

Consistent Collections Consultation – WWP Draft

Introduction (page 16)

- Q1 Warwickshire Waste Partnership
- Q2 ruthdixon@warwickshire.gov.uk
- Q3 Which best describes you?
Local Government
- Q4 Warwickshire Waste Partnership
- Q5 Would you like your response to be confidential?
No

Proposals on separate collection of dry recyclable waste from households

Proposal 1 - Collection of dry recyclable materials

- Q6 Do you agree or disagree that local authorities should be required to collect the following dry materials from all households, including flats, by the end of the financial year in which payments to local authorities under Extended Producer Responsibility for packaging commences (currently proposed to be 2023/4 subject to consultation)? (P26)

	Agree –this material can be collected in this timeframe	Disagree –this material can't be collected in this timeframe	Not sure /don't have an opinion /not applicable
Aluminium foil	Y		
Aluminium food trays	Y		
Steel and aluminium aerosols	Y		
Aluminium tubes, e.g. tomato puree tubes	Y		
Metal jar lids	Y		
Food and drink cartons, e.g. Tetrapak		Y	

- Q7 If you have disagreed with the inclusion of any of the additional materials above in the timeframe set out, please state why this would not be feasible, indicating which dry recyclable material you are referring to in your response. (P27)

Tubes

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees with the inclusion of aluminium tubes but raises the issue that tubes cannot be safely cleaned of all food residue. This issue will need confirming with metal reprocessors.

Cartons

Warwickshire Waste Partnership members will part-own a new, state of the art MRF, due to open mid-2023. So, in our particular case, the space and equipment to sort and store cartons for recycling will be available from the start of consistent collections. However, we are aware that the majority of other local authorities will not have access to the most up to date MRF facilities which can easily gear up to make provision for new materials. So, the partnership recognises that fellow authorities will have concerns about the sorting capability for food and drinks cartons in the UK and therefore concerns about adding them to the list of materials that should be collected from 2023/24.

The new MRF that Warwickshire will use will be capable of sorting fully comingled recycling to high quality standards and that will include being able to sort cartons, even when flattened. However, we understand the logic of asking for cartons in the plastics stream for older sorting facilities, to keep fibres cleaner and to keep cartons in their shape so they are easier to sort. Some kerbside sort vehicles can have an element of compaction on the plastics compartment. If materials are bulked before reaching the MRF then there is another opportunity for cartons to get flattened. Residents may also flatten cartons even if the local authority instruction is not to. Therefore, if older sorting facilities cannot cope with cartons that are flattened then there is less likelihood of them being recycled, despite being collected. Sorting capability in the UK overall is not robust enough to provide comprehensive coverage of MRFs that will be able to sort food and drinks cartons to a level suitable for the required end markets.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would like to see the inclusion of cartons later than proposed to ensure that there is sufficient reprocessing capacity in the UK or Europe to deal with the quantities of this material that will be sorted for recycling. There is currently only one facility able to reprocess this material in the UK, in Halifax. There is uncertainty about how DRS and EPR decisions will affect the prevalence of cartons in the waste stream or the future capacity for reprocessing of cartons in the UK. The partners are keen that there is sufficient end market capacity that none of the plastic-containing waste collected in Warwickshire is shipped beyond the EU for reprocessing. Chemical processing mentioned in the consultation as a solution to plastics end markets is less applicable when discussing cartons, as they are predominantly composed of paperboard, with plastic and metal layers.

Q8 Some local authorities may not be able to collect all these items from all households at kerbside by 2023/24. Under what circumstances might it be appropriate for these collection services to begin after this date? (P28)

Collection contracts

Sorting contracts

Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) infrastructure capacity

Cost burden

Reprocessing

End markets

Other (please specify)

Please provide the reason for your response and indicate how long local authorities require before they can collect all of these materials, following the date that funding is available from Extended Producer Responsibility.

Collection Contracts

Warwickshire collection contracts are being aligned to the availability of a new, state of the art MRF from mid-2023. However, we are aware that most local authorities will be at varying points in a collection contract, which are typically designed in length around the useful working life of the collection vehicles, typically 7 years or longer. This also applies to directly delivered services. If mandated changes force changes to collection contracts or infrastructure, this should be covered by EPR payments or new burdens.

With the associated requirement to collect food waste some local authorities may require a fundamental change in their collection arrangements, rather than just “adding in” some dry recycling materials. The most cost-effective way to do this is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on which the obligations and payments fall.

If an authority needs to move from a current co-mingled service to a source separated service, there are all the associated issues with the increase in vehicles, staff, depot space etc that will need to be taken into account and make the change much more complex and so likely to take longer to achieve.

Concerns have been raised about the ability of the market to supply services to councils and contractors if there is high demand, due to lots of contracts and vehicle replacements happening at the same time. So, there may be shortages of collection vehicles, or longer lead in times. Also, some authorities might find they have few, or even no bidders for collection contracts. This will then lead to possible value for money issues, fewer bidders generally means that less competitive bids will be made, and a higher service cost ensues.

Sorting Contracts

The most cost-effective way to change contracts or contract terms is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider as to whether these

payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on who the obligations and payments fall.

MRF Infrastructure

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the ability of most MRFs nationwide to be able to adapt within the timescales to enable consistent and thorough sorting of food and drinks cartons. Local authorities are limited to which MRFs they can supply, due to proximity. In certain places, there may be challenges with other materials also. As councils will not receive payments for EPR obligated materials until 2023/24, and MRFs gain their income through gate fees for council contracts, it is not clear how they will receive a cash flow to provide the investment to change their equipment to be ready for the EPR / consistent collection materials. A competitive procurement process will be affected by increased demand over a short timescale, for MRF capacity and for collection contractors, separated material off takers, vehicles, reprocessing – there could be significant capacity issues.

Cost burden

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is concerned that if up-front transition costs are not provided and if EPR funding and new burden funding for food waste are not aligned, there will be impacts on the whole collections system. Authorities in Warwickshire do not currently collect food waste separately, so we will look to implement one service change for food and dry recycling collections. If the funding for food waste collections is not provided up front, this will delay planned changes for the dry recycling materials.

Reprocessing

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that the reprocessing capacity is likely to be available for cartons in time in the UK and in Europe. The partners do not want material from Warwickshire to have to be shipped beyond Europe for reprocessing because the government has mandated collection of cartons before there is suitable and secure reprocessing capacity available.

End Markets

The UK currently relies on many export end markets. The vast majority are reputable and legitimate end markets where materials are recycled properly. However, there remains a lack of full transparency for a local authority to have full sight of where collected materials end up. There is the perception, partially legitimate, that export beyond Europe is undesirable, and that some material exported is not recycled. This then can put doubt in the public's mind if a local authority report that they are exporting waste beyond Europe for recycling, that the material they are putting out for collection is getting recycled. This can then erode public confidence in the recycling systems and so participation can drop off. The partnership would like to see government put in place more assurances that recycling cannot be exported illegally. New materials for collection should not be mandated until proper end markets are securely in place.

Other – Flats/HMO

Flats and HMOs present challenges when it comes to implementing recycling collection services. There is often a lack of space for containers and use of shared facilities can make it difficult to undertake education and enforcement activities. These properties can be very different, and it will take more time to arrange to collect additional materials from them. There needs to be a recognition and acceptance that some flats and HMOs will need to have a comingled collection.

Q9 Do you agree or disagree that food and drink cartons should be included in the plastic recyclable waste stream in regulations, to reduce contamination of fibres (paper and card)? (P28)

Agree – cartons should be included in the plastic recyclable waste stream.

Disagree – cartons should be included the paper and card recyclable waste stream.

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable.

Please provide the reason for your response and state if there are any unintended consequences that we should consider.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that food and drinks cartons should be collected in the timescale given, due to lack of reprocessing capacity. For most local authorities there will also be difficulties with MRF sorting capacity for this material in the timescales. However, in Warwickshire, there will not be an issue with being able to collect cartons in any manner and then have the ability to sort into a high-quality recycling stream in the new, state of the art MRF. Local authorities and their MRFs plus the end markets are best placed to dictate which material stream the cartons are collected with. It will ultimately depend on how the MRF is configured as to what is the best mix of materials.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership understands the rationale put forward for placing food and drinks cartons in the plastics waste stream. There could be communications problems when local authorities promote their collection services to residents. Cartons are generally seen as paper/card products by residents and that recycling stream is likely to be the one they first think of putting cartons in to. There will confusion introduced as residents are asked to put a paper/card item in the plastics recycling container. Communications can be effective, to a point, but with limited enforcement tools available there is only so much local authorities can do to compel residents to use collections systems correctly.

This should be included in the exemptions that Defra are proposing, to allow cartons and plastics to be collected together without the need for a written assessment to be undertaken.

Q10 Assuming food and drink cartons are included by the date that Extended Producer Responsibility commences, what would be the financial impact on gate fees and processing costs from sending mixed material streams containing cartons into a Materials Recovery Facility? (P28)

No increase

0–9% increase

10–20% increase

21–100% increase

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Please provide the reason for your response.

It is unclear what the financial impacts on gate fees will be. Given that most MRFs will need to invest in new equipment and processes to sort out drinks cartons it is not unreasonable to assume that gate fees will increase as a result.

Proposal 2 - Collection of plastic films from households

Q11 Do you agree or disagree that local authorities should adopt the collection of this material from all households, including flats, no later than 2026/27?

(P29)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership members will part-own a new, state of the art MRF, due to open mid-2023. So, in our particular case, the space and equipment to sort and store plastic film for recycling will be available from the start of consistent collections. However, we are aware that the majority of other local authorities will not have access to the most up to date MRF facilities which can easily gear up to make provision for new materials. So, the partnership recognises that fellow authorities will have concerns about the sorting capability for plastic film in the UK, concerns about contracts, and therefore concerns about adding them to the list of materials that should be collected from 2026/27.

The new MRF that Warwickshire will use will be capable of sorting fully comingled recycling to high quality standards and that will include being able to sort many types of plastic film. The plastic film explicitly mentioned in the consultation document is limited to polyethylene type material: carrier bags, bread bags and bubble wrap. More clarity on whether government intends to also include other types of film, such as crisp packets or ready meal film lids is urgently needed. Separately collected films and flexibles presents a serious litter concern due to how readily the material can be taken by the wind. Collecting this comingled in a lidded bin will allay this issue.

The introduction of film will bring with it many communication and contamination challenges for local authorities. A lot of education will be needed to help the public understand the definition of films and flexibles. Once residents find they are allowed to include plastic bags in their recycling, it is likely that many will assume it is OK to put other material for recycling into plastic bags, and this will cause difficulties for any type of recycling collection system. Residents may also wrongly assume now that any type of plastic can go into their kerbside system, and hard plastic items will

become a more prevalent contamination stream. It is also likely that some residents will not separate plastic film from other packaging items, for example putting a plastic tub into the recycling with the film lid still partially attached. There is also concern that the public will be unable and unwilling to present some plastic film material in a clean form, resulting in contamination of other recycling.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is keen that there is sufficient end market capacity and that none of the plastic-containing waste collected in Warwickshire is shipped beyond the EU for reprocessing. It is felt that with ongoing developments in physical and chemical processing driven by EPR and mentioned in the consultation as a solution, adequate quality plastics end markets will be available by 2026/27. However, if they are not, the government should put back the start date.

Q12 Which of the following reasons might prevent plastic film collections being offered to all households by the end of the financial year 2026/27? (P29)

Collection contracts

Sorting contracts

Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) infrastructure capacity

Cost burden

Reprocessing

End markets

Other (please specify)

Please provide the reason for your response and provide evidence to support your answer.

