

EAST KENT JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

19 October 2009

Subject:	East Kent Joint Waste Project
Director/Head of Service:	Mark Seed (on behalf of East Kent Waste Management Group)
Classification:	This report is open to the public.
Summary:	This report updates EKJSC on the progress made on the East Kent Joint Waste Project and seeks views on the current proposals to assist with the development of a decision report to EKJAC.
Next stage in process	To complete the draft of the report to EKJAC that will recommend that each of the 4 East Kent District Councils and Kent County Council formally consider and decide on the agreed financial, procurement and legal proposals.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1. **Introduction**
 - 1.1 Implementation of the Kent Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) requires future waste management services to develop beyond those currently offered to householders. The costs of these services are expressed across the two tiers of local government and as a result, effective cost minimisation requires an aligned approach and co-ordinated decision-making.
 - 1.2 The East Kent Waste Management Group consists of officers from the four East Kent District Collection Authorities and Kent County Council as Disposal Authority. The group was charged by the Leaders and Chief Executives to develop a cost effective collection and processing proposal across the authorities to deliver the following key aims:
 - To minimise exposure to the escalating costs of waste disposal
 - To deliver cost efficiencies in collection systems,
 - To increase the rate of recycling
 - To develop a coordinated approach to managing waste across the two tiers of Local Government
 - 1.3 This report details the current position with regard to financial, procurement and legal issues within the joint waste project.
2. **Detail**
 - Finance**
 - 2.1 Detailed modelling of differing collection methodologies has been undertaken and compared with alternative views for each District. The overall comparison between

these two views is shown at Annex 1 to this report. Agreement has been reached between KCC and the four Districts as to the most effective collection methodology, (referred to as the Nominal Optimum Model or NOM). In essence this would be based upon:

- Split Bodied, fortnightly collection of kerbside recyclables,
- Co-mingled fortnightly collection of food and garden waste
- Fortnightly collection of residual waste (to alternate with recycling collections).

There may be some amendment to this collection methodology if, through the Competitive Dialogue Procurement process, tenderers propose variations on this methodology which generate further benefits. The Competitive Dialogue Process is outlined in paragraph 2.9 and Annex 3 below.

2.2 Work has also been undertaken on the likely avoided disposal costs and benefits of the implementation this system through financial modelling from 2013-20.

- Future costs of disposal are on average reduced by £2.9mn p.a. in this period,
- Overall recycling/composting performance in East Kent increases to 48%
- The cost of processing recyclate reduces and its value is enhanced by segregating paper plus card at the point of collection.

2.3 In order to ensure that District Councils are not financially disadvantaged as a result of adopting the NOM, Kent County Council have undertaken to provide additional revenue funding of £1.59mn p.a., to:

- Allow for the additional costs of introducing the new collection system
- Refund lost recycling income
- Refund lost garden waste income

This funding level is indicative and may also vary subject to any changes in collection methodology derived from the Competitive Dialogue Process and future review of the Council incomes in their baseline year.

2.4 KCC has also undertaken to finance containerisation costs of £3.35mn incurred by the districts to implement the changes in service.

2.5 The impact of the project would be to generate a net average avoided disposal benefit of £1.3mn per annum during 2013-2020 (transition years 2010-2013 excluded).

2.5 Agreement has been reached with Service Heads and Section 151 officers for collection savings arising from joint working to be included within the total project benefits for disaggregation (these savings exclude the benefit of moving to alternate weekly split bodied collections in Shepway and the change to alternate weekly collections of residual waste in Dover). The joint savings will also arise from the reduction in the number of collection crews across the East Kent area and the reduction in contractor's overhead and management costs. Details of the extent of the collection savings arising from joint working across the four districts will be defined by tenderers as part of the Competitive Dialogue Process. Collection savings generated in joint working partnerships elsewhere in the UK have typically been identified as between 5-10% of the contract value. With collection service gross costs exceeding £10m, collection savings of between £500k and £1m could be achieved.

