

**A
MUNICIPAL WASTE
MANAGEMENT
STRATEGY FOR
UTTLESFORD DISTRICT
COUNCIL
(1st DRAFT)**

2004

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- There are increasing legislative pressures to move towards more sustainable waste management practices.
- Specifically these are the:
 - EU Landfill Directive (and associated UK legislation)
 - Statutory Recycling Targets
- Efficient and effective segregated collections will be needed in all strategies for municipal waste if European and UK targets are to be met.
- Uttlesford District Council and Essex County Council now have a duty to reduce the amount of biodegradable waste they deliver to landfill and to increase the amount of other materials recycled. Both authorities have been set statutory recycling targets of 36% and 33% recycling respectively, which is to be achieved by 2005/06.
- In order to avoid or reduce financial penalties for exceeding Landfill Allowances, Essex County Council could direct this Council to separate waste for recycling.
- In order to meet statutory recycling targets and minimise the risk of being directed, this Council will need to provide a waste management service that achieves the highest possible levels of recycling and reduces the amount of biodegradable waste taken to landfill balanced against affordability.
- This strategy will form the basis of a specification and service plan that will be required by any future waste management contract.
- Key decisions need to be made by members to formulate Council Policies in order to adopt this strategy.
- This strategy considers how best the Council can work towards achieving its statutory recycling target and contribute to reducing the amount of Municipal Biodegradable Waste going to landfill.
- The collection of dry recyclables alone will not enable recycling rates to rise above 25%. Therefore it is inevitable that organic materials will have to be segregated at source, for composting, if we are to achieve a 36% recycling rate.
- The materials identified represent the best balance of recycling performance versus sustainability and affordability.

- Higher levels of recycling are achievable but are dependant on public acceptability and participation of any current and future schemes implemented by this council. Therefore any potential scheme must:
 - Target the heaviest and most common materials in the waste stream.
 - Encourage high levels of participation
 - Be user friendly and reliable to ensure that maximum levels of materials are captured
- Higher levels of recycling will increase income to the Council and will help to offset the cost of providing a higher level of service.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2-3
LIST OF TABLES	6
GLOSSARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	8
2 BACKGROUND TO WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE UTTLESFORD DISTRICT	8
2.1 PROFILE OF THE DISTRICT	8
2.2 SERVICE PROVISION-COUNCIL OPERATIONAL POLICY DECISIONS.	8-9
3 WHERE ARE WE NOW?	
3.1 WASTE ARISING	10-11
3.2 WASTE COMPOSITION	11-12
3.3 SCOPE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES CURRENTLY PROVIDED.	13
3.4 CURRENT COSTS	13-14
3.5 EXISTING CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS	15
3.6 COLLECTION POINTS	15-16
3.7 PRESENTATION OF WASTE	16
3.8 RECYCLING SITES	16-17
4 WHERE ARE WE GOING?	
4.1 DRIVERS FOR CHANGE	18
4.1.1 LEGISLATIVE DRIVERS FOR CHANGE	18-24
4.1.2 NON LEGISLATIVE DRIVERS FOR CHANGE	24-26
5 HOW ARE WE GOING TO GET THERE	26
5.1 WASTE MANAGEMENT HIERARCHY	27
5.1.1 WASTE MINIMISATION	27-32
5.1.2 RE-USE	32-35
5.1.3 RECYCLE	35-43
5.1.4 RECOVERY	43
6.0 FUTURE WASTE MANAGEMENT CONTRACTS	43
6.1 ESSEX WASTE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT	43-44
6.2 UTTLEFORDS REFUSE AND RECYCLING CONTRACT 2006-2011	44-46
7 WASTE EDUCATION AND AWARENESS STRATEGY	47-49
8 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	50-51

9	RECYCLING PLAN	52-54
10	APPENDICES	
	CALCULATIONS OF PROJECTED RECYCLING RATES	56-58
	MEL WASTE ANALYSIS FOR UTTLESFORD AND THE WEST AREA	59

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
TABLE 1: HOUSEHOLD WASTE ARISING BY AUTHORITY FOR 2003/	10
TABLE 2: UTTLESFORDS HOUSEHOLD WASTE ARISING 2001 – 2004	11
TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF MEL COMPOSITIONAL ANALYSIS OF KERBSIDE RESIDUAL WASTE.	12
TABLE 4: ESTIMATED COSTS AND INCOMES FOR 2004/05 FOR THESE SERVICES	13
TABLE 5: COMPARISON OF COSTS FOR ESSEX AUTHORITIES.	14
TABLE 6: EXISTING CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS	15
TABLE 7: TABLE OF RECYCLING SITES.	17
TABLE 8: STATUTORY RECYCLING RATES	19
TABLE 9 LANDFILL ALLOWANCE TRADING SCHEME (LATS) FOR UTTLESFORD	21
TABLE 10. WRAP BUDGET PROFILE.	24
TABLE 11: BENCH MARKING OF BULKY HOUSEHOLD WASTE COLLECTIONS	29
TABLE 12: CHANGES IN FLY TIPPING AS A RESULT OF CHARGING FOR BULKY COLLECTIONS	.30
TABLE 13: THEORETICAL RECYCLING RATES TARGETING 100% OF HOUSEHOLDS AND OPTIMUM PARTICIPATION AND CAPTURE RATES	36
TABLE 14: PROPOSED RECYCLING SERVICES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE STATUTORY RECYCLING RATES OF 36%	38
TABLE 15 EC. PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE	45
TABLE 16: ESTIMATES FOR THE MAIN HEADS IN IMPLIMENTING KERBSIDE COLLECTION OF KITCHEN WASTE FROM 18,000 PROPERTIES	50
TABLE 17: ESTIMATES FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF KERBSIDE COLLECTION OF GLASS	51

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

UDC UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

ECC ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

WCA WASTE COLLECTION AUTHORITY

WDA WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY

DEFRA DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS

DETR

PARTICIPATION RATE – The number of households that use the recycling service provided.

CAPTURE RATE – The “capture rate” is the percentage of potentially recyclable material set out for recycling by *participating households*, where a participating household is defined as a household that sets out recyclables at least once during the month.

SET-OUT RATE – The number of participating households that present their recycling for collection on any given collection day.

1: INTRODUCTION

The Landfill directive is already having a big impact on the amount of waste sent to landfill and that which is now re-used, recycled and recovered. It will steadily divert biodegradable waste away from landfill to be treated by other means including composting and anaerobic digestion. Further directives require more and more businesses to recycle or recover their waste products when finished with and more of these controls are to come.

This Strategy sets out how Uttlesford District Council can reduce the impact of the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme and meet its statutory recycling target of 36%, however it is doubtful that 36% will be achieved by 2006. This council has adopted the Joint Waste Management Strategy for Essex and in doing so, has agreed to reach its statutory recycling target by 2007/08 at the latest.

Affordability and the lack of a recycling infra-structure capable of processing the material locally, are key limiting factors, which must be overcome if the Council is to meet the challenging recycling target that it has been set.

This Strategy has been prepared in parallel with the development of the Essex, Southend and Thurrock Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy that is scheduled for completion and adoption by all Essex authorities by the end of December 2004. The strategy will be reviewed annually and will develop to meet changing legislative and industry forces.

2: BACKGROUND TO WASTE MANAGEMENT IN UTTLESFORD

2.1 PROFILE OF THE DISTRICT

The District of Uttlesford lies in East Anglia and is one of the 12 district authorities of the County of Essex. It is predominantly a rural district with major centres of population at Saffron Walden Great Dunmow and Stansted. There are 29,800 households with a population of 69,000 in 2003/04 split into 53 parishes of varying sizes. Access to and through the district is reasonable by way of a direct link to London and Cambridge via the M11 and to the East Coast of England via the A120.

2.2 SERVICE PROVISION – COUNCILS OPERATIONAL POLICY DECISIONS

Members of the Council have, through Committee resolutions and informal discussions at waste management seminars, given a clear steer as to their expectations and aspirations for the waste management services provided by the Council. These now need to become formally adopted policies of the Council:

- Importance of support for waste minimisation initiatives and provision of services, which encourage waste minimisation.
- Importance of education and promotional activities to raise awareness of waste issues and to encourage waste minimisation and participation in recycling schemes.

- Importance of high quality, cost effective, reliable and responsive waste management services.
- With the exception of clinical waste collections, to charge for collection services such as bulky household waste collections wherever possible. i.e. the Polluter Pays Principle. When a charge is applied, the level should be gauged in line with other Essex authorities.
- To withdraw the provision of weekend skips for general waste.
- To review the Commercial Waste Collection Service.
- Financial commitment by the Council and through DEFRA funding for the provision of recycling services which yield 26% recycling by 2006.
- A strong desire to reach the statutory recycling target and beyond if possible.
- Investigate opportunities for joint working with Essex County Council and other district authorities.
- This Council has not ruled out the possibility of fortnightly collections of residual waste.
- The desire of the Council is to have the collection of all waste carried out on the same day using the same vehicle where possible.
- Wheeled bins for general refuse are not acceptable.
- A review of the collection containers for dry recyclables is required under a single pass system.
- Support for the development of a Joint Waste Management Strategy for Essex, Southend and Thurrock.
- Recognise the need to move to a boundary collection for all waste related services.
- Recognise the need to establish a policy on the presentation of waste.
- Introduce a kerbside glass collection service.
- Realise the need to allow potential contracts the flexibility to develop recycling services that meet the aspirations of the Council.
- There is a need in any future contract to include a provision for the reuse of bulky household waste.

3 WHERE ARE WE NOW?

3.1 WASTE ARISING

TABLE 1: HOUSEHOLD WASTE ARISING BY AUTHORITY FOR 2003/04.

AUTHORITY	Kgm per head	Population	H/H Waste to Landfill (Tonnes)	H/H Waste Recycled (Tonnes)	H/H Waste Composed (Tonnes)	Total Recycled & Composed (Tonnes)	Total Waste Arisings (Tonnes)	Total recycled & composted 2003/4 (%)	Statutory Performance Standard 03/04 (%)
TENDRING District Council	0.353	134465	40,256.61	7,213.2	0.0	7,213.2	47,469.8	15.20%	16%
HARLOW District Council	0.375	76700	24,892.44	3,735.1	155.9	3,891.1	28,783.5	13.52%	10%
COLCHESTER Borough Council	0.377	159500	45,175.98	10,572.2	4,309.8	14,882.0	60,057.9	24.78%	28%
BRAINTREE District Council	0.394	132300	41,088.07	8,940.3	2,144.4	11,084.7	52,172.8	21.25%	14%
MALDON District Council	0.396	55170	17,930.77	3,243.7	674.6	3,918.3	21,849.0	17.93%	22%
CASTLE POINT Borough Council	0.410	84600	28,421.26	3,218.5	3,065.3	6,283.8	34,705.1	18.11%	16%
ROCHFORD District Council	0.418	78273	29,350.08	2,519.3	854.7	3,374.0	32,724.1	10.31%	10%
EPPING FOREST District Council	0.429	116623	39,876.43	6,826.2	3,315.2	10,141.4	50,017.9	20.28%	28%
BRENTWOOD Borough Council	0.459	71700	28,127.00	3,038.7	1,761.4	4,800.1	32,927.1	14.58%	28%
UTTLESFORD District Council	0.462	69000	25,689.54	6,178.5	30.4	6,208.9	31,898.4	19.46%	24%
BASILDON District Council	0.464	164400	61,906.16	8,681.2	5,711.2	14,392.3	76,298.5	18.86%	20%
CHELMSFORD Borough Council	0.466	155500	56,355.81	11,583.2	4,556.0	16,139.1	72,494.9	22.26%	10%

Table 1 shows the;

- total household waste arisings,
- weight per head of population,
- percentage recycled and composted and
- statutory performance standard by authority for 2003/04.