Collection Contracts

Warwickshire collection contracts are being aligned to the availability of a new, state of the art MRF from mid-2023. However, we are aware that most local authorities will be at varying points in a collection contract, which are typically designed in length around the useful working life of the collection vehicles, typically 7 years or longer. This also applies to directly delivered services. If mandated changes force changes to collection contracts or infrastructure, this should be covered by EPR payments or new burdens.

With the associated requirement to collect food waste some local authorities may require a fundamental change in their collection arrangements, rather than just “adding in” some dry recycling materials. The most cost-effective way to do this is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider as to whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on who the obligations and payments fall.

If an authority needs to move from a current co-mingled service to a source separated service, there are all the associated issues with the increase in vehicles,

staff, depot space etc that will need to be taken account of and make the change much more complex and so likely to take longer to achieve.

Concerns have been raised about the ability of the market to supply services to councils and contractors if there is high demand, due to lots of contracts and vehicle replacements happening at the same time. So, there may be shortages of collection vehicles, or longer lead in times. Also, some authorities might find they have few, or even no bidders for collection contracts. This will then lead to possible value for money issues, fewer bidders generally means that less competitive bids will be made, and a higher service cost ensues.

Sorting Contracts

The most cost-effective way to change contracts or contract terms is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider as to whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on who the obligations and payments fall.

MRF Infrastructure

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the ability of most MRFs nationwide to be able to adapt within the timescales to enable consistent and thorough sorting of plastic film. Local authorities are limited to which MRFs they can supply, due to proximity. In certain places, there may be challenges with other materials also. As councils will not receive payments for EPR obligated materials until 2023/24, and MRFs gain their income through gate fees for council contracts, it is possible that they will not receive enough cash flow to provide the investment to change their equipment to be ready for plastic film. A competitive procurement process will be affected by increased demand over a short timescale, for MRF capacity and for collection contractors, separated material off takers, vehicles, reprocessing – there could be significant capacity issues.

Cost burden

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is concerned that if up-front transition costs are not provided and if EPR funding and new burden funding for food waste are not aligned, there will be impacts on the whole collections system. Authorities in Warwickshire do not currently collect food waste separately, so we will look to implement one service change for food and dry recycling collections. If the funding for food waste collections is not provided up front, this will delay planned changes for the dry recycling materials.

Reprocessing

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the reprocessing capacity is likely to be available, in the UK and in Europe, for plastic film. However, the partners do not want material from Warwickshire to have to be shipped beyond Europe for reprocessing because that government has mandated collection of cartons before there is suitable and secure reprocessing available.

End Markets

The UK currently relies on many export end markets. The vast majority are reputable and legitimate end markets where materials are recycled properly. However, there remains a lack of full transparency for a local authority to have full sight of where collected materials end up. There is the perception, partially legitimate, that export beyond Europe is undesirable, and that some material exported is not recycled. This then can put doubt in the public's mind if a local authority report that they are exporting waste beyond Europe for recycling, that the material they are putting out for collection is getting recycled. This can then erode public confidence in the recycling systems and so participation can drop off. The partnership would like to see government put in place more assurances that recycling cannot be exported illegally. New materials should for collection should not be mandated until proper end markets are securely in place. Ensuring there are sufficient end-markets within the UK & Europe also reduces the distance over which material is hauled, thereby reducing the potential carbon footprint of tackling such waste streams

Other – Flats/HMO

Flats and HMOs present challenges when it comes to implementing recycling collection services. There is often a lack of space for containers and use of shared facilities can make it difficult to undertake education and enforcement activities. These properties can be very different, and it will take more time to arrange to collect additional materials from them. There needs to be a recognition and acceptance that some flats and HMOs will need to have a comingled collection.

Other – film from businesses

It is not clear why two different dates are being proposed for household and business streams of films and flexibles. Although there may be more opportunity for completely separate collections of film from business, Council trade waste customers tend to be smaller businesses producing low quantities of waste with little storage space for waste. It is also doubtful if film could be collected separately or co-mingled by this date and the date should be aligned with the date for household plastic film.

Proposal 3 & 4 – Food waste

Q13 Do you agree or disagree that the above should be collected for recycling within the food waste stream? (P35)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and specify which materials should be included or excluded in this definition.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees in principle with the criteria for food waste outlined in the consultation document. There will need to be further work done to fully define food waste as the examples given in the consultation document are simplistic. For example, bones or plate scrapings are not mentioned. When the final

definition is made, it would be useful if it is written in a way that can be used in public-facing messaging.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership hopes that government will talk directly to AD management companies about tea bags and the fact some have plastic elements.

Q14 Which parts of Proposal 4 do you agree or disagree with? (P36)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure or Don't have an opinion
Local authorities already collecting food waste separately must continue to collect this material for recycling at least weekly from the 2023/24 financial year	Y		
Local authorities should have a separate food waste collection service (at least weekly) in place for all household properties including flats as quickly as contracts allow	Y		
Local authorities without existing contracts in place that would be affected by introducing a separate food waste collection service should have a separate food waste collection service in place (at least weekly), for all households including flats, by the 2024/25 financial year at the latest		Y	
Local authorities with long term existing mixed food/garden waste collection or disposal contracts in place should have a separate food waste collection service in place (at least weekly) for all household properties including flats as soon as soon as contracts allow, with an end date to meet this requirement between 2024/25 and 2030/31	Y		
Local authorities with long term residual waste disposal contracts affected by introducing a separate food waste collection service (e.g. some Energy from Waste or Mechanical Biological Treatment contracts) should introduce a separate food waste collection service (at least weekly) to all households including flats as soon as contracts allow, with an end date to meet this	Y		

requirement to be set between 2024/25 and 2030/31			
---	--	--	--

Please provide any views on the end date for these obligations and any evidence on associated costs and benefits.

Local authorities should have a separate food waste collection service (at least weekly) in place for all household properties including flats as quickly as contracts allow.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agree in principle with the concept of collecting food waste from households and that new burdens funding will cover the cost of this. However, in some areas, particularly rural areas with spread out housing stock, we would question the requirement for weekly separate collections. Local authorities are best placed to know where separate weekly collections are viable and where they are just so impractical as to be totally inefficient and very costly. There is concern that new burdens will not take this into account adequately or be in place soon enough. For authorities with challenging locations, it could take longer than the stated timescales for the correct infrastructure to be put in place.

Equally, there are specific issues related to flats food collections that make them more challenging than collections for standard housing. This can particularly be true of flats over shops, for example.

Direct delivery authorities may not have contracts in place preventing them to make early changes, but they will have assets that are still in operation and changing use of assets early has high cost implications. For all of these reasons, government should release funds for consistent collections early, to aid a transition to the new regime.

Local authorities without existing contracts in place that would be affected by introducing a separate food waste collection service should have a separate food waste collection service in place (at least weekly), for all households including flats, by the 2024/25 financial year at the latest.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agree in principle with the concept of collecting food waste from households. However, we would question the requirement for weekly separate collections. Local authorities are best placed to know where separate collections are viable and where cost and efficiency considerations make their introduction impracticable.

We are concerned that the scale of potential service change for Warwickshire, where food waste is currently not collected separately but comingled with the green garden waste, is such that we cannot meet the implementation date of 2024/25. It would certainly not be possible without the payment of up-front transition costs to cover the new burden cost of set-up. Councils would also require the assurance of continued and adequate ongoing revenue funding.

Adding food waste in the most cost-effective manner will most likely mean altering the way in which dry recycling is also collected. This will mean a completely new collection fleet, revisions to transfer stations and new levels of staffing. We estimate that the work will take up to three years from planning to delivery. While the consultation is clear in its intent that separate food waste collections will be mandated for local authorities, it would be unreasonable for local authorities to progress this at this time without further details on the requirements and the funding that will support it.

Within Warwickshire, there will be an impact on our IVC treatment contracts that continue beyond the proposed implementation date. New burdens funding will need to cover any charges incurred because food waste has been removed from this stream meaning we fail to meet our minimum contracted tonnages. There will also be the need for the county to seek new treatment capacity for the separately collected food waste and there is no guarantee that there will be sufficient available capacity within a reasonable haulage distance from the collection points, especially when all neighbouring authorities are also going to market for similar capacity at the same time. This will at best push prices up and at worst leave some authorities with no treatment contracts at all, making the introduction of any service impossible. With so many councils going to market at the same time for caddies, vehicles and treatment infrastructure there will be price rises, delays and other issues.

We also have concerns that introducing separate food collections when we are aiming to reduce food waste will send out the wrong message.

Local authorities with long term existing mixed food/garden waste collection or disposal contracts in place should have a separate food waste collection service in place (at least weekly) for all household properties including flats as soon as soon as contracts allow, with an end date to meet this requirement between 2024/25 and 2030/31.

It should be expected that most local authorities would be able to meet this requirement by the end of 2030/31. The issue is then more about the cost of doing so and if this will be fully funded under the new burdens process. Local authorities would need assurances that any contact change costs arising as result of meeting this timescale are fully funded through new burdens. There is a danger however, that contractors may realise that contract changes will be funded and so push contract change costs as high as possible.

Local authorities with long term residual waste disposal contracts affected by introducing a separate food waste collection service (e.g. some Energy from Waste or Mechanical Biological Treatment contracts) should introduce a separate food waste collection service (at least weekly) to all households including flats as soon as contracts allow, with an end date to meet this requirement to be set between 2024/25 and 2030/31

It should be expected that most local authorities would be able to meet this requirement by the end of 2030/31. The issue is then more about the cost of doing so and if this will be fully funded under the new burdens process. Local authorities would need assurances that any contact change costs arising as a result of meeting this timescale are fully funded through new burdens funding.

Q15 Some local authorities may experience greater barriers to introducing a separate food waste collection service to all household properties, including flats, by the dates proposed above. For what reasons might it be appropriate for these collection services to begin after this date? (P37)

Collection contracts

Treatment contracts

Cost burden

Reprocessing

End markets

Other (please specify)

If you have disagreed with any of the proposed implementation dates above, please provide examples of circumstances where it would be appropriate for this collection service to begin after these proposed dates and any supporting evidence where possible.

Collection Contracts

Collection contracts typically are designed around the useful working life of the vehicles that are utilised on them. Standard practice is usually seven years although there can be differences to this. This also applies to in-house operations.

With the associated requirements to collect certain dry materials some local authorities may require a fundamental change in their collection arrangements, rather than just “adding in” food waste. The most cost-effective way to do this is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider as to whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on whom the obligations and payments fall.

It is often (but not always) the case that the most cost-effective way to collect food waste is on the same vehicle as another material, either recycling or residual. This makes the ability to change earlier than a collection contract finishes both more difficult and potentially more costly.

There are associated factors related to changing a collection contract if there is a move from comingled to source separation collection to facilitate cost effective food collection. The vehicle fleet is very likely to increase in size which means additional resources in terms of staff, fleet support services, depot space and associated impacts on carbon emissions. At a time when most local authorities have declared

Climate Emergencies and are working hard to meet net zero carbon targets, the potential impact on carbon emissions should not be underestimated.

Treatment Contracts

The availability of AD processing sites is not yet at the level that would meet the demand that England-wide food waste collections would generate. This may mean that it is more difficult for some local authorities to enter into contracts than others. It will also impact on the costs of some contracts that may initially be let with a large transport element as food waste is transported to distant plants while new facilities are built nearer to where the waste is generated. This may then also have a knock-on effect on transfer stations. Again, the potential impact on carbon emissions should not be underestimated.

Existing transfer stations may not be configured or licenced to accept food waste. If food waste must be transported longer distances then this will impact on the design and operation of a transfer station. The timetable is very tight in terms of allowing time for new transfer stations to be planned and built.

If an authority does not have any suitable collection systems already in place then it is both the collection and treatment infrastructure that need to be procured. There are doubts whether all local authorities will be able to source AD treatment contracts by 2024/25, especially those in regions where there is limited AD capacity.

