

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET****DATE: 24 FEBRUARY 2015****REPORT OF: MR MIKE GOODMAN, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING****LEAD OFFICER: TREVOR PUGH, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR – ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE****SUBJECT: SURREY WASTE STRATEGY****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To ensure that authorities in two-tier counties such as Surrey work together to manage their waste in a coherent way, the law requires these authorities to produce a joint strategy for the management of municipal waste, and keep this under review. The Surrey Waste Partnership has prepared a revised strategy which is now recommended for adoption by partner authorities, including Surrey County Council.

This report also gives an update on progress with the Eco Park development and delivering savings at Community Recycling Centres.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

1. Cabinet endorses the Surrey Waste Partnership's Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Revision 2 (2015) and recommends it to County Council for adoption.
2. Cabinet requires that a further report on the Eco Park be brought back to the Cabinet in April 2015 with an updated value for money and affordability assessment
3. Cabinet approves the consultation process for potential changes at Community Recycling Centres and agrees that the proposals for consultation will be finalised and agreed by the Strategic Director Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning.
4. A report outlining the results of the consultation and recommendations for implementation of cost saving measures at Community Recycling Centres is brought back to Cabinet by July 2015.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Adopting the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy will enable Surrey County Council (SCC) to work closely with Surrey districts and boroughs to improve performance and manage waste in a way that offers best value to the Surrey taxpayer.

Revisions to pricing for the Eco Park have arisen due to delays, associated with planning beyond the control of the Council. This has led to further time being required to complete the assessment process. To allow this to happen it is proposed that a further report including an updated value for money analysis should be brought to the Cabinet in April 2015.

Given the current financial climate, it has been necessary to investigate opportunities for making savings through optimising and rationalising the way in which Community Recycling Centres are managed. This will help address a funding gap that arises from increasing costs and reducing funding, in addition to contributing to other savings that will be required across SCC in the coming years.

DETAILS:

Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy Revision 2 (2015)

1. The authorities in two-tier counties such as Surrey have different responsibilities for managing waste and recycling. The districts and boroughs are responsible for its collection and the county council is responsible for its treatment and disposal.
2. To ensure that the authorities work together to manage the waste in a coherent way, the law¹ requires two-tier areas to produce a joint strategy for the management of municipal waste, and to keep this under review.
3. In 2006, the Waste Members' Group of the Surrey Local Government Association (SLGA) produced the first Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Surrey, which was adopted by Surrey County Council.
4. The SLGA Waste Members' Group then became Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP). This includes all of Surrey's authorities and is the main forum through which waste management matters are discussed and improvement actions are agreed. To reflect the dynamic nature of waste management in Surrey, SWP produced a revision of the joint strategy in 2010.
5. Again, much change has occurred since the 2010 revision and a further revision has now been prepared in order to ensure that the joint actions for the next ten years reflect the current needs and aspirations for the future. This comprehensive revision includes a new aim, objectives and targets which are supported by a new set of specific and measurable actions.
6. It is recommended that Surrey County Council adopts this new version of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. The revised strategy is provided as Annex 1 and this report provides a brief summary of its key sections.

¹ Waste Emissions and Trading Act 2003

Consultation

7. The revised strategy was developed by combining the input of:
 - Officers and Members of Surrey Waste Partnership via a project steering group (including Cllr Mike Goodman) and scrutiny at Partnership meetings
 - Best practice examples of other joint waste strategies
 - A consultation of residents and other key stakeholders
8. The consultation exercise took place between July and October 2014 and focused on identifying residents' barriers to reducing, reusing and recycling more of their waste. Other stakeholders included the waste management industry, businesses, environment and conservation groups and other local authorities.
9. SCC's Environment and Transport Select Committee was also included in the consultation and Members provided their input at the meeting in July 2014.
10. The feedback from the consultation was incorporated into the final draft of the strategy which was endorsed by the Environment and Transport Select Committee at its meeting on 22 January 2015.

Past performance

11. Much has been achieved since 2006, and Surrey County Council has actively participated in partnership working, making it responsible for many of the successes. Waste collection arrangements have largely been aligned, the range of recycling materials able to be collected has greatly increased and waste food collection from houses is now universal. Surrey's recycling rate has increased from 31% to 52% in 2013/14 and waste to landfill has decreased from 67% to 11% during the same period.

Current challenges

12. Whilst progress has been made over the last few years, the Council is now facing a number of serious challenges:
 - Stalling performance
 - Changing legislation and regulation
 - Increasing population
 - Budget pressures

Aims and targets

13. Surrey's authorities can and must continue to improve in order to succeed against the challenges described above; therefore the strategy has an ambitious aim - to be the leading county area in England for waste management. Performance against the aim will be measured periodically using the following indicators:
 - Household waste and recycling per person (kg)
 - Recycling and recovery rate (%)
 - Municipal waste sent to landfill (%)
 - Cost per household (£)
14. Targets against each of these indicators are presented in the revised strategy document (Annex 1).

Objectives and actions

15. To achieve the strategy's challenging aim and meet the targets, the following high level objectives set out what should be done:
- Provide a high quality service
 - Work with others
 - Maximise value from waste materials
16. These objectives are broken down into work areas containing specific actions within Annex 1. The successful delivery of these will help to achieve this revised strategy's targets.