TABLE 2: HOUSEHOLD WASTE ARISING 2001 - 2004

	Household Waste Arisings (Tonnes)			
Uttlesford	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04
Total Household Waste Arisings	Tonnes 33,831.7	Tonnes 32578.1	Tonnes 32,496.7	Tonnes 31,898.4
% Reduction	-	-3.70	-0.25	-1.85
Recycling Tonnage	4884	5271	5577	6209
Recycling Performance	14.4%	16.2%	17.6%	19.5%

Table 2 shows the

- total household waste arisings and
- the percentage recycled and composted for 2003/04 and the previous 3 years for Uttlesford District Council.

It is pleasing to see a reduction in the amount of total household waste arisings from 2000 to 2004 of - 5.7%. This is against a national average forecast of + 3% per year. This is particularly satisfying as there has been a steady increase in the number of households and population in Uttlesford during these years.

Recycling Rate

The formula used to establish the recycling rate is as follows:

$$\text{Recycling Rate} = \frac{\text{total recycled and composted}}{\text{the total waste arisings}}$$

(total waste arisings = total waste to landfill + total recycled and composted).

Therefore 2003/04 Recycling Rate = 6209 / 31898 = 19.5

3.2 WASTE COMPOSITION

Essex County Council commissioned MEL Waste Consultants to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the composition of waste across the county during 2004.

Their analysis within Uttlesford covered the following waste streams.

Kerbside residual waste
Kerbside recycling
Litter and street sweepings

Their analysis (of kerbside and street sweeping waste) was based on sampling undertaken in two 3-week periods. The first of these, in February, representing the "winter" sample and the second, undertaken in June, representing the "summer" sample.

The analysis was expected to provide a representative picture of household waste composition county wide and at local level. The robustness of the analysis at district level will vary depending on the extent of sampling undertaken in any district. MEL has confirmed that the statistics are robust enough for Uttlesford to produce a local Waste Management Strategy.

A summary of the results for Uttlesford are detailed below. A more detailed analysis can be found in appendix 2 This analysis identifies the material that remains in the residual waste stream despite the measures and services provided by this Council that encourage recycling by residents.

TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF MEL COMPOSITIONAL ANALYSIS OF KERBSIDE RESIDUAL WASTE.

Material	Percentage %	Tonnage
Kitchen Waste	35.19	8142
Paper and Card	14.15	3274
Glass and Jars	7.6	1758
Garden Waste	5.05	1610
Textiles	2.11	673
Plastics	1.91	609
Ferrous and Non Ferrous Metal	1.45	462
Total	67.46%	16528

The waste audit only took account of the residual waste presented for collection at the kerbside and therefore did not take account of material that was home composted, collected for recycling or taken to bring sites (including weekend garden waste schemes) or Civic Amenity sites.

Table 3 shows that a total of 67.46% of material could potentially be recycled. However this would only be possible if ALL households in the District participated in any given recycling scheme and that ALL potentially recyclable materials were captured. i.e. a 100% participation and capture rate.

3.3 SCOPE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES CURRENTLY PROVIDED

- Provision of weekly back door general domestic waste collections.
- Provision of alternate weekly kerbside collection of dry recyclables from approximately **90% of households** within the district.
- Weekly Parish green waste collection service from **17** locations (March-November inclusive);
- The district has **51** “bring” recycling sites throughout the district
- 43 of these sites collecting **glass, cans and paper**
- 7 recycling sites also collect **textiles, shoes and books**
- **2** “bring” recycling sites also collect plastic
- Weekend recycling sites at Saffron Walden, Stansted and Thaxted for **wood, metal and green waste.**
- Clinical waste collection service.
- **Free** bulky household waste collection service
- 121 weekend general waste skip to various parishes
- **Assisted** recyclable collections for persons unable, due to disability/infirmity, to present their recyclable materials at the front curtilage of their property.
- Commercial waste collection service.
- Limited commercial collection of cardboard.

3.4 CURRENT COSTS

TABLE 4: ESTIMATED COST AND INCOME FOR 2004/05 FOR PROVIDING THESE SERVICES.

		2004/05 Estimates
Refuse Collection	Gross cost	£1,400,750
	Income	£456,760
	Net Cost	£943,630
Recycling Services	Gross cost	£735,950
	Income	£392,940
	Net cost	£343,010
Total Cost		£1,286,640
Annual Cost per Household		£42.88

Table 5 provides information on BV 86 (best value indicator) for the costs of waste collection per household in the different Essex WCAs.

Clearly there are many explanations for the differing costs across the County (e.g. differences in the range of recycling services provided, the population density, vehicles used, distances to disposal sites, number of bulky waste collections made etc). For this reason, the cost information in the table cannot provide a direct comparison between the services provided by different WCAs. Nevertheless, the information provides a general picture of the costs of the collection element of waste management in Essex. The Table also shows the recycling/composting performance achieved by each WCA in 2003/04.

TABLE 5: COMPARISON OF COSTS FOR ESSEX AUTHORITIES.

Authority	2003/04 reported performance against BV 86 (£/household)	2003/04 performance against BV82a + BV82b (% household waste recycled & composted)
Basildon	41.16	18.9
Braintree	52.82	14.8
Brentwood	36.67	14.6
Castle Point	30.13	18.1
Chelmsford	54.52	23.6
Colchester	41.94	24.9
Epping Forest	24.65	22.8
Harlow	48.50	13.7
Maldon	35.68	17.2
Rochford	30.99	10.0
Tendring	24.35	15.2
Uttlesford	42.43	20.4
Essex Average	38.65	18.9

The Council is required to report, annually, the net cost of collecting household waste per household. Although the authorities share some cost information, there is presently no agreed inter-authority framework for the collection, monitoring or analysis of service costs. During 2004/05 the partner authorities plan to establish key cost indicators that can be shared. From this, partners can begin to see the cost trends for different elements of the service (for example the relative spend on collection, disposal, recycling activities, waste awareness and education) and assess the relative costs of different types of material recycling schemes and initiatives.

A good deal of cost data has been collected as part of the monitoring and analysis of three High Diversion Trials (in neighbourhoods in Braintree DC, Chelmsford BC and Colchester BC) and the analysis of this data has already informed decisions on the establishment or expansion of kerbside recycling schemes. The additional reporting costs for District/Borough Councils are not expected to be significant. Moreover, the additional reporting is likely to result in significant benefits to all authorities from the exchange of good practice, leading to efficiency savings over time.

3.5 EXISTING CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

TABLE 6: EXISTING CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR	CONTRACT PERIOD
Refuse collection Commercial waste collections Servicing recycling banks Servicing weekend skips for general waste	Verdant – Group Plc	July 2006
Clinical Waste Collections	General Business Holdings	No formal agreement
Kerbside Collection of Dry Recyclables. Weekend Green Waste sites and Weekend Recycling sites	Uttlesford's In House Team	No formal agreement
Servicing Textile Banks	Salvation Army	No formal agreement
Glass Sales	United Glass	No formal agreement
Green box dry recyclables	Waste Recycling Group	No formal agreement
Paper sales	Aylesford Newsprint	March 2009
Street Cleansing Service	Uttlesford's In House Team	July 2006
Abandoned vehicle removal	Uttlesford's In House Team	July 2006

3.6 COLLECTION POINTS

This Council has different policies for collecting different types of waste, as follows:

Household Waste

The policy of this Council is to collect residual waste from the 'back door' or the place of storage. In practice 70% of residents place their residual waste on the boundary of their property on their nominated day of collection. Where there is no uniform collection point there is a greater risk of having missed collections especially during holiday periods when there is a change to the normal collection crews.

Dry Recyclables

The Policy for the collection of dry recyclables is that the waste must be presented at the boundary of the property on the nominated day of collection.

Single Pass System

This Council has long had a vision of having a single pass system for the collection of dry recyclables and residual waste. Combining these wastes in split body vehicles on the same day will make doorstep recycling available to all properties in the District. It will also encourage residents to separate their waste for collection and therefore increase participation and our recycling rate. The single pass system will form the basis of any new contract for managing the waste produced within the district.

In order to achieve a single pass system, it is essential to have a uniform collection point for all waste.

It is recommended that this Council adopt a “boundary collection” policy for all waste related services with the exception of those residents who are elderly or infirm.

Arrangements should be made for the collection of waste from the property of elderly or infirm residents who cannot move the waste themselves to the collection point. Therefore, it is necessary to decide the type of evidence that is acceptable, such as a doctor's note, to ensure that arrangements are legitimate.

3.7 PRESENTATION OF WASTE

There are a large number of properties presenting their waste in wheelie bins on their nominated day of collection. This is causing a great deal of frustration from the collection crews and from residents when they do not have all the waste taken. These bins cannot be emptied completely as there is a health and safety risk to the collectors leaning into the bins to retrieve bags at the bottom. Members should be aware that lifting mechanisms are required to empty wheelie bins completely.

There are also a number of properties still presenting loose waste in dustbins. This also has health and safety implications in terms sharp objects present in the bin as well as hygiene. Therefore, this type of collection should not be continued in the present day.

There does not appear to be a Council policy on the presentation of waste and this needs to be addressed for the new contract specification.

Under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Section 46, the waste collection authority can by notice require the householder to place the waste for collection in receptacles of a type and number specified.

It is recommended that this council specify the type of receptacle for waste collection as being a black bag and that waste contained by any other method will not be collected.

3.8 RECYCLING SITES

Key: 1 = Glass; 2 = Cans; 3 = Paper; 4 = Textiles; 5 = Plastic; 6 = Books; 7 = Card

TABLE 7: TABLE OF RECYCLING SITES.