Furthermore there is potential for some rationalisation of depot and transfer generating additional savings. Whilst a provisional estimate of an additional £500k has been made within the disaggregation modelling this will be discussed and detailed further as part of the Competitive Dialogue Process.

2.7 A summary of the potential project benefits, amounting to £4.4million p.a. are detailed at Annex 2. The Annex also demonstrates how the potential additional benefit could be disaggregated to the partner authorities. The financial benefit accruing to the districts detailed on this Schedule is in addition to the enabling payment and containerisation funding they will receive from KCC in order to make the change in service provision.

2.8 The disaggregation of this benefit is to be based on the following principles:

- The investment made to change services will be refunded from disposal and collection savings before any benefits are distributed.
- Canterbury City Council to receive additional funding of £189k p.a. to compensate for the shortfall between its Project View and the Alternative View (excluding garden waste charging)
- The remaining benefit (or overage) to be disaggregated between KCC and the District Authorities in accordance with the following:
 - (a) 50% Kent County Council
 - (b) 50% District Authorities.
- The benefit derived to the District Authorities to be disaggregated in proportion to the number of households within each district area.

Procurement

2.9 In view of the ending of existing contract arrangements for refuse collections and street cleansing services in Dover and Shepway from 30th September 2010 progress has also been made in the procurement of collection and processing capacity. A Procurement Board has been established consisting of officers from all partner authorities which reports to the East Kent Joint Waste Steering Group. A Competitive Dialogue approach is being adopted for the procurement as it enables tenderers to assist in the development of the best practicable solution. The Competitive Dialogue Timetable is attached at Annex 3 and outlines the key dates up to contract commencement.

2.10 The OJEU notice was dispatched on Friday 7th August and the Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) subsequently sent out to 35 companies who had expressed interest. Of 12 respondents 9 companies successfully completed the PQQ stage and will be invited to enter into the Competitive Dialogue Process. A Contract Descriptive Document outlining the aspirations of the Partnership is being sent out to tenderers and their outline responses are due back on the 6th November.

2.11 Final contract specifications are expected to be drafted in the New Year with contract award timetabled for April 2010.

Legal

- 2.12 A draft memorandum of understanding (MoU) is nearing completion to provide a basis for a legally binding agreement to cover the key areas below:
- 1) Canterbury City Council, Dover District Council, Shepway District Council and Thanet District Council are required to commit to the NOM collection methodology as refined and informed by the Competitive Dialogue Process in order to deliver materials for processing in a single cost efficient manner.
 - 2) Dover District Council and Shepway District Council must commit to deliver their specified recycling waste streams to the transfer points and facilities specified by KCC from October 2010.
 - 3) Canterbury City Council and Thanet District Council must commit to deliver their specified recycling waste streams to the transfer points and facilities specified by KCC from April 2013, or earlier by mutual agreement.(re end of Hersden Contract 2012).
 - 4) Kent County Council will fund enabling payments and containerisation funding to the District Councils in accordance with the Districts compliance with the NOM collecting methodology.
 - 5) Kent County Council will provide processing capacity and or facilities for the materials collected by the Districts in accordance with the NOM collecting methodology.
- 2.13 It is necessary for individual authorities to commit formally to the project in accordance with the principles indicated above to allow a legally binding agreement to be put in place by January 2010.

3. Relevant Council Policy/Strategies/Budgetary Documents

- 3.1 This project delivers the principal objectives of the Kent Joint Municipal Waste Strategy (which have been adopted by all the partner authorities), namely:
- to deliver high quality services to the people of Kent, including an emphasis on waste reduction, recycling and diversion from landfill
 - to meet the statutory targets set for Kent, and
 - exceed them in areas where this is a locally agreed priority.
- 3.2 The project also addresses key environmental drivers for future service provision and development which include compliance with:
- National Waste Strategy 2007 (50% recycling by 2020 and progressive reductions in residual waste per individual).
 - Household Waste Recycling Act (provision of recycling collection service to all households by end of 2010).
 - Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme - the EU has imposed targets for member states to reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal¹ waste sent to landfill; Government has transposed these into Landfill Allowances for Waste

¹ The EU target is to reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste sent to landfill to 75%, 50% and 35% of that produced in 1995, by 2010, 2013 and 2020 respectively.

