

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee

Communities OSC

Date of Committee

3rd November 2010

Report Title

Household Waste Recycling Centres Task and Finish Group

Summary

In November 2011 the current contract for six of the Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) will end. This is the report of the Task and Finish Group's findings and recommendations following a meeting to discuss possible introduction of new focussed contract to improve services, improve performance and realise efficiencies.

For further information please contact:

Alwin McGibbon
Overview and Scrutiny
Officer
Tel: 01926 412075
alwinmcgibbon@warwickshire.gov.uk

Michelle McHugh
Overview and Scrutiny
Manager
Tel: 01926 412144
michellemchugh@warwickshire.gov.uk

Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework?

No.

Background papers

Household Waste Recycling Centres Review 2010

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:-

Details to be specified

Other Committees

☐

Local Member(s)

☒ N/A

Other Elected Members

☒ Cllr Whitehouse, Cllr Sweet, Cllr Williams

Cabinet Member

☒ Cllr Cockburn

Chief Executive

☐

Legal

☒ Ian Marriott

Finance

☐

Other Strategic Directors

☐

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| District Councils | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Health Authority | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Police | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Other Bodies/Individuals | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

FINAL DECISION NO

SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS:

Details to be specified

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------|
| Further consideration by this Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| To Council | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| To Cabinet | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| To an O & S Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| To an Area Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

- | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Other | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | To be forwarded to Paul Galland -Strategic Director for Environment & Economy to inform his decision making process |
|-------|-------------------------------------|---|

Agenda No

Communities OSC - 3rd November 2010.

Household Waste Recycling Centre Task and Finish Group

Report of the Chair of HWRC Task and Finish Group Cllr Chris Davis

Recommendation

The Committee to:

1. Consider the findings and recommendations of the HWRC Task and Finish Group
2. To agree this report be forwarded to the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy – Paul Galland to inform his decision making process

CLLR CHRIS DAVIS
Chair of HWRC Task and
Finish Group

Shire Hall
Warwick

28 October 2010

Report of the Household Waste Recycling Centres Task and Finish Group

1. Meeting

- 1.1 The Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) Task & Finish Group held a select committee meeting on Monday, 25th October, 2010 to review the proposals for HWRCs in Warwickshire. This is a report of their findings and recommendations to be forwarded to the Communities OSC on the 3rd November and then passed onto the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy to inform the decision making in relation to the Household Waste Recycling Centres.

In Attendance

Cllr Chris Davis (Chair)
Cllr Jeff Clarke
Cllr Chattaway
Cllr Ray Sweet
Cllr Carolyn Robins

Glenn Fleet
Kitran Eastman
Martin Stott
Alwin McGibbon

Apologies

Cllr Alan Cockburn
Cllr Barry Lobbett

- 1.2 The T & F Group agreed the scope (Appendix A) and considered the specification was an important aspect of this review.
- 1.3 The T&F Group asked at this point if Cabinet was aware of the proposals for HWRCs. The response from officers was that Cabinet was given a report on 9th September 2010 where the following was resolved:
1. That Cabinet approves the commencement of a procurement process for the provision of the Household Waste Recycling Centres.
 2. That Cabinet authorises the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy in consultation with the Lead Portfolio Holder for Environment and Economy and Leader of the Council, to determine the specification for HWRC contract on terms acceptable to the Strategic Director of Customers, Workforce and Governance and the Strategic Director for Resources including:
 - Number and location of HWRCs
 - Facilities and services at each HWRC
 - Opening days and times

- Changes in policies
3. That Cabinet authorises the Strategic Director for the Environment and Economy acting in consultation with the Strategic Director for Customers, Workforce and Governance and the Strategic Director for Resources to decide whether to award contracts or manage any or all of the HWRCs in-house.
 4. That Cabinet authorises the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy to enter into all relevant contracts subject to agreeing terms and conditions acceptable to the Strategic Director for Customers, Workforce and Governance and Strategic Director for Resources