Parish	Address	Materials	Parish	Address	Materials
Ashdon	Fallowden Lane	1 2 3	Lt Hallingbury	Village Car Park	1
Aythorpe Roding	The Axe and Compasses PH	1 2 3	Lt Walden	The Crown PH	1 2 3
Barnston	The Bushel and Sack PH	1 2 3	Manuden	Opp. The Yew Tree PH	1 2 3
Birchanger	Birchwood	1 2 3	Newport	Car Park, Railway Station	1 2 3
Broxted	The Price of Wales PH	1 2 3	Newport	The Coach & Horses PH	1
Chrishall	Nr The Red Cow PH	1 2 3	Radwinter	Rec. Ground, Water Lane	1 2 3
Clavering	Village Hall Car Park	1	Rickling	The Cricketers Arms PH	1 2 3
Clavering	M M Supermarket. Stortford Road	1 2 3	Saffron Walden	CA Site, Thaxted Road	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Debden	The Village Hall Car Park	1 2 3	Saffron Walden	Lord Butler Leisure Centre	1 2 3
Duddenhoe End	Village Hall, Church Road	1 2 3	Saffron Walden	Car Park, The Common	1 2 3 4
Elsenham	The Crown PH	1 2 3	Saffron Walden	Swan Meadow Car Park	1
Farnham	Village Hall, Rectory Lane	1 2 3	Saffron Walden	Council Offices,	1 2 3
Felsted	Stebbing Road	1 2 3	Saffron Walden	Tesco Store, Radwinter Rd	1 2 3 4 5
Great Chesterford	Village Hall Car Park	1	Stansted	Cannons Mead	1 2 3
Great Dunmow	Tesco Store, Stortford Road	1 2 3 4 5 6	Stansted	Lower Street Car Park	1 2 3 4 6
Great Dunmow	Car Park, White Street	1 2 3 4	Stansted	The Three Colts PH	4
Great Easton	Village Hall, Rebecca Mead	1 2 3	Stebbing	The White Hart PH, High St.	1 2 3
Great Sampford	The Red Lion PH, Finchingfield Rd	1 2 3	Takeley	The Green Man PH	1 2 3
Hadstock	The King's Head PH	1 2 3	Takeley	Youth Centre, Brewers End	1
Hatfield Broad Oak	The Duke's Head	1	Thaxted	Car Park, Margaret St	1 2 3 4
Hempstead	Bluebell Inn Ph	1 3	Wendens Ambo	The Bell PH, Royston Road	1 2 3
Henham	Car Park, Rugby Club	1 2 3	White Roding	Sports and Social Club	1 2 3
High Easter	Village Hall, The Street	1 2 3	Wicken Bonhunt	Wicken House, Wicken Road	1 2 3
High Roding	The Black Lion PH	1	Widdington	Village Hall, High Street	1 2 3
Lt Bardfield	Styles	1 2 3	Wimbish	Village Hall, Mill Road	1 2 3
Lt Easton	Memorial Hall Car Park	1 2 3			

4 WHERE ARE WE GOING?

4.1 DRIVERS FOR CHANGE

4.1.1 Legislative drivers

Landfill Directive

The EC Landfill Directive (99/31/EC) sets targets for the reduction of biodegradable municipal waste sent to landfill. These are mandatory for the UK Government and the requirement to achieve the targets set out below has been passed down to individual Waste Disposal Authorities via the Landfill Trading Allowance Scheme. The UK national targets are:

By 2010 to reduce biodegradable municipal waste landfilled to 75% of that produced in 1995;

By 2013 to reduce biodegradable municipal waste landfilled to 50% of that produced in 1995;

By 2020 to reduce biodegradable municipal waste landfilled to 35% of that produced in 1995.

The 1995 base is significant given that nationally waste arisings are increasing annually by approx 3% which will mean even more biodegradable waste having to be diverted.

To comply with the Landfill Directive, the Government has established national targets for recovery of municipal waste, and recycling/composting of household waste. These are:

National recycling/composting targets:

- To recycle or compost at least 25% of household waste by 2005;
- To recycle or compost at least 30% of household waste by 2010;
- To recycle or compost at least 33% of household waste by 2015.

National recovery targets:

- To recover value from 40% of municipal waste by 2005;
- To recover value from 45% of municipal waste by 2010;
- To recover value from 67% of municipal waste by 2015.

'Recover' means to obtain value from waste through recycling, composting, other forms of material recovery, or recovery of energy.

For example, in 2015 the Government expects 67% of municipal waste to be recovered. This may be achieved purely by recycling/composting (materials recovery), or by a combination of recycling/composting and energy recovery. Reliance on energy recovery alone is not an acceptable solution in terms of both the National Waste Strategy and the Essex Waste Strategy.

Failure to meet the requirements of the Landfill Directive may cost the UK Government £0.5 million per day.

National Waste Strategy

The Department of the Environment, Transport and Regions (DETR) document, Waste Strategy 2000, published in May 2000 sets out how the Government intends to fulfil the requirements of European Law. Waste Strategy 2000 interprets and integrates the requirements of EU directives into a single national policy response.

Local authorities in turn are expected to incorporate the requirements of Waste Strategy 2000 into their own policies and plans. This requirement is being monitored under the Best Value regime. Both the County-wide and the Uttlesford's Waste Management Strategies are being prepared to meet the requirements of the National Waste Strategy.

Statutory Recycling Targets

Every local authority has been set statutory recycling targets for 2003/4 and 2005/6 based on their performance during 1997/8.

TABLE 8: STATUTORY RECYCLING RATES.

This Council's targets for household waste recycling/composting are as follows:

	Statutory Target 2003/4	Statutory Target 2005/6
Uttlesford District Council	24%	36%
Essex County Council	22%	33%

Initially, recycling undertaken by local authorities was discretionary with an obligation only to produce a Recycling Plan. In 2001 the government issued statutory recycling targets for 2003/04 and 2005/06. These targets were based on the levels of recycling during 1998/99 and were simply doubled and trebled for 2003/ and 2005/06.

Statutory recycling targets for 2007/08 and beyond are currently under consideration. Whilst details have yet to be published, it is expected that the new targets will be even more challenging.

Household Waste Recycling Act 2003

The Household Waste Recycling Act 2003 requires all collection authorities to collect at least two types of recyclable waste to every household (excludes chargeable garden waste) together or individually separated from the rest of the household waste by 31 December 2010. A two-stream kerbside collection service is therefore the absolute minimum standard. However, a three-stream collection service, residual waste, dry recyclables and biodegradable waste, will be required if the Council is to get close to meeting its statutory recycling target of 36%.

Waste And Emissions Trading Act 2003

The Waste and Emissions Trading 2003 requires local authorities in two-tier areas to have a joint municipal waste management strategy and gives waste disposal authorities a power to direct waste collection authorities to separate waste for recycling. Draft guidance currently in consultation makes it clear that where a disposal authority directs a collection authority to separate its waste, the collection authority will be liable for all additional costs incurred as a result of the direction up to what is required to meet its statutory recycling target. The power of direction will only apply to biodegradable waste as the Act is purely concerned with reducing the amount of biodegradable waste taken to landfill. However the definition of biodegradable waste is wide and will include kitchen waste, garden waste, paper, card and textiles.

Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme

The Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS) brought into force by the Waste and Emissions Trading Act 2003 requires a progressive reduction in the amount of Biodegradable Municipal Waste (BMW) landfilled by the UK from 2005/06 in order to meet the targets in the Landfill Directive for 2010, 2013 and 2020.

Allowances to deposit Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) to landfill will be allocated to each Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) each year by the Government. If a WDA does not have enough allowances in a particular year to cover the amount of material to be taken to landfill, the WDA will have the option to purchase surplus allowances from another WDA at the prevailing market rate to avoid incurring financial penalties. The financial penalties that will be incurred have yet to be finalised but are likely to be in the region of £150 per tonne for every tonne, from 2005, taken to landfill not covered by a landfill allowance permit.

Table 9 sets out Uttlesford's predicted allocation of the Essex landfill allowances for each year from 2005/06 to 2009/10. Uttlesford is responsible for 4.9% of the total MSW produced in Essex. The 2009/10 target has been set by DEFRA in line with the Landfill Directive requirement to reduce biodegradable waste going to landfill to 75% of 1995 levels.

The projected performance in row 9 is based on 2003/04 levels of recycling. It assumes Uttlesford does not introduce any additional recycling schemes to reduce the amount biodegradable waste taken to landfill. The table shows that this Council will be exceeding the predicted allocation of Essex County Council's landfill allowances by 1,423 tonnes in 2005/06 and by 8,696 in 2009/10.

TABLE 9: LANDFILL ALLOWANCE TRADING SCHEME (LATS) FOR UTTLESFORD

Row			2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
1	Projected MSW arisings (tonnes)		37,648	38,777	39,941	41,139	42,373
2	Predicted BMW in waste (tonnes) using Gov. 68% assumption	= 68% of row 1	25,601	26,369	27,160	27,974	28,814
3	Paper/Card/Books recycled (tonnes)		4,603	4,742	4,884	5,030	5,180
4	Putresible (Green Organic) composted and Wood (tonnes)		725	747	769	792	816
5	Textiles/Footware reused/recycled (50% biodegradable)		198	203	210	216	222
6	Planned total BMW removal (tonnes)	= total of rows 3-5	5,427	5,591	5,758	5,930	6,107
7	Calculated BMW in waste to landfill	= row 2 – row 6	20,174	20,778	21,402	22,044	22,707
8	BMW permitted To landfill (tonnes)		18,750	17,960	16,097	15,591	14,011
9	Performance against target	= row 7 – row 8	+ 1,423	+ 2,818	+ 4,494	+ 6,454	+ 8,696

In September of 2004 Essex County Council secured funding of £160,000 from the Local Authority Support Unit to engage Enviro, a specialist consultancy contractor to develop a LATS management strategy for Essex.

The project aims to develop a LATS Strategy for Essex, that will address how high levels of recycling can be achieved and maintained, and how the impact of LATS on Essex should be managed. The strategy should set out a deliverable programme of action that should be taken in the interim period (2005/06 – 2009/10) and the longer term (next 20 years) to meet recycling and LATS targets, mitigating risks and financial penalties.

The strategy will be developed on three levels: countywide, area approach (east, west and Thames Gateway) and at individual waste collection authority level.

The LATS Management Strategy will be produced in the context of the Joint Waste Management Strategy that Essex is currently developing and should be completed by 31 March 2005 at the latest.

Powers of Direction from Waste Disposal Authority

The Waste and Emissions Trading Act 2003 (WETS) inserted a number of provisions into the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA) which essentially allow the WDA to issue a direction to a WCA to separate waste before delivered.

DEFRA issued draft guidance on the use of 'Powers of Direction'. It is not particularly detailed, but does provide some elaboration on the statutory provisions. It states the Direction is designed to be used in circumstances where the fact that a WCA does not separate biodegradable waste from other waste streams and impedes the WDA's ability to meet the LATS. It can only be used where it is necessary for the WDA to meet its own statutory requirements.

Essex County Council as the WDA can issue a direction requiring Uttlesford District Council to separate the waste as they see necessary to meet their statutory obligations and fit in with their strategy.

Given the level of penalty stated previously, it is inevitable that Disposal Authorities will use the Power of Direction contained in the Waste and Emissions Trading Act 2003 to require WCAs to separate and recycle the biodegradable element of household waste they collect, thereby diverting it from landfill.

It has been stated by Essex County Council officers that the Power of Direction will be used only as a last resort to protect themselves against any financial penalties they may incur as a result of not meeting their LATS obligation. Essex County Council would prefer to work with the district authorities to ensure services are in place to meet the targets in the Landfill Directive.