Disposal Authorities in England. Authorities exceeding their target will be fined.

- 3.3 The project also consistent with the Delivering Value for Money in Local Government (the VfM Delivery Plan) which set an expectation that substantial savings (£2.8bn) would arise through smarter procurement.

4. **Consultation planned or undertaken**

- 4.1 Consultation to-date has been limited to leaders, chief officers, Programme Board members consisting of portfolio holders from Partner Authorities, East Kent Joint Waste Scrutiny Sub-Group and Local Authority employed staff in affected areas.
- 4.2 A Communications Strategy is now being developed which will include wider consultation with members, employees, Neighbourhood Forums and the wider public.

5. **Options available with reasons for suitability**

- 5.1 The NOM has been developed from financial modelling based upon assumptions drawn from WRAP research, waste processors, council waste management and waste planning officers and experience from other Joint Working Waste Projects. The NOM will however be further developed through the Competitive Dialogue Process undertaken with interested tenderers over the next 3 months and only completed when the Final Specification is agreed in the New Year. This approach ensures that all opportunities to maximise the benefits of cost effective collection and processing solutions are explored.

6. **Reasons for supporting option recommended**

- 6.1 The cost modelling for developing the NOM has involved assessing a range of alternative operating models, of which the NOM provided the greatest overall cost and performance benefits.
- 6.2 In terms of risk, the model has been tested for sensitivity across a wide range of recycle market conditions and contract disposal rates. The version chosen for the report represents a conservative view of potential costs and income, and still demonstrates a significant saving. However, sensitivity analysis is still continuing in order to ensure that the model remains robust

7. **Implications**

(a) **Financial Implications**

See 2.2 to 2.8 above and Annex 1 and 2 to this Report.

(b) **Legal Implications**

The MoU will set out the principles upon which the partnership is to be founded. In order for the project to progress and to maximise the efficiency to be derived from the current round of procurement all parties must commit formally to the undertakings within the MoU set out in paragraph 2.12 above. This provides clarity for each authority's commitments in respect of service changes, financial obligations and benefits.

Other implications

(c) Staffing/resource

The table below identifies those services provided by contractors and those services which are currently provided in-house:

Authority	Waste Collection – Residual and Recycling	Street Cleansing
Dover District Council	SITA	SITA
Shepway District Council	VEOLIA	In-house
Canterbury City Council	SERCO	SERCO
Thanet District Council	In-house	In-house

TUPE regulations will apply to the transfer of staff between contractors and from councils.

Subsequent discussions on contract management arrangements will form part of the East Kent councils' wider discussions on the provision of joint services. This will potentially affect client staff in all the districts and KCC.

(d) Property Portfolio

Properties available for use at the present time to the successful tenderer are detailed below:

Depot	Council
Military Road Depot, Folkestone	SDC
Tower Hamlets Depot, Tower Hamlets Road, Dover	DDC

(e) Environmental/Sustainability

Not only does the project drive up recycling performance from an average of 37% to an average of 48% across East Kent but it also:

- Maximises cost effectiveness removing artificial barriers across the two tiers of Government
- Enables cross border operation to deliver more efficient collection practices,
- Reduces collection and transfer/haulage mileage,
- Encourages opportunities for co-location of transfer, processing and depot facilities
- Enables environmental criteria to be included within the contract evaluation.

(f) Planning/Building Regulations

Contractors will be responsible for ensuring any facilities provided for use in this contract have the appropriate planning and building regulation permissions

(g) Human Rights issues

The proposals are consistent with Human Rights legislation.

(h) **Crime and Disorder**

No significant implications.

(i) **Biodiversity**

No significant implications.

(j) **Safeguarding Children**

No significant implications.

(k) **Energy efficiency**

An outcome of the proposals will be to reduce vehicle and property requirements to the minimum, which will lead to reduced energy and fuel usage.