2. Review of HWRCs in Warwickshire

- 2.1 In early 2010 the Waste Management Group commenced an internal fundamental review of the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) provision. The aim of the study was to review all aspects of the current service, as well as gather information both on the current service and best practice across the county. This information can then be used to inform decisions on the procurement of a new HWRC contract for December 2011.
- 2.2 This fundamental review looked at
 - ☞ **Location of sites** – including distribution, number per authority area, travelling time between sites
 - ☞ **Opening Times** – including days and hours
 - ☞ **Waste Acceptance** – including household and trade waste accepted on sites
 - ☞ **Site Performance** – including recycling rates, tonnages taken at the site and benchmarking with other authorities
 - ☞ **Composition of residual waste** – results of a waste analysis commissioned for this review
 - ☞ **Site visitor numbers** – including numbers by hour, day, and site
 - ☞ **Costs** – including 2010/11 expected costs, unit comparison costs and in-house benchmarking exercise
 - ☞ **Current Contracts** – including lessons learnt from the current contract
 - ☞ **Legal Position** – including the statutory functions which Warwickshire has in relation to HWRCs
- 2.3 The review also took into account the 20% savings which the Waste Management Group had been asked to find within the budget setting process. A number of options were identified for the future of Warwickshire's HWRCs. (All costs referred to in this executive summary relate to all our Household sites remaining open, the more that are closed the lower the level of saving).

3. Existing Provision

- 3.1 Currently there are nine HWRCs spread across the county, with at least one site located in each district/borough area.

- North Warwickshire Borough – Grendon HWRC
- Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough – Judkins HWRC
- Rugby Borough – Hunters Lane HWRC
- Stratford District – Burton Farm, Shipston, Stockton and Wellesbourne HWRCs
- Warwick District – Cherry Orchard and Princes Drive HWRCs

3.2 **Grendon HWRC, North Warwickshire** is owned by WCC and run by HW Martins. It will be replaced by **Lower House Farm** in North Warwickshire, a new site situated off the A5. Planning permission has been approved for a Household Waste Recycling Centre and a Transfer Station. A contract has been agreed with Staffordshire where they will be paying half the costs for their residents to use the facility as well as transferring waste to Staffordshire to use as new Energy from Waste (EfW). Grendon will close in 2013.

3.3 **Judkins HWRC, Nuneaton & Bedworth** is not owned by the County Council. Cabinet approved a 3 year contract which is up for renewal in 2012. This will soon be going out to tender for a new provider, but sorting out a temporary contract to design, build and operate a new site that needs to be at least as half as big again to accommodate the waste locally. WCC do not intend to pay capital funding for this it is intended that this is part of the operator's costs. This would require it to be a longer contract if this occurs. The County Council have looked at other sites to see if they could provide waste services in-house locally but this would require planning permission from Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council. The other issue would be that it would require capital investment. The Task and Finish Group are of the view that the Environment and Economy Directorate should instigate discussions with the Borough Council regarding the plans for HWRC in Nuneaton and Bedworth.

Recommendation 1

The Portfolio Holder and the Leader of the Council to advise the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy Directorate to discuss the options for Judkins HWRC with Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council in regards to a new location of site if the proposal for in-house arrangements is accepted.

3.4 Councillors did raise concerns about the build time and if the County could move that fast to agree a new site. The response was that within the contract there would be a clause that if the site was not ready there would be a continuation of service at Judkins HWRC.

Recommendation 2

The Strategic Director for Environment and Economy to include a clause within the contract to ensure there is a continuation of service at the Judkins HWRC if the new enlarged site is not fully operational within the specified timescale.

- 3.5 **Hunters Lane HWRC and Transfer Station, Rugby** is directly run and owned by WCC. It is a new site that opened in 2008 and is well used with a charity re-use shop on site run by Age Concern Warwickshire.
- 3.6 **Cherry Orchard HWRC, Kenilworth** is owned by WCC but is run by HW Martins. It is a small site that is mainly used by Kenilworth residents. .
- 3.7 **Princes Drive HWRC and Transfer Station, Leamington** is owned by WCC and is run by HW Martin. It is an expensive facility partly due to being the only site that deals with bio/clinical waste in Warwickshire which has contributed to the increase cost of waste disposal. It has a charity re-use shop run by Action 21.
- 3.8 **Stockton HWRC, Stratford** is owned by WCC and run by HW Martins. Currently it opens 3 days a week, but it used to be only 2 days. It is the most expensive site in Warwickshire costing £6.40 per visit excluding disposal and £7.63 per visit including disposal.
- 3.9 **Burton Farm HWRC, Stratford** is leased from a local landowner and is 7 years into a 25 year contract. It is a good site with one of the cheapest cost per visit (£1.35 excluding disposal and £2.04 including disposal). It has a charity re-use shop run by Shakespeare Hospice, which raised £1 million last year. No changes can be made to the lease arrangements the County Council spent a great deal of capital investment in the site.
- 3.10 The T & F Group asked at this stage if it was possible for smaller community organisations to run the re-use shops rather than bigger charities. The response was that although these re-use shops are operated by bigger charities there was a requirement for them to use the monies raised locally.
- 3.11 There are 4 other re-use shops on sites operated by HW Martins. The profits from these sites are put back into the sites often via staff wages.