The Animal By-Products Regulations 2003

The Animal By- Products Regulations require catering wastes sent for processing to be treated to set procedures and conditions that ensure all pathogens are reduced to an acceptable level of 10%. The principle impact on municipal waste management is that domestic kitchen waste, or waste that has been in direct contact with kitchen waste, is classed as catering waste and cannot be composted in open windrow conditions.

Landfill Tax & Recycling Credits

In October 1996, the Government introduced a new tax called the Landfill Tax. This is an additional environmental tax, which is paid on top of normal landfill rates by any company or local authority that wishes to dispose of waste through a landfill site. The landfill tax is collected through landfill operators and then paid as a tax to central Government.

The purpose of creating the landfill tax is to:

- Reduce the amount of rubbish disposed of at landfill sites through increasing the cost of landfill; and
- Increase the use of more sustainable waste management techniques such as recycling and composting.

The landfill tax rate for biodegradable waste has increased by £1 per tonne each year since its introduction, and now stands at £15 per tonne. From 2005/6, in a bid to further encourage the diversion of waste from landfill, the Government has introduced an annual escalator set at £3 per tonne each year until it reaches £35 per tonne.

WDAs are required to pass on their disposal savings to WCAs who have diverted waste from landfill in the form of a recycling credit. The current value of the recycling credit in Essex is £36.18 per tonne. This will rise at least by £3 per tonne each year, in line with the increase in the landfill tax.

WCAs rely on recycling credits to offset the additional costs incurred as a result of their recycling activities. In 2003/4, this Council received approximately £177,620 in recycling credits. Based on current costs, if the Council were to meet its 36% recycling target and recycle approximately 11,000 tonnes it would receive £356,000 per year in recycling credits. With the annual escalator this would increase by £21,000 per annum. Unlike income from the sale of materials that is affected by market fluctuation, this income is guaranteed.

However the Government has indicated that it is committed to a review of the recycling credit system.

Whilst Uttlesford District Council as a WCA benefits indirectly from the increase in landfill tax, the burden of it is borne by Essex County Council (the waste disposal authority) and the Essex council tax payer. In order to minimise the escalating disposal costs, support for waste minimisation initiatives is essential.

Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Directive

The Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Directive has been adopted and received Royal Assent in November 2003. It places an obligation on manufacturers to collect and recycle WEEE. One consequence of this is that Local Authorities may be required to provide (but not fund) facilities at Civic Amenity sites to receive these items from householders.

Producers Responsibility Obligations (Packaging Waste) Regulations 1997

These regulations set targets for those involved in the packaging industry chain, from raw material production, to retailing for the recovery and recycling of packaging waste. The regulations give substance to “Producer Responsibility” which is an extension of the Polluter Pays Principle, and is aimed at ensuring businesses take responsibility for the products they have placed on the market once those products have reached the end of their life.

4.1.2 Non-Legislative Drivers

External Funding

The Council has been successful in recent years in securing external funding from the Essex Environment Trust and from DEFRA both on its own and in partnership with other Essex authorities. As part of the latest round of DEFRA funding, the Council secured funding to cover the capital costs of the weekend recycling sites at Dunmow, Thaxted and Stansted; these started in April 2004. In addition, the Council secured the capital cost and the first year revenue cost for additional properties to be included in recycling services.

WRAP Communications Fund

In 2004, Uttlesford was awarded a total of £9,883 to support the marketing and promotion of the schemes funded under the national Waste Minimization and Recycling Fund (the DEFRA funding stated above).

Specifically, the WRAP fund was used to support the introduction of the Weekend Recycling Sites and the extension of the recycling round to current non-participants.

The grant was apportioned as follows:

TABLE 10: WRAP BUDGET PROFILE

Items	To be produced	Budget
3 banners to promote the 3 Weekend Recycling Sites	Apr-04	£462
12 A3 posters to promote the 3 Weekend Recycling Sites	Apr-04	£30
20,000 A5 pamphlets to be used whilst door knocking	Feb-05	£448
25,000 magnets to be used whilst door knocking	Jun-04	£4,906
Information leaflets - kerbside (partial funding of the 'Recycling in Uttlesford' booklet	Nov-04	£762
	Spend to date	£6,608
	Total Budget	£9,883
	Available Funds	£3,275

As shown in Table 10, banners and posters have been used to promote the Weekend Recycling Sites in Stansted, Thaxted and Dunmow. In addition, this service has been advertised in local press, on the UDC website and through Parish Councils.

The pamphlets and magnets will be used by a team of doorknockers in 2005, who will engage non-participating households face-to-face and leaflet participating households to thank them for their efforts. The revenue for the doorknockers is funded through ECC's share of the WRAP fund.

WASTE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMME

The Waste Management Document "Waste Not Want Not" written by DEFRA's Strategy Unit identified several action points and recommendations. Among these recommendations were the establishment of the Waste Implementation Programme (WIP).

WIP's main focus is to meet the legally binding targets set by the EU Landfill Directive for recycling/composting of BMW. WIP has eight main focus areas including local authority funding, local authority support, kerbside collections and waste awareness.

ESSEX PUBLIC SERVICE AGREEMENT (PSA)

The Government is trying to encourage local authorities to exceed their statutory recycling targets by offering additional payments through local public service agreements. The Essex PSA to which all Essex authorities have signed up to requires Essex authorities to meet a "stretch" collective recycling target of 30% by 2004/5. Uttlesford has stated that it will recycle 23% as a contribution to this target. If this target is met, which it is likely to be with the assistance of DEFRA funding received for 2004/5, the Council will receive a one-off performance reward.

DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR ESSEX, SOUTHEND AND THURROCK

As part of the development of the Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Essex, Southend and Thurrock, Essex authorities are exploring the possibility of letting an integrated contract or contracts and applying for Private Finance Initiative (PFI) funding to offset some of the cost of providing the disposal/recycling infra-structure. In order to qualify for PFI funding it is likely that a joint recycling rate in excess of 45% will be required. As the funding will only be available for capital expenditure, the County Council will benefit most from such funding but it may be that in order to secure this funding they will be prepared to give financial assistance to collection authorities to encourage higher levels of recycling.

Irrespective of whether or not this Council decides to be part of an integrated waste management contract for Essex, Essex County Council has made it clear that it will need all authorities to produce a service plan setting out how it intends to deal with the waste it collects and its anticipated recycling targets so that its contractor can

design and build waste management facilities that are sufficient for the needs of the County without being excessive.

PUBLIC DEMAND FOR EXTENSION OF RECYCLING SERVICES

There is an increasing expectation that the Council should be providing multi-material kerbside collections for recyclables. Unfavourable comparisons are often made with our neighbouring authorities that are operating more extensive kerbside recycling schemes, for example glass and green waste collections. The DEFRA Municipal Waste Management Survey 2002/3 found that 33% of households were served with kerbside collections for four or more materials.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT THREAT OF CAPPING AUTHORITIES WHO EXCEED PERMITTED SPENDING LEVELS

Whilst there is a strong expectation that recycling services are expanded to meet statutory recycling targets, there is also pressure on local authorities to contain growth in expenditure. Failure to do so could result in an authority's expenditure being capped. There is a need therefore to balance the requirement to extend recycling services with affordability and the impact that the growth of recycling services will have on the Council tax and other Council services.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AUDITS – COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (CPA)

In the section, "Does the Council help keep the locality clean" in the public open space diagnostic, the Council's performance was graded 'B' (low need to improve). Recycling, clean streets, free collection of 'end of life' vehicles and high customer satisfaction with waste collection and recycling services were identified as strengths. However, not meeting the governments recycling target of 24% for 2003/04 and having no plans in place to meet the governments target of 36% for 2005/06 as well as the high amounts of waste collected per person were identified as weaknesses.

The failure to meet statutory targets was identified as a risk to the Council in view of the fact that government is considering implementing financial penalties for non-achievement of targets.

5 HOW ARE WE GOING TO GET THERE?

There have been many changes in the drivers and priorities in the way we collect and treat waste. For example, 10 years ago, the priority would have been to identify adequate landfill capacity. More recently, attention has changed to increasing recycling, but now the focus is diverting and treating biodegradable waste from landfill. This is in order to comply with the diversion requirements of the EU landfill Directive and minimise the costs that would otherwise be incurred under LATS.

Currently most of our waste is landfilled and in order to meet these new directives we will have to follow the Waste Management Hierarchy.

5.1 Waste Management Hierarchy

This theoretical framework ranks waste management options in order of sustainability:

Reduce	The most effective environmental solution may be to reduce the amount of waste we generate. For example, by the provision of home compost units.
Re-Use	Some materials and products can be used again for either the same or different purpose.
Recycling	Materials can be used in the production process as secondary raw materials.
Recovery	If reduction, re-use or recycling is not possible, then we must gain value from the residual waste through energy recovery.
Disposal	If none of the previous options offer an appropriate solution, only then should the waste be disposed to landfill.

5.1.1 WASTE MINIMISATION

There is an established home-composting initiative that exists in Essex promoting the sale of subsidised home composters. The total number sold within Uttlesford was 7,341 at the end of 2003/04. Based on WRAP's assumption that a home composting unit diverts approximately 120kg/hhd/yr (provisional figure), this equates to a diversion of 880 tonnes of biodegradable waste (assuming all units are currently active). The waste that is diverted from landfill, identified above is not included in our recycling performance.

There is also an Essex wide 'Cloth Nappy Campaign', which was launched in 2000. The MEL waste analysis suggests that disposable nappies represent up to 3.9% of the residual waste stream. This Council will continue to promote and support the Campaign.

As stated earlier members place a high importance in support of waste minimisation initiatives and provision of services that encourage waste minimisation and prevention. Uttlesford District has in the past produced more waste than any other authority in Essex. During 2003/04 the Council managed to move up two places within the "Essex league", as can be seen in Table 1. However, we are still in the bottom quartile, producing 0.462 Kgms per head of population. In order to reach the top quartile in Essex, a value of 0.375 will need to be achieved. As a result, this Council will have to reduce the total amount of household waste collected annually by 6,032 tonnes. However, there are services currently provided that do not promote or encourage household waste minimisation or prevention that could be tackled. These are:

- 1) Free collection of bulky household waste.
- 2) Weekend skips for general waste.
- 3) Commercial waste collections.

Bulky Household Waste Collections

Uttlesford has a statutory obligation to collect bulky household waste but it may recover a reasonable charge for the collection of this waste. However, in the past, this Council has chosen to provide this service, as well as the general waste skips, free of charge. This is as a result of two main drivers. Firstly, the desire to protect the environment and character of the district by preventing or minimising fly-tipping and general abandonment of waste in the countryside. Secondly, this district has only one civic amenity site, whereas other Districts, of a similar size, have two or three sites. This under-provision has for the past twenty years been met by providing these services.