Plan for delivery

17. To deliver the strategy successfully, each partner, including Surrey County Council, is required to develop an operational plan which delivers the actions. Delivery will be monitored annually, and the annual review will be considered by the Partnership.
18. Targets and actions will be revised periodically during the life of the strategy, and a further revision of the whole document is anticipated as being necessary in 2019/20.

Conclusions

19. This revision of the joint waste strategy has been produced via a thorough and inclusive process. The successful completion of its actions will result in higher performing, better value waste services for Surrey.
20. Adoption is commended to Surrey County Council by the Surrey Waste Partnership's Members' and Officers' Groups, and SCC's Environment and Transport Select Committee.

Adoption is concurrently being considered by all 12 partner authorities' democratic processes which will then result in formal adoption across the Surrey Waste Partnership.

Eco Park

21. On 25 November 2014 the Cabinet received a progress report on the delivery of the Eco Park. It was agreed, during that meeting, that a further report on the Eco Park be brought back to the Cabinet in February 2015 with an updated value for money and affordability assessment. The purpose of this section of the report is to update Cabinet on progress with regard to this.
22. Since the report to the Cabinet on 25 November 2014, an application for permission for a Judicial Review of the Planning and Regulatory Committee's decision to grant a variation to the planning consent has been refused by the High Court. The planning permission is therefore now secure. The challenge period in respect of the Environmental Permit has expired without any application being made and so the Permit has similarly been secured.
23. As Cabinet is aware, it has previously agreed to continue with phase one of the Eco Park development, whilst minimising the commitment of expenditure until the

necessary remaining consents were obtained. Recently, therefore work has commenced to clear vegetation around the site so that, in the event of a future Cabinet decision to start construction, this would not be delayed by restrictions on tree works during the bird nesting season

24. As was explained in the officer report to Cabinet in November 2014, delays, associated with planning beyond the control of the Council (an extended period awaiting a call-in decision and an unsuccessful application to the High Court for permission to bring Judicial Review proceedings) have resulted in revisions to pricing. A revised price and construction timetable were received from M+W just before Christmas. These are being evaluated both by SITA and Council officers, together with external advisors and discussions are continuing. This in turn has led to further time being required to complete the assessment process. To allow this to happen it is proposed that a further report including an updated value for money analysis should be brought to the Cabinet in April 2015.

Community Recycling Centres

25. Since reporting to Cabinet in November 2014, work has continued to progress on a number of initiatives for cost savings at the Community Recycling Centres (CRCs).
26. Activities that are currently underway include intercepting black bag waste to extract recyclable materials. New recycling outlets have also been found for rigid plastics and mattresses. These have resulted in benefits from the sale of increased amounts of recyclable materials and savings on residual waste disposal costs.
27. Further opportunities for making savings have been identified and these include:
- Targeted reductions in opening days and/or hours.
 - Charging for non-household materials such as rubble, plasterboard, tyres, gas bottles and asbestos.
 - Accepting, and charging for, commercial waste at more sites.
 - Generating income through selling materials either on or off site (e.g. reuse shops).
 - Closing particular sites which are inefficient to operate in their current form and cannot be improved due to prohibitive redevelopment costs or site-specific restrictions.
28. Over the next few months it is proposed to undertake consultation on the range of potential cost saving initiatives listed above. Members of the public and other key stakeholders such as district and borough partners will be included in the consultation. The proposals for consultation will be finalised and agreed by the Strategic Director Environment and Infrastructure in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning.
29. It is intended that a further report detailing the results of this consultation and recommendations for implementation of cost saving initiatives will be brought back to Cabinet by July 2015.

CONSULTATION:

30. Public consultation on the Surrey Waste Strategy took place from 1 July to 12 October 2014.
31. SCC's Environment and Transport Select Committee was also included in the strategy consultation and Members provided their input at the meeting in July 2014.
32. The feedback from the consultation was incorporated into the final draft of the strategy which was endorsed by the Environment and Transport Select Committee at its meeting on 22 January 2015.
33. There has been extensive consultation on the Eco Park in the past and details of this can be found in the 25 June 2013 and 30 October 2013 Cabinet reports.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

Waste Strategy

34. Risk: Not all partners adopt the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy which would impact on SCC's ability to work closely with Surrey districts and boroughs to improve performance and manage waste in a way that offers best value to the Surrey taxpayer.
35. Mitigation: All members of the Surrey Waste Partnership, including Portfolio Holders, have been involved in the development of strategy and the Partnership has collectively endorsed it. The process allows for minor amendments to be made to the strategy if particular issues arise during adoption by individual authorities.

Eco Park

36. Risk: Not being able to deliver key waste infrastructure through the Private Finance Initiative (Waste Infrastructure Grant) contract may lead to negative financial and reputational impact.
37. Mitigation: Strong resourcing within SCC with appropriate governance arrangements and strategic overview in place.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

38. Adopting the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy will enable Surrey County Council (SCC) to work closely with Surrey districts and boroughs to improve performance and manage waste in a way that offers best value to the Surrey taxpayer
39. Work is currently underway with regard to a review of the affordability and value for money assessment of the Eco Park.
40. The financial implications of the CRC proposals will be set out in the July 2015 Cabinet report.