Recommendation 3

If the in-house proposal goes ahead that the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy organises a meeting with councillors and local organisations to discuss the option of local volunteers running the re-use shops to raise funds that will benefit the local community.

- 3.12 **Wellesbourne HWRC, Stratford** is owned by WCC and run by HW Martins. It is a very small site and the proposal is that this should close.
- 3.13 **Shipston HWRC, Stratford** is owned by WCC and run by HW Martins. It is also a small site. Gloucestershire contribute around 10% to the running costs so their residents living on the boundaries can use this facility.
- 3.14 The T & F Group asked whether many residents used sites in neighbouring counties. Worcestershire already ban residents from Warwickshire, Coventry is very busy, Oxfordshire and Solihull may in the future consider changes where residents from Warwickshire may not be allowed to use these sites, so these cannot be relied on as an alternative.

4. Review Proposals

A. High Levels of Savings – Statutory Minimum Service

- 4.1 Sites must be open at “reasonable times” including Saturdays, and accept all “household waste” free of charge. Legislation does not prescribe a minimum number of sites but HWRCs must be “reasonably accessible”. It is not considered best practice, for a County the size of Warwickshire to have just one site. If WCC shut all but the Princes Drive site in Leamington Spa, it could save an estimated £1,800,000. If would, however, have extreme implications including affecting over 1.2 million visits to the HWRCs each year.
- 4.2 The T & F Group considered this was not a viable option after reviewing the table of site usage at Princes Drive, which indicates that it would be unlikely to cope with any increase in site visits, especially at times of high usage, without causing traffic problems on roads locally.

B. Medium Levels of Savings – Rationalising of HWRC Provision

- 4.3 Currently three of the five district/borough areas have just one HWRC. Stratford District and Warwick District, however, have four and two respectively. Rationalising the HWRC provision down to one in each district/borough area through the closure of Cherry Orchard in Kenilworth, and Stockton, Wellesbourne and Shipston in Stratford district could potentially save WCC an estimated £639,000 per year. This would result in a change of service in the south of the county but not the northern three boroughs. The implications would be less than in the high level savings option, but would still affect over 365,000 visits to the HWRCs each year.
- 4.4 The T & F Group were not opposed to the closure of smaller sites in the south of the county especially where 3 of the smaller sites cost more per visit than larger sites, such as Stockton which costs £6.40 to £7.63 per visit as opposed to Burton Farm which costs £1.25 to £2.04 per visit.

Councillors recognise that Shipston HWRC is currently supported by monies from Gloucestershire (around 10% of total costs of site) so their residents can use it. With it being located at the extreme south of the county the T & F Group consider it may be worth approaching Gloucestershire County Council to see if they would be willing to manage the site jointly. Cherry Orchard, Kenilworth is slightly larger and is considered a secondary site along with Burton Farm and Grendon. Concerns were raised as to whether Princes Drive would have the capacity to take on the extra visits if this site was closed. There was some discussion on whether promoting times when there are fewer visits to Princes Drive with times to avoid, would help increase the capacity to be able to handle the extra demand.

Recommendation 4

If the option to close Shipston HWRC is being considered that the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy approaches Gloucestershire County Council to ascertain whether they would be prepared to jointly manage the site (sharing all overhead costs) so it could remain open.

- 4.5 The Review of HWRC report did identify that if further savings were needed then Judkins HWRC in Nuneaton could potentially be closed. This would save an additional estimated £472,000 per year, but as the second largest HWRC in Warwickshire the number of visits affected would be the equivalent to the combined visits of the four proposed closures set out above.
- 4.6 The T & F Group were not happy with this proposal because of the high density of the population and the number of people that use this facility. Rather it has been suggested that the site actually needs to have a bigger footprint to accommodate the waste locally. There were also concerns raised that it would be at least an hour's journey for some residents with the additional environmental impact it could have with increase of traffic to the site in North Warwickshire.