Cost burden

Warwickshire Waste Partnership members have expressed concern about whether the cost burden of mandated weekly food waste collections will be fully covered on an ongoing basis. We appreciate that Defra have stated this is the case but there are no firm funding proposals in place and it will ultimately be subject to the next spending review and financial settlement for local authorities. There has also been concern expressed that any additional funding may well be offset by reductions in funding elsewhere, meaning that ultimately the full costs of the new burden is not funded. We also believe that funds would be better spent on reducing avoidable food waste in the first place and encouraging home composting for the majority of what remains.

Reprocessing

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the reprocessing capacity is likely to become available in due course but there are concerns if there will be suitable capacity by 2023/24 or 2024/25. As highlighted above there needs to be proper consideration of the transfer station network that is needed to enable local authorities to efficiently manage food waste collection onward movement to AD plants. The requirement to add a composting stage to AD plants to enable them to be able to fully deal with caddy liners and other compostable packaging is also a concern in relation to reprocessing capacity.

End Markets

In relation to the end markets for the outputs of AD plants, Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concern about the land bank available for the digestate. There may need to be support for the AD industry to grow such markets to the levels that can economically deal with the amount of digestate that will be produced when all councils collect food waste. With the move towards electric vehicles, it is unclear if end uses such as vehicle fuel for gas produced by AD plants is a viable long-term solution. Warwickshire Waste Partnership would encourage governments to look at how they can support end markets for AD plants for both digestate and gas. This will ensure that gate fees remain lower and the burden then on local authorities and government in relation to that cost is reduced.

Other – Flats/HMO

There are well documented issues with collecting food waste from flats. There is often a lack of space for containers and use of shared facilities can make it difficult to undertake education and enforcement activities. Education and communication are expensive and very resource intensive. For local authorities with higher-than-average numbers of flats and HMOs it may prove more difficult to meet the stated deadlines for at least part of their area. There could also be higher costs associated with the provision of those services to these types of property which will need to be fully covered by new burdens. There are also issues related to collection in very rural areas where the spread-out nature of the housing stock leads to a very inefficient and costly service. Many places require narrow access vehicles, this could be problematic when several authorities are trying to procure these at the same time.

Other – participation

Many residents will be pleased to see the provision of a weekly food waste collection and will participate keenly. However, we expect there to be a smaller but significant proportion of residents who do not set out their food waste and continue to include it in their residual waste. We would be keen to be assisted in ensuring full participation on food waste recycling by being given enforcement powers or encouragement methods to aid this. If only encouragement or incentivisation methods are adopted, these will be more costly and will need to be funded.

Other – Driving down food waste

Warwickshire Waste Partnership are keen to assert that more needs to be done to reduce food waste in the first instance. An effective national campaign to reduce food waste is needed, with local authorities supporting this with local action using materials linked to the national campaign. A school of thought says that when householder is given a separate food waste recycling system, they are confronted with the extent of the avoidable food waste they create and seek to reduce it. However, another school of thought says that householders see recycling as a good thing and are proud to fill their food waste caddies with both unavoidable food waste but also avoidable food waste that is costing them and the environment. Recycling collection systems need to reflect the waste hierarchy with householders encouraged first to reduce waste rather than generating it. If both avoidable food waste was reduced and home composting was maximised, there would not be the need for costly separate food waste collections and vehicles travelling around

collecting it. This is another example where weight-based targets can lead to waste management choices that are not necessarily the most highly environmentally friendly option.

Proposal 5 - Caddy Liners

Q16 Do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please provide any other comments on the use of caddy liners in separate food waste collections, including on any preferences for caddy liner material types. (P39)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees in principle that the use of caddy liners has consistently been shown in most cases to increase the capture rate of food waste from households. However, we believe that a concerted behaviour change campaign at a national level can help to reduce many issues with food waste. First, it can drive down unavoidable food waste, reducing the expense and resources involved in collecting it, including the use of liners, and most importantly reducing the environmental and climate impacts of the food waste itself, at the same time as saving householders money. For the food waste that is left, a national campaign can help citizens get over the perceived unpleasantness of collecting food waste separately and can educate them as to what food waste is and that the best option is to set it out without newspaper or caddy liners. We acknowledge that liners and paper can cause issues at some AD plants given their treatment processes and so mandating liners would not work. Warwickshire Waste Partnership would like to see caddy liners cited as possible good practice but not mandated. There are good examples of collection systems that have high levels of food waste recycling without the use of liners.

If local authorities are mandated to use caddy liners, then they must be funded through the new burdens system. If a national campaign of reducing food waste and encouraging food waste recycling is not funded, then ongoing funding of caddy liners would likely lead to a higher capture rate of food waste. Funded paper liners may be a better avenue. We would not support using plastic bags as caddy liners as this gives the wrong message about reducing plastic use. The costs of distributing liners and dealing with ongoing requests for them would also need to be covered on a permanent basis.

Proposal 6 – Biodegradable and compostable packaging

Q17 Do you have any comments on how the collection and disposal of compostable and biodegradable materials should be treated under recycling consistency reforms? For example, this could include examples of what should be provided in guidance on the collection and disposal of these materials. (P42)

At the present time biodegradable and compostable packaging should not be considered for collection through the kerbside collection infrastructure. Only very clear, universal on-pack labelling will assist with resident communications and ensuring that the right packaging is put in the right container. Even then, it will be very difficult for collectors, sorters and reprocessors to identify contamination versus compostable items. The use of the term compostable requires much improved control and enforcement. More education needs to be funded to help both the public and businesses to understand that compostable packaging and cutlery etc cannot be recycled in the kerbside system and needs to be handled in closed systems by way of vendor takeback only. Biodegradable is a meaningless term for packaging and should be defined properly or taken out of circulation.

Q18 Do you agree or disagree that anaerobic digestion plants treating food waste should be required to include a composting phase in the treatment process?

(P42)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Please provide any evidence where possible and explain any advantages and disadvantages.

If anaerobic digestion plants were required to include a composting phase this will impact on the operating costs of such plants, and therefore gate fees. These additional costs will need to be covered by new burdens funding if the government strongly believe the environmental gains to be worthwhile.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that there is value from an environmental viewpoint to ensuring that all compostable liners used in the collections are fully processed. Composting would greatly assist in that. Biodegradable liners is a term that confuses and should be taken out of circulation.

For some AD plants meeting this requirement could mean substantial changes to their plant and equipment and this will take time. Therefore, the mandated use of caddy liners is not supported at this time.

Proposal 7 – Definition of Garden Waste

Q19 Do you agree or disagree with the materials included in and excluded from this description of garden waste? (P46)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and specify which materials should be included or excluded in this definition.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership broadly agrees with the proposed definition but believes that it will require more detail. For example, the proposed definition

includes “garden weeds” but there are certain weeds that local authorities request to not be placed in garden waste collection containers. The requirement not to include certain weeds, such as Japanese knotweed, is crucial if the quality of the final compost product is to be maintained. Therefore, the inclusion of garden weeds in the description of garden waste could introduce confusion for residents if council information then states that certain weeds are excluded from their collection systems. There are further complications in that many residents don’t know what the different weeds are and education would be needed regarding this, adding to costs.

Proposal 8 –Free Garden waste collection

Q20 Given the above costs, recycling benefits and carbon emissions reductions, do you agree or disagree that local authorities should be required to introduce a free minimum standard garden waste collection (240 litre containers, fortnightly collection frequency and throughout the growing season), if this is fully funded by Government, and if authorities remain free to charge for more frequent collections and/or additional capacity? (P47)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don’t have an opinion / not applicable

Please provide any comments or evidence on the costs and benefits presented above.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership strongly believes that public funds should not be mandated to be spent on the provision of free kerbside garden waste collections. The service would not be free in any case but would be paid for by the taxpayer in a non-equitable way. Funding the collections this way is unfair as householders who live in properties with no garden, who are very often lower income householders, subsidise the collections from those with gardens. It does not follow the producer pays waste principle. Where a subscription service is provided, payment is only from those who have a garden and do not home compost all of their garden waste. It is prudent to provide a service only to those who want it. The partnership believes strongly that this should be a local decision.

In Warwickshire, 4 out of 5 waste collection authorities charge for garden waste collections, all at £40 per year for a year-round fortnightly service in 240l bins. The introduction of these subscription services has met with minimal pushback from the public in the promotional phase, and once established, many more households with gardens have taken up the service compared with the data indicated in the consultation. Table 1 shows the percentage of subscriptions as a proportion of all households and of households with gardens and indicates the level on annual income. The expected national cost in new burdens will be estimated too low if the government’s figures of take up of services is lower than in reality. The take up levels demonstrate that households that want this service are prepared to pay for it at a reasonable price point.

	North Warwickshire	Nuneaton and Bedworth	Rugby	Stratford
% of all HH	56%	38%	53%	75%
% of HH w garden (est.)	60%	70%	56%	82%
£M income per year	£0.7M	£1.1M	£1.0M	£1.7M

Table 1 – Warwickshire garden waste subscription data

If charged-for services are to be stopped, the four authorities in Warwickshire would need to be recompensed fully through new burdens for this loss of income and so would all other authorities in the country who charge, which we understand to be up to 75% of local authorities.

The proposal is looking to fix a problem that, in Warwickshire at least, does not exist. The move to a charged-for service has not driven garden waste into the residual waste bin. Residual waste tonnages have not increased in line with the drop in garden waste received for composting by the council. There has been a small but manageable increase in green waste brought to recycling centres. There has not been an increase in domestic-type garden waste fly-tips. We believe that most of the material that is now not collected by the local authority is being home composted. We have had a huge increase in interest in home composting in the county. The information and videos we provide on our webpages has seen a big increase in visits. We have seen a doubling of sales of subsidised composting equipment.

A review of residual waste compositional analysis in Warwickshire in September 2018 showed that garden waste in residual waste in (at the time) the only charged-for area was 1.28% compared to the county average of 1.16%. It is predicted that a change to a free service in Warwickshire would not yield any significant reduction in green waste in residual, nothing near the figures that Defra has stated could be feasible.

With a charged-for service, there is no concern in Warwickshire that it is driving waste into the residual waste stream adding to greenhouse gas outputs. In fact, the potential to reduce carbon through more efficient round restructuring is possible when some streets no longer need to be covered by the service because there are no subscribers in that area. The use of in-cab technology linking in with the subscription data could further reduce collection miles and maybe even reduce the number of rounds, helping with the provision of any extra food and recycling collection services.

The growing season only stipulation will not work, as councils will have already invested in contracts, vehicles, insurance, maintenance and staff to collect green waste and so will still have the costs associated with these in the winter and will need to be paid for a year round service. Garden waste is generated by the public year-round. The growing season gets longer each year due to changes in climate. It is likely that if a free garden waste service as outlined in the consultation document is introduced, very few local authorities will charge for any additional

aspect. The administrative costs of doing so are likely to outweigh any income that would result.

A well promoted charged-for service will take off from the outset and lead to good take-up. In North Warwickshire, for example, the service is linked with sponsorship from a local garden centre and the offer of garden centre voucher worth more than the value of the subscription. We believe that even a service that is not promoted will increase coverage over time.

Based on the take up in Warwickshire, we believe that paid for garden waste services can contribute significantly to the national 65% recycling target in a cost-effective manner.

Warwickshire Waste Authority believes that it should be left as a local decision as to whether to charge for a garden waste service and that charging drives increased home composting and is a more equitable system. If charging is stopped, local councils will need to be recompensed fully for all associated costs, including loss of income, through new burdens funding. Full loss of current income should be compensated.