8. **Conclusions**

The East Kent Joint Waste Project enables the implementation of the Kent Joint Municipal Waste Strategy in East Kent and in the process delivers significant benefits to Partner Districts and Kent County Council.

Districts will benefit from:

- Expanded recycling services including garden and food waste collections to a minimum of 60% of district households
- Enhanced recycling performance averaging 48% across the East Kent area
- Additional annual funding from KCC to net off the budget impact of the changes
- Additional capital funding to finance the changes in containerisation required
- 50% share of disposal benefits after investment costs have been recovered.

KCC will benefit from:

- 50% share of net disposal benefits
- Ability to strategically manage the waste streams within East Kent
- Removal of distorting influence of recycling credit payment mechanism

Both parties also benefit from:

- More certainty through securing long term processing capacity
- Better coordination of recycling, prevention and minimisation initiatives
- Environmental benefits such as reduced carbon emissions from more efficient transport arrangements.

9. **Background Papers**

Annex 1 – Project View/Alternative View

Annex 2 – Disaggregation Views

Annex 3 – Procurement Timetable

Contact Officer: Mark Seed Telephone: 01843 577742

Project View/Alternative View Comparison Table

Authority	Project View		Alternative View	
	Rec. Rate	Financial impact	Rec. Rate	Financial Impact
Canterbury City Council	51%	Existing Budget maintained £548k Enabling Funding and £202k Contain. Funding to expand services	Opt 1 47% Opt 2 36%	Existing budget reduced by £737k (End market income) Existing budget reduced by £1,605k (End Market recycle and Garden waste Income)
Dover District Council	44%	Existing Budget reduced by £375k (3 vehicle round saving) £219k Enabling Funding to replace lost income and £1,338k Contain. Funding	25%	Existing budget reduced by £407k (GW Income and 1 vehicle round saving)
Shepway District Council	52%	Existing Budget reduced by £584k (5 vehicle round saving) £594k Enabling Funding to replace lost income and £667k Contain. Funding	39%	Existing Budget reduced by £584k (vehicle round saving). Shepway retains GW income and end market income
Thanet District Council	44%	Existing Budget maintained plus £233k Enabling Funding £1,148k Contain. Funding to expand services	27%	Existing budget reduced by £561k Containerisation funding of £332k required
Kent County Council	48%	Generates avoided disposal benefit of £2.9mn. Requires enabling funding of £1.59mn. Containerisation Funding of £3.35mn. Overall future budget requirement reduced by £1.31mn.	33%	Additional budget cost up to £367k.

Disaggregation Views

SAVINGS BREAKDOWN:

	Original			Amended		
	NOM - Disposal Benefits Only			NOM - Collection and Disposal Benefits		
£k (annual averages for project period)						
Adjusted NOM Savings						
Gross Disposal Savings			2,897			2,897
Joint Contract Collection Savings			0			1,000
Joint Contract Disposal/Collection Savings			0			500
Revised Gross Disposal Savings PLUS project savings			2,897			4,397
Inflation Impact Removed			0			0
Landfill Impact Removed			0			0
Containerisation Costs			0			0
Revised Gross Disposal Savings LESS adjustments			2,897			4,397
Enabling Payments		(1,590)			(1,590)	
Additional Canterbury Enabling Payment		0			(189)	
Revised WCA Funding			(1,590)			(1,739)
Adjusted Total Net Savings			1,307			2,618
Project Savings Sharing Proposal						
Revised Gross Disposal Savings (from above)	2,897			4,397		
Revised WCA Funding	(1,590)			(1,739)		
KCC Net Saving	1,307	50%	654	2,658	50%	1,309
District Net Saving	1,307	50%	654	2,658	50%	1,309
Adjusted Total Net Savings			1,307			2,618
District Sharing	Hholds	%	Savings	Hholds	%	Savings
(Households used as apportionment basis)	2007/8	Share	Share £k	2007/8	Share	Share £k
Canterbury	61,605	28.7%	188	61,605	28.7%	376
Dover	47,730	22.2%	145	47,730	22.2%	290
Shepway	45,135	21.0%	137	45,135	21.0%	275
Thanet	60,365	28.1%	184	60,365	28.1%	368
District Net Saving (apportionment view)	214,835	100.0%	674	214,835	100.0%	1,309