Recommendation 5

If the proposal to close sites is considered that the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council seek to retain the Judkins HWRC, as the second largest site in the County, due to its high usage and the environmental impact if residents had to travel to North Warwickshire.

C. Additional Medium Levels of Savings – Streamlining of Opening Times

- 4.7 Opening all the “rationalised” sites only five days a week would bring Warwickshire in line with some of its neighbouring authorities such as Staffordshire. The additional savings are estimated to be in the region of £158,000. The savings for this option would be less than possibly expected as the savings can only be made on the sites’ variable costs such as staff, not on waste through put or on fixed infrastructure. This would affect an estimated 380,000 visits a year. When other authorities have employed this method they have ensured that site closure days do not coincide with other sites in the area.
- 4.8 Limiting the opening hours at all the “rationalised” sites would save an estimated £155,000, based on:
- i) **Summer opening times**, Weekday 10am to 4pm, Weekend 9am to 6pm
 - ii) **Winter opening times**, Weekday 10am to 4pm, Weekend 9am to 4pm.
- 4.9 Savings are estimated to be in the region of £155,000, and would affect 198,000 visits a year.
- 4.10 *Limiting both the opening hours and only opening five days a week would save an estimated £258,000, and affect 514,000 visits a year. If Judkins was also to close the saving in the section would be smaller***
- 4.11 The T & F Group were not opposed to the idea of altering openings times to bring Warwickshire in line with neighbouring authorities and adopting a method to ensure site closures do not coincide with other sites in the area to make additional savings. However they considered that opening hours should suit the needs of the local community which may differ from site to site. They considered that if this was adopted that opening times should be widely publicised to ensure the public are aware.

Recommendation 6

If the proposal to change opening times is adopted that the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy ensure the new opening times are widely publicised so the public are fully aware of the changes.

5. Further Options Identified in the Review

a) **Service Delivery - Running Sites In-house**

- 5.1 It is estimated that the current contracts are potentially costing Warwickshire County Council an estimated £557,302 more than if the facilities were run directly by the Waste Management Group, if there was no sites closed. The contract with HW Martins will end in November

2011, as such the service will need to be re-tendered earlier in the year, or the resources to be mobilised for bringing the service back in house. Bringing the service provision back in house for all sites apart from Judkins would give the Council more flexibility in an uncertain future. It would give the Council the power to make decisions regarding improvements to the quality and level of service, without being faced with a large variation of contract costs. This would allow the freedom to initiate new services or trial various recycling streams, as well as change or review waste disposal or processing outlets.

- 5.2 Running the sites directly would, however, leave the council open to more risk relating to; cost of staff (including pensions or redundancy payments), fluctuations in gate fees and recyclables income, fuel prices, Health and Safety as well as the Vehicles/Machinery needed.
- 5.3 The T & F Group took into consideration the disadvantages outlined above, but considered running the sites in-house was a good alternative to closure of the proposed sites in the south of the county and Judkins. This was their preferred option. The current sites run by the County Council are cleaner and have better signage. Running the sites in-house would be cheaper there would be greater flexibility to make changes to the sites and services and there would be one contract for haulage. There would also be savings made in not having to draw up contracts and having to advertise them. There were other possible benefits where staff currently under the threat of redundancy could be redeployed, although councillors accepted that existing staff at these sites would be eligible for transfer arrangements to the County Council. Councillors also identified another advantage where they would be able to monitor their sites locally and contact officers if they encountered any problems with the site or services provided on behalf of residents.
- 5.4 The T & F Group were aware that if the price of recyclables go down, expenditure could increase, but acknowledge there would be the option to go out to tender at a later date if required. The T & F Group are of the view that it would be important to have performance measures in place to measure the performance of HWRCs, which would be the responsibility of officers from Environment & Economy Directorate and County Councillors to monitor.

Recommendations 7 & 8

If HWRCs are provided in-house, the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy conducts a full risk assessment to ensure that all possible risks are identified before any decisions are made.

