

---

# **WARWICKSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP**

The **Warwickshire Waste Partnership** will meet at the **SHIRE HALL, WARWICK** on **TUESDAY** the 15<sup>th</sup> June 2010 at 2:00 p.m.

## **AGENDA**

- 1. Apologies**
- 2. Disclosures of Personal and Prejudicial Interests**
- 3. Minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2010 (attached)**
- 4. Defra Waste Management Consultation Responses**
- 5. Development of W2R Energy from Waste PFI Project – Progress Update**
- 6. Project to increase the number of households participating in recycling in the Boroughs of North Warwickshire and Nuneaton and Bedworth**
- 7. Warwickshire’s Waste Management Statistics 2009/10 (Estimates).**
- 8. Any other business**
- 9. Future Meeting dates on Tuesdays at 2:00 p.m. Shire Hall**
  - 21 September 2010**
  - 7 December 2010**
  - 8 March 2011**

**JIM GRAHAM**  
Secretary of the Partnership  
Shire Hall,  
Warwick.

## **Membership of the Warwickshire Waste Partnership**

### **North Warwickshire Borough Council**

*Councillor Tilly May (Councillor Stuart Swan - Substitute)*

### **Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council**

*Councillor N Grant (none - Substitute)*

### **Rugby Borough Council**

*Councillor Dr Mark Williams (Councillor Ms C. A. Robins- Substitute)*

### **Stratford-on-Avon District Council**

*Councillor Simon Jackson (Robert Weeks (Officer)).*

### **Warwick District Council**

*Councillor Dave Shilton (Councillor N Vincent - Substitute)*

### **Warwickshire County Council**

*Councillors Penny Bould, Alan Cockburn (Chair), Michael Doody, John Whitehouse and a vacancy.*

**General Enquiries on these agenda papers should be made to Jean Hardwick of the County Council's Customers, Workforce and Governance Directorate, Shire Hall, Warwick CV34 4RR.  
Telephone 01926 412476 E-mail [jeanhardwick@warwickshire.gov.uk](mailto:jeanhardwick@warwickshire.gov.uk)**

**Enquiries relating to specific reports should be made to the officer mentioned in the report**

The **WARWICKSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP**  
met at the Shire Hall, Warwick on **16 March 2010**

Present:

**North Warwickshire Borough Council**

Councillor Tilly May

**Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council**

Councillor Nick Grant

Officer Sarah Elliott

**Rugby Borough Council**

Councillor Heather Timms (Vice Chair – in the Chair)

Officer Sean Lawson

**Stratford-on-Avon District Council**

Councillor Simon Jackson

Officer Chris Dobson

**Warwick District Council**

Councillor Dave Shilton

Officer Becky Davies

**Warwickshire County Council**

Councillor Penny Bould

Councillor John Whitehouse

**Officers**

Kitran Eastman

Glenn Fleet

Tamalyn Goodwin

Jean Hardwick

Ian Marriott

Andy Smith

Martin Stott

Lucy Rumble (Project Transform)

The Chair welcomed Dr. Wusu Sannoh, (Mayor (Leader)) Bo City Council, Sierra Leone, who was visiting Warwickshire at the invitation of the County Council's in connection with the Commonwealth Local Government Good Practice Scheme/UNDP funded waste management, sanitation and health project.

## 1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alan Cockburn, Richard Dobbs (North Warwickshire Borough Council) and Rob Hoof (Warwick District Council).

## 2. Disclosures of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

Members declared personal interests as follows -

- (1) Councillor Penny Bould declared personal interests as a Member of Friends of the Earth and Warwick District Tree Warden Network
- (2) Councillor John Whitehouse declared a personal interest in agenda item 5, Summary of Progress made by the Warwickshire Waste Partnership, having made a charitable donation to Friends of the Earth.

## 3. Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2009

### (a) Minutes

**Resolved** that the minutes of the Partnership meeting held on 8 December 2009 be approved and be signed by the Chair subject to an apology for absence being recorded from Councillor Dave Shillton.

### (b) Matters Arising

None

### Warwickshire Waste Partnership – Member representation

Members commented that the revised page 2 of the agenda, circulated at the meeting, showing current membership of the Partnership, was not up to date.

It was agreed that a copy of the list of members be circulated by email after the meeting for up date.

## 4. Summary of the Progress Made by the Warwickshire Waste Partnership towards reaching the targets agreed in Warwickshire's Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

The Partnership received a report of the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy on behalf of the Officers' Group which summarised the progress made by the Warwickshire Waste Partnership towards reaching the targets agreed in Warwickshire's Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

Tamalyn Goodwin presented the Strategy and highlighted –

- (1) The seven key target areas identified in the Strategy;
- (2) That the review of the Strategy was on hold pending the outcome of the forthcoming policy consultation by central Government;
- (3) The next steps – working towards the delivery of targets.

In reply to questions the officers -

- (1) Explained that funding and additional support was being given to the two borough councils to help them meet their targets. A progress report could be reported to a future meeting;
- (2) Acknowledged that recycling of plastics continued to be a complex and controversial issue. The Chair suggested that WRAP should be invited to attend the Partnership's Annual meeting to provide an update on the use of plastics and plastic recycling;
- (3) Reported that a Workshop was being arranged for September to look at best practice and the experiences gained by all the district/borough councils;
- (4) Reported that WRAP had produced a report for both North Warwickshire and Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Councils giving options for implementing food waste collections that would divert biodegradable waste from landfill. The Chair suggested that the two districts should be asked to share their reports with the Partnership;
- (5) Undertook to establish whether recycling collection for schools also included collections from Colleges.

During discussion –

- (1) The need for clarification of the indicator relating to the “number of vehicles operating on alternative fuel sources” was requested (last target page A5 of 16). It was noted that Rugby Borough Council currently used vehicles fuelled by bio diesel but that this would cease if fuel prices continued to rise;
- (2) Members were informed of the pilot scheme starting on 1<sup>st</sup> April which would pay extra recycling credits over the next two years..

In reply to a question about the aims and purpose of the Partnership, the Chair asked Ian Marriott to update the Partnership, under agenda item 6, any other business, on the proposals for the setting up a Joint Waste Committee.

The Partnership agreed that –

- (1) Warwickshire's Municipal Waste Management Strategy Draft Annual Progress report be approved subject to clarification of the reference to “investigation and implement where practical cleaner fuels”.
- (2) The report is made available on the Warwickshire Waste Partnership web pages;

- (3) The Communications Unit is asked to prepare a press release raising awareness of the success of the Partnership over the last two years;
- (4) WRAP is invited to attend the Partnership's Annual Conference to give an update on the latest initiatives with regard to the use of plastics and recycling;
- (5) North Warwickshire and Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Councils are asked to share with the Partnership the report that has been prepared by WRAP on bio waste.
- (6) Emily Martin is asked to establish whether recycling collection for schools also included Colleges.