Procurement Timetable

Stage	Date	Task
	2009	
Pre-Qualification Questionnaire	10 August	Pre-qualification questionnaires available on request.
Procurement Board	18 August (14.00)	Review progress.
Procurement Board	Tues, 1 September (14.00)	Review progress.
Open Day	10 September	Briefing & Depot Open Day for all prospective tenderers.
Procurement Board	Tues, 15 September (14.00)	Review progress.
Pre-Qualification submission deadline	Fri, 18 September	For inclusion in the shortlist completed PQQ. Documentation must be returned by no later than noon 18 September 2009.
Review PQQ's	Tues, 22 September	MC to meet with Waste Consulting.
PQQ Scoring	Weds, 23 September (10.00 to 17.00, Room 405, SDC)	Review submissions and score.
Procurement Board	Tues, 29 September (14.00)	Review progress.
Invitation to participate in initial dialogue on Outline Solutions	2-5 October	Short listed Tenderers will be notified and sent an outline specification inviting them to participate in a dialogue on outline solutions.
Opening Dialogue meetings	Tues/ Weds, 13/14 October (SDC)	First stage meetings.
Procurement Board	Tues, 27 October (14.00)	Review progress.
Bidders submit Outline Solutions	6 November	
Dialogue on Outline Solutions	Tues/ Weds 10/11 November (SDC)	Second Stage Meetings
Invitation to submit Detailed Solutions	13 November	Short listed Tenderers will be notified and invited to participate in a dialogue on detailed solutions.
Procurement Board	Tues, 24 November (14.00)	Review progress.
Bidders submit Detailed Solutions	4 December	
Dialogue on Detailed Solutions	Tues/ Weds, 8/9 December (SDC)	Third Stage Meetings
Invitation to submit Refined Solutions	14 December	Short listed Tenderers will be notified and invited to participate in dialogue on Refined Solutions.
Procurement Board	Tues, 22 December (14.00)	Review progress.
	2010	
Bidders submit Refined Solutions	9 January	
Dialogue on Refined Solutions	Tues/ Weds, 12/13 January (SDC)	Fourth Stage Meetings
Closure of Dialogue Process	18 January	Short listed tenderers will be notified and invited to participate in dialogue on Refined Solutions.
Procurement Board	Tues, 19 January (14.00)	Review progress.

Stage	Date	Task
Issue Final Tender documentation	January/February	
Bidders submit Final Tenders	February/March	
Clarification Period	March	
Identification of Preferred Bidder	March	
Bid Refinement	March	
Contract Award	April	
Contract Run-in Period	April - September	
Contract Commences	1 October 2010	(Or such other date as may be agreed).

EAST KENT (JOINT SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
WASTE MANAGEMENT WORKING SUB-GROUP

9 September 2008

Minutes

Present: Councillor M Fisher (CCC)
Councillor M Harrison (TDC)
Councillor K Mills (DDC)

Officers John Bunnett, Deputy Chief Executive (TDC)
Present: Lorraine Burley, Senior Committee Administrator (SDC)

Also Councillor D Lloyd-Jones (DDC) Substitute Member
Present: Rebecca Brough (DDC)

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor A Clifton-Holt (SDC) - substitute to be Councillor P Martin and Mr Vye (KCC) who was to be substituting for Mr Law.

2. Election of Chairman

Councillor M Harrison was elected as Chairman.

3. Terms of Reference

- (i) It was confirmed that the composition of the sub-group be five non-executive cross party members, one from each participating authority.
- (ii) It was confirmed that membership of the sub-group be nominated from the membership of the East Kent (Joint Scrutiny) Committee with named substitutes.
- (iii) It was agreed that three members are required to make a quorum.

It was agreed that items (iv) to (viii) be discussed as a single item.