Proposal 9 – Other Garden waste collection options

Q21 How likely are the following options to support the above policy aims? (P48)

	Very Likely	Likely	Unlikely
Provide updated guidance on reasonable charges for garden waste.	Y		
Issue clear communications to non-participating households.	Y		
Support on increasing home composting (e.g. subsidised bin provision).	Y		

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that a charged-for garden waste service is a fair method of service provision and does not cause garden waste to be diverted into the residual waste stream. Charging should be a local decision. Each of the above measures could further help with making sure that garden waste is collected or treated in the best way.

In particular, support on increasing home composting would be welcomed as the most environmentally friendly and cost-effective way of helping the public to compost. It is better in the waste hierarchy and better from a transport emissions point of view. This also has the potential to reduce some of the food waste that local authorities collect. A comprehensive ongoing national home composting campaign alongside practical and financial help to councils to promote and subsidise would be welcomed. In Warwickshire, we offer detailed composting information on our web pages. We have an online training video and plan to resume face to face home composting workshops when able. We run a master composter volunteer scheme and we sell subsidised home composting equipment online and from HWRCs. With

more funds and support through a national campaign, we believe there is still more home composting potential in Warwickshire.

Home composting information could be one of the items communicated to non-participating households. There are also a few community compost schemes starting up in Warwickshire and at the same time we can talk to residents about reducing food waste.

The take-up of green waste subscription services in Warwickshire demonstrates that householders are prepared to pay the charges levied for the service. We disagree with a government-stipulated cap on charges. Any cap on allowed subscription charges must take into account all costs involved in providing the service. That includes all physical collection costs plus the cost to manage and promote subscriptions. Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the £30 mentioned in the consultation document will be too low to cover the costs for most authorities, including the Warwickshire WCAs. The costs to run a service and therefore the charge levied will naturally vary around the country, not least because of differing labour costs. If the upper cost is limited to a figure less than the current charge in Warwickshire, new burdens funding should cover the difference and any future service delivery cost increases. We would support the idea of ensuring that charges are fair by the government working with local authorities to draw up a list of allowable costs.

Q22 Do you have any further comments on the above options, or any other alternatives that could help to increase the recycling of garden waste and/or reduce the quantity of garden waste in the residual waste stream? Please provide supporting evidence where possible. (P48)

Reasonable Charges

Charged-for services are known to provide better quality material for composting operations than free services. The effect of charging is that people are more invested in the collection system and are likely to take more care in what garden waste they place in their containers. For Warwickshire authorities, a £30 maximum charge will not cover their full collection, administration and promotion costs. This would then require Defra to fund the resultant difference in costs for local authorities as it would fall under the new burdens. To prevent overcharging, the regulation could stipulate what costs are legitimate to include when calculating the annual charge that allows local authorities to recover their associated costs.

Clear Communications

Warwickshire local authorities undertake a great deal of communication aimed at ensuring all recyclable waste is recycled and not put in residual containers. Despite best efforts with the funds available, public behaviour is still such that recycling collections are not used to their fullest and over half of the residual waste bin contains material that could have been recycling in current kerbside systems. By far the greatest chunk of this at 35% plus of the residual waste bin is food waste. Garden waste at just over 1% is not a large concern, however, the partnership would still welcome a national campaign and local funds to reduce further the amount of green waste in the residual bin. Part of the issue is that local authorities have very few

policy tools available to them to compel residents to use the collection systems correctly. Enforcement powers have been eroded over time and having the threat of enforcement can be a useful aspect of communications activity.

Home Composting

Promotion of home composting is a favourable alternative to the collection of green waste. There are environmental benefits to not having to send vehicles out to collect green waste and the associated energy involved in industrial composting sites. In a target-based policy area the issue is that it is not possible to measure how much waste each home composting unit “processes” in a year. WRAP undertook extensive work previously that produced very good calculations on estimated figures that could be attributed to home compost activity. Warwickshire Waste Partnership would urge a review of this work and for it to be updated so that figures could be attributed to home composting activities.

Promoting home composting alongside a free garden waste service is less effective and this has been seen in Warwickshire by a large increase in the purchase of home composting equipment from the county as charged for services have been rolled out. Future take-up of home composting is likely to slow if a free service is available, as will the development of community composting schemes.

Proposal 10 – Exemptions on separate collection of two recyclable streams

Q23 Could the following recyclable waste streams be collected together from households, without significantly reducing the potential for those streams to be recycled? (P50)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure / Don't have an opinion
Plastic and metal	Y		
Glass and metal	Y		

If you have agreed with either of the above, please provide evidence to justify why any proposed exemption would be compatible with the general requirement for separate collection of each recyclable waste stream.

Plastic and metal

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that mixing plastic containers and metal causes any issue regarding material quality. It is unclear from the consultation proposal if plastic film would form part of this exemption. Most existing MRFs in the UK cannot separate plastic film or cartons. However, the new sub-regional MRF will have the ability to separate all proposed streams if collected via a comingled system in a way that provides quality as good as kerbside sort if not better as the MRF will enable separation of material into different fractions and grades beyond the levels achieved at the kerbside.

Glass and metal

There can be issues with noise levels when glass is collected separately at the kerbside. Collecting glass and metal together might have the potential to increase this risk. In a fully comingled collection noise levels are dampened by the mixing of

the recycling. Of more concern is the risk to operatives of manual lifting of these items as it would not be feasible for wheeled bins to be provided for every waste stream. This is also a risk to residents.

Q24 What, if any, other exemptions would you propose to the requirement to collect the recyclable waste in each waste stream separately, where it would not significantly reduce the potential for recycling or composting? (P50)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership understands the need for waste that has been collected for recycling to ultimately end up being recycled and for the quality of the recyclate to be good enough that there are viable end markets for the material. The ideal is for there to be enough quality materials to feed various closed loop systems and to increase the recycled content of packaging and paper products. Newer MRF technology has greatly improved on the technology that was built into older MRFs and within restrictions, the waste sorting industry has made improvements to existing infrastructure. So, there will be large variance across MRFs as to what materials they can sort and what quality they can achieve. For that reason, limiting what material can be mixed is less desirable than keeping options open and challenging mixing on the basis of a TEEP-style assessment. If any MRF is shown to be supplying sustainable end markets then materials can be collected together in any combination that the MRF can accept.

Local choice instead of stipulation would be welcomed in Warwickshire as from mid-2023 we will be using a new state of the art MRF that will have the ability to take fully comingled material, including all of the new materials, and achieve output material quality that is equal to or better than current kerbside sort systems.

The partnership believes that glass, plastic and metal could be collected together without the need for a written assessment. These materials create a natural “container” dry recycling stream that would lend itself then to a twin stream collection system when paired with a fibre stream in places where the MRF technology needs that separation to keep quality high.

Many top-performing recycling local authorities in England operate a co-mingled collection system. This includes Stratford District Council in Warwickshire which has a fully comingled service and a recycling rate of 60% in 2019/20. Its Warwickshire neighbour Warwick District Council, which has a similar demographic and geography, offers a kerbside sort service and has a lower recycling rate of 54%. We see this as a strong indication that the simpler service leads to higher recycling. A fully comingled method sits comfortably with the EPR proposal to label packaging with a binary recycle or don't recycle; the item either goes in the one recycling bin or it doesn't. In 2013, North Warwickshire Borough Council moved from a source segregated system using boxes to a dual stream service in order to simplify the collection system, provide more recycling capacity and reduce litter from recycling collections. Full year recycling rates either side of this change increased by 62%. In 2019 North Warwickshire Borough Council moved from the dual stream service to fully comingled in order to improve the health and safety of collectors and provide a

simpler service. Full year recycling rates either side of this change were increased by 16%.

Fully comingled collections can provide both the quality of material that the markets need and the quantity of material to achieve a high national recycling rate and enable packaging producers to meet the targets they will be set. Crucially, comingled systems are simple for the public to understand and will link in well with the proposed EPR labelling of recycled or not recycled. There are no concerns with confusion, running out of capacity or how to store the many containers.

Local authorities have developed a large bank of knowledge and experience in proving collection services and systems that meet the expectations of their residents, are operationally efficient and provide materials to the specification that the wide variety of end markets that exist need.

There have been numerous examples of resident kick back against multi stream collections due to the higher number of containers they have to accommodate in their homes. This has seen some authorities move to twin stream or co-mingled collections services without dropping either the quantity or quality of the material collected. Comingled methodology also allows for easily adding new materials, so long as they can be sorted at the MRF. All waste is safely contained and littering from escaped waste is not a concern.

The collection element of kerbside sort is more costly and time consuming than comingled. Kerbside sort methodology can pose some serious Health and Safety risks. HSE guidance on manual handling advises that collectors should lift as little as possible, but this is not possible in the kerbside sort system, where containers of glass and paper / card boxes are heavy. There is also the risk of puncture wounds from sharp waste elements such as glass or metal. There are road safety issues with sorting waste in the street. During the pandemic, there has been concerns about the kerbside sort technique bringing operatives into close quarters with potentially contaminated waste. With comingled collections there is no lifting or handling involved for the public (which can be problematic for physically less able householders) or operatives. Use of boxes quite often results in materials blowing all over the street and also getting wet.

Proposal 11 – Exceptions on two or more streams collected together

Q25 Do you have any views on the proposed definition for ‘technically practicable’? (P54)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that local circumstances should determine what is technically practicable for an authority. Each assessment should be considered individually as technical reasons will differ from place to place.

Technical practicability should take into account the impacts of citizen behaviour as this ultimately impacts all recycling collection services.

A crucial principle that Warwick Waste Partnership puts forward is, if a MRF is shown to be supplying sustainable end markets with quality materials, then materials can be collected together in any combination that the MRF can accept. Therefore, if a MRF can demonstrate it is supplying suitable end markets then it is technically feasible to collect materials together. Currently hundreds of thousands of tonnes of material are collected comingled and sorted to be sent to quality end markets.

There should be recognition of the infrastructure needed to support separate collection under the technical aspect of exemptions. If separate collection requires increased collection fleets that cannot be accommodated in existing depots this could be considered a technical exemption. It may also fall into an economic one as well depending on the costs of new vehicles and/or a new depot.

If a DRS were to go ahead in England, it could make some source separated collection much less efficient if a great deal of material is removed through a DRS.

Q26 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples cover areas where it may not be 'technically practicable' to deliver separate collection? (P54)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree with any of the above, please provide the reason for your response and indicate which example you are referring to.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership do agree that the proposed examples cover areas where it may not be technically practicable to deliver separate collections. However, these may not be the only areas and we would be keen for government to seek further discussion with local authorities to develop a comprehensive list of examples ready for any more detailed guidance that may be published.

Q27 What other examples of areas that are not 'technically practicable' should be considered in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P54)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Social and economic demographics of an area
- Geography of an area and housing stock
- Health and safety guidelines and risk assessments for kerbside sort
- HSE guidance – manual handling, collectors should lift as little as possible. Glass and paper / card boxes are heavy
- HSE guidance – handling contaminated and / or sharp waste (glass / metal)
- Preventing vermin from accessing waste
- Greater capacity afforded by comingled versus kerbside sort
- Access issues, for example: narrow roads, long drives, back lanes, resident parking blocking roads
- Traffic flow

- Assisted collections and the ability of the frail or disabled to cope adequately with separate containers
- Balancing the capacity of each stillage on the collection vehicle
- Vehicle availability – long lead-in times of several months for purchasing
- Depot space – for vehicles, transfer of materials, containers
- Electric vehicles charging points required for electric vehicles
- Additional vehicles requiring more staff, shortage in frontline staff and trained or untrained drivers and cost of training
- Permitting restrictions, licensing
- End markets
- Maintenance infrastructure and maintenance crews for vehicles
- Flats, HMOs, dense housing, houses with no frontage - space for bins
- Small businesses - space for bins
- Consumers unclear about the system
- Equality issues, can all people safely and confidently access the system as it was designed to be used?
- Public acceptability and participation

Q28 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples cover areas that may not be 'economically practicable' to deliver separate collection? (P55)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree with any of the above, please provide the reason for your response and indicate which example you are referring to.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership do agree that the proposed examples cover areas where it may not be economically practicable to deliver separate collections. However, these may not be the only areas and we would be keen for government to seek further discussion with local authorities to develop a comprehensive list of examples ready for any more detailed guidance that may be published.

