and to ensure high rates of high quality recycling, cost savings and improved sustainable development outcomes.

Mr. Pierce in commencing his presentation referred to the number of pieces of legislation that were relevant: Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 and The Environment (Wales) Act 2016. Both these pieces of legislation he advised set out the requirement to separate collection of four key recycle streams (paper, metal, plastic and glass), with a duty on Local Authorities to assess their collections for compliance with the legislation. Other policy initiatives had also been addressed in this regard.

There had also been a recent appraisal of the Collections Blueprint commissioned by Welsh Government in September 2015 and Eunomia Research & Consulting (Eunomia) was engaged to review the Blueprint to establish whether this was still the best option for a waste management service across Wales that best delivered:

- The Well Being Goals set for the Welsh Government and Local Authorities in the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015;
- the best overall value for money;
- compliance with the EU WFD namely:
 - Article 11 – separate collection requirements;
 - Article 28 & 30 – to produce and update waste management plans;
 - High quality recycling and the best overall requirement of Articles 10 and 4 respectively of the WFD;
- Local Authority landfill diversion and statutory recycling targets (SRTs);
- support for the drive for a circular economy in Wales and resilience in terms of recycle markets.

Eunomia concluded that the Collections Blueprint still provided clear benefits in terms of cost and material quality (Appendix B).

Although the Council had not yet introduced a revised compliant collection scheme, it could demonstrate aspects of TEEP (technically, environmentally and economically practicable) as it had not been economically and practically possible to operate a separate collection system in the absence of a Waste Transfer Station (WTS) in the Vale and that it was not financially possible being contractually tied to a co-mingled dry recycling processing contract up until March 2018. The Council had also not yet been subject to challenge as it had been working with Welsh Government in conjunction with WRAP to establish the most sustainable and economic process for the Vale.

Mr. Pierce further stated that in commencing the review, a variety of collection configurations had been discussed with the Local Authority, with a number of these being taken forward, seven options in total. The modelling that was undertaken used WRAP's own Kerbside Analysis Tool (KAT) and the Authority provided operational and financial data to WRAP to enable the modelling to be undertaken. The KAT was a well-established tool which was used extensively across the UK for modelling resources needed to provide kerbside recycling services. Projections were made based on the Authority's own data, took into account the Authority's current productivity and local circumstances. The toolkit also took into account vehicle specifications and capacities, with cost predictions being based on unit costs provided by the Authority, including labour costs, fleet costs and fuel costs. A copy of the presentation was tabled at the meeting for Members' information.

The options listed were:

- Option 1 – Restricting black bags only;
- Option 1 Atlantic Trading Estate (ATE), Barry – Maintain a co-mingled dry recycling collection service but with a local WTS;
- Option 2 – Maintain a co-mingled dry recycling collection service but with separately collected glass and the use of a WTS;
- Option 3 – Implement a twin stream collection system with separately collected glass and the use of a WTS;
- Option 4 – Implement a source separated dry recycling collection service (not

- including food);
- Options 5, 6 and 7 – Implement a source separated dry recycling collection service as per Welsh Government's Collections Blueprint.

Based on the modelling carried out, the Operational Manager stated that option 7 was suggested for consideration. The Particular aspects of this system including two collections per household per week incorporating; the separate collection of residual waste (restricted) and garden waste alternative weeks to the residual, the collection of source separated dry-recycling and food combined, using lightweight multi-compartment vehicles and two loaders.

In relation to Options 4, 5, 6 and 7, a multi compartment vehicle would be required with compaction units for plastic, cans and cardboard; this would increase the capacity and efficiency of the vehicle. The vehicle was based on a smaller, lighter chassis than standard refuse vehicles, being cheaper to purchase and having better fuel economy.

The container options were broadly similar to the current options, however Options 2 and 3 required the Council to place specific material in boxes and bags. For Options 4, 5 and 7 householders were to sort specific materials into boxes and bags with an additional box provided for paper and for Option 6, trollibocs would be provided to as many households as possible.

Committee was further informed that the amount of capital expenditure required varied with each configuration and was dependent upon the number and type of containers needed and the amount of sorting and bulking of material that was needed post collection.

The capital costs with regard to new vehicles were annualised over seven years and were included in the revenue cost for each option that was modelled. WRAP had been asked to provide assistance to the Authority under the Collaborative Change Programme and Mr. Pierce stated that Options 5, 6 and 7 were compliant with legislation and provided revenue savings compared to the baseline. Other advantages would be separate collection, higher quality material with reject rates being far lower and higher quality material being less likely to be exported and more resilient to fluctuations in the market.

Prior to the question and answer session, a Member asked the Operational Manager to provide a background overview to apprise new Members of the issues facing the Council. The Operational Manager stated that the performance recycling rate for the Vale was 64% which showed that currently the Council was meeting its targets, however, in order for the targets to be increased, source segregation was required. In referring to the transportation of waste recycling he stated that the Vale of Glamorgan currently operated a co-mingled service which was taken to Lamby Way in Cardiff in the first instance and subsequently to Leicester. The cost of this process was significant in vehicle time plus the fact that the co-mingled operation resulted in at least a 10% contamination rate. Also highlighting the change in markets, the officer particularly referred to the fact that China was shutting its doors to the receipt of waste and , together with the contract in Leicester expiring at the end of the

month, the Council had to therefore reconsider its waste recycling operation and hence the collaboration programme with WRAP.