## **5. Waste Management Performance Figures Q1 and 2 of 2009/2010.**

The Partnership received a report from the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy on behalf of the Officers' Group which detailed the quantities of waste arising across Warwickshire during the first two quarter of 2009/10.

Kitram Eastman circulated a revised copy of Appendix B of the report which included pages B1 and B2 of 2 and highlighted –

- (1) That the actual figure for the amount of waste going into landfill had been sent to the Environment Agency for validation;
- (2) That all areas of waste management performance were heading in the right direction;
- (3) Overall recycling rates and waste composting continued to increase consistently;
- (4) The Waste minimisation activities carried out by all partners to encourage residents to reduce the amount of food thrown away;
- (5) The increase in waste disposed of through energy recovery to support Warwickshire's Landfill Allowance Targets (LATs).

Councillor John Whitehouse enquired about the discrepancy in the forecast and actual figure for waste going into landfill reported to Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Martin Stott explained that this related to the timing of the County Council performance reports and the availability of actual data. Kitran Eastman explained that the figure reported to the O&S Committee was a forecast based on the best information available at that time and she was pleased to say that the actual figures, as of 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010, showed improved performance.

In reply to a further question Glenn Fleet added that, last year 21,000 tonnes of waste had been diverted to the Coventry Energy from Waste Plant from landfill to support Warwickshire's Landfill Allowance Targets, up to 30,000 tonnes this year and next year 50,000 tonnes was anticipated.

The Partnership noted the waste management performance figures for Quarter 1 and 2 of 2009/10

## **6. Any Other Business**

### **(a) Warwickshire Joint Waste Committee**

Ian Marriot explained that the Partnership had been moving towards the setting up of a Joint Waste Committee for 2 years. The proposal for a Joint Committee had been agreed by all partners' Executive Committees and had delegated power to develop a Joint Municipal Waste Strategy.

The draft Heads of Terms for setting up a joint committee had been circulated to officers of the partner organisations for the second time for comment and although the revisions proposed were minor some responses were still outstanding. The Joint Committee would have a business plan and programme of works and a budget of £7000 made up of contributions of £740 from each of the partners. He had hoped to meet with officers after the meeting to discuss the outstanding issues.

The Chair asked Ian Marriott to circulate to Members a copy of the draft Heads of Terms for setting up the Joint Committee and an anticipated timescale for implementation.

### **(b) Support for the City of Bo, Sierra Leone.**

Glenn Fleet explained that in 2005 he had been involved in training staff to co-ordinate a waste audit of the City of Bo which had a population of 220,000 and 13,000 properties. He said that the waste audit revealed that Bo was producing only 22,000 and year, outstripping Warwickshire. Bo residents were much more skilled in material re-use, including plastics. He said it had been a pleasure working with Bo City Council and Makeni City Council on this project since 2008. The UN had funded the capital equipment for rolling out a pilot waste management project in both these authorities. The Commonwealth Local Government Forum had paid the officers' expenses from the County Council to provide technical support to develop the project. A few issues had arisen about the timing in connection with the availability of capital funding and procure of the equipment. It was hoped that the pilots would be finished early 2011.

Dr.Wusu referred to the good relationship that existed between Bo City Council and Warwickshire. He said that the first and most important task for Bo City was to remove the rubbish and to target the waste collection system. Bo was also creating a small police force to help keep the City clean with help from the National Police. Although these Police were not in uniform they had done some work helping to keep the streets clean and organising the street traders. He said that he had learned a lot from the officers from Warwickshire over the last 5 years.

The Chair thanked Dr Wusu for addressing the Partnership.

(c) Project Transform

Ivy Rumble reported that a Seminar had been arranged for Wednesday 24 March for officers across all partner organisations and Project Transform, where the opportunity would be provided for officers to ask questions and to hold frank discussions. She anticipated that approximately 65 people would be attending the Seminar.

**7. Future Meeting Dates (2:00 p.m. Shire Hall) –**

Future meeting dates were noted as follows-

15 June 2010  
21 September 2010  
7 December 2010  
8 March 2011

.....  
Chair of Partnership

The meeting closed at 3.40 p.m.



## Warwickshire Waste Partnership – 15 June 2010

### Defra Waste Management Consultation Responses

#### Report of the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy on behalf of the Officers Group

##### Summary

Since the last meeting of the Waste Partnership, Warwickshire County Council has responded to two consultations related to waste management. These consultations were carried out by the Government through the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra).

This report summarises the consultations, while **Appendix A and B** contain the Warwickshire County Councils responses.

##### Recommendation

That the Warwickshire Waste Partnership notes the consultation responses.

## 1. Background

- 1.1 This report and attached appendices contain Warwickshire County Council's response to two consultations which were carried out by the Government through the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). Each response is in line with the Warwickshire Municipal Waste Management Strategy, and views expressed by members of the Warwickshire Waste Partnership.

The two consultations relate to waste management:-

- (i) Implementation of the "Packaging Strategy"; and
- (ii) Potential landfill bans;

- 1.1 The closing dates for these consultations were 27 May 2010 and 10 June 2010 respectively.

## 2. Summary of the Potential Landfill Ban Consultation

- 2.1 The "Consultation on the introduction of restrictions on the landfilling of certain wastes", outlines and examines waste streams which are being considered for

landfill restrictions or bans. The waste streams being considered are paper and card; textiles; metals; wood; food waste; glass and plastics.

- 2.2 Several options are outlined in the consultation, these include doing nothing and relying on current measures such as landfill tax to continue to reduce the amount we landfill; introducing bans on landfilling on their own or accompanied by a requirement for waste to be sorted; introducing a sorting or tougher pre-treatment requirement without a landfill ban; and introducing producer responsibility requirements for certain wastes.
- 2.3 If introduced, the restrictions are expected to have a dramatic impact on waste management practices, by boosting the separate collection, recycling and recovery of waste. It is important, however, that the timescales given to any such bans are sufficient to allow the development of the necessary collection, recycling and treatment infrastructure. As such Defra are also asking for views on lead in times to any ban.
- 2.4 Defra has indicated that at this stage, it has no preferred option with regards to which material(s) will be restricted, although food waste could be a prime candidate, due to the government's vocal support for reducing food waste.
- 2.5 Research into how a landfill ban might work in practice in the UK was published alongside the consultation. The research was carried out by Eunomia and looked at the practicalities of implementing landfill bans in the UK. Landfill bans of biodegradable or recyclable wastes have been found to have successfully worked in many other European countries including Germany and Austria. In most cases a ban has been implemented alongside other measures such as landfill tax and other requirements such as mandatory sorting or treatment of waste. Landfill bans in other countries were implemented over a 2-12 year period.
- 2.6 It is unclear currently how any landfill restrictions would be policed. Detailed proposals on the way bans and other measures will be introduced, who the onus would fall upon and the lead-in times to implement them is to be the subject of a full second-stage consultation.