Q29 What other examples of 'economically practicable' should be considered in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P55)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Materials markets, possible saturation leading to lower value
- Communication costs to the public, especially if there is a significant service change, many new containers are introduced or a move to comingled is quickly followed by a move back to kerbside sort
- Sourcing of vehicles, bins and other infrastructure at the same time will cause problems, the market is not geared up to deliver such a change.
- Contract changes
- Cost of additional fleet (electric? / hydrogen?)
- Depots and storage of fleet

- Transfer arrangements and / or bulking
- Cost of crews and of supervision and ancillary staff
- Attracting and retaining drivers is a significant issue
- Higher contamination could lead to more rejected loads
- Cost of containers and availability

Q30 Do you have any views on what might constitute ‘excessive costs’ in terms of economic practicability? (P55)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the phrase “excessive costs” as this implies that there is a high degree of magnitude above the standard cost before it is deemed uneconomic for a local authority to collect materials separately.

Under EPR, packaging producers will demand that collection services are efficient and effective, suggesting that costs should not approach an excessive level before an assessment says it is acceptable for an alternative solution to be sought. Each collection solution will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis considering local circumstances.

There is no detail within the consultation on what level and type of evidence would be required to demonstrate that costs would be excessive for a local authority to collect materials separately. Until this is known it then makes it more difficult to comment thoroughly on this proposal.

Q31 Do you have any views on what should be considered ‘significant,’ in terms of cases where separate collection provides no significant environmental benefit over the collection of recyclable waste streams together? (P56)

As with the phrase “excessive costs” the use of “significant” in this case suggests a very high threshold of proof that a comingled collection method has good environmental benefit. Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports good environmental outcomes, creating a circular economy and lowering carbon impact. Solutions need to be found where good environmental performance can be achieved and collection costs are covered by EPR, not scarce public funds. Each collection solution will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis considering local circumstances.

In Warwickshire, 4 of the 5 collection authorities operate a co-mingled / dual stream collection service. If they were forced to move to source separation service there is a good probability that they would see a decrease in the tonnage of recycling collected. This would then have a negative environmental impact, which most people would see as significant.

There are examples of authorities that have moved from a source separated collection system to a twin stream or comingled system and seen their recycling rates increase whilst still supplying material to the same end markets as they did previously. This means they have improved the environmental benefit of the systems they operate.

Q32 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples for ‘no significant environmental benefit’ are appropriate? (P56)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree with any of the above, please provide the reason for your response and indicate which example you are referring to.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees with the examples given but does not believe that they are limited just to the examples given.

Q33 What other examples of 'no significant environmental benefit' should be included in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P56)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Carbon impact
- Air quality impact
- Additional vehicles
- Material output variety, quality and acceptability to end markets
- Maintaining dry waste while set out for collection
- Greater capacity through comingled versus kerbside sort
- Lack of litter / escaped waste generated by comingled versus kerbside sort
- Closed loop end markets versus aggregate, etc
- Balance between the quality in comingled and vehicle miles in collecting separately for possibly no increase in quality

Proposal 12 – Compliance and enforcement

Q34 Do you agree or disagree that local authorities should only be required to submit a single written assessment for their service area? (P58)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports the concept of a single written assessment including a single assessment for more than one authority where collection and / or treatment is shared or where other circumstances make it appropriate.

Q35 What other ways to reduce the burden on local authorities should we consider for the written assessment? (P58)

When the TEEP requirements were introduced, there was a lack of clear guidance and advice available to local authorities. A "Route Map" has since been designed to assist local authorities in their decision making on separate collections of recyclables. The Route Map with updates could act as a template for any future guidance and templates. We also understand that the WRAP assessment tool is being updated. Any tool should be co-designed with local authorities so that they are not too

restrictive or onerous. Tools should aid consistency in assessments as well as ease of use.

A single assessment for more than one authority should be permitted where collection and / or treatment is shared or where other circumstances make it appropriate.

Completing a written assessment is a new requirement and therefore a new burden on local authorities, additional funding to cover the resources needed to complete assessments must be provided by Government.

Q36 What factors should be taken into consideration including in the written assessment? For example, different housing stock in a service area, costs of breaking existing contractual arrangements and/or access to treatment facilities. (P58)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests:

- Geography - rurality and urbanisation (variable population densities) of local authority
- Demographics
- Depot location and transfer stations
- Carbon impact and air quality
- Infrastructure needed and space needed for vehicles for example if need to go to kerbside sort, can existing infrastructure cope?
- Service planning and operational costs
- Procurement and recruitment
- Cost of changing/amending contracts
- MRF infrastructure. Onward reprocessing and markets
- Fixed assets – depots and transfer stations
- H&S assessment of operatives
- H&S, accessibility and equality regarding residents
- Flats with limited or no storage space
- Litter and street scene
- Participation and communication

Q37 Do you agree or disagree that reference to standard default values and data, which could be used to support a written assessment, would be useful? (P59)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Whilst the use of standard or default values can be useful in making an assessment quicker and easier, they also mean the assessment is less representative of the actual situation a local authority faces. The use of default values should therefore not be mandatory, and the preference would be that local authorities use their own values as much as possible.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests that a range of default values should be developed and used if default values are to be used at all, instead of one default value. This range could link to EPR family groupings.

Q38 Do you agree or disagree that a template for a written assessment would be useful to include in guidance? (P59)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports the use of templates if it is not too restrictive and directive. There needs to be flexibility to be able to add information and edit the template to suit.

Proposal 13 – Minimum service standards of dry recyclable materials

Q39 Do you agree or disagree with Proposal 13, particularly on the separation of fibres from other recyclable waste streams and the collection of plastic films? (P61)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Fibres

For Warwickshire authorities, we know that it will not be necessary to keep fibres separate in the collection model because our new, state of the art MRF due to open in mid-2023 will achieve high quality output materials from a fully comingled collection method. A TEEP-style assessment should determine which collection method is appropriate.

In recent years, two Warwickshire collection authorities have operated a dual stream collection model with fibre collected in a separate caddy that sits in the top of the DMR wheelie bin. There are many practical issues with this dual stream collection model, in particular the manual handling of the fibre container. Also, the balance of materials collected on the split body RCV, especially with recent increases in cardboard collected. There are also issues with the inserts themselves splitting and the cost of replacing these, as well as the danger posed by the sharp edges caused by splitting. One authority has recently moved from dual stream to fully comingled. There had been no alteration to the ultimate destinations of the DRM and no change in quality output. All of the above issues are resolved and the total amount of recycling collected has increased by 16%. It is believed that this is because the system is now more easily understood by householders and easier to use in practice. There are numerous examples of fibres being collected with one or more other materials that are of a suitable quality and are supplying end markets with no issues to the specification desired.

It will be difficult for all authorities who currently collect comingled to change to a dual stream or more source separated system if mandated to by new regulation within the timescale proposed. The magnitude of service change for some authorities would be a large-scale project that will take time to complete effectively.

Plastic Film

In Warwickshire, it will be feasible for local authorities to collect plastic film by 2026/27, however, we do not believe it is viable for all local authorities to collect plastic film by 2026/27 due to a lack of sorting and end market capacity.

Residual Waste Frequency

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not support statutory guidance that states local authorities cannot collect residual waste less frequently than fortnightly. There are sound evidence-based reasons why some local authorities have instigated three or even four weekly residual collections. We want to see local authorities retain the option to choose these frequencies if it is deemed right for the area and circumstances. We believe that all of the EPR, DRS and food waste proposals will mean that there will be hardly any residual waste, especially when plastic film is also collected for recycling. It will be inefficient and have a high carbon impact if all local authorities are made to collect fortnightly when local circumstances mean that a less frequent service to most households would be suitable. EPR producers will want to fund efficient and effective collection systems and restricting residual waste capacity is a proven way of driving up recycling rates while reducing collection and disposal costs. In the neighbouring borough of Daventry, residual waste dropped by 18% in year one of the introduction of a three weekly residual waste collection alongside comprehensive dry recycling and weekly separate food waste collection and a charged-for green waste service. The reduction of carbon footprint for a three weekly collection service is another significant driver.

Proposal 14 – Non-statutory guidance

Q40 Which service areas or materials would be helpful to include in non- statutory guidance? (P63)

There is a lack of detail in the consultation document that makes commenting on non-statutory guidance difficult. It is unclear what the purpose of the non-statutory guidance and non-binding indicators is. Clarity on this would enable a more informed view to be taken.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests:

- HWRC usage
- Recognition of local authority knowledge so there is flexibility in how they deliver collection services
- Communications best practise and sharing of good ideas
- Clinical waste collections – definition of clinical waste should be statutory
- Schedule 1 of the Controlled Waste Regs development and clarification (although this should be statutory)

- Bulky waste collections
- Bring sites for business waste
- Enforcement for non-compliance

Proposal 15 – Review of Environmental Permitting Regulations

Q41 Do you have any comments on the recommendations from the review of the Part 2 of Schedule 9 of the Environmental Permitting Regulations? (P64)

The driver behind the implementation of the MRF regulations was not linked to aspects of producer responsibility policy reform. Changes in the regulations need to be a suitable vehicle to deliver aspects of EPR reform.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that careful consideration will need to be given to the design of the sampling protocol. It needs to be designed in a way that is fair to both collectors and reprocessors. This means there needs to be clear definitions in place for non-target material that is an operational concern but does not impact material quality, and genuine contamination that then impacts on material quality. The protocol should not be designed in a way that leaves loopholes that will reduce or remove justifiable payments to local authorities and other waste collectors.

Q42 If amendments are made to Part 2 of Schedule 9, do you agree or disagree that it is necessary to continue to retain requirements to sample non-packaging dry recyclable materials? (P64)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Please provide the reason for your response where possible.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the sampling of non-packaging would be advantageous as this gives a more complete picture of changes in waste composition.

Proposal 16 – Recycling Credits

Q43 Do you agree or disagree that provision for exchange of recycling credits should not relate to packaging material subject to Extended Producer Responsibility payments? (P68)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Please provide the reason for your response.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees that there will not be a need for recycling credits for packaging material subject to EPR payments once payments to local authorities start.

Q44 In relation to recycled waste streams not affected by Extended Producer Responsibility or which are not new burdens we are seeking views on two options: (P68)

- Option 1 Should we retain requirements for Waste Disposal Authorities to make payment of recycling credits or another levy arrangement with Waste Collection Authorities in respect of non-packaging waste?
- Option 2 Should we discontinue recycling credits and require all two-tier authorities to agree local arrangements?

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure / Don't have an opinion / not applicable
Option 1	Y		
Option 2		Y	

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would like to see the recycling credits system retained to cover recycled waste streams not affected by EPR or new burdens. The current arrangements do allow two tier local authority areas to make alternative local arrangements, which need to be fair to both tiers of local government. A suitable conciliation process would be welcomed for cases where agreements prove difficult to reach.

The recycling credits for non-packaging waste need to be viewed in the context of a continued and sustained decline in the amount of paper/newsprint collected for recycling. Any changes in the system should be designed with this in mind and the likely future occurrence of paper in the recycling stream in the next five to ten years.

Q45 Where local agreement cannot be arrived at what are your suggestions for resolving these? For example, should a binding formula be applied as currently and if so, please provide examples of what this could look like. (P68)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes there is scope to put in place an appropriate appeals/mediation process in the unlikely event that a local agreement cannot be reached. By having the process in place, it is more likely an agreement can be reached and stops one tier acting in a unilateral manner.