Following the presentation a question and answer session ensued.

Question	Response
<p>What are the financial differences with regard to Options 5 and 7?</p>	<p>One model was based on one driver and one loader, the other was based on one driver and two loaders. The reason that two loaders had been included was due to the fact that one driver / one loader could hold up the traffic considerably during collections and therefore result in longer time taken to load the vehicle. The difference in cost was £30k to £40k.</p> <p>The Council had previously undertaken kerbside sorting before co-mingling was introduced in order to increase participation. However, the product via the co- mingling operation proved inferior with regard to contamination rates and as such the Council needed to increase its recycling rates.</p>
<p>Will the new arrangements affect houses in multiple occupations (HMOs)?</p>	<p>WRAP had identified an option for HMOs but the Operational Manager advised that he did not think it would work in the locality. His preference at this stage would be to install bin stores and suggested that the co-mingling operation remain for HMOs until alternative solutions could be found.</p>
<p>How do we encourage people to recycle at the rates required?</p>	<p>It was going to be a challenge although t Operational Manager referred to issues that had recently been faced by the neighbouring Authority of Bridgend, as an example, advising that it had taken a number of months when the new arrangements had been brought in, but now they were one of the highest Councils in Wales for recycling rates.</p>
<p>Concerns were raised in relation to the number of drivers and loaders who would be struggling on the narrow streets in the Vale and the fact that the Authority was quite a wide spread area. Well aware of the Welsh Government's agenda and the fact that Bridgend Council's service was undertaken by were private providers, a Member raised concern as to whether</p>	<p>In response, the officer advised that with the European legislation changing Welsh Government direction, the Council had no option but to meet the performance targets set by Welsh Government and therefore to realign its resources to make sure the correct resources were placed on the streets in order to ensure a high rate of collection. The Department was</p>

<p>the Vale would be considering a similar course of action which they hoped would not be the case.</p>	<p>also proposing to increase the number of vehicles to collect the waste which would see an increase in jobs. It was also envisaged that the process would be staggered. Aware that the black bags proposal would be a significant change for residents, the Operational Manager also took the opportunity to reassure Members that a number of other Councils had already put this initiative in place. A number of advertising campaigns would also be undertaken as it was important to educate the public and schools in order to ensure that the right messages were being relayed prior to kerbside sort being introduced.</p>
<p>Any support from the City Deal being provided?</p>	<p>The regional idea / concept would be appropriate but the main issue for the Vale was the fact that the waste vehicles themselves did not travel well and transporting any considerable distance was very costly.</p>
<p>Suggestion to produce a guidance note for larger families?</p> <p>How can the Council enforce recycling?</p>	<p>The Department was currently proposing a trial, by inviting families to join with the intention to assess their waste in order to help them through the process. All Members agreed that education was key and that learning from other Councils was also important in particular as to how they had handled their programme rollout.</p> <p>The officer advised that the WRAP organisation offered a fantastic support package through the process to the Local Authority.</p> <p>Following a query regarding waste recycling by Wards, the Operational Manager stated that some houses did not put any waste out. It was noted that Dinas Powys was the top recycling Ward in the Vale, but that there were also some 500 properties that did not appear to recycle. The Department could serve notices on properties where more than two black bags were placed for collection but in the first instance the Department would be keen to educate people and leave enforcement for later down the line.</p>

Will the new receptacles be supplied with lids?	Yes
---	-----

Councillor Cox, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services, with permission to speak, reiterated his statement at the last Full Council meeting where he had urged all Councillors to promote the new collection system within their Wards.

During the discussion Members noted that the containers used for water at the meeting were plastic and queried whether these were recyclable. The officer agreed to look into the matter and report to Members.

In conclusion, the Chairman took the opportunity to thank the officers for an excellent question and answer session and referred to the fact that the changes proposed were in response to legislative requirements and financial pressures that the changes were being made in. It was subsequently

RECOMMENDED –

- (1) T H A T Cabinet be requested to identify a strategy for educating the public and in particular working with families and schools in order to communicate the changes proposed.
- (2) T H A T Cabinet be requested to arrange for an internal review to be undertaken throughout all Vale Council premises with regard to the use of plastics.
- (3) T H A T Cabinet be requested to keep under review the impact of the changes proposed and to consider enforcement if needed.
- (4) T H A T the officers be thanked for an informative presentation.

Reasons for recommendations

- (1) To ensure that the public are fully aware of the forthcoming changes and the need to increase recycling rates.
- (2) In order that the use of plastic throughout Council buildings can be reviewed.
- (3) To ensure that the impact of the changes is monitored and reported to Committee together with the need for enforcement should it arise.
- (4) In recognition of the presentation and responses to queries raised at the meeting.”