### **3. Summary of the Packaging Consultation**

- 3.1 The “Implementing the Packaging Strategy: recovery and recycling targets, funding transparency and technical changes” outlines new targets for the recovery and recycling of packaging waste by 2020, alongside options to make the Packaging Waste Recovery Notes (PRN) system more transparent.
- 3.2 The PRN system is part of the Producer Responsibility Obligations (Packaging Waste) Regulations 2007, which oblige producers to pay towards the cost of recycling packaging materials and increase packaging waste recycling rates.
- 3.3 The consultation is split into three main parts which are:-
  - (i) New recovery and recycling targets for packaging waste for 2011-20 for obligated businesses (see table below);

- (ii) Strengthened reporting provisions for accredited exporters and reprocessors, to promote transparency in how producer funding is spent;
- (iii) Technical changes to improve clarity and operation of the regulations.

3.4 The tables below show the proposed targets for businesses and the expected recycling rate that will be achieved. Only businesses which handle more than 50 tonnes of packaging a year and have an annual turnover of over £2 million need to meet the targets in table one.

Table 1 (below) - Proposed business targets 2011-2020, including current 2010 targets (%)

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
<b>Paper</b>	69.5	72.0	74.0	76.0	78.0	80.0	82.0	84.0	86.0	88.0	90.0
<b>Glass</b>	81.0	82.0	83.0	84.0	85.0	86.0	87.0	88.0	89.0	90.0	90.0
<b>Aluminium</b>	40.0	43.0	46.0	49.0	52.0	55.0	58.0	61.0	64.0	67.0	70.0
<b>Steel</b>	69.0	71.5	74.0	76.5	79.0	81.5	84.0	86.5	89.0	91.5	94.0
<b>Plastic</b>	29.0	30.0	35.0	40.0	45.0	50.0	55.0	60.0	65.0	70.0	75.0
<b>Wood</b>	22.0	28.0	34.0	40.0	46.0	53.0	59.0	65.0	71.0	74.0	74.0
<b>Overall Recycling</b>	68.1	69.0	69.9	70.8	71.8	72.7	73.6	74.5	75.4	76.4	77.3
<b>Overall Recovery</b>	74.0	75.0	76.0	77.0	78.0	79.0	80.0	81.0	82.0	83.0	84.0

*Source: Defra*

Table 2 (below) – Showing recycling rates 2011-2020 (%) if business targets in table 1 achieved

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
<b>Paper</b>	69.0	70.9	72.8	74.7	76.6	78.5	80.5	82.4	84.3	86.2
<b>Glass</b>	62.9	63.6	64.4	65.2	65.9	66.7	67.5	68.2	69.0	69.0
<b>Aluminium</b>	42.8	45.7	48.7	51.7	54.7	57.7	60.6	63.6	66.6	69.6
<b>Steel</b>	56.9	58.9	60.9	62.8	64.8	66.8	68.8	70.8	72.8	74.8
<b>Plastic</b>	22.8	26.6	30.3	34.1	37.9	41.7	45.5	49.3	53.1	56.9
<b>Wood</b>	26.7	32.4	38.2	43.9	50.6	56.3	62.0	67.8	70.6	70.6
<b>Overall Recycling</b>	59.0	59.7	60.5	61.2	62.0	63.4	65.8	68.1	70.3	71.9
<b>Overall Recovery</b>	64.1	64.9	65.7	66.6	67.4	68.2	69.0	69.8	70.6	71.9

*Source: Defra*

3.5 Notably, the consultation proposes to set differentiated glass recycling targets depending on how the material is recycled - with similar plans to set sub-targets for plastics from 2013.

3.6 Defra sets out two options regarding the level at which UK business targets should be set for the next 10 years.

- (i) **Option 1** -increasing the UK business targets to achieve an overall 70% packaging recycling rate by 2020, including challenging targets for plastics at 75% and aluminium at 70% (see tables one and two).
- (ii) **Option 2** -continue the current packaging recycling targets which achieved a recycling rate of 61% in 2008.

Option 1 is the Government's preferred option as it is more in line with the Packaging Strategy and will produce a better environmental outcome. Defra is concerned that if targets are not increased further, businesses may perceive they do not need to invest further in recycling.

3.7 The consultation also asks for views on the transparency of producer funding, (PRN revenue), which was identified in the packaging strategy as an important issue for both local authorities and producers. The main issue that the proposals seek to address is the issue that producers are currently unable to report on how the funding they provide is spent, beyond the mere fulfilment of a legal obligation. Similarly, local authorities need better information about financial flows, so they are able to make informed planning decisions, or have informed discussions with their waste contractors. The consultation sets out four main options for improving the transparency of producer funding in detail. These are:-

- (i) Maximising the effectiveness of the current reporting system.
- (ii) Revised categories for reporting PRN/PERN revenue expenditure.
- (iii) Automatic reconciliation of revenue against expenditure.
- (iv) Reports on expenditure in percentage terms for each accredited reprocessor/exporter.

## 4. Summary of Responses

4.1 The response to the consultation on the implementation of the packaging strategy (**See Appendix B**) outlines Warwickshire's support for increasing the recycling and recovery targets for the packaging industry. It also outlines the need for greater financial support by industry and government if they want local authorities to aid them in reaching their targets.

The response also outlines the need for greater transparency in relation to Packaging Waste Recovery Notes (PRN).

4.2 The response to the consultation on potential landfill bans on certain waste types (**See Appendix A**) outlines the County Council's support for diverting waste away from landfill.

4.3 The proposed response acknowledges that this is a first stage consultation and that a second stage consultation would consider more detailed proposals to evaluate, if any such landfill bans could be introduced in practical terms, and where the onus would be placed in terms of responsibility, accountability and funding.

- 4.4 The proposed response acknowledges that the evidence outlined for potential landfill bans show a potential “net benefit to society”.
- 4.5 The response also outlines that although a blanket requirement to pre-treat any waste at the point of landfill disposal would be the most practical solution for a landfill ban, this has its risks of pushing unsuitable waste, or waste where the net benefit of recycling over incineration is clear into Energy-from Waste (EfW) facilities.
- 4.6 The proposed response also states that it would not be supportive of any requirement to pre-treat waste from household waste sources that is sent to an EfW facility.

**Enquiries:** about this report should be made to Kitran Eastman - Waste Strategy and Partnership Manager, 01926 - 418064, e-mail [kitraneastman@warwickshire.gov.uk](mailto:kitraneastman@warwickshire.gov.uk)

### **Background Papers**

Defra “Consultation on the introduction of restrictions on the landfilling of certain wastes”.

Original consultation document can be found at

<http://www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/packaging-regs/consultation.pdf>

Defra Consultation on “Implementing the Packaging Strategy: recovery and recycling targets, funding transparency and technical changes”.