John Bunnett summarised the report 'Converging the waste collection, recycling and disposal services of East Kent – working towards the optimum service' which had previously been presented to the East Kent (Joint Arrangements) Committee on 25 June 2008 and also to the East Kent (Joint Scrutiny) Committee on 9 July 2008.

Next steps for consideration included:

- a) Technical – how waste is collected and recycled, how the county deals with different materials and the costs involved in collecting waste and its disposal. The sub-group will need to increase its knowledge base regarding facts and figures, including visits to see other waste collection and disposal systems. Also to be investigated are issues around glass, efficiency, cost effectiveness and best practice elsewhere.
- b) Legal – Mark Ellender (CCC) will take the lead on legal matters and will be drawing up an arrangement that all authorities will be signing up to. Attention was drawn to the fact that all authorities taking part must be committed from the outset as there will be an outlay on capital equipment by Kent County Council on behalf of the project.
- c) Finance – Mike Davis (DDC) will lead.

It was proposed to look at best practice both in this country and abroad (desk top appraisal) and information was available from the global work done by Environmental Resources Management Ltd (ERM).

After the meeting, a programme would be drawn up detailing logistics and organisations to be contacted.

All the current waste disposal contracts the local authorities have in operation will have expired by 2013 and completing the work required between now and then will be challenging. The Waste Management Working Sub-Group is due to report back to the East Kent (Joint Scrutiny) Committee in March 2009.

It was agreed that a report on the current situation regarding waste management would be prepared by John Bunnett for the next meeting and background documents would be available.

John Bunnett went on to emphasise the importance of keeping the general public informed and updated about the project and possible consultation exercises.

After discussion, authorities and their current responsibilities for the project were listed:

Canterbury City Council – Legal
Dover District Council – Finance
Thanet District Council – Lead
Shepway District Council – Administration

It was therefore suggested that Kent County Council take over the public information role.

4. Any other business

Kent County Council had yet to appoint a successor member to Mr John Law for the Waste Management Working Sub-Group, who was the KCC Conservative lead spokesman on the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee – this position has been filled by Mr John Simmonds.

5. Date, time and venue of the next meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting be held in approximately a month's time, to start at 9am at Dover District Council offices.

EAST KENT (JOINT SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
WASTE MANAGEMENT WORKING SUB-GROUP

3 December 2008

Minutes

Present: Councillor Clifton-Holt (SDC)
Councillor M Harrison, Chair (TDC)
Councillor K Mills (DDC)

Officers Present: John Bunnett, Deputy Chief Executive (TDC)
Lorraine Burley, Senior Committee Administrator (SDC)

Also Present: Chris Stannard, Project Manager
Rebecca Brough (DDC)

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Fisher (CCC) and Councillors Simmonds and Vye (KCC).

2. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 9 September 2008 were agreed and signed as a true record.

4. Presentation of the current waste management situation in Kent and East Kent

John Bunnett introduced Chris Stannard, Project Manager for the East Kent Joint contain two elements:

- To bring everyone to the same knowledge base regarding the background to waste management.
- How the project had progressed since September 2008

The presentation (which had previously been distributed) covered the following points:

- Kent's waste tonnes per annum

- Household waste
- The Kent Waste Management Story

Up until 1990's predominantly landfill
 Kent waste diversion from landfill
 Three Waste Streams (Recycling, Green and Residual)
 Kent waste diversion from landfill
Residual
 Waste Transfer and disposal to landfill 1994-2006
 Landfill
 Allington Waste to Energy
 Waste arisings and collection
Recycling
 Recycling collections
 Current collections
 Household Waste Recycling Centres
Green Waste Collections
 Composting – Garden/Food Waste
 Predicted Waste Flows based on Current Plans
 Future Planned Diversion

5. 'Converging District and County waste services – can it be done?'

A second presentation (Appendix 1 attached) followed covering the following points:

Summary
 Purpose of the session
 Background – Current Services
 Aims
 ERM Report (November 2007)
 Coordination and Technical – TDC
 Legal – CCC
 Financial – Dover
 Political
 How far have we got?
 What is left to do?
 Conclusions and Key Messages

John Bunnett stated it was imperative that if any authority had issues which could possibly be 'deal breakers' that these be discussed as early as possible as a substantial initial investment would be made into the project.