Section 151 Officer Commentary

41. The adoption of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy should facilitate more effective waste management arrangements across Surrey, with consequent benefits for value for money. Work is ongoing with regard to the Eco Park including an assessment of affordability and value for money, and it is intended that the outcome of this analysis will be reported to Cabinet in April 2015. Any financial implications will then be reflected in the refresh of the Medium Term Financial Plan (2015-20) which will take place in summer 2015.

Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer

42. The Waste and Emissions Trading Act 2003 requires all local authorities to have in place a joint strategy for the management of waste from households and any other waste that because of its nature or composition is similar to waste from households and to review and keep the strategy up to date.

43. The public sector equality duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) applies to the decision to be made by Cabinet in this report. There is a requirement when deciding the recommendations to have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity for people with protected characteristics, foster good relations between such groups and eliminate any unlawful discrimination. These matters are dealt with in the Equalities and Diversity paragraph below.

Equalities and Diversity

44. Waste strategy - summary of key impacts and actions:

<p>Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis</p>	<p>A second revision of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) has been produced. In order to assess equality impacts, residents, including groups with protected characteristics were consulted as part of the strategy's development. The strategy was updated following the consultation.</p> <p>In addition, an SCC EIA specialist undertook reviews of draft strategy documents both before and after the consultation and minor amendments were made to reduce some potentially negative equality impacts.</p>
<p>Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications not reaching the protected groups • Changes to household products and waste collection services as a result of lobbying. • Reducing capacity for non-recyclable waste • Recycling more materials • Space for recycling at new developments • Not collecting contaminated recycling bins • Changing collection systems
<p>Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA</p>	<p>No changes. The actions of the JMWMS are high-level and there is sufficient flexibility to allow partners to mitigate the impacts when planning any changes in detail.</p>
<p>Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications teams to fully engage with impacted groups • SWP manager to fully consider the implications of

impacts	lobbying on groups with protected characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local policies for reducing non-recyclable bin capacity should allow flexibility for groups with protected characteristics • Consider the needs of groups with protected characteristics when assessing the suitability of new materials for recycling • Consider the needs of groups with protected characteristics when reviewing bin space provision at new developments • Local policies for dealing with contaminated recyclable bins should allow flexibility for groups with protected characteristics • Collection authorities should carry out a full EIA for their district/borough when proposing any changes to collection systems
Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated	At this stage it is not perceived that the actions of the strategy will result in any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated.

The full EIA can be found as Annex 2.

45. This report confirms that there has been no change to the Equalities and Diversity implications of the Eco Park as described in the 30 October Cabinet 2013 report

Other Implications:

46. The potential implications for the following council priorities and policy areas have been considered. Where the impact is potentially significant a summary of the issues is set out in detail below.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	Public health implications are not considered significant for this report. These matters were referred to in the report to the 25 June 2013 Cabinet and will have been considered as part of the regulatory permissions related to the Eco Park.
Climate change	Set out below.
Carbon emissions	Set out below.

Climate change/carbon emissions implications

47. This report confirms that the climate change and carbon emissions implications for the Eco Park remain the same as described in the 30 October 2013 Cabinet report.

48. The majority of the waste strategy initiatives discussed above are likely to have beneficial implications, for example; Reducing waste arisings and recycling

material rather than disposing of it reduces the carbon impact of producing materials and associated emissions from transportation and disposal.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

49. The waste strategy is currently being taken through individual councils' democratic processes which will result in formal adoption across the Surrey Waste Partnership.
50. A further report including an updated value for money analysis will be brought to the Cabinet by April 2015.

Contact Officer:

Ian Boast, Assistant Director for Environment. Tel: 020 8541 9479

Consulted:

There has been a comprehensive consultation process with regard to the Eco Park, as described in the 25 June Cabinet report and which included:

- Constituency MP and other Local MPs
- All local Residents Associations (Charlton Village RA; Shepperton RA)
- Spelthorne Local Committee, which includes local councillors and county councillors
- Spelthorne Borough Council relevant officers (e.g. Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive, Director for Environment)
- Over 10,000 local residents
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Neighbours to the Charlton Lane site
- SCC Cabinet

(Note: this does not relate to the County Planning Authority consultation as part of the planning application as this was a separate process.)

Consulted on report to Cabinet:

- Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
- Chief Executive
- Strategic Director Environment and Infrastructure
- Director of Finance
- Monitoring Officer

Annexes:

- Annex 1: Waste Strategy document
- Annex 2: Waste Strategy equality impact assessment

Sources/background papers:

- Cabinet Reports:– 2 February 2010 – 14 March 2011 – 26 March 2013 – 25 June 2013 - 30 October 2013, 24 June 2014 (including the EIA which remains appropriate), 25 November 2014.
- Mott MacDonald technical advisors report – Technology Review August 2012
- Mott MacDonald Technical Due Diligence – M+W proposal June 2013

This page is intentionally left blank