Original consultation document can be found at

<http://www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/landfill-restrictions/20100318-landfill-restrictions-condoc.pdf>

PAUL GALLAND  
Strategic Director for Environment and Economy  
Shire Hall  
Warwick

7 June 2010

## Appendix A

# Warwickshire County Council

Consultation Response to Defra for

“Consultation on the introduction of restrictions  
on the landfilling of certain wastes”



**1. Given the evidence available, do you think there is a case for a landfill ban on these waste type?** *(paper and card; textiles; metals; wood; food waste; glass and plastic )*

Yes - Based on the evidence presented due to the net benefit to society,

Warwickshire County Council (WCC) acknowledges that Defra have declared that a second stage consultation would consider more detailed proposals. This second stage would evaluate if any of such landfill bans could be introduced in practical terms, and where the onus would be placed in-terms of responsibility, accountability and funding.

The current set of legislative, regulatory and fiscal policy drivers is taking the management of household waste to a position where 40% to 60% recycling and 95% landfill diversion will be achieved by the majority of local authorities by 2020. Waste Composition Analysis of household waste arisings across England and Wales generally show that Local Authorities are recording food as the main identifiable waste type remaining in the residual waste at around 30% by weight (+/- 5%). However, some textiles (e.g. carpet), dense plastics and wood are often 'hidden' in waste composition analysis as they are often catalogued under miscellaneous combustible materials rather than under their primary material type categories.

WCC considers that food, textiles, dense plastics and wood waste types are proving to be the most challenging for many of local authorities to either collect economically (e.g. food) or divert from landfill as a result of undeveloped infrastructure/end-markets, particularly for 'spoilt/soiled' textiles and wood/chipboard treated with chemicals.

As such, WCC would be particular interested in any proposals put forward to target food, textiles, dense plastics and wood for consideration within a second stage consultation.

**2. What would be the practical difficulties and issues in implementing a landfill ban on this waste type?** *(paper and card; textiles; metals; wood; food waste; glass and plastic )*

WCC acknowledge that Defra policies designed to manage waste often target 'Household' waste as an entity that can be managed differently from 'Commercial' and 'Industrial' waste and recognise that sometimes the UK's existing approach is "focussed too narrowly on waste collected by local authorities" (paragraph 4.31).

When considering how an accreditation approach may apply to Commercial and Industrial waste collected outside of the municipalities' control, an accreditation scheme has the potential to present a problematic scenario similar to the existing pre-treatment requirement. If we consider that small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) make up a large proportion of the economy - up to 80% to 90% in some local authority administrative areas (AWM 2009), it is felt that the existing collection, transfer and treatment/disposal arrangements are such that it may not be practicable to operate an accreditation scheme with any confidence.

It may be that a blanket requirement to pre-treat any waste at the point of landfill disposal would be the most practical solution, but this has its risks of pushing unsuitable waste, or waste where the net benefit of recycling over incineration is clear into Energy-from Waste (EfW) facilities. This risk is touched upon in the consultation (paragraph 7.8) but would need exploring in further detail within a second consultation.

WCC would not be supportive of any requirement to pre-treat waste from household waste sources that is sent to an EfW facility, but can see the benefits of applying such a requirement to any commercial sources of waste prior to any treatment via EfW.

On a different matter relating to practical issues surrounding landfill bans, WCC acknowledged Defra's position in that "landfill should be the home of last resort for most wastes" (paragraph 3.2). Whilst WCC agrees with this position, a landfill ban in total would not provide a 'last resort'. However, a last resort may be required in practical terms for a number of reasons, for example:

*Should markets for recyclables collapse / fall in demand for secondary materials occur as a result of a world wide economic downturn – it might be considered prudent to put in some form of contingency planning that does not require altering primary or secondary legislation or stipulating a direction from the Secretary of State.*

*Advanced technologies (e.g. EfW) require planned maintenance but it should be acknowledged that unscheduled shutdowns occur where waste may be diverted to landfill. This potential for this problem may reduce given the recent PFI support for a wider spatial distribution of infrastructure of advanced treatment facilities, but contingency planning (e.g. "de minimis" allowances based on plant capacity, etc) would be considered prudent and easily incorporated into WasteDataFlow reporting for municipal waste.*

One final observation is that any landfill bans would need to consider how they would impact upon Local Authorities within a two-tier administrative arrangement that may have several Waste Collection Authorities with different collection strategies. For example,

*Within a County, it may be that the Northern area is served by an EfW facility so the need to collect/sort food is not paramount from a landfill ban perspective. However, in the Southern area, perhaps a landfill and anaerobic digestion facility are available. This could potentially lead to Waste Collection Authorities having to adapt their collection strategies to meet the requirements of the infrastructure rather than adopting the best environmental and economic option to meet local expectations. Conversely, it might be the Waste Disposal Authorities that will be looking to Defra for further guidance on how best to use the existing powers of direction to the Waste Collection Authorities as provided for in the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to make best use of this infrastructure.*

This would no doubt be resolved through Statutory Municipal Waste Management Strategies but an assessment of the potential for inequitable or perverse outcomes within two-tier authorities should be considered within a second stage consultation.

### **3. If you support a ban on this type of waste what should the lead-in time be for a ban on this waste type, to allow time for the necessary infrastructure to develop?**

WCC agrees in principle at this first consultation stage that 7 to 10 years (paragraph 7.2) is a reasonable timescale to consider and implement any of the four of the options and any/all of the nine proposed waste types.

By 2015, it is considered that the municipal sector waste strategies will be well developed and that the large PFI supported infrastructure projects should be largely operational. This would allow time for a post 2020/LATS reflection/evaluation as to whether or not landfill bans have a significant future role to play. This time frame would seem to be in line with the acknowledgment that "...it is considered England will meet the target without the need for additional measures" (paragraph 4.17) in respect of the Waste Framework Directive requiring 50% target for recycling/reuse.



4. **If you do not support a ban on this waste type, do you think other measures should be used to divert it from landfill and if so what would they be? (Please consider the alternative options listed in paragraphs 7.8 -7.17 and any other possibilities)**

WCC has not identified paper/card as a preferred material that should be subject to a landfill ban (even though it is still a relatively significant part of the residual household waste composition) given that the market value for recycling paper/card is a 'pull' on this waste commodity rather than trying to 'push' it out of the waste stream through landfill bans.

However, WCC is a strong advocator of Producer Responsibility and the prospect of any mandatory producer responsibility agreement (as opposed to a the current voluntary agreement, paragraph 6.7) with the Direct Marketing Association and Periodical Publishers Association to target 'junk-mail; would be well received. WCC does support Option 3: Producer Responsibility as the preferred option for targeting paper/card (paragraph 7.16).

5. **There may be other possible approaches to improve resource efficiency and reduce GHG emissions from this waste type (for example encouraging manufacturers and retailers to move away from using materials that are hard to recover or recycle). We would welcome observations and suggestions for each waste type.**

WCC would welcome any further detailed proposals in the second stage consultation on the rationalisation of the range and type of materials (e.g. reducing the number of available plastic polymers for use in packaging) and the co-fusion of materials (e.g. wood and plastic) that makes it difficult to recycle in post-consumer waste streams.

Textiles might be of particular interest to evaluate the benefits of specifying standards around carpet manufacturing.