A table 'East Kent Work Programme – Proposed Timetable (attached as Appendix 2) was distributed to those present.

Responding to questions, John Bunnett and Chris Stannard stated:

The scheme would have been most cost effective if it had been possible to start from scratch. However, there were existing waste collection contracts for the four authorities.

There are two options as how to proceed:

- To tender a contract to the waste industry (a process could be constructed to allow local authorities to bid).
- To create a local authority type company.

Both options would have staff implications and trade unions (Unison and GMB) had been contacted as well as Thanet District Council Human Resources Section as their waste collection service is in-house.

Quality/value judgements are difficult to make, Thanet DC recently brought back in-house arrangements and there has been a 20% increase in performance, but working hours have decreased from 48 hours to 37.5 per week. Likewise, kerbside sorting as operated by Shepway DC results in an income but takes longer and uses more operatives and vehicles and benefits KCC. Sending waste to be processed is cheaper.

Public consultation is considered to be vitally important, Chris Stannard is to attend the Dover Neighbourhood Forum meeting in January 2009 to start the process as Dover DC will have the most changes to make to waste collection services. Remaining forums are to be contacted in due course.

It was envisaged that food and garden waste would be co-mingled. This would lead to a loss of revenue for those authorities who charge for a separate garden waste collection as collecting food waste cannot be charged for Shepway DC stands to lose £200,000pa.

KCC offer credits to district councils for recyclable materials, but the value of recyclates has recently dropped dramatically. It should be ensured that any new facility should have adequate storage facilities until prices rise.

The trend is to move away from weekly to fortnightly waste collections, and it will be important to reassure the public that this will be satisfactory. A specific size (240 litres) wheelie bin is supplied for fortnightly collections. However, in Dover approximately 30% of households (mainly in deprived areas) are unable to have a wheelie bin due to the steep incline of roads. If plastic bags are to be used there may be problems with the control of pests. There is also a limit to the amount of garden waste that is permitted to be collected. A solution to this may be the distribution of composting bins to residents.

6. Time, date and venue of next meeting

Thursday 15 January 2009 at Shepway District Council offices

EAST KENT (JOINT SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
WASTE MANAGEMENT WORKING SUB-GROUP

15 January 2009

Minutes

Present:

Councillor M Harrison, Chair (TDC)
Councillor M Fisher (CCC)
Councillor D Lloyd-Jones (DDC) Substitute for Cllr K Mills
Councillor J Simmonds (KCC)
Councillor Clifton-Holt (SDC)

Officers Present: John Bunnett, Deputy Chief Executive (TDC)
Lorraine Burley, Senior Committee Administrator (SDC)

Also Present: Chris Stannard, Project Manager
Rebecca Brough (DDC)

1. Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

2. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 3 December 2008 were agreed and signed as a true record.

4. Presentation and verbal update on the project

The presentation had previously been made to the Programme Board on 13 January 2009 and is attached to these minutes as Appendix 1.

Points covered:

Meeting Objectives

Technical Update

a) Recycling service Options for Change

- Dry recycle options reviewed
- Food waste options reviewed

b) Implications of Project for Districts

c) Implications for County

Finance Update

Legal Update

Timescale

Discussion Issues

John Bunnett asked what matters would be regarded by individual authorities as 'Dealbreakers'.

Thanet – public resistance, political repercussions, food and garden waste co-mingled. However, a 'dealmaker' would be the glass collection.

Dover – public resistance and problems regarding the suitability of use of wheelie bins. Dealmakers would be glass collection and being able to convince the public that taxes were being kept down.

Canterbury - collection of glass is positive, as is co-mingling food and garden waste (at present Canterbury does not collect garden waste during the winter). Lines of communication should be open at all times and a contractual arrangement, rather than a joint board, would be preferred.

Shepway – No savings being made; drop in service to the public; too many changes; and if the MURF breaks down and the material is taken to landfill.