Proposal 17 – dry recycling collections from non-household premises

Q46 Do you agree or disagree that waste collectors should be required to collect the following dry materials from all non-household premises for recycling, in 2023/24? (P76)

	Agree –this material can be collected in this timeframe	Disagree –this material can't be collected in this timeframe	Not sure / Don't have an opinion /not applicable
Aluminium foil	Y		
Aluminium food trays	Y		

Steel and aluminium aerosols	Y		
Aluminium tubes, e.g. tomato puree tubes	Y		
Metal jar lids	Y		
Food and drink cartons, e.g. Tetrapak		Y	

If you disagree with the inclusion of any of the materials above in the timeframe set out, please provide the reason for your response and indicate which dry recyclable material you are referring to.

Tubes

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees with the inclusion of aluminium tubes but raises the issue that tubes cannot be easily cleaned of all food residue. This issue will need confirming with metal reprocessors.

Cartons

Warwickshire Waste Partnership members will part-own a new, state of the art MRF, due to open mid-2023. So, in our particular case, the space and equipment to sort and store cartons for recycling will be available from the start of consistent collections. Any trade recycling collected by Warwickshire local authorities can be sorted at the MRF and third-party waste can also be sorted. However, we are aware that the majority of other locations will not have access to the most up to date MRF facilities which can easily gear up to make provision for cartons. So, the partnership recognises that in other parts of the country there will be concerns about the sorting capability for food and drinks cartons in the UK and therefore concerns about adding them to the list of materials that should be collected from businesses from 2023/24.

The bigger concern for Warwickshire councils and businesses is that there is not sufficient reprocessing capacity in the UK or Europe to deal with the quantities of this material that will be sorted for recycling. There is currently only one facility able to reprocess this material in the UK, in Halifax. There is uncertainty about how DRS and EPR decisions will affect the prevalence of cartons in the waste stream or the future capacity for reprocessing of cartons in the UK.

Q47 Some waste collectors may not be able to collect all the items in the dry recyclable waste streams from all non-household municipal premises in 2023/24. Under what circumstances might it be appropriate for these collection services to begin after this date? (P76)

Collection contracts

Sorting contracts

Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) infrastructure capacity

Cost burden
Reprocessing
End markets
Other (please specify)

Please provide the reason for your response and indicate how long waste collectors require before they can collect all these materials.

Collection Contracts

Warwickshire collection contracts are being aligned to the availability of a new, state of the art MRF from mid-2023. However, we are aware that most local authorities will be at varying points in a collection contract, which are typically designed in length around the useful working life of the collection vehicles, typically 7 years or longer. This also applies to directly delivered services. Warwickshire authorities will be in a position to offer the collections of all materials to trade customers from the date, but elsewhere in the country, contracts may prevent this.

If business have to be offered a source separated service and a comingled service is precluded, there are all the associated issues with the increase in vehicles, staff, depot space etc that will need to be taken into account and make the change much more complex and so likely to take longer to achieve.

Sorting Contracts

The most cost-effective way to change contracts or contract terms is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider as to whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on who the obligations and payments fall.

MRF Infrastructure

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the ability of most MRFs nationwide to be able to adapt within the timescales to enable consistent and thorough sorting of food and drinks cartons. Local authorities and local businesses are limited to which MRFs they can supply, due to proximity. In certain places, there may be challenges with other materials also. As councils will not receive payments for EPR obligated materials until 2023/24, and MRFs gain their income through gate fees for council contracts, it is not clear how they will receive a cash flow to provide the investment to change their equipment to be ready for the EPR / consistent collection materials.

A competitive procurement process will be affected by increased demand over a short timescale, for MRF capacity and for collection contractors, separated material off takers, vehicles, reprocessing – there could be significant capacity issues.

Cost burden

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is concerned that if up-front transition costs are not provided and if EPR funding and new burden funding for food waste are not aligned,

there will be impacts on the whole collections system, including for trade collections. Authorities in Warwickshire do not currently collect food waste separately, so we will look to implement one service change for food and dry recycling collections. If the funding for food waste collections is not provided up front, this will delay planned changes for the dry recycling materials and what can be offered to businesses.

Reprocessing

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that the reprocessing capacity is likely to be available for cartons in time in the UK and in Europe. The partners do not want material from Warwickshire businesses to have to be shipped beyond Europe for reprocessing because the government has mandated collection of cartons before there is suitable and secure reprocessing available.

End Markets

The UK currently relies on many export end markets. The vast majority are reputable and legitimate end markets where materials are recycled properly. However, there remains a lack of full transparency for a local authority or business to have full sight of where collected materials end up. There is the perception, partially legitimate, that export beyond Europe is undesirable, and that some material exported is not recycled. The partnership would like to see government put in place more assurances that recycling cannot be exported illegally. New materials for collection should not be mandated until proper end markets are securely in place.

Other – Small businesses

Small businesses present challenges when it comes to implementing recycling collection services. There is often a lack of space for containers and use of shared facilities can make it difficult to undertake education and enforcement activities. There needs to be a recognition and acceptance that some businesses will need to have a comingled collection.

Proposal 18 – Collection of film from non-household premises

Q48 Do you agree or disagree that collections of plastic films could be introduced by the end of 2024/25 from non-household municipal premises? (P77)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and any evidence as to why this would not be feasible.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership members will part-own a new, state of the art MRF, due to open mid-2023. So, in our particular case, the space and equipment to sort and store plastic film for recycling will be available from the start of consistent collections. However, we are aware that the majority of other local authorities will not have access to the most up to date MRF facilities which can easily gear up to make provision for new materials to business customers. So, the partnership

recognises that fellow authorities will have concerns about the sorting capability for plastic film in the UK, concerns about contracts, and therefore concerns about adding them to the list of materials that should be collected from businesses from 2024/25.

The new MRF that Warwickshire will use will be capable of sorting fully comingled recycling to high quality standards and that will include being able to sort many types of plastic film. The plastic film explicitly mentioned in the consultation document is limited to polyethylene type material: carrier bags, bread bags and bubble wrap. More clarity on whether government intends to also include other types of film is urgently needed, and there will be a wide range generated by businesses. Separately collected films and flexibles presents a serious litter concern due to how readily the material can be taken by the wind. Collecting this comingled in a lidded bin will allay this issue.

The introduction of film will bring with it many communication and contamination challenges for collectors. A lot of education will be needed to help staff understand the definition of films and flexibles. There is concern about how clean films and flexibles will be presented for collection by businesses and how the sorting and reprocessing infrastructure will be set up to cope with this.

Given the above issues, there is a question about why it is proposed that businesses can be provided with film collections earlier than households? We believe that the 2026/27 date for films from all households is not achievable and for most small and micro firms it will not be achievable either. They present their waste streams in very similar ways to households, have very little storage to separate materials out into and to accommodate multiple containers. We believe these proposals and timeline do not take account of this vast sector of trade waste customers.

Some local authorities may also wish to co-collect household and non-household recycling streams together to drive efficiency. Therefore, there needs to be alignment with the household and non-household streams in terms of dates, types of materials and how they are collected. This means that it is less likely that film collections from businesses will be able to happen before they can from households.

There is also a danger that mandating film from businesses earlier than households puts local authority trade waste services at a disadvantage where they do co-collect with household waste. There is then the potential that local authorities could be at risk of losing trade waste customers. The requirement could then have the consequence of being anti-competitive for local authority trade waste services.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is keen that there is sufficient end market capacity that none of the plastic-containing waste collected in Warwickshire is shipped beyond the EU for reprocessing. It is felt that with ongoing developments in physical and chemical processing driven by EPR and mentioned in the consultation as a solution, adequate quality plastics end markets will be available by 2026/27. However, if they are not, the government should put back the start date.

Q49 Do you have any other comments on this proposal? For example, please specify any barriers that may prevent collectors delivering these services. (P77)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes it will be very difficult to undertake extensive separate collections of films from small and micro businesses. They often have little room for storage of separate streams of waste of the containers needed. It is much more likely that they will end up having to receive collections of mixed recyclables. This then needs the sorting infrastructure in the UK to be able to deal with film. Although this should be available in Warwickshire, currently most UK MRFs cannot effectively sort film for supply to viable end markets. This calls into question then the viability of film collections from small and micro businesses in the short and medium term.

Proposal 19 – on-site food waste treatment technologies

Q50 Do you agree or disagree with Proposal 19? (P79)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Q51 Do you have any other comments on the use of these technologies and the impact on costs to businesses and recycling performance? (P80)

This choice is best left to individual businesses who are best placed to decide if they wish to bear the cost of operation themselves or use a waste management company.

Proposal 20 – reducing barriers to non-household waste recycling

Q52 What are the main barriers that businesses (and micro-firms in particular) face to recycle more? (P81)

	Large barrier	Some barrier	Low/no barrier
Communication		Y	
Financial	Y		
Space	Y		
Engagement		Y	
Drivers to segregate waste	Y		
Location		Y	
Enforcement		Y	
Variation in bin colours and signage		Y	
Contractual		Y	
Staff/training		Y	
Other			

If you have selected other above, please specify.

Please provide any comments on how these barriers can be overcome.

Co-mingled recycling will be necessary for a lot of small and micro businesses due to space/storage issues. This then needs to align with household waste collections when collected within a mixed trade and household round, which is an efficient option. Most current collections from small and micro business are done on a co-mingled basis because of the barriers outlined above.

If source separated is mandated, additional staff will be needed by WCA trade services to educate and enforce correct use of bins. This resource should not be underestimated as education is an ongoing process and it can take several visits with a business to have collections running as they should. Businesses have staff turnover, so continued education may be needed.

Enforcement powers for non-household waste are needed to back up any education that does take place. Local authorities do want to use enforcement powers as this means behaviour has not changed but having the threat of enforcement as a measure of last resort is a huge aid to the education process. When enforcement action is used, this can then also assist the local authority in their engagement with other businesses.

Small and micro business are less likely to know or understand their legal obligations regarding waste, especially when these new requirements to recycle and separate waste are introduced. This forms part of the education activities that local authorities will need to undertake, and this includes for the many businesses that are not their customers, as local authorities will often be contacted for advice from local small businesses.

The availability of service providers in rural areas may mean that businesses have limited choice in the type of service they can access.

Proposal 21 – exemptions and phasing on micro-firms

Q53 Should micro-firms (including businesses, other organisations and non-domestic premises that employ fewer than 10 FTEs) be exempt from the requirement to present the five recyclable waste streams (paper & card, glass, metal, plastic, food waste) for recycling? Please select the option below that most closely represents your view and provide any evidence to support your comments. (P83)

Yes – all micro-firms should be exempt from the requirement – Option 1

No – but all micro-firms should be given two additional years to comply with the new requirements in the Environment Bill (i.e. compliant in 2025/26) – Option 2

No – all micro-firms should be required to present these waste streams for recycling, from the 'go live' date in 2023/24

Collections are best optimised when the same service is delivered to all customers on the collection round. This enables standardised vehicles, containers and customer

engagement. With the new consistency for recycling for households and larger businesses coming into force in 2023/24, it does not seem supportive of the aims of the policy to allow a proportion of the potential customers to be able to retain a different collection system for up to two years or indefinitely. This will increase the complexity of the necessary collection systems which will be a cost that is passed to Government under the new burdens funding. It is more efficient and effective if the same requirements are on all households and non-households on the same implementation timetable.

There will be operational challenges for micro businesses and their collectors (predominantly local authorities) to overcome to enable separate collections to be undertaken. An initial view is that a different assessment process/template is devised that is more applicable to micro businesses. On the basis that it is understood that a large proportion of micro firms will need to have co-mingled collections, it would be preferable if the requirements apply to the same timescale as requirements on households.