6. **In addition to the above we invite comments on the costs and benefits detailed in the Consultation Stage Impact Assessment. In particular we would welcome information/views concerning three issues: (i) the likely impacts of the policy options in light of changes already occurring from existing instruments; (ii) the assumptions on the diversion rates assumed from different policy options; and (iii) the impact of the policy options on the efficiency of recycling markets – whether the unit cost estimates are reasonable and whether the implementation of the options would lower unit costs over time.**

No response.

## Appendix B

# Warwickshire County Council

Consultation Response to Defra for

“Implementing the Packaging Strategy:  
recovery and recycling targets, funding  
transparency and technical changes”



## Chapter 1

- Q1. In your view, are our projections for waste arisings reasonably accurate? Are you aware of any other factors which may affect the levels of packaging entering the waste stream? Please provide us with as much evidence as possible to support your answer, so we can adjust our figures as necessary.**

Warwickshire County Council (WCC) is not in a position to comment on the figures suggested by industry. WCC has, however, like most other local authorities seen a significant drop in waste arisings over the last 12 months, both in actual tonnages and waste per head. We believe that a factor in this is the reduction in packaging weights, as well as the changing economic circumstances. We would hope that these most recent results which have been returned to government via Wastedataflow, have been taken into account when forecasting packaging waste arising.

- Q2. In your view, are the predictions for obligated tonnage reasonably accurate? Are you aware of any other factors which may affect the levels of obligated tonnage reported? Please provide evidence to support your answer, so we are in a position to adjust our figures as necessary.**

Warwickshire County Council (WCC) is not in a position to comment on the figures suggested by industry. If previous assumptions on obligated tonnage, however, have proved to be accurate it would appear to make sense to continue those assumptions.

- Q3. Do you agree with our proposed targets for paper/board, and our analysis of what they are likely to require? Please provide evidence to support your answer, so we are in a position to adjust our figures as necessary.**

WCC supports these increased target for paper/board, to match or surpass the best in Europe. There is a need for greater understanding of what other policy instruments these countries have in place that aid and facilitate these high levels of recovery. Therefore understanding whether just setting higher targets under the Packaging Obligation Framework would be enough to enable high levels of recovery to be achieved.

WCC would like to see Defra investigate a mechanism for stretching the targets if those in the early years are quickly achieved.

- Q4. Do you agree with our proposed targets for glass and our analysis of what they are likely to require? Please provide evidence to support your answer, so we are in a position to adjust our figures as necessary.**

WCC supports an increased target for glass, however, does feel that the targets do not go far enough when taking into account the stated 600,000 tonnes available from the commercial sector waste streams.

Although glass has a high kg/HH yield the collection of glass in a colour segregate manner can be expensive for local authorities. As stated in paragraph 4.25 the collection method for glass is key and mainly dictates the end usage for the glass. If industry and government wishes for improved sources segregation, to ensure that glass goes to re-melt and not aggregate then greater funding will be required for local authorities.

Given this is producer responsibility legislation local authorities would look to obligated producers to bear the additional financial burden of supplying the container end market. There would also be a concern about the end market capacity for all colours of glass – one of the reasons the aggregate market developed in the first place.

- Q5. Do you agree with our proposed targets for aluminium and our analysis of what they are likely to require? We would also welcome your views on how aluminium in composite applications should be accounted for. Please provide evidence to support your answer, so we are in a position to adjust our figures as necessary.**

WCC supports these increased targets for aluminium, however would like to see a mechanism for stretching the targets if those in the early years are quickly achieved.

In terms of looking at the waste hierarchy the dealing with composite materials in terms of whether they are classed as paper or aluminium is 'end of pipe' thinking. A much better way to address the problem is to adopt a 'start of pipe' viewpoint and find ways to eliminate use of composite materials in packaging or design them in such a way that recovery of them is made very simple.

- Q6. Do you agree with our proposed targets for steel, and our analysis of what they are likely to require? Please provide evidence to support your answer, so we are in a position to adjust our figures as necessary.**

WCC supports the increased target for steel, however, believes that there is scope to go even further. These targets they would only result in the capture of only one third of the indicated amount of steel currently in the municipal waste stream. There is a case for increasing the targets in an effort to push obligated companies to engage closely with local authorities to develop and fund systems and communications to extract the steel from the waste stream.

- Q7. Do you agree with our proposed targets for plastic and our analysis of what they are likely to require? Please provide evidence to support your answer, so we are in a position to adjust our figures as necessary.**

WCC supports these increased target.

One of the major barriers for local authorities recycling of plastics is large variety of plastics used. This leads to a large amount of public confusion. WCC would like to see the packaging industry working together to limited the number of plastics used, and to work for greater standardise of the types used for different products. This would enable locals authorities to simplify the messages for its collections which would aid increases in participations by the public. In those local authority areas where only plastic "bottles" are accepted, greater support is needed to expand collection to further packaging.

End markets for mixed plastics (and sorting technology) will be key to achieving this target. WCC is aware that the infrastructure is starting to develop but this is one particular area where transparency in the use of PRN revenues to develop infrastructure could make a big difference.

- Q8. Do you agree with our proposed targets for wood and our analysis of what they are likely to require? Please provide evidence to support your answer, so we are in a position to adjust our figures as necessary.**

If the proposed targets for wood are increased to 2020 to match the current recycling levels there is no challenge or incentive for change or improvement. A better solution would see targets increase dramatically in the short term to match current recycling levels and then

extend beyond those levels to 2020 to encourage investment in infrastructure and realise greater environmental benefits from greater recovery levels.

**Q.9 Do you support government's preferred option of increasing targets between 2010 and 2020?**

*If you are a packaging producer, or a compliance scheme we would much appreciate your views on the cost assumptions that we have used in the Impact Assessment.*

**If you are a local authority, a waste management company or a member of the public, we would welcome your views on our analysis of what the proposed targets would mean for you.**

The comments above highlight WCCs overall approach to the proposed increase in targets.

High targets mean more focus will be placed on obtaining waste from the municipal waste stream. If improvements in household collections are needed to meet these targets than a clear financial support will be needed. WCC wouldn't want to see financial burdens falling on local authority as a result of these targets given that this is producer responsibility legislation.

A direct funding injection into collection infrastructure as well improved revenues support via the PRNs would enable local authorities' to better plan and forecast. With the current pressure on local authority spending it is vital that these funding streams are available.

**Q.10 What do you think are the reasons for the obligated tonnage gap in glass and plastics? What can be done to reduce that gap (and who should do it)?**

We cannot comment on the reason for the obligated tonnage gap but would ask whether this presents a case for lowering the de minimus level for those materials where there is a gap. This would bring more companies in to the system that have specific responsibilities for tonnages and so generate more funds to increase material capture.