The provision of CA sites is the responsibility of ECC and their policy is that residents should be within a 6 mile radius of the nearest site (as the crow flies). As previously stated Uttlesford has only one CA site in the District, in Saffron Walden. ECC has long had plans to develop a CA site in the Great Dunmow area. The estimated completion for this site is July 2006. When operational, all Uttlesford residents should be within the required distance of a CA site if you include the sites at Bishop Stortford, Harlow and Chelmsford.

Once two CA sites have been established, the Council can review its policy on providing these services free of charge, particularly as householders will have a free alternative method of disposal. Table 11 illustrates the costs and restrictions applied to collections of bulky household waste by authorities in Essex.

TABLE 11: BENCH MARKING OF BULKY HOUSEHOLD WASTE COLLECTIONS

Bulky Household Waste Collections in Essex 2003/04

District	Price	Restriction on No. (up to....)	No. per year	No. properties (2002)	Collections per property
Harlow	None	3 large items or 8 bags	18,200	34019	0.535
Uttlesford	None	None	7,700	28,965	0.266
Basildon	None	5 items	19,000	72,095	0.264
Rochford	None	3 items, once per 3 months only	7,000	33,180	0.211
Brentwood	£12 min charge	For 2 items, £6 per item thereafter	3,000	30,182	0.099
Thurrock	£10.00, £17.50	3 & up to 10 respectively, >10 = quotable	5,153	61,018	0.084
Epping Forest	£22, £27, £37, £45	3, 7, 10, 15 items respectively	4,000	52,125	0.077
Chelmsford	£18.00	5 items, plus £12.10 for fridges, £24.20 for fix & fits	4,900	66,110	0.074
Braintree	£23.50	6 items	2,950	56,790	0.052
Southend	Individually priced	None	3,120	70,000	0.045
Maldon	£15 + VAT	3 items, contractor quotes, £23.50 if collect fridges	780	25,323	0.031
Castle Point	£25.00	5 items, free to OAP	1,000	35,461	0.028
Tendring	£16.50+VAT	3 items	1,645	63,751	0.026
Colchester	£21.54, £10.02, free	5 bulky items, up to two white goods items	1,300	66,403	0.020

UDC has provided this free service for a number of years and in 2003/04 there were over 9,000 collections carried out at a cost to this Council of £100,000 (this does not include the cost of administration of the service or the disposal cost to ECC).

Unfortunately, it is difficult to quantify the tonnage produced by this service, as the majority of it is collected co-mingled with domestic waste. An estimate would be from 650 to 1000 tonnes per year. The weight generated by this service has a direct impact on the total household waste collected and therefore the council's recycling rate.

Table 11 clearly shows that those authorities that charge for special collections have lower collection ratios per property. Therefore, these authorities are collecting less household waste in terms of weight. If this Council's policy is to charge for this service and reduce the total number of collections to approximately 2000, there will be a reduction in waste collected of up to 700 tonnes, creating a financial saving to UDC of approximately £80,000 in collection costs and £21,000 in disposal costs to ECC. In addition, if this waste was taken to the CA site, then 50% of the waste could be recycled.

A popular assumption is that the introduction of a bulky waste collection charge will result in increased fly-tipping across the District. However, in a response to a recent survey of Essex Authorities and the Daventry Group, little evidence was found to support this trend. This is shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12: CHANGES IN FLY TIPPING AS A RESULT OF CHARGING FOR BULKY COLLECTIONS.

Braintree	No substantial increase in fly tipping.
Tendering	Always charged no comment
Southend	Always charged no comment
Castle Point	No Information
Daventry	No noticeable increase
Hambleton	May have small increase nothing significant
Harbough	May have had a small increase when first introduced but not any more
Kennett	Has been a fee for 18 months caused increase in fly tipping to start no problem since new CA site opened
North Keveston	Carried out a survey before and after the introduction of a fee and found no increase in fly tipping
Bamburgh	No increase
Stratford	Fees in place for three years no increase in fly tipping
Tewsbury	Fees introduced 12 months ago, no increase.

It is clear from the benchmarking under taken that the introduction of charging for Bulky Waste Collections does not increase the amount of fly tipping within the district. In any case, if and when a charge is introduced, any changes in fly-tipping will be recorded on a national database, termed "Fly Capture".

It is recommended that a reasonable charge will be levied on each Bulky Household Waste collection. This charge will come into force when all residents are within a reasonable distance of a Civic Amenity Site.

In the interim, this Council will reduce the amount of household waste collected by introducing restrictions on the bulky waste collection service to:

- Restrict the number of items per collection.
- Restrict the number of collections per year.
- Restrict the items UDC collect. For example, kitchen and bathroom installations, sheds, greenhouses, radiators, boilers and carpets. Contractors usually install these items. Therefore, it should be the contractor's responsibility to dispose of their waste under the Duty of Care.

It is recommended that these restrictions come into effect from April 2005.

Weekend General Skips to Parishes for General Waste

There is no statutory requirement for this authority to provide this service. It has historically been provided due to the reasons stated previously. However, this service has grown rapidly over the years and the estimated tonnage produced was approximately 600-800 tonnes in 2003/04.

A recent problem has evolved where hazardous waste is being placed in the unsupervised containers. This action puts at risk the Council's Waste Carriers Licence. It is suspected that these skips are used by traders who are avoiding their Duty of Care. Also, a large proportion of the waste collected at weekends is green waste that could be recycled if it was taken to the CA sites. Due to these problems, this service will be fully supervised in 2005, the cost of which being borne by the Parish.

It is recommended that this service is withdrawn to those Parishes that are within a six-mile radius of a CA site, starting April 2005, and that the service will cease altogether when the CA site at Dunmow becomes operational.

Any savings made by this change should allow UDC to increase the spread and frequency of the green waste collection service. The effect of this would be to increase the amount we recycle and decrease the total amount of waste collected.

Commercial Waste Collections

There is no statutory requirement on this Council to collect commercial waste. However, under Section 45 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, if a request is made by the occupier of premises in the District to collect any commercial waste, this Council must make arrangements for this, either via in-house services or through a contractor.

It is inevitable that commercial waste will enter the domestic waste stream as a result of collecting commercial waste and household waste co-mingled. The effects of this will be to under estimate commercial waste tonnages and over estimate household tonnages. The disposal costs of commercial waste are charged to UDC by ECC on estimated tonnages. The charge for disposal was £117,156 for 2003/04.

Essex County Council will be reviewing its policies on commercial waste and could use its Powers of Direction to force this council to collect commercial waste separately.

As stated in Table 4 the estimated income generated by the collection of commercial waste for 2005 will be £456,000. The true costs of providing this service cannot be identified within the Council's estimates because it does not separate the administration, enforcement and overall management of this service.

It is recommended that a project team from financial services, Internal Audit and Environmental Services carry out an in depth review to identify whether this Council should continue to be a direct provider for Commercial Waste Collections.

To achieve this we need to make a full assessment of its financial performance and any other benefits we may gain from it and identify the impact on other Council services should it be withdrawn.

5.1.2 RE-USE

Uttlesford is lagging behind other Essex authorities in terms of achieving active diversion of waste through reuse. This is principally due to the fact there are very few recycling and reuse community groups present in the District and only one group, Shire Hill Enterprises, based in the District.

Despite this, it must be remembered that reuse as a principle is above recycling in the Waste Hierarchy, as stated in the Waste Strategy 2000. In theory, therefore, it should be given a higher priority by UDC than recycling. However, since the Government's emphasis has historically been on recycling, it has had very little emphasis.

The Drive for Reuse

Recently, the creation of reuse credits has been proposed by the Government. August 2004 saw the deadline for submissions to the ODPM consultation paper on reuse. This called for changes to the BVPI framework, specifically that of BV (X18) – 'the proportion of the total tonnage of household waste arisings that have been sent for reuse'. It is widely agreed that major benefits would be gained by thoroughly quantifying the currently unrewarded tonnages of material reused from household waste, civic amenity sites, and by community reuse organisations working in quality partnerships with local councils to divert bulky waste.

Although a response to this consultation has yet to be published, the Government has indicated that it is likely to adopt reuse credits.

In line with the awakening of the reuse concept, it is recommended that similarly, Uttlesford gives reuse due consideration. This can be facilitated with the aid of current infrastructure, principally through ECORRN.

ECORRN

The Essex Community Reuse & Recycling Network (ECORRN) was established following a meeting in March 2003 of over 60 representatives from Essex community reuse/recycling groups and the 15 local authorities in Essex. Assisted by the local WasteWISE project, it is now expanding in 2004 as a community business/limited company and through an Essex Reuse Partnership of social enterprises, community groups and councils committed to expanding reuse. This will focus on the effective quantifying and then diversion of reusable items from household bulky waste that is currently all landfilled. ECORRN has a current membership of over 35 community groups, a Management Committee (of which Uttlesford is currently a member), and has already assisted the significant expansion of local reuse projects including three major new schemes.

It is recommended that Uttlesford continue to support ECORRN in order to maintain contact with local reuse groups, charities, Local Authorities and other networks and their activities.

Present Reuse in East Anglia

At present, reuse occurs through an extensive network of charity shops and community group projects. A survey carried out by ECORRN, estimated that in 2003, these organisations diverted 8,180 tonnes and 1,160 tonnes, respectively.

Within Uttlesford, the principle organisations that reuse and recycle household waste are as follows:

- St. Clare's Hospice: based in Harlow, but has charity shops in Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow. In addition, St. Clare's has two vehicles enabling the household collection of furniture, textiles and bric-a-brac (no electrical items) from the District. These are then delivered to the warehouse in Harlow where they are sold.
- CROFT (Chelmsford Recycling Furniture Project & Task Force) collects household furniture from residents in the southern end of Uttlesford.
- Emmaus Cambridge collects white goods, furniture and bric-a-brac from the Saffron Walden vicinity and to the south.
- Cambridge SOFA
- Shire Hill Enterprises in Saffron Walden employs volunteers with learning difficulties teaching them valuable skills. The group accepts timber that is made into useful products and sold. The group also collects aluminium cans, foil, printer/ toner cartridges and mobile phones for recycling.

Should an organisation such as those listed above be able to adopt bulky waste collections, there is potential to divert the majority of the 650-1000 tonnes/ year, estimated to be landfilled through the special collection service.

Case studies exist in East Anglia where such agreements are already in place.

Peterborough City Council (unitary authority). Recycling rate 13.3%; Composting rate 12.4%; Households 68,000. Project start date: November 2004.

The Peterborough Electrical Appliance Recycling Partnership (PEARP) is an affiliation between Peterborough City Council and COMPASS and allows for the collection of white goods and IT units. COMPASS also provides training skills for the long term unemployed who train for recognised NVQs. This scheme employs 4 or 5 full time staff, with remainder being volunteers under the COMPASS system.

RESTORE an additional part of COMPASS directly collect furniture for reuse. Calls for special collections received into Peterborough CC's office are assessed as to whether the goods are suitable for reuse. If so, the relevant group cherry picks the items prior to the refuse collection. If an item is deemed unsuitable upon collection, a bulky waste form is left for the resident to fill in.