In Warwickshire, we offer trade waste services at all of our HWRCs and these are designed with small businesses in mind. Businesses can purchase an annual permit to bring kerbside-type recyclables to the HWRC. They can pay as they go to recycle wood, hardcore, plasterboard and green waste.

Q54 Should any non-household municipal premises other than micro-sized firms be exempt from the requirement? Please provide evidence to support your comments. (P84)

No

Proposal 22 – Waste franchising/zoning

Q55 Which recyclable waste streams should be included under a potential zoning scheme? (P88)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure / Don't have an opinion / not applicable
Dry recyclable waste streams	Y		
Food waste	Y		
Other items e.g. bulky office waste	Y		

Waste management systems work most effectively and efficiently where there is a standardised service being delivered to the maximum number of customers in a locality. This creates better value and more robust processes and supply chains. If these are enabled through a zoning approach, then all businesses are guaranteed an equitable level of service provision for comparative cost. New innovative solutions such as shared waste and recycling containers then become possible. The collection provider can spread their overheads and development costs over the widest cost recovery base to minimise the pass-on charge to individual businesses. Cost and environmental savings in transport are also a key consideration.

Q56 Which of the below options, if any, is your preferred option for zoning/collaborative procurement? Please select the option that most closely aligns with your preference. (P89)

- *Encouraging two neighbouring businesses to share the same containers under contract*
- *Encouraging businesses to use shared facilities on a site/estate*
- *Business Improvement Districts/partnerships tendering to offer a preferential rate (opt-in)*
- *Co-collection – the contractor for household services also deliver the non-household municipal services*
- *Framework zoning – shortlist of suppliers licensed to offer services in the zone*
- *Material specific zoning – one contractor delivers food, one for packaging, one for refuse collection services*
- *Exclusive service zoning – one contractor delivers the core recycling and waste services for the zone*
- *None of the above*

All of the options have merits and shortcomings that will vary depending on location and other factors.

Encouraging two neighbouring businesses to share the same containers under contract.

If this option were implemented there would need to be revisions to how the current Duty of Care system operates. If there were problems with the use of containers it would take resources and time to establish which business was at fault.

Encouraging businesses to use shared facilities on a site/estate

The current Duty of Care system would need to change to reflect joint usage of containers and collections. The issues regarding problems with enforcement are tricky in this option as there will be multiple businesses sharing facilities. The problems that local authorities have with flats and HMOs and their communal facilities suggest this option is one that has the most problems associated with it. Shared facilities tend to lend themselves more to co-mingled collections. Different containers for different materials can be provided but the education and enforcement on the use of these amongst multiple users becomes much more problematic. Space, planning and controlling access are also barriers to this option. If the purpose of co-collection / zoning is to reduce traffic, air pollution and carbon emissions, several businesses all driving to a collection site is not an improvement on several waste collection companies all driving to neighbouring business premises.

Business Improvement Districts/partnerships tendering to offer a preferential rate (opt-in)

There may be issues with the effectiveness if it is an opt in system. If the waste collectors that were not successful in winning the tender were able to match the

preferential rate on offer, the waste producers would still have a wide range of choice and so the number of operators may not be reduced. Warwickshire Waste Partnership is concerned regarding the expertise and knowledge that might be available in BIDs to run and operate such a procurement exercise. This may mean that there needs to be a role for local authorities or others to support the procurement.

Co-collection – the contractor for household services also deliver the non-household municipal services

Where local authorities tender out their household collection services, this will increase the size and scale of the contracts that they let. It is also likely that in some instances there might be more than one business collection zone in a local authority area. This will further increase the scale of the procurement exercise. As such there will need to be a recognition that local authorities will require extra resources for this option. Some of this could be short term external assistance. There will however be ongoing contract management resources that need to be factored in.

Where local authorities direct deliver their services there are similar advantages to above and many DDOs already operate a co-collection model which would be enhanced by these legislation changes and potentially further enhanced by some zoning.

Framework zoning – shortlist of suppliers licensed to offer services in the zone

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that this option is worth pursuing and should have more research put into it as a medium to long term option.

Local authorities should automatically be on the short list of zone suppliers where a compliant trade waste service is offered, in order to fulfil the statutory duty of a local authority to make arrangements for collection of business waste.

Any firm that is on a framework should have a duty or obligation placed on them that is equivalent to the one local authorities currently have in order to ensure that all businesses in that zone can access suitable collections services.

Material specific zoning – one contractor delivers food, one for packaging, one for refuse collection services

In many instances, local authority household services are likely to be set up where food is collected on the same vehicle as packaging or refuse, by way of a pod. This option poses a risk to local authority trade waste services if they are not a named contractor for all materials. Small business rely on local authorities to provide their trade waste collections and so if material zoning were brought in there would need to be an obligation placed on the relevant waste collector that they provide a service to all businesses in their zone.

Exclusive service zoning – one contractor delivers the core recycling and waste services for the zone

There is merit in proposals on the zoning of business waste services. It has the potential to increase efficiency and effectiveness of business waste collections. There are issues around zoning in rural areas.

Q57 Do you have any views on the roles of stakeholders (for example Defra, the Environment Agency, WRAP, local authorities, business improvement districts, businesses and other organisations and chambers of commerce) in implementing a potential zoning or franchising scheme? For example, do you think there could be roles for one or more of these organisations in each of the following activities: (P89)

- *Procurement*
- *Scheme design*
- *Administration and day to day management*
- *Enforcement*
- *Business support*
- *Development of tools and guidance*
- *Delivery of communications campaigns*
- *Any other activities (please specify)*

*If you think that there is a role for any other stakeholders, please specify.
Please provide explanations where possible to support your above response.*

Any stakeholder responsible for implementing a zoning/franchising scheme must be representative and publicly accountable and local authorities or BIDs fulfil these criteria. They must be committed to delivering best value and environmental outcomes for the best quality services that can be procured. Both organisations can deliver all the activities listed above, either individually or in partnership. As shapers of place and locality, local councils (or working through BIDs) are best placed to assume this strategic role.

Q58 Do you have any further views on how a potential waste collection franchising / zoning scheme could be implemented? (P89)

The procurement of any franchising/zoning scheme must acknowledge any available capacity via municipal infrastructure (EfW, MRF, AD etc) to maximise local processing/disposal before longer distance solutions. The proposal should consider how this can be hard-wired into the procurement process to promote public-private partnership working. This will stimulate local investment in municipal treatment infrastructure and could better deliver locally sustainable solutions. There would need to be duty placed on waste producers that they use the collector(s) stated for their zone. This goes beyond the current Duty of Care requirements.

Q59 Do you have any views on how Government can support non-household municipal waste producers to procure waste management services collaboratively? This could include working with other stakeholders. (P90)

Businesses/NHM waste producers should be obligated to be included within the local franchise/zoning arrangement by default. This would mean that information on

their obligation and participation can be provided from their first contact with the necessary authorities (planning, environmental health, BID, chamber of commerce etc) and the service(s) to them started immediately upon them becoming operational as a business/organisation. This will make enforcement easier and lead to an improvement in the amenity and quality of the street scene.

Q60 Which type(s) of business support would be helpful? (Select any number of responses) (P90)

1:1 support

National /regional campaigns

National guidance and good practice case studies

Online business support tools (e.g. online calculators and good practice guidance)

Other (please specify)

All of the above.

Businesses need clear and concise reference information online and 1:1 personal or group (in forums) support to refresh their knowledge.

More resources will be needed for local authorities to be able to fully support businesses and provide information to them.

Q61 Are there any barriers to setting up commercial waste bring sites, and do you find these sites useful? (P90)

Finding locations that can meet regulatory requirements (planning, permitting) may prove problematic in the short to medium term. The Covid 19 pandemic necessitated the introduction of booking systems and other processes at HWRCs to manage use of the sites and social distancing. Whilst this has had the effect of limiting capacity, in some instances it has also improved the overall efficiency of operations at several sites. This means such systems may be maintained in the longer term.

If sites are then expected to take additional material from businesses, this will put new pressures on site usage that may be difficult to meet through the existing infrastructure. It will also mean that new HWRC sites may require larger sites and plots of land than perhaps they had previously. This could make their development take longer and fewer new sites may ultimately come forward. Sites will need to be licenced and resources will be needed to apply for licenses, along with ongoing costs of complying with licence conditions and operating sites to a suitable standard. Sites will need to be staffed for all or part of their availability, so resource levels will need to be taken into account.

Space on existing HWRCs are constrained in Warwickshire. This will make adding addition capacity and containers more difficult. Availability of sites maybe an issue going forward, especially for small and micro businesses. These businesses may have little opportunity to use bring sites during their own working hours and so would want to use them to or from work. Most current sites will not operate outside

normal business working hours, especially during winter. Site licencing or planning could restrict any expansion of opening hours.

The use of bring sites by commercial waste producers will need to comply with any duty of care requirements. This may be difficult under the current duty of care system, especially in terms of any possible enforcement activity that could be needed. It is suggested the duty of care requirements will need to be reviewed considering all the changes that the consistent collections and EPR proposal are likely to bring about.

Proposal 23 – exemptions to separate collection from non-household premises

Q62 Could the following recyclable waste streams be collected together from non-household municipal premises, without significantly reducing the potential for those streams to be recycled? (P91)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure / Don't have an opinion
Plastic and metal	Y		
Glass and metal	Y		

If you have agreed with either of the above, please provide evidence to justify why any proposed exemption would be compatible with the general requirement for separate collection of each recyclable waste stream.

Plastic and metal

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that mixing plastic containers and metal causes any issue regarding material quality. It is unclear from the consultation proposal if plastic film would form part of this exemption. Most existing MRFs in the UK cannot separate plastic film or cartons. However, the new Warwickshire MRF will have the ability to separate all proposed streams if collected comingled in a way that provides quality as good as kerbside sort if not better.

Glass and metal

There can be issues with noise levels when glass is collected separately at the kerbside. Collecting glass and metal together might have the potential to increase this risk. In a fully comingled collection noise levels are dampened by the mixing of the recycling.

Q63 What, if any, other exemptions would you propose to the requirement to collect the recyclable waste stream in each waste stream separately where it would not significantly reduce the potential for recycling or composting? (P91)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would like to see the co-collection of household and non-household waste facilitated as much as possible. This will reduce the costs of operation for local authorities and so for businesses and producers under the EPR scheme.

Limiting what material can be mixed is less desirable than keeping options open and challenging mixing on the basis of a TEEP-style assessment. If any MRF is shown to be supplying sustainable end markets, then materials can be collected together in any combination that the MRF can accept. The partnership believes that glass, plastic and metal could be collected together without the need for a written assessment.

Local choice instead of stipulation would be welcomed in Warwickshire as from mid-2023 we will be using a new state of the art MRF that will have the ability to take fully comingled material, including all of the new materials, and achieve output material quality that is equal to or better than current kerbside sort systems. Crucially, comingled systems are simple for businesses to understand and will link in well with the proposed EPR labelling of recycled or not recycled. There are no concerns with confusion, running out of capacity or how to store the many containers. Comingled methodology also allows for easily adding new materials, so long as they can be sorted at the MRF. All waste is safely contained and littering from escaped waste is not a concern.

The collection element of kerbside sort is more costly and time consuming than comingled. Kerbside sort methodology would pose some serious Health and Safety risks in a business setting. HSE guidance on manual handling advises that collectors should lift as little as possible, but this is not possible in the kerbside sort system, where containers of glass and paper / card boxes are heavy. There is also the risk of puncture wounds from sharp waste elements such as glass or metal. There are road safety issues with sorting waste in the street. During the pandemic, there has been concerns about the kerbside sort technique bringing operatives into close quarters with potentially contaminated waste. With comingled collections there is no lifting or handling involved for the business or operatives.