**Q11. Do you support government's proposal to split the glass target in line with end-use and reduce the allowable recycling through aggregates over time? Have you got any data which would make our estimate of total tonnages of glass going to re-melt, aggregate or other end-uses more accurate? If so please provide it with your response.**

**If you are a local authority, a waste management company or a packaging producer, we would welcome your views on our analysis of what this proposal would mean for you, including the cost assumptions used in our Impact Assessment.**

*If you are an accredited exporter or re-processor, please give us your views on the likely impact of this proposal on your business*

In terms of resource efficiency and ecological foot printing there is a compelling argument and logic for closed loop recycling and restricting the aggregates end market for glass. However, this is then closing off 30% of the current end market capacity and as is highlighted in the consultation document the additional income from the remelt market does not normally cover increased costs of colour separated collection. Due to its weight and density, the issues of collecting/storing/transporting glass separately can be significant to local authorities. Careful thought therefore needs to be given how the potential additional costs of collection or remelt can be passed on to local authorities to ensure any additional financial burden is not shouldered by them.

Currently glass reprocessing can be very geographical limited where as an outlet for glass to aggregates can normally be found locally. The worst case could see local authorities currently undertaking non colour separated collections stop altogether as the aggregate market is closed down, causing future targets to be missed. There is also a need to understand what will replace the glass in the aggregates market and the carbon implications of that as an overall carbon deficit may result, despite more glass going to remelt.

As such to increase source segregation a direct injection into collection infrastructure as well improved revenues support via the PRNs would be needed. With the current pressure on local authority spending it is vital that these funding streams are available.

- Q.12 Do you support government's proposal in principle to split the plastics target? We would welcome views from producers regarding the administrative burden of the proposed change in data collection. If you are a local authority, a waste management company or a member of the public, we would welcome your views on our analysis of what this proposal would mean for you. If you are an accredited exporter or re-processor, please give us your views on the likely impact of this proposal on your business.**

WCC supports the principle of splitting the plastic targets to stimulate the markets for plastics which currently are not viable to collect. As such WCC believes that the best option would be the "hybrid split" outlined in section 6.3. This options would enable local authorities to access the financial impact of expanding the range of plastics collected.

There is a need to be sure that whilst the split might progress and encourage 'underperforming' materials, that it does not result in momentum being lost on other types of plastic. Their targets still need to be set at levels that are challenging and result in an increase in recovery rates

## Chapter 2

- Q.13 Do you agree with these proposals? If not, please set out an alternative which you think would work better but achieve the same results. We would welcome your views on the expected benefits and disadvantages set out in this proposal, especially is your business stands to be directly affected by them.**

Yes - WCC would welcome proposals which would make the flow of PRN funding/value transparent. WCC believes that it is currently this lack of transparencies which makes some elements of the waste packaging chain sceptical about their impact. As such potential changes in PRN values are rarely taken into account by local authorities'.

Reporting alone is not enough if what the PRN revenue spend is being used for is not aimed specifically at areas that will increase the overall capacity of and recycling levels for packaging. The areas of spend should be reviewed and if needed restricted to those areas that ensure investment on capacity expansion in undertaken – both in terms of collection and treatment infrastructure.

It is debateable that the proposed reporting requirements will increase the administrative burden given that there is a reporting regime in place already that needs to be complied with. We would not want to see PRN revenue diverted to 'admin' instead of the intended use to increase the UK's ability to meet the packaging targets and increase recovery.

- Q.14 Do you agree with the proposed change in reporting categories? If not, please set out an alternative which you think would work better but achieve the same results. We would welcome your views on the expected benefits and disadvantages set out in this proposal.**

If you are an accredited re-processor/exporter, please give us an estimate, in staff days, of how much longer it would take your business to collate the information in the form requested, compared to what you are having to report now:-

- (a) The first year this came into force (for new reporting categories? For sub-material?)
- (b) Subsequent years (for new reporting categories? For sub-material?)

No response.

- Q.15 Do you agree with the proposal for automatic reconciliation? If not, is there another mechanism which in your view would work better and fulfil same objectives?**

Data collection and reporting needs to be accurate and comprehensive. Any amendments to achieve this are supported. Given the reconciliation process that local authorities must undertake as part of the Waste Data Flow system it does not appear unreasonable to expect private industry to perform a similar function with the National Packaging Waste Database

- Q.16 Do you think any of these options should be pursued, and if so, what are the benefits and costs you think would arise? Are there any other options that would work better and fulfil the same objectives?**

No response.

- Q. 17 Do you think any of these options should be pursued, and if so, what are the benefits and costs you think would arise? Are there any other options that would work better and fulfil the same objectives?**

No response.

### Chapter 3

- Q 18 Do you agree with the above technical change being made?**

No response.

- Q.19 Do you agree that packaging sent to offshore oil platforms should form part of the UK's recovery/recycling obligation? If not, please provide details. If you are an obligated packaging company supplying packaging to an offshore platform, we would welcome any cost estimates of this change for your business.**

WCC agrees it should be part of recovery/recycling obligation

- Q.20 Do you agree that the requirement for re-processors and exporters to provide independent audit reports should be removed from the Regulations? If not please give details. If you are an accredited re-processor or exporter, please tell us what savings this would result in for your business.**

No response.

**Q.21 Do you agree with the proposed fee structure for Part Cs  
If not, please give details.**

No response.

**Q. 22 Do you agree with the above technical change being made?  
If you are a small subsidiary company with a turnover of less than £2million, please tell  
us how much time this is likely to save for you per year, and any other savings you  
may be able to make.**

No response.

**Q.23 Do you agree with the above technical change being made?**

No response.



## Warwickshire Waste Partnership – 15 June 2010

### Development of W2R Energy from Waste PFI Project – Progress Update

#### Report of the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy on behalf of the Officers Group

##### Summary

This report provides an update on the development of the proposed Energy from Waste plant (W2R) to serve Northern Warwickshire, being led by Staffordshire County Council.

##### Recommendation

That the Warwickshire Waste Partnership notes the report.

## 1. Background

- 1.1 At the December 2009 meeting of the Warwickshire Waste Partnership a report was presented providing an update regarding a key project to divert residual waste away from landfill named Project W2R (waste to resources). This report provides an update on progress with Project W2R which is being led by Staffordshire County Council.

## 2. Progress with Project W2R

- 2.1 The W2R Energy from Waste (EfW) plant will be capable of processing around 300,000 tonnes of residual waste per annum at Four Ashes, Staffordshire.
- 2.2 It is proposed that Warwickshire sends 35,000 tonnes of waste per annum to the plant. This 35,000 tonnes will consist of all of the residual waste from North Warwickshire Borough and approximately half of the residual waste from Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough.
- 2.3 The estimated annual tonnages for Warwickshire's input into W2R are a minimum of 30,000, probable 35,000, and a guaranteed maximum of 40,000 tonnes.