This project was made possible when Peterborough CC secured European funding from Urban 2, part of the second round of the urban regeneration funding from the EU. This financed a building and its refurbishment as an Appliance Reuse and Recycling Centre (ARRC). Funding was also secured from DEFRA and private companies such as Hewlett Packard. As a result, the scheme is paying for itself, with only minimal input from the council budget.

Braintree District Council Recycling rate 17.1%; Composting rate 4.1%; Households 56,800.

BRAINTREE DC/ FARLEIGH HOSPICE DETAILS TO FOLLOW

Farleigh Hospice –

Workskills has funding for training in electricals processing (washing machines, fridges and cookers) and establish one processing centre and provides training. Over £200k – looking for 5 or 6 projects around the County to provide the training. Ring Miles Cooper

EXDRA is the funding for it – under the European Social Fund 4b

A Framework for Diverting Household Waste for Reuse

Effective diversion of household waste for reuse is achieved through an integrated approach similar to holistic waste management. That is to combine the following procedures:

1. Ensure all householders have knowledge of local companies who have the facility to reuse their 'waste'. This means the householder can dispose of their 'waste' responsibly independent of the Council. This has already been achieved through the 'Recycling in Uttlesford' booklet 2005.
2. Ensure that front-line services at the Council are fully aware of local company details so the public can easily be diverted to the appropriate reuse business when an incoming call is made. This can easily be achieved by giving training to relevant staff.
3. Aim to enter into partnership with a contractor/ community group to adopt the special collection service and subsequently sort for reuse.

Future Reuse in Uttlesford

The final point above will achieve significant results, but requires careful consideration in how it is adopted.

It is possible for the present refuse contract to be amended to allow a local community group to adopt the special collection service. However, since the contract with Verdant expires in July 2006, it seems appropriate to include the reuse of bulky waste in the new contract specification. Alternatively, if a suitable community group can be found, the service could be sub-contracted or excluded from the contract entirely and adopted by a community group externally. However, the former option is favourable since it allows for sharing of resources between the contractor and community group; for example, vehicles and depot space.

It is recommended that the feasibility of contracting a community group directly, such as St. Clare's Hospice, be investigated in 2005. Should no appropriate group be found, it is recommended to include in the new contract specification, a provision for the diversion of household waste from landfill for reuse, particularly bulky waste.

5.1.3 RECYCLING

Table 3 shows the composition of the residual waste stream subsequent to current recycling efforts. It shows that 67.46% of the waste stream is recyclable (16,528 tonnes). Using Uttlesford's 2003/04 figures as a baseline, Table 13 below shows the recycling rate that could theoretically be achieved if all these waste types were targeted. Its principle assumptions are an optimum participation rate of 80% and capture rate of 90%, no incremental increase in recycling rate year on year and targeting 100% of households.

TABLE 13: THEORETICAL RECYCLING RATES TARGETING 100% OF HOUSEHOLDS AND OPTIMUM PARTICIPATION AND CAPTURE RATES.

Material	Origin	Recycling rate contribution based on current performance (2003/04)	Recycling rate contribution assuming participation and capture rates (80% participation, 90% capture rate kerbside)
Kitchen Waste	Kerbside	0.08% (27)	18.38% (5862)
Paper and card	Kerbside	12.01% (3832)	19.40% (6189)
Paper	Bring sites	1.47% (468)	1.47% (468)
Green waste	Village sites and weekend skips	-	2.19% (700)
Mixed glass	Kerbside	-	3.97% (1266)
Glass	Bring sites	4.11% (1310)	4.11% (1310)
Cans	Kerbside	0.25% (79)	1.09% (348)
Cans	Bring sites	0.05% (15)	0.05% (15)
Textiles and books	Bring sites	0.43% (138)	0.90% (288)
Textiles	Kerbside	0.15% (47)	1.67% (532)
White goods	Special Collections	0.36% (115)	0.36% (115)
Scrap metal	Various	0.16% (51)	0.16% (51)
Plastics	Kerbside	0.29% (91)	1.66% (529)
Plastics	Bring sites	0.05% (17)	0.05% (17)
Other		0.05% (16)	0.05% (16)
TOTAL		19.46% (6,206)	55.51% (17,706)

DESIGNING NEW WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES TO MEET THE COUNCIL'S STATUTORY RECYCLING TARGETS

This section considers how the Council could meet its statutory recycling target of 36% in line with the Joint Waste Strategy for Essex by 2008 and to reduce the amount of biodegradable waste taken to landfill.

PROPOSED RECYCLING SERVICES

It is inefficient, uneconomic and unrealistic to target all materials in the residual waste stream to 100% of properties within the Uttlesford District.

It is recommended that this Council continue to target dry recyclables from as many properties as possible and to introduce the collection of biodegradable waste from the main townships of Saffron Walden, Newport, Stansted, Takeley, Dunmow and Thaxted (approximately 18,000 properties).

It is recommended that a kerbside glass collection be introduced to all properties on the recycling round.

This is in response to public demand and the fact that glass is the only major dry recyclable material not targeted at the kerbside.

It is recommended that this Council continue to fund the weekend recycling centres at Dunmow, Thaxted and Stansted and that Thaxted and Stansted change from fortnightly to weekly services.

It is recommended that any revenue saved as a result of any changes to current services be used to increase the spread and frequency of green waste collections to as many Parishes as possible.

It is predicted that the combination of these collections will yield an additional 4,780 tonnes of recyclable material. This will elevate the recycling rate to over 36%, which exceeds Uttlesford's statutory recycling rate and meets the requirement of the Joint Waste Management Strategy for Essex and reduce the amount of biodegradable waste to landfill.

TABLE 14: PROPOSED RECYCLING SERVICES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE STATUTORY RECYCLING RATES OF 36%

Material	Origin	Recycling rate contribution based on current performance (2003/04)		Recycling rate contribution of additional recycling services assuming optimum participation and capture rates (80% participation, 90% capture rate kerbside)	
Kitchen Waste	Kerbside	0.08%	27	11.03%	3517
Paper and card	Kerbside	12.01%	3832		
Paper	Bring sites	1.47%	468		
Green waste	Village sites and weekend skips	-	-	2.19	700
Mixed glass	Kerbside	-	-	3.97%	1266
Glass	Bring sites	4.11%	1310		
Cans	Kerbside	0.25%	79		
Cans	Bring sites	0.05%	15		
Textiles and books	Bring sites	0.43%	138		
Textiles	Kerbside	0.15%	47		
White goods	Special Collections	0.36%	115		
Scrap metal	Assorted sources	0.16%	51		
Plastics	Kerbside	0.29%	91		
Plastics	Bring sites	0.05%	17		
Other	-	0.05%	16		
SUB TOTAL		19.46%	6206	16.19%	5483
TOTAL			36.65%		11689 tonnes

ASSUMPTIONS

In exploring the various recycling options and calculating projected recycling rates, a number of assumptions have been made. These are:

- The Member steer as set out in Section 2 remains unchanged.
- No annual growth rate.
- Calculations are based on 23,140 tonnes of residual household waste collected kerbside during 2003/04 (Uttlesford waste analysis) and the total tonnage of household waste actually collected in 2003/04 31,898 tonnes, to estimate recycling percentages.
- Recycling services are carried out on a fortnightly basis.
- An average participation rate, for the proposed additional services, of 80% across the District and an average capture rate of 90% is achieved.

- Targeting flats for the proposed new services is essential to reach the participation rates required.
- Participation and capture rates for current services remain the same.
- Kitchen waste collection occurs to approximately 18,000 properties.
- No collection of green waste co-mingled with the kitchen waste. Should the householder choose to fill any available void space in their wheelie bin with green waste, which is acceptable, the recycling rate will be further elevated by an unquantifiable amount.
- The introduction of kerbside collection of glass.
- Weekend recycling sites continue and the Thaxted and Stansted service change to a weekly service.

WASTE STREAMS TARGETED IN PROPOSED KERBSIDE RECYCLING SERVICE

Kitchen Waste

Based on the Uttlesford waste analysis, it would be prudent to target kitchen waste, which accounts for 35.19% (8142 tonnes) of the residual waste stream. This service provided to approximately 18,000 properties at 80% participation and 90% capture rate will deliver 3,517 tonnes, which equates to an additional 11% to our current recycling rate.

As previously stated, Enviro will produce a LATS strategy by March 2005, which will detail a plan of action to divert biodegradable waste from landfill.

It is recommended that no plans for the collection of kitchen waste be implemented until the results of the LATS strategy are published.

Glass

The recycling element of glass bottles and jars are estimated to account for 7.6% of the domestic waste stream. This equates 1,758 tonnes.

Assuming a participation rate of 80% and a capture rate of 90%, the kerbside collection of glass will yield an additional 3.97% to the recycling rate.

Glass bottles and jars already contribute 4.11% to the Council's annual recycling rate, which equates to 1310 tonnes of glass collected from the network of bring sites across the District. Experience elsewhere shows that despite the introduction of kerbside schemes, usage of bring sites remains high.

Based on optimum participation and capture rates, the recycling contribution for glass could be increased to **8.08%**.

OTHER RESIDUAL WASTE STREAM MATERIALS

The following section highlights the possibilities of achieving higher recycling rates than those proposed in Table 14. Since these materials are already collected under

UDC's current recycling services, this can only be achieved by optimising participation and capture rate through publicity, education and enforcement.

Newspaper and Card

The recycling element of newspaper and card account for 14.15% of the waste stream. This equates to 3,274 tonnes. The total amount of newspaper and card (kerbside and banks) collected in Uttlesford during 2003/4 was 3271 tonnes.

The Council already has an established fortnightly kerbside collection service in place. A network of paper recycling banks provided throughout the District by the Council complements the kerbside collection service.

The paper collected from the kerbside contributes 8.78% to the Council's annual recycling rate. Paper collected through bring sites contributes a further 1.47%. Paper therefore accounts for an annual total contribution of 10.25%
Cardboard collection contributes 0.35%.

Based on an optimum participation rate of 80% and capture rate of 90%, the recycling contribution could be increased to **17.99%**.

Garden waste

Garden waste accounts for only 5.05% of the waste stream. This equates to 1,610 tonnes.

It is the Council's policy not to provide a "free" kerbside garden waste collection service. The provision of such a service increases the overall amount of waste collected by the Council and has the effect of generating waste. It is the Council's policy to encourage home composting wherever possible which is the most environmentally sound method of disposing of garden waste. The Council will continue to promote the subsidised compost bins provided through the Essex County Council contract.

The Council recognises its statutory duty to provide a kerbside collection service for garden waste (for which it can make a charge) and supplies special green sacks (current cost £1.00 each and 50 pence to OAP's and disabled persons). Waste collected from these sacks is collected with the residual waste and taken to landfill.

The village green waste collection service is an established and popular scheme. This and the addition of the weekend recycling generate approximately 700 tonnes per year for composting. This contributes **2.19%** to the Council's annual recycling rate.

Ferrous and Non Ferrous Metal

The Council currently collects cans from a network of recycling banks across the district. Whilst the value of cans collected is high, the actual tonnage collected is low. In 2003/4, a total of 18 tonnes were collected. This equates to a **0.1%** contribution to the Council's annual recycling rate.