KCC - Economies are to be made; needs to be 'sold' correctly, needs briefing to make it happen. There is a government drive towards single authorities, we must co-operate or be forced.

John Bunnett stated that it should be made very clear that this should not be seen as the next step towards unitary government. This group does not consider this project as the thin end of the wedge towards a unitary authority – we are working together for value for money.

5. Time, date and venue of the next meetings

It was agreed that the following meetings be held on:

Monday 9 February at 10am, Civic Centre, Castle Hill Avenue, Folkestone
 Monday 23 March at 2pm, Civic Centre, Castle Hill Avenue, Folkestone.

EAST KENT (JOINT SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE
WASTE MANAGEMENT WORKING SUB-GROUP

9 February 2009

Minutes

Present: Councillor M Harrison, Chair (TDC)
Councillor K Mills (DDC)
Councillor J Simmonds (KCC)
Councillor A Clifton-Holt (SDC)

Officers John Bunnett, Deputy Chief Executive (TDC)
Present: Lorraine Burley, Senior Committee Administrator (SDC)

Also Chris Stannard, Project Manager
Present: Matt Bench, Project Manager
Rebecca Brough (DDC)

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Fisher (CCC)

2. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 15 January 2009 were agreed and signed as a true record.

4. Presentations and verbal update on the project

John Bunnett introduced two presentations which covered:

- a. Food/Green waste collections
- b. How waste collection services will change

In the discussions following the presentations, John Bunnett said that the future service to Dover should be flagged up as a concern, as only the 60% of households who currently use a wheeled refuse bin will receive an improved service. The remaining 40% of households using black bags because of the unsuitability of the terrain for wheeled bins will receive their current service.

In response to questions, John Bunnett stated:

- All food items could be put into the food waste bins and if once collected, there was a pronounced concentration of one type of food, this could be monitored and regulated at the depot.
- That initially, there is some public concern to a change in waste collection services, but once settled in, public acceptance is good. A mix of consultation and marketing is required and the Thanet and Dover areas will need special consideration regarding the proposed alternate weekly collections.
- Kent County Council household recycling sites do not at present take organic waste in parallel with the proposed domestic collections – this will happen over time, but it will be a massive investment.
- Current waste collection vehicles have a liquid trap to prevent seepage on roads.
- A visit for Members to the Blaise Farm composting facility will be arranged.
- Every property covered by the authorities will have to be assessed as to its suitability for a bin or bag collection service.
- Under the new proposals there will be three types of refuse collection vehicles:

One vehicle each for the collection of residual and food/garden waste and one split bodied truck for the collection of card and paper in one section and cans, plastic and glass in the other.

John Bunnett went on to state that the Waste Management Working Sub-Group needed to meet for a final time, possibly on the 23 March to discuss detailed finance and other issues, the duration of this meeting would be approximately three hours. The East Kent Joint Arrangements Committee was now meeting on the 8 April and the Sub-Group would formally report to the East Kent Joint Scrutiny Committee on 28 April.

Concerns were raised over the lack of public consultation regarding the proposals, and that waste forums and neighbourhood forums had not been engaged. John Bunnett answered that this was something that had been struggled with and it had been felt that the best option was to recommend a particular system.

Members were of the opinion that Kent County Council should work in parallel with the other four authorities as far as waste disposal at civic amenity sites and the promotion of composting and recycling dry materials were concerned. John Bunnett said that an officer from KCC would be invited to the next meeting of the Sub-Group to present a short paper on household waste sites, transfer stations and processing facilities.

During general discussion, it was stated that Thanet pays £29 per ton to dispose of waste and Shepway pays £55 per ton. A concern was that Shepway would have the greatest change to its collection service and it might draw criticism as not all properties would be accessible to receive the new service.

John Bunnett informed Members that any change, even if beneficial is traumatic and cost/service has to be balanced. The biggest saver in the new scheme would be KCC which would then distribute cost savings to the district councils.

5. Time, date and venue of the next meetings

It was agreed that the next meeting be held on:

Monday 23 March at 2pm, Civic Centre, Castle Hill Avenue, Folkestone.