- 2.4 Veolia as Preferred Bidder was approved by Staffordshire County Council's Cabinet on 19 May and endorsed at their Full Council on 20 May. See **Appendix A**.
- 2.5 In respect of Warwickshire, final affordability of the full business case for W2R was approved by Cabinet on 27 May 2010.
- 2.6 Following a highly-competitive procurement exercise, Defra has highlighted that W2R is so far the only Energy from Waste PFI project to undercut its Outline Business Case (OBC) cost estimates.
- 2.7 As the W2R PFI project is only partially-indexed, its local authority partners will see a dramatic fall in costs in real terms. Staffordshire County Council is predicting that the contract will save its tax payers more than £250 million over the next 25 years while Warwickshire will save around £60 million based on projected inputs.
- 2.8 W2R will also help Warwickshire meet its Landfill Allowance targets and its landfill diversion targets under the County's Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

### **3. Next Steps**

- 3.1 Sign off Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) as approved in principle by Cabinet on 28 January 2010.
- 3.2 It is anticipated that the new Energy from Waste Facility will be operational by December 2013.

**Enquiries:** about this report should be made to David Whitehouse, Project Manager, 01926 - 412961, email davidwhitehouse@warwickshire.gov.uk

### **Background Papers**

None.

PAUL GALLAND  
Strategic Director for Environment and Economy  
Shire Hall  
Warwick

2 June 2010

## Warwickshire Waste Partnership – 15 June 2010

### Development of Long-Term Residual Waste Treatment Facility - Progress Update

#### Staffordshire County Council News Release

*For release after 3.30pm Thursday 20th May 2010*

#### **Staffordshire's Energy from Waste saves tax payer over £250m**

Veolia Environmental Services was today confirmed as the "preferred bidder" to run Staffordshire's energy from waste project.

The contract will save Staffordshire tax payers over £250 million over the next 25 years, councillors heard at today's meeting of Staffordshire County Council.

Veolia, which is one of Europe's leaders in the environmental field, was selected as the "preferred bidder" after a rigorous and demanding process.

Planning permission for the plant on the Four Ashes industrial estate in the south of Staffordshire was secured in 2008. The plant will generate enough power for over 32,000 homes. And it will create 40 new jobs.

Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Infrastructure Robert Marshall said Veolia had demonstrated the best value for the tax payer and top quality technological and environmental credentials.

"This is about protecting the tax payer from escalating costs and protecting the environment from mounting piles of rubbish.

"Veolia was up against some very impressive opposition in this world wide field of environmental technology.

"We have harnessed the very best brains in the business to ensure Staffordshire gets maximum value, and maximum quality," he said.

It's one the biggest contracts the County Council has ever signed up to.

The final contract is likely to be signed and sealed in the summer once the legal details have been concluded.

**ends**

**Notes for Editors:**

It's all part of Staffordshire's "Zero Waste to Landfill" strategy, which is tackling head on the growing problem of domestic waste. Staffordshire is dedicated to maximising recycling first, and then recovering energy from the left over residual waste.

The project is central to Staffordshire's drive to protect tax payers and residents from the rising environmental and financial costs of landfill.

The project has already received backing from Government to the tune of £122.4 million – recognising the major contribution it will make to national targets for reducing landfill.

It has also been given the green light by the Audit Commission as being the clear winner in prudent management of tax payers' cash.

## Warwickshire Waste Partnership – 15 June 2010

### Project to Increase the Number of Households Participating in Recycling in the Boroughs of North Warwickshire and Nuneaton and Bedworth

#### Report of the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy on behalf of the Officers Group

##### Summary

The report summarises the progress made on a project to increase the number of households participating in recycling in the boroughs of North Warwickshire and Nuneaton and Bedworth.

##### Recommendation

That the Warwickshire Waste Partnership notes the work taking place between the partners and receives further updates through the life of the project.

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Statistics for both dry recycling levels and residual waste levels across the five Warwickshire waste collection authority areas were compared at the half way point during the financial year 2009/10. It was found that Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough and North Warwickshire Borough were performing below the level of the other three authorities. A decision was made, during the service planning process between the partners, that additional funding and support would be needed by the two boroughs, to help them improve their performance over the next 12 months.
- 1.2 In previous years, the other three authorities have received help from the County Council to put in place their alternate week collection infrastructure and communications campaigns.

## 2. Background

- 2.1 Of the five waste collection authorities in Warwickshire, three have introduced alternate week collection methods over the past few years: Rugby, Stratford and Warwick. These three authorities currently perform better than the remaining two, in terms of both dry recycling rates and residual waste levels. The following table demonstrates averaged rates for the five waste collection authorities and the average for the county, for data from Q1 to Q3 inclusive 2009/2010.

Authority	Average household dry recycling rate	Total residual household waste per household (kg)
North Warwickshire	9.57%	610.50
Nuneaton and Bedworth	16.31%	485.15
Rugby	25.04%	360.29
Stratford	25.52%	296.06
Warwick	21.20%	313.48
Warwickshire	22.64%	451.91

- 2.2 The elevated performance of Rugby, Stratford and Warwick can be attributed, at least in part, to these authorities moving to an alternate week collection method. Additionally, when these changes were made over the past few years, large scale communications campaigns were employed to explain the changes and encourage full participation. The authorities received assistance with these campaigns from Warwickshire County Council staff.
- 2.3 Currently Nuneaton and Bedworth collect both residual waste and dry recycling on a weekly basis. North Warwickshire collect residual waste weekly and dry recycling fortnightly. Until this year, very little assistance has been given to the boroughs to support increasing participation in recycling, increasing recycling levels or decreasing residual waste.

This new assistance is in the form of funding and additional help from the Waste Projects Team. It is envisaged that the funding will be spent in three areas, namely:-

- (i) A temporary member of staff for each authority until 31 March 2011, to coordinate the project.
- (ii) Two full dry recycling participation surveys across all households in both boroughs. One at the start and one at the end of the funding period.
- (iii) A targeted communication campaign to encourage participation.

### **3. Progress Update**

- 3.1 Warwickshire Waste Projects Team have met twice with representatives from the two boroughs to initiate the project. This group will continue to meet regularly. Additionally the two project co-ordinators will work closely together sharing ideas.
- 3.2 A job specification for the Project Co-ordinator posts has been written. Each borough is currently in the process of recruiting. The posts will be offered as a possible secondment opportunity as we recognise the short duration of the funding.
- 3.3 Work has started on setting up the baseline participation survey. We will be following the best practice methodology set out by WRAP. Both boroughs use the same contractor for their dry recycling collections: Palm Recycling. Palm have sent details of all of their recycling collection rounds and establishing the logistics of the survey is underway. Agency staff will be used to assist with the participation surveys.