The Council currently collects cans co-mingled within the green box recycling services but it is not possible to establish accurate statistics for this material as a separate item.

Capture rates for cans tend to be lower than for other materials as the public find it inconvenient to wash cans, particularly pet food tins which they tend to put in the general refuse instead.

Plastics

Plastics are collected co-mingled at the kerbside with cans and card. Therefore, there are no statistics on plastics alone.

Plastics are also collected at a number of recycling centres throughout the district. During the year 2003/04 we collected 15.4 tonnes, which contributes **0.05%** to the Council's annual recycling rate.

Textiles

Textiles account for 2.11% of the waste stream.

There is a network of textile banks across the district that contributes **0.6%** to the annual recycling rate.

It is recommended that the Council look to increase the number of textile recycling banks supplied at the recycling sites.

Experience both in this district and elsewhere is that yield from a regular kerbside collection service is poor. It is not therefore proposed to pursue this option at this time. In any case, if a kerbside collection of glass (in the green box) is implemented within the single pass system, or otherwise, kerbside textile collection will have to be withdrawn because Health and Safety issues prohibit the collection of glass and textiles within the same container.

As an alternative, it may be possible to collect textiles from the kerbside on an ad hoc basis for example once every six months. The Council will also encourage charities such as Oxfam or the Salvation Army to carry out kerbside collections and may pass on recycling credits if appropriate.

Green Box

The Council has a fortnightly collection from the kerbside of cans, plastics, card and textiles co-mingled in the green box.

The contents of the Green Box contribute **3.72%**, which equates to 1186.78 tonnes.

The plastics identified as recyclable in the Uttlesford waste analysis is 5.48%, which equates 1267 tonnes.

Assuming participation rate of 60% and capture rate of 80%, the collection of additional plastic will yield an additional 1.91% to the recycling rate. If the

participation rate were to be increased to an optimum participation of 80% and capture rate of 90%, the recycling rate contribution would be increased to **2.86%**.

Optimisation of Participation and Capture Rates

The provision of an efficient and reliable collection service is fundamental to optimising user participation in recycling schemes.

The promotion of existing recycling schemes needs to be reinforced on an on-going basis to maintain and encourage higher usage. It is reasonable to expect improvements to participation and capture rates as schemes become established and public awareness of waste issues increases.

Other authorities have tried to optimise recycling schemes by introducing some form of compulsion. For example, limiting the amount of refuse that will be collected (e.g. number of sacks, no side waste on wheeled bin collections, etc) or by providing fortnightly refuse collections. In both cases people are effectively forced to recycle. Such schemes can alienate the public and can be difficult and costly to enforce.

It is this Council's policy to work with the community to improve recycling rates. The Council wishes to continue to educate and work with the local community and the introduction of some form of compulsion will only be considered as a last resort. Moreover, the public are only likely to accept compulsory recycling schemes where effective and efficient recycling services are in place.

A more positive way to optimise recycling activities would be to introduce weekly kerbside recycling collections. This will help to get people "in the recycling habit". With fortnightly collections, many people get confused as to when their recycling is to be collected, particularly following holiday periods and will therefore not recycle. A lot of officer time is spent informing people of when their recycling collections will be made.

Weekly kerbside recycling collections will also improve capture rates. This is because with the fortnightly service once their designated container is full, some residents tend to stop recycling until it has been emptied. Weekly collections will in effective double their capacity to recycle and encourage those people who do recycle, to recycle all of the time. There are clear benefits in providing weekly kerbside recycling services but obviously the benefits will need to be weighed against the cost of providing such services.

Research suggests that weekly collections for recyclables can increase the amount of material collected kerbside by up to 30%.

Weekly collections of recyclable material will be introduced as part of the new contract and the implementation of a Single Pass System.

How successful the Council is in optimising participation and capture rates, will determine what additional recycling schemes will be required if the Council is to meet its statutory recycling targets.

Refurbishment of Recycling Sites

In early 2004, a recycling site inspection was carried out in order to optimise their location, appearance, range of recyclates, signage and availability, in line with the Corporate Plan, Section P2.3.

5.1.4 RECOVERY

If reduction or re-use is not possible the next best thing is to gain as much value from the waste as possible through energy recovery. This will be dependant on the treatment process chosen by Essex County Council under the Essex Waste Management Contract. This item will follow on completion of the Procurement Phase of the Joint Contract.

6.0 FUTURE WASTE MANAGEMENT CONTRACTS

Key Dates

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Uttlesford's Refuse Collection Contract Ends | July 2006. |
| 2. Minimum of 5 Years for any Future Refuse and Recycling Contract | July 2011 |
| 3. Uttlesford's Recycling Contract | No End Date |
| 4. Essex Procurement Process Ends | July 2007 |

6.1 Essex Waste Management Contract

Essex has for some time been looking at the possibility of having a joint contract for the collection *and* disposal of all municipal waste generated in Essex. In 2002 all of the authorities joined together to form a Waste Management Advisory Board. (WMAB) where each authority is represented by its cabinet member or committee representative with responsibility for waste management. This non-executive group has steered the development of a strategy, which could deliver a joint Municipal Waste Management Contract.

In 2003 it was decided by the WMAB that Essex should be divided into three contract areas East, West and Thames Gateway Areas.

1. East. Colchester, Chelmsford, Tending, Malden
2. West. Braintree, Epping, Harlow, Brentwood and Uttlesford
3. Thames Gateway. Basildon, Castle Point, Rochford, Southend and Thurrock.

These area groups have been regularly meeting to discuss and pursue the possibility of a joint contract: the key areas of discussion have been:

- Agreed levels of recycling
- Vertical and horizontal working arrangements
- A Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy
- The formation of a Joint Committee
- A draft Constitution for the Joint Committee
- PFI funding for the Essex Contract
- Waste Analysis by District, Area and Essex as a whole
- System Integration and Service Plans

- Draft Communications Plan

In December of 2004 this Council agreed the following recommendation from the WMAB regarding Uttlesfords participation in the long-term arrangements for the management of Municipal Solid Waste across Essex:

Recommend that:

1. The draft Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy is adopted.
 - a) Uttlesford District Council will enter into the joint procurement process for long term waste management solutions, with a view to utilising PFI credits to support 3 area contracts.
 - b) The Council agrees that, subject to satisfactory contract outcome, contractual integration of some or all of the relevant services is envisaged.

Relevant services for these purposes may be regarded as Refuse and Recycling.
 - c) The establishment of an Area Joint Committee to be agreed, to manage the procurement process.
 - d). The authority agrees the financial contribution to the procurement process, as previously advised.
 - e). The draft Communications Plan be agreed.

The procurement process will provide an opportunity for partner authorities to evaluate and determine opportunities for future collaborative working and assess financial savings that might accrue through the possible increase in efficiency and improved optimisation of collection resources.

The procurement process for the long term Essex contract will be finalised in July 2007.

6.2 Uttlesford's Refuse and Recycling Contract 2006-2011

Uttlesford's refuse collection services have been carried out by the Private sector for the past 14 years. The current contract expires in July 2006 having already been extended by the maximum allowed in the contract conditions.

In June 2004 this Council agreed in principle to the transfer of the Recycling services and the employees to, Verdant, the current contractor for refuse collection and to extend the Refuse Contract by a further two years. Having both of these services under one management team would enable a single pass system to be introduced earlier than originally expected.

Negotiations to bring about a successful transfer of these services and employees has been explored but found to be unworkable.

As a result this will leave a need to bridge the gap between the end of the current contract in July 2006 and the earliest start of the proposed Essex contract in July 2007. In addition, the Council's vision of having a single pass system cannot be implemented until the refuse and recycling contracts are combined.

A full report will be taken to the Environment Committee in January 2005 with the recommendation to authorise officers to initiate the procurement process for a combined Refuse and Recycling contract, for Uttlesford, to achieve a start date of July 2006 for a period of 5 years to 2011.

It is recommended to introduce a single pass collection service of all household waste under the terms of the new contract.

The table below sets out in detail the timetable of events required to successfully complete the procurement process by July 2006.

TABLE 15: EU PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE

<u>OJEU NOTICE</u>		BY 1 September 2005
CLOSE OF EXPRESSION OF INTERESTED PARTIES	AT LEAST 37 CLEAR DAYS	10 October 2005
SEND OUT PRE QUALIFYING QUESTIONNAIRE (PQQ)		11 OCTOBER 2005
PQQ TO BE RETURNED		14 NOVEMBER 2005
PRELIMINARY SCREENING		21 NOVEMBER 2005
TAKE UP REFERENCES		28 NOVEMBER 2005
INVITATION TO TENDER	MUST INVITE AT LEAST FIVE	4 JANUARY 2006
DEADLINE FOR RAISING QUERIES		3 FEBRUARY 2006
DESPATCH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	MUST LEAVE 6 DAYS BEFORE RETURN OF BIDS	10 FEBRUARY 2006
RETURN OF BIDS	MUST BE AT LEAST 40 CLEAR DAYS FROM ITT	21 FEBRUARY 2006
APPLICATION LOG SHEET		21 FEBRUARY 2006
EVALUATION – FINAL SELECTION		19 MARCH 2006
COMMITTEE DECISION??		WHENEVER THE NEXT COMMITTEE WILL BE – BY END OF MARCH
NOTIFY OF INTENDED AWARD		DAY AFTER COMMITTEE
NOTIFY FAILED BIDDERS		1 WEEK LATER
START OF CONTRACT LEAD IN TIME		1 ST MAY 2006
CONTRACT START DATE		1 AUGUST 2006

The Contract Specification should be drawn up prior to advertising in the OJEU notice. This Waste Management Strategy will form the basis of the specification and any decisions regarding the service provision will need to be made by Spring 2005.

It is recommended that Consultants be engaged and a Project Team appointed to oversee the procurement period.

Their aim will be to carry out soft market testing, drawing up contract specifications and evaluation criteria and eventual recommendations to the Council of the award of contract.

7 WASTE EDUCATION AND AWARENESS STRATEGY

Waste Education and Awareness in Uttlesford has historically been on an ad hoc basis. That is, any new recycling event or activity was marketed beforehand on a solo basis. The improvement in recycling performance in recent years has been due to the influx of new housing into the District and increased participation through the provision of boxes for kerbside collections. The introduction of the Weekend Recycling Service in April 2004 has contributed, but lacking a fully integrated, proactive and thorough Waste Education and Awareness Programme, Uttlesford's recycling rate has yet to be optimised. With the impending strategic changes due in 2006, a Strategy of this calibre is essential to further increase participation and capture rates.

INTRODUCTION

The Council recognises the need to reform its waste education and awareness activities if it is going to be successful in changing people's attitude to waste and how they deal with the waste they produce.

Optimisation of participation and capture rates will require a major change in how people handle their waste and without the provision of a high quality, reliable collection service backed up by a sustained educational programme this will not be achieved.