For the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy, Strategic Director of Resources and the Strategic Director of Customers, Workforce and Governance to consider the implications of the in-house proposal and report their findings to the Portfolio holder and the Leader before any decision is made.

b) Service Delivery - Tendering All Sites

- 5.5 The contract for six of the nine HWRCs comes to an end in November 2011, while the final externalised site at Judkins ends in March 2012. All the sites could be tendered at the same time, broken into packages/lots including the two sites currently run in-house. Contracting out of all the HWRCs would release some of the risk involved with operating the sites particularly around staffing, waste acceptance, including site licence and legislation requirements, plant machinery/maintenance purchase and haulage. It would, however, reduce the flexibility to make changes to the sites and service. The administration for the sites would remain broadly similar if all of the sites were externalised. Additional contract management would be needed, however, staff who are currently utilised in managing the in-house sites could be re-focused. It is vital that from the outset of any new contract, the contract monitoring and management is rigorous. This will ensure that the contract is adhered to fully and that site standards are met and performance levels achieved.
- 5.6 One of the main benefits of private companies running waste recycling centres is that the disposal would no longer be the responsibility of the County Council. However, this would require some careful monitoring to see if what is being provided is at least as good as current services with improvement targets.
- 5.7 The T & F Group considered this could be an alternative to the option of running all the sites in-house, but recognised that this would not give the flexibility of being able to change sites or services so readily. However, there were benefits regarding in the reduction of the risks involved in operating the sites.
- 5.8 The T & F noted the possibility that contracting out the sites could lead to charges being made to the public. Since the meeting it has been clarified that tendering operation of HWRC's would not remove the duty to accept household waste free of charge. Under current legislation, charges could only be introduced if a site ceased to operate as a statutory HWRC. For example if a site was thought not to be necessary in order to meet our statutory duties it might be sold or leased to a private business for operation as a commercial waste site. Such a business is likely to be aimed mainly at trade users, but such a site might also accept household waste for a charge. The T & F Group consider that the public may prefer being charged to their local site being closed and having to travel to a site further away.

Recommendation 9

If HWRCs are operated by private companies, the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council ensure that performance measures are put in place to monitor the effectiveness of private contractors running recycling services with year by year improvement targets in place.

c) Improved on site signage and markings

- 5.8 Currently the standard of signage across the HWRCs is variable. Signage and ease of use was highlighted through the public survey as important elements of a HWRC. 63% of the public stated they would prefer “Improved signage” to “More staff on site”. If the HWRC is bright and clean, and signage is clear and easy to read then the public will be happier to use the sites and are more likely to separate out items for reuse, recycling and composting.
- 5.9 The T & F Group supported this proposal and if the services were in-house it would be easy to implement. They also considered drop off zones for smaller items as a good idea especially if it improved throughput on sites. However, if the decision was to have more sites tendered out to private companies it would need to be added as a requirement into the contract.

Recommendation 10

That the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council supports the proposal to improve site signage and markings at HWRCs and if services were tendered out to private companies that they request that the Strategic Director of Environment and the Economy includes improved signage in their contract.

d) Policy Enhancements

- 5.10 To increase the recycling performance of the HWRCs and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill, new policies could be introduced across all sites. Suggested policies are:
- i) Ban on “Black Bags” (or “Open Sack Policy”) - as it is estimated that over 50% of all residual waste taken to the sites could have been easily recycled if it had been sorted. This would be the equivalent to over 2,200 tonnes of waste diverted from landfill and a saving of over £143,500 on disposal costs. During the public surveys the public ranked “ban on black bags” as more preferable than higher council tax and “fewer sites”, but less favourable than sites only open five days a week.
- 5.11 The T & F Group supported this policy in principle, but did not like the term ‘Ban on Black Bags’ they felt it had negative implications and the preferred using the ‘Open Sack Policy’ instead. Recognise that the open bag policy could potentially make enough savings to help a site to remain open.

Recommendation 11

That the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council endorse the 'Open Sack Policy' to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill and to help the County Council make potential savings of £143,500.

- ii) Charging for construction and demolition waste from householders (i.e. bricks, rubble, soil, etc) are not classed as household waste. As such a charge can be made for depositing this waste at HWRCs. This has already been applied in areas such as North Lincolnshire.

- 5.12 The T & F Group again supported in principle the charging for construction and demolition waste from householders, especially if it could potentially save the County Council £56,000, but recognise there could be problems in proving the source of material at the point of inspection.