- 3.4 The data from the baseline participation survey, coupled with that from the Project Transform composition analysis, will be used to develop targeted promotional work to increase participation in recycling, and to encourage waste minimisation and increase levels of recycling. The Waste Projects Team will support the two Project Co-ordinators in doing this and envisage the work to include targeted leaflets, local authority newsletters, local PR, roadshows, work with community groups and competitions. The campaign will look to examine and address any barriers that prevent householders from recycling.
- 3.5 In September, North Warwickshire plan to introduce collections of cardboard and plastic food containers and bottles. It is hoped this new service will automatically produce an increase in recycling participation, due to the promotional work that will be involved. It will be legitimate for the project co-ordinator to be involved in the roll out of the new recycling provision. (Nuneaton and Bedworth already collect these two waste streams).
- 3.6 We have general agreement that the main participation survey and therefore the target will refer to dry recycling only. However, participation data for green waste collections will be gathered by the two Project Co-ordinators when the main survey is complete.

#### **4. Success Criteria**

- 4.1 North Warwickshire estimate that their recycling participation level is at about 35% to 40%. On this basis, we have put forward a target of a five percentage point increase in participation rate.
- 4.2 Nuneaton and Bedworth had a sample participation survey carried out in January 2009, which suggested their recycling participation rate is higher. This is backed up by their higher recycling rate and lower residual waste per household. A five percentage point increase from a higher starting baseline may not be totally realistic, but we have set this as a provisional target for swing in participation.
- 4.3 When the initial participation data is in, we will take advice from WRAP over what increase in participation target is fair and achievable, it may be different for each authority.

#### **5. Next Steps**

- 5.1 The current re-deployee pools in the two boroughs are small, and there have been no forthcoming suitable applicants for the two project co-ordinator posts. The posts will be promoted internally for two weeks with the option of secondment. The posts will then be promoted within Warwickshire and according to the borough council's terms until they are filled.
- 5.2 The baseline participation survey is being planned so that it can be underway very soon after the borough project co-ordinator is in place. Each area will be surveyed over 3 collections. Nuneaton and Bedworth's recycling is collected weekly and the survey will, therefore, take 3 weeks to complete. North Warwickshire, however,

operates a fortnightly recycling collection which will increase the time it takes to complete the survey to 6 weeks.

- 5.3 The baseline participation survey data will determine further promotional campaign activity. This will be the coordinators' key task until into 2011.
- 5.4 The final participation surveys will take place in February and March 2011.

**Enquiries:** about this report should be made to Ruth Dixon, Senior Waste Project Manager, 01926 412961, email [ruthdixon@warwickshire.gov.uk](mailto:ruthdixon@warwickshire.gov.uk)

**Background Papers:** None

PAUL GALLAND  
Strategic Director for Environment and Economy  
Shire Hall  
Warwick

2 June 2010



## Warwickshire Waste Partnership – 15 June 2010

### Waste Management Statistics for 2009/10 (Estimates)

#### Report of the Strategic Director for Environment and Economy on behalf of the Officers Group

##### Summary

The report details estimated quantities of waste handled by the Warwickshire Councils during 2009/10.

##### Recommendation

The Warwickshire Waste Partnership is recommended to note the report.

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides the Partnership with an analysis of the estimated amount of household waste arising in Warwickshire and associated performance for 2009/10.
- 1.2 Full detail of the performance is set out in **Appendix A**.
- 1.3 The Partnership is asked to note that figures provided are estimates for year-end performance, and until finally validated and agreed in September 2010 by the Environment Agency have the potential to change.

## 2. Performance and Analysis for 2009/10

- 2.1 The overall waste performance in Warwickshire is good with all areas providing positive results for 2009/2010. Notably;
  - (i) Recycling has increased from 21.50% in 2008/2009 to 24.81% in 2009/2010.
  - (ii) Composting has increased from 21.70% in 2008/2009 to 24.05% in 2009/010 giving an estimated combined composting and recycling rate of 48.86%.
  - (iii) Residual waste sent to landfill has decrease from 49.80% in 2008/2009 to 39.31% in 2009/2010.
  - (iv) Waste sent to the Energy from Waste plant in Coventry has increased from 7.00% in 2008/2009 to 11.83% in 2009/2010, an increase of 9,606 tonnes.

- (v) Total household waste has reduced by 4.6% from last year.

This performance is in line with the Waste Partnerships Waste Strategy 2015.

2.2 The encouraging performance for Warwickshire can be attributed to many factors:-

- (i) Rugby Borough, Warwick District and Stratford on Avon District Councils have all introduced new kerbside schemes within the last two years incorporating co-mingled recycling and biowaste at kerbside on an alternate weekly basis with the exception of Warwick who employ kerbside sort. This has increase the potential capture rate for recyclables and biodegradable waste at kerbside. The implementation of these services are thought to be the main contributing factor for the increase recycling and composting rates in Warwickshire.

2.3 The reduction in landfilled residual waste is thought the be due to three main influences. Firstly, the increased use of the Energy from Waste plant in Coventry as determined in the Partnerships' Waste Strategy.

- (i) Secondly, the introduction of the Love Food, Hate Waste campaign funded by WRAP (Waste Resource Action Programme) which encourages residents to reduce the amount of food thrown away. The campaign consisted of roadshows, a LFHW week in February half term and promotions through local media.
- (ii) It is widely acknowledged that the recession has played a role in reducing the amount of waste generated throughout the UK, it is also thought that a social shift towards frugality may be having an impact. The majority of councils have seen a decrease in waste arisings which has been accelerated by the recession, however, figures show that a small decrease in waste across the UK started to happen before the recession struck. This coupled with an increase in recycling points to a wider cultural shift.

### 3. Next Steps

3.1 Final figures are expected to be available to report on in September 2010.

**Enquiries:** about this report should be made to Kitran Eastman, Waste Strategy and Partnership Manager, Waste Management, 01926 418064, email [kitraneastman@warwickshire.gov.uk](mailto:kitraneastman@warwickshire.gov.uk)

#### **Background Papers**

None.

PAUL GALLAND  
Strategic Director for Environment and Economy  
Shire Hall  
Warwick

3 June 2010

**Warwickshire Waste Partnership – 15 June 2010**

**Waste Management Statistics for 2009/10 (Estimates)**

Waste Arisings		Non-household waste	
District Dry Recycling	47751	Inerts	8823
County Dry Recycling	17990	Trade	8743
Total Composting	63006		
Energy from Waste	31000		
Landfill	119798		

<b>Total Municipal Waste</b>	279,545 (estimated)
<b>Total Household Waste</b>	261,578 (estimated)
<b>Total Household Waste 08/09</b>	274,206
<b>% change for total household waste 08/09</b>	-4.6 (estimated)

**Performance**

	2009/2010 (estimated)	2008/2009 (from WDF <sup>1</sup> )	% change from 08/09
Recycling Rate	24.81	21.50	☺ ↑ 15.40
Composting Rate	24.05	21.70	☺ ↑ 10.83
Recycling and Composting Rate	48.86	43.20	☺ ↑ 13.10
Landfill Rate	39.31	49.80	☹ ↓ -21.07
Energy from Waste	11.83	7.00	☺ ↑ 69.04

1. Waste Data Flow

NB. District recycling rates are taken from claimed recycling credits. All other figures are taken from Warwickshire County Council in-house records and at the publication of this report are considered **estimates**.