VISION

A community that understands the importance of sustainable waste management and that is committed in the first instance to waste minimisation, and then to the re-use and recycling of the waste that it produces.

OBJECTIVES

- To increase community waste awareness
- To reduce the amount of household waste produced in the District
- To reduce the amount of waste taken to landfill
- To encourage and support re-use initiatives
- To promote the recycling services provided by the Council and others in the Uttlesford district.
- To achieve increased participation in recycling schemes provided by the Council and private enterprises.
- To gather information about preferred collection schemes in order to assist the Council in the development of future waste collection arrangements.

TARGET AUDIENCE

Residents and workers in the Uttlesford District, but in particular householders, school children and local families.

METHODOLOGY

An on-going, sustained education campaign, which will consist of the following:

1. Provision of information to residents twice a year by way of the 'Uttlesford Life' magazine and the annual 'Recycling in Uttlesford' booklet. Further information provision by supplying notice boards to all recycling sites, in line with recommendations made in the 'Recycling Site Audit', specified under Section P2.1 of the UDC Quality of Life Corporate Plan, 2003-2007.
2. Liaison with Parish/Town Council's in terms of advertising current and future service provision and supplying 'Recycling in Uttlesford' booklets locally.
3. Waste education workshops, targeting primary schools principally, but also other community groups in Uttlesford such as Womens Institutes.
4. Creation of a 'Sustainability Roadshow' to advertise responsible waste management (as well as promotion of water and energy efficiency) to include four local events per year on a rotation at Stansted, Thaxted, Dunmow and Saffron Walden.
5. Targeted campaigns (with other Agencies or Council departments where appropriate), such as the Anglia Regions Waste Awareness Campaign (ARWAC).
6. Bi-annual customer surveys to gauge householder's satisfaction with local services and to provide feedback.
7. Ongoing use of the local media to promote new and existing facilities and Council achievements.
8. Comprehensive information provision on the Council's website.
9. Support the national waste awareness campaign, Recycle Now, and the regional awareness campaign, Don't Rubbish Essex.
10. Support the Essex Community Reuse and Recycling Network (ECORRN) in its bid to increase community reuse in Essex.

FUNDING

The Council acknowledges the need for on-going waste education and promotional campaigns and will continue to provide financial assistance for such activities. However, it will seek to secure in partnership where appropriate, additional external funding wherever possible to enhance its promotional and educational activities. To

that end the council along with other Essex authorities has been successful in obtaining funding from the Waste Resources Action Programme to promote schemes funded via DEFRA. Similarly, under future circumstances, the Council will look for private sponsorship of 'large-scale' promotional activities such as the production of the annual 'Recycling in Uttlesford' booklet.

REVIEW OF STRATEGY

The effectiveness of the Council's waste education strategy will be monitored on an on-going basis. Such monitoring shall take account of the following:

- Trends in the amount of waste collected
- The amount of waste diverted from landfill
- The cost of the waste collection service
- Results of any waste analysis
- Any available benchmarking information, e.g. National Performance Indicators, Local Performance Indicators
- Feedback from the public and the results of customer surveys
- Participation and set out rates for kerbside collection schemes
- Feedback from our Contractors (Street Cleansing, Refuse/Recycling and Animal Warden)

8 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The tables below gives estimated costs, (of the main heads) for the introduction of stand-alone services for kerbside collections of kitchen waste and glass bottles and jars. If these services are introduced as part of a new waste management contract and the contractor is allowed flexibility in providing the services within the contract then these costs will be reduced.

TABLE 16: ESTIMATES FOR THE MAIN HEADS IN IMPLIMENTING KERBSIDE COLLECTION OF KITCHEN WASTE FROM 18,000 PROPERTIES.

Headings	Income	Cost Implications	
		Capital (£)	Revenue (£)
Recycling Credit	109,378		
Disposal Costs			105,510
Vehicles (4)		520,000	
Wheelie Bins 18,000		360,000	
Drivers (5)			95,500
Loaders (6)			81,714
Supervisor			25,000
Fuel			30,000
Insurance			3,000
Vehicle Maintenance			30,000
Total	109,378	880,000	345,724

The estimates above are based on collection of kitchen waste only in a wheelie bin. Therefore, any green waste collected as a result of the householder filling any available void space, will have a financial impact on both the income and disposal cost.

TABLE 17: ESTIMATES FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF KERBSIDE COLLECTION OF GLASS

Headings	Cost Implications		
	Income	Expenses	
	(£)	Capital (£)	Revenue (£)
Recycling Credits	39,246		
Income from sale of Glass	12,660		
Disposal Costs			
Supply of Bags			80,000
One Additional Vehicle		125,000	
Two Additional Drivers			38,200
Two Additional Loaders.			27,238
Supervisor			25,000
Administration Assistant.			10,000
Fuel			10,000
Insurance			1,000
Vehicle Maintenance			10,000
TOTAL	51,906	125,000	191,438

9 WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Policy and Services	Implementation date	Budget implications	Comments
Introduce Boundary Collections for all waste related services before new contract start date	By Winter 2005	There will only be publicity budget implications	This will make a reduction in the price of any new contract
Introduce assisted collections for all waste related services	By Winter 2005	There will only be publicity budget implications	Clear pre-prepared acceptance criteria are required before implementation
Adopt a Council Policy on Waste Presentation: refuse bags only	Spring 2005	There will only be publicity budget implications	This will reduce the risk of Health and Safety implications. Clear guidance from members is required on waste that is not presented in the proper method
Continue the Weekend Recycling Sites and increase the frequency of the Stansted and Thaxted sites to a weekly service	April 2005	Additional cost of £17,000 pa for increased frequency	This will increase the Council's recycling rate and potentially divert the waste from the Parish CA skips into the recycling stream
Improvement and extension of Uttlesford's recycling sites	April 2005	£20,000 (already exists in UDC budget).	Implement recommendations as stated in the 'Bring Site Report' (to be published by March 2005), to include increasing the number of textile sites
Introduce a Charge for all Bulky Household Waste Collections	When CA site at Dunmow is Operational (Autumn 2006)	Savings of around £80,000. This could generate an income of £40,000 (2000 collections at £20).	This charge will reduce the total amount of waste collected. If all waste is taken to CA sites 50% could be recycled. Will help to increase recycling rate
Introduce restrictions on Bulky Household waste Collections	April 2005	This could generate savings of around	Clear Guidance from Members is required on what restrictions should be applied. This will reduce

Policy and Services	Implementation date	Budget implications	Comments
		£10,000 (estimated – should not be used for budgetary purposes)	the total amount of waste collected
Withdraw weekend CA skips from Parishes that are within a reasonable distance of a CA site	April 2005	Could generate possible savings	Will reduce the total amount of waste collected and help increase the recycling rate. Any possible savings could be used to increase the spread and frequency of green waste collections to the Parishes
Cease weekend CA skips altogether	When CA site at Dunmow is operational (Autumn 2006)	Will generate savings	Will reduce the total amount of waste collected and help increase the recycling rate. Any possible savings could be used to increase the spread and frequency of green waste collections to the Parishes
Carry out a comprehensive review of the Commercial Waste Collection Service	Start date mid January 2006 with a report to members in April 2006	Await outcome of review	
Introduce fortnightly kerbside glass	Earliest implementation, August 2005 (assume Waste Strategy agreed April 2005 and vehicle procurement period of 3 months)	See Table 17	If this is introduced prior to any new contract the DSO will require an additional vehicle (due to an average increase of over 2.5 tonnes/ round/ day) and 4 additional operatives (this will take the number of operatives working on recycling rounds to 16). To supplement this, a management structure is required capable of delivering these services. This change will require a review of collection methods, from boxes to bags

Policy and Services	Implementation date	Budget implications	Comments
Weekly Kerbside collection of kitchen waste from approximately 18,000 properties Special Attention needs to be given to flats in order to achieve participation rates	No decisions should be made until ENVIROS publish the LATS Strategy for Essex, 31 March 2005	See table 16	4 additional vehicles, with lifting equipment, will be required if this additional service is implemented before the start of a new contract in 2006. An additional management structure will be required from the DSO or Verdant if this is introduced prior to any new contract.
Uttlesford's Refuse and Recycling Contract 2006-2011	March 2005	£30,000	Employ a consultant and establish a Project Team for the duration of the procurement process
Contractual Integration with Essex Waste Management Contract	July 2011	Unknown	Will be dependant on Successful outcome of tender process (January 2007)
Introduce a Single Pass System to all properties in the District to maximise participation and capture rates	To be introduced under with the new contract specification in 2006	Bags Revenue £75,000 + delivery charges. Will be subject to the market at time of tender. Shift from fortnightly to weekly collections will incur significant cost	Timetable for implementation will be considered at time of tender evaluation for new contract. This will require a change in collection methods from boxes to bags
Reuse of suitable household waste	To be introduced under with the new contract specification in 2006	Unknown	A method statement will be required within the new contract. This will form part of the evaluation criteria for awarding the contract
High profile education and awareness campaign	On-going	Within existing budget	Aim is to encourage waste minimisation/re-use and to optimise participation and capture rates to secure best possible recycling rate for the recycling services provided by the Council

Calculation of projected recycling rates

Paper and Card

Paper and Card are estimated to account for approximately 14.15% left in the domestic waste stream.

The table below summarises the likely additional recycling rates from the kerbside collection of paper and card that could be achieved assuming a participation rate of 60% and 80% capture rate, and the optimum recycling rate that could be achieved, according to the Uttlesford waste analysis.

Material	% of waste stream	Tonnes/yr	Projected Performance based on 60% participation, 80% capture	Projected Performance based on 80% participation, 90% capture
Paper and Card	14.15			
Total tonnes/yr		3274	1572	2357
Recycling rate contribution		10.26%	5.0%	7.39%

Material yields from the collection of Paper and Card from kerbside and bring sites 2003/04.

Material	Tonnes	Current performance	
Paper Kerbside		2802.32 tonnes (8.79%)	
Bring sites		468.27tonnes (1.47%)	
Card		112 tonnes (0.35%)	
Total tonnes /year		3382.59	
Recycling rate contribution		10.60%	

Mixed Glass Bottles and Jars

Glass bottles and jars are estimated to account for approximately 7.70% of the domestic waste stream.

The table below summarises the likely recycling rates from the kerbside collection of glass that could be achieved assuming a participation rate of 60% and 80% capture rate, and the optimum recycling rate that could be achieved based on 80% participation and a capture rate of 90%, according to the Uttlesford waste analysis.

Material	% of waste stream	Tonnes/yr	Projected Performance based on 60% participation, 80% capture	Projected Performance Based on 80% participation, 90% capture
Mixed glass	7.60%			
Total tonnes/yr		1759	843	1266
Recycling rate contribution		5.51%	2.65%	3.97%

In addition the Council currently collects 1310 tonnes a year from bring sites this contributes 4.11% to the annual recycling rate. Based on the optimum recycling rate at 80% participation and 90% capture rate, the recycling rate for glass and jars could be increased to 8.08%

Ferrous and Non Ferrous

Material