Recommendation 12

That the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council endorse the proposal to charge for construction and demolition waste and to develop a table of charges for this waste working with Strategic Director of Resources and the Strategic Director for Customers, Workforce and Governance.

e) Late Night Opening

- 5.13 During the public consultation exercise, 86% of the public expressed a preference for a late night opening. Although some challenges exist with implementing such a scheme, it may be prudent to return to this option as potential mitigation on the impact to the public.
- 5.14 The T & F Group support this in principle but recognise that there are implications in having sites open later at night especially if they are within a residential area.

Recommendation 13

That the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council takes into consideration the environmental impact late night opening could have on those sites located within a residential area.

6. Additional Information for consideration

- 6.1 The T & F Group thanked the officers for an excellent report considered it 'First Class' and finished the meeting with whatever is agreed that it should go to the Waste Forum especially if it leads to a change in policy.

Recommendation 14

Whatever proposal is agreed by the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy a report should be submitted to the Warwickshire Waste Partnership outlining the proposals especially if it leads to a change in policy.

7. Findings

- 7.1 The findings of the T & F Group were:

- a) They had concerns about the tight deadline given for this review but recognise that this was due to budgetary pressures and the need for the report to go to Communities OSC in November 2010.
- b) Councillors recognise that HWRC will be a diminishing service
- c) Consider the report provided by Environment and Economy on the 'Review of Household Recycling Waste Centre 2010' was a first class report and would like to draw this to the attention of the Portfolio Holder and the Leader of the Council should read it before taking any decisions on the future provision of HWRCs
- d) If some HWRCs have to close there should be at least one in each of the Districts and Boroughs
- e) If HWRCs are closed it may be possible to lease them for use as private "no-statutory business. The result may be charges for use by the public but this may be preferable to travelling to another site further away.
- f) With Shipston HWRC being based at the extreme south of the county they would like the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy Directorate to approach Gloucestershire to see if they can seek an agreement on whether they could run a joint site.
- g) Consider the in-house option was worth investigating further as it could lead to potential savings and provide the flexibility to make changes to the sites and services
- h) Tendering the operations of all HWRCs would reduce the risk but also flexibility and there is evidence that overall cost savings can be made by in-house operation.

- i) They are supportive of the altering site opening times, closing early, opening fewer days a week to reflect the current usage of HWRC. However they did have concerns about the option of late night opening one day a week to offset these changes where sites are located within residential areas with increased in noise and traffic.
- j) They support the suggested improvements in signage and drop off zones for smaller amounts and consider if services were in house this would be easy to implement. However if HWRCs are tendered out to private companies they would like to see this added to the contract with them.
- k) If proposed changes are made to the location of the Judkins site that Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council are included in the discussions at a very early stage.
- l) Consider the proposal to have an 'open sack policy' is better than using the 'ban on black bags' which has negative connotations. They fully support this proposal to try and increase recycling rates and reduce landfill as well as the potential savings it could make which could help a site remain open.
- m) They support the proposal to charge residents for inert waste where there could be potential savings of £56,000. However, these charges need to be agreed to ensure they are perceived as fair to residents.
- n) When an agreement is reached on the future of HWRCs in Warwickshire a report should be given to the Warwickshire Waste Partnership especially if it results in a change of policy.

8. Recommendations

8.1 The Task and Finish Group's preferred option would be to have HWRCs in-house and taking this into consideration they have made the following recommendations:

1. The Portfolio Holder and the Leader of the Council to advise the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy Directorate to discuss the options for Judkins HWRC with Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council in regards to a new location of site if the proposal for in-house arrangements is accepted.
2. The Strategic Director for Environment and Economy to include a clause within the contract to ensure there is a continuation of service at the Judkins HWRC if the new enlarged site is not fully operational within the specified timescale.
3. If the in-house proposal goes ahead that the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy organises a meeting with councillors and local organisations to discuss the option of local volunteers running the re-use shops to raise funds that will benefit the local community.