Proposal 24 – exemption on two or more recyclables from non-household premises

Q64 Do you have any views on the proposed definition for ‘technically practicable’? (P93)

In principle this will follow the same concepts as for household waste. These issues and considerations are best done at the franchise/zoning level as a holistic exercise for all types of business. This would enable minimum standards and best practice to be included within the procurement and a more equitable and fair level of service provision for local communities through benchmarking and comparison. A comparison would be a locality-based waste/recycling management plan, the smaller scale equivalent of a JMWMS.

Q65 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples cover areas where it may not be ‘technically practicable’ to deliver separate collection? (P94)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you have disagreed with any of the above, please say why and indicate which example you are referring to.

The proposed examples do cover areas where it may not be technically practicable to deliver separate collections. However, these may not be the only areas.

Q66 What other examples of areas that are not 'technically practicable' should be considered in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P94)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Social and economic demographics of an area
- Geography of an area and business types
- Health and safety guidelines and risk assessments for kerbside sort
- HSE guidance – manual handling, collectors should lift as little as possible. Glass and paper / card boxes are heavy
- HSE guidance – handling contaminated and / or sharp waste (glass / metal)
- Preventing vermin from accessing waste
- Greater capacity afforded by comingled versus kerbside sort
- Access issues, for example: narrow roads, long drives, parking blocking roads
- Traffic flow
- Balancing the capacity of each stillage on the collection vehicle
- Vehicle availability – long lead-in times of several months for purchasing
- Depot space – for vehicles, transfer of materials, containers
- Electric vehicles charging points required for electric vehicles
- Additional vehicles requiring more staff, shortage in frontline staff and trained or untrained drivers and cost of training
- Permitting restrictions, licensing
- End markets
- Maintenance infrastructure and maintenance crews for vehicles
- Small businesses - space for bins
- Staff unclear about the system
- Business willingness to participate

Q67 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples cover areas that may not be 'economically practicable' to deliver separate collection are appropriate? (P94)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you have disagreed with any of the above, please say why and indicate which example you are referring to.

In principle this will follow the same concepts as for household waste. These issues and considerations are best done at the franchise/zoning level as a holistic exercise

for all types of business. This would enable minimum standards and best practice to be included within the procurement and a more equitable and fair level of service provision for local communities through benchmarking and comparison. A comparison would be a locality-based waste/recycling management plan, the smaller scale equivalent of a JMWMS.

Q68 What other examples of 'economically practicable' should be considered in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P95)

Economically practicable refers to separate collection which does not cause excessive costs in comparison with the treatment of a non-separated waste stream, considering the added value of recovery and recycling and the principle of proportionality. If the additional cost of collecting a recyclable waste stream separately outweighs its value once collected, it may not be economically practicable to collect a waste stream separately.

It is also unclear at this moment in time how "economically practicable" will be determined in relation to EPR payments and the options for business waste that were put forward in that consultation. This is complicated further by the fact that there is working group looking at further options that have not been presented in that consultation.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Materials markets, possible saturation leading to lower value
- Communication costs to businesses, especially if there is a significant service change, many new containers are introduced or a move to comingled is quickly followed by a move back to kerbside sort
- Sourcing of vehicles, bins and other infrastructure at the same time will cause problems, the market is not geared up to deliver such a change.
- Contract changes
- Cost of additional fleet (electric? / hydrogen?)
- Depots and storage of fleet
- Transfer arrangements and / or bulking
- Cost of crews and of supervision and ancillary staff
- Attracting and retaining drivers is a significant issue
- Higher contamination could lead to more rejected loads
- Cost of containers and availability

Q69 Do you have any views on what might constitute 'excessive costs' in terms of economic practicability? (P95)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the phrase "excessive costs" as this implies that there is a high degree of magnitude above the standard cost before it is deemed uneconomic for a local authority to collect materials separately.

Under EPR, packaging producers will demand that collection services are efficient and effective, suggesting that costs should not approach an excessive level before an assessment says it is acceptable for an alternative solution to be sought. Each

collection solution will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis considering local circumstances.

There is no detail within the consultation on what level and type of evidence would be required to demonstrate that costs would be excessive for a local authority to collect materials separately. Until this is known it then makes it more difficult to comment thoroughly on this proposal.

Q70 Do you have any views on what should be considered 'significant,' in terms of cases where separate collection provides no significant environmental benefit over the collection of recyclable waste streams together? (P95)

As with the phrase "excessive costs" the use of "significant" in this case suggests a very high threshold of proof that a comingled collection method has good environmental benefit. Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports good environmental outcomes, creating a circular economy and lowering carbon impact. Solutions need to be found where good environmental performance can be achieved and collection costs are covered by EPR, not scarce public funds. Each collection solution will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis considering local circumstances.

Q71 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples for 'no significant environmental benefit' are appropriate? (P95)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you have disagreed with any of the above, please say why and indicate which example you are referring to.

In principle this will follow the same concepts as for household waste. These issues and considerations are best done at the franchise/zoning level as a holistic exercise for all types of business. This would enable minimum standards and best practice to be included within the procurement and a more equitable and fair level of service provision for local communities through benchmarking and comparison. A comparison would be a locality-based waste/recycling management plan, the smaller scale equivalent of a JMWMS.

Q72 What other examples of 'no significant environmental benefit' should be included in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P96)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Carbon impact
- Air quality impact
- Additional vehicles
- Material output quality and acceptability to end markets
- Maintaining dry waste while set out for collection
- Greater capacity through comingled versus kerbside sort

- Lack of litter / escaped waste generated by comingled versus kerbside sort
- Closed loop end markets versus aggregate, etc
- Balance between the quality in comingled and vehicle miles in collecting separately for possibly no increase in quality.

Proposal 25 – compliance and enforcement

Q73 What ways to reduce the burden on waste collectors and producers should we consider for the written assessment? (P97)

- Standard template preferably online
- No easy opt outs – organisations completing the template should be limited to a choice of responses and not allowed too many (if any at all) free form entries that require intensive and subjective assessment. This will mean that external audit and verification will be easier and quicker and the number of assessments requiring review can be reduced (compared to if each individual business had to do its own). Similar to a municipal waste and recycling strategy
- Ideally done at a franchise/zoning level rather than individual businesses so all businesses within the service area can use this as evidence for any regulatory challenge.

Q74 We are proposing to include factors in the written assessment which take account of the different collection requirements, for example, different premises within a service area. What other factors should we consider including in the written assessment? (P98)

- Collective container provision shared between businesses in franchise area/zone. This would need to subject to considerations relating to duty of care obligations.
- Secure digital access to containers like RF transponders (bin chipping) on bin lifts. Linked with automatic bin weighing/volume measurement, it will enable businesses to just pay for the waste/recycling they produce. These costs amortised across a zone/franchise area will be lower than if put on an individual business.
- If business collections are undertaken on a zoning basis, thought may need to be given to the size of zone in relation to the assessment. It is likely that there may need to be several different collection methods within each zone to take account of the different business sizes and characteristics.

Q75 Would reference to standard default values and data, that could be used to support a written assessment, be useful? (P98)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Whilst the use of standard or default values can be useful in making an assessment quicker and easier, they also mean the assessment is less representative of the actual situation a local authority faces. The use of default values should therefore not be mandatory, and the preference would be that local authorities use their own values as much as possible.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests that a range of default values should be developed and used if default values are to be used at all, instead of one default value.

Q76 Do you agree or disagree that a template for a written assessment would be useful to include in guidance? (P98)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports the use of templates if it is not too restrictive and directive. There needs to be the flexibility to add information and edit the template to suit.

Q77 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed approach to written assessments and non-household municipal collections will deliver the overall objectives of encouraging greater separation and assessing where the three exceptions (technical and economical practicability and environmental benefit) apply? (P98)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

The challenges faced by small and micro businesses in managing and having their waste collected separately should not be underestimated. It needs to be acknowledged that local authorities and other waste collectors currently provide good co-mingled business waste collections that deliver material that is of the quality needed for the markets they supply.

There needs to be an assessment of the value in increasing costs of collection against the increase in "quality" of material achieved.

Proposal 26 – costs and benefits

Q78 Do you have any comments and/or evidence on familiarisation costs (e.g. time of FTE(s) spent on understanding and implementing new requirements) and ongoing costs (e.g. sorting costs) to households and businesses? (P103)

Until the full extent of the changes is known it is not possible to provide figures on this. Given that this consultation and the EPR consultation still contain a great many unknowns, it is unreasonable to expect local authorities to plan in any level of detail for the changes.

All local authorities will have examples of costs of previous service changes, but few of these are likely to reflect the changes that would be needed to meet the policy changes proposed in this and the EPR consultations. Too much prescription in the way waste if collected will stifle innovation and further efficiencies and environmental / carbon benefits.

In 2013, North Warwickshire Borough Council moved from a source segregated system using boxes to a dual stream service in order to simplify the service, provide more recycling capacity and reduce litter from recycling collections. Full year recycling rates either side of this change increased by 62%.

In 2019 North Warwickshire Borough Council moved from the dual stream service to fully comingled in order to improve the health and safety of collectors and provide a simpler service. Full year recycling rates either side of this change were increased by 16%.

Both changes were popular, so moving to more containers would be difficult and should not be necessary as the new sub-regional MRF will deliver quality materials from comingled collections. Many Warwickshire properties have little outdoor or indoor space for additional containers.

A service change requires additional staff to liaise with businesses and households as well as deliver the practical elements and procurement. The extent of initial and ongoing communications work should not be underestimated.

Q79 Do you have any comments on our impact assessment assumptions and identified impacts (including both monetised and unmonetised)? (P103)

Some concerns from Warwickshire Waste Partnership are outlined:

Garden Waste Collections

Carbon inputs related to charged garden waste collections are generally much lower than free services. Fewer vehicles are used in collections; their routes are far more optimised and so the carbon attributed to them smaller.

The quality of green waste collected on paid for services is also higher than free services. This means less rejected material, with the carbon loss that incurs, and a better quality of compost that is produced, with the carbon gains that accrues.

Dry Recycling Collections

If carbon savings are a key driver, then the assessments must be done across dry recycling streams as well as garden waste. Looking to achieve weight-based targets may undermine better policy choices in terms of carbon, e.g. vastly increasing home composting instead of free green waste collections.

The same reprocessors are often taking material from all types of collection system, source separated, twin stream and co- mingled. If a reprocessor is accepting material for recycling, then that material is quality because it is fit for purpose.

Relevance of Modelling – Covid-19 Impacts

The Covid-19 pandemic has created some major and potentially long-lasting changes in the waste that people and business produce, where it is produced and this has impacted on collection and treatment operations. These changes must be considered if the proposed policies are to design and implement a new system of household and business waste management that is future proofed.

New Burdens

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the estimates of the new burdens local authorities will face if the proposals in the consultation are implemented. There are legitimate costs in operating waste management services that we believe may not have been captured, both existing and potential.

One example is the amount of resource needed to undertake written assessments. Whilst the consultation contains proposals on how this burden may be minimised, there is a possibility of judicial challenges if written assessments conclude that services should deviate from source separated collections. Local authorities will want to ensure their assessments are robust and have suitable levels of research and evidence behind them. This may mean they require much more resource than has been anticipated in the modelling and the impact assessment.

The partnership is concerned that local authorities will not receive full funding for the new burdens these proposals will incur. Defra themselves have indicated that the proposals are subject to confirmation in the next spending review, which will be one of the most difficult since the financial crash and has many national and international level pressures on it. This may see the spending on waste moved down the overall priorities in the spending review compared to where it might have been pre-pandemic and when the first round of consultations was released in 2019.

There is a need for funding to enact changes to be provided up front, in order to meet the timescales and this does not seem to have been factored into the new burdens plan. If there is a delay in the payment of EPR funds, will new burdens cover the shortfall to enable local authorities to establish consistent collections in line with the proposed timetable?