4. If the option to close Shipston HWRC is being considered that the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy approaches Gloucestershire County Council to ascertain whether they would be prepared to jointly manage the site (sharing all overhead costs) so it could remain open.
5. If the proposal to close sites is considered that the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council seek to retain the Judkins HWRC, as the second largest site in the County, due to its high usage and the environmental impact if residents had to travel to North Warwickshire.
6. If the proposal to change opening times is adopted that the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy ensure the new opening times are widely publicised so the public are fully aware of the changes.
7. If HWRCs are provided in-house, the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy conducts a full risk assessment to ensure that all possible risks are identified before any decisions are made.
8. For the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy, Strategic Director of Resources and the Strategic Director of Customers, Workforce and Governance to consider the implications of the in-house proposal and report their findings to the Portfolio holder and the Leader before any decision is made.
9. If HWRCs are operated by private companies, the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council ensure that performance measures are put in place to monitor the effectiveness of private contractors running recycling services with year by year improvement targets in place.
10. That the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council supports the proposal to improve site signage and markings at HWRCs and if services were tendered out to private companies that they request that the Strategic Director of Environment and the Economy includes improved signage in their contract
11. That the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council endorse the 'Open Sack Policy' to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill and to help the County Council make potential savings of £143,500
12. That the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council endorse the proposal to charge for construction and demolition waste and to develop a table of charges for this waste working with Strategic Director of Resources and the Strategic Director for Customers, Workforce and Governance

13. That the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council takes into consideration the environmental impact late night opening could have on those sites located within a residential area.
14. Whichever of the proposals are agreed by the Strategic Director of the Environment and Economy a report should be submitted to the Warwickshire Waste Partnership outlining these proposals especially if it leads to a change in policy.

Review Topic (Name of review)	Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) Provision
Panel/Working Group etc – Members	Cllr Davis (Chair), Cllr Cockburn, Cllr Clarke, Cllr Lobbett, Cllr Robins, Cllr Sweet, Cllr Chattaway. WCC Officers – Martin Stott, Kitran Eastman, Glenn Fleet
Key Officer Contact	Alwin McGibbon (Overview & Scrutiny Officer),
Relevant Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Cockburn, Environment and Economy
Relevant Corporate/LAA Priorities/Targets	Developing sustainable places and communities NI 191 Residual Household Waste per Household
Timing Issues	<p>The Portfolio Holder / Leader decision regarding the specification of the contract needs to happen prior to 1st November 2010, therefore if commissioned the single issue meeting will need to take place within October.</p> <p>This review will constitute a single meeting, with findings and recommendations reported to the Chair, Vice Chair and Spokes for Communities OSC. The Chair of Communities OSC will report recommendations to the Portfolio Holder and Leader prior to the decision being made.</p>
Type of Review	Single meeting – roundtable discussion
Resource Estimate	This is proposed as a short, sharp scrutiny exercise. A provisional estimate of scrutiny officer support is between 2-3 days, or 12-18 hours. This includes the preparation for a single issue meeting, research time, liaison and contact with witnesses, one single issue meeting, liaising with members to agree recommendations and writing and submitting a report.
Rationale (Key issues and/or reason for doing the review)	<p>In November 2011 the current contract for six of the Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) will end. This offers an opportunity to introduce a new focussed contract to improve services, improve performance and realise efficiencies. On the 9th September 2010, Cabinet referred the decision making regarding the specification of the contract to Cllr Cockburn as Portfolio Holder and Cllr Farnell as Leader. This includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Number and location of HWRC's ii) Facilities and services at each HWRC iii) Opening days and times iv) Changes in policies

<p>Objectives of Review (Specify exactly what the review should achieve)</p>	<p>The objectives of the single issue meeting will be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To scrutinise the process undertaken in reaching the decision regarding the specification of the contract 2) To consider whether the proposed contract specification meets the current and future needs of Warwickshire residents 3) To consider whether the proposed contract will improve services, improve performance and realise efficiencies 4) To make recommendations to Portfolio Holder and Leader in relation to the above.
<p>Scope of the Topic (What is specifically to be included/excluded)</p>	<p><u>Include</u> The following is included in the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract specification for Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) <p><u>Excluded</u> The following falls outside the scope of the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement process • Implementation of contract • Waste / recycling strategy
<p>Indicators of Success – Outputs (What factors would tell you what a good review should look like?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations accepted and implemented to deliver improvements • A contract specification which is fit for purpose to meet the current and future needs of Warwickshire residents, improve services, improve performance and realise efficiencies
<p>Indicators of Success – Outcomes (What are the potential outcomes of the review e.g. service improvements, policy change, etc?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in recycling at the HWRC's • A more cost effective service
<p>Other Work Being Undertaken (What other work is currently being undertaken in relation to this topic, and any appropriate timescales and deadlines for that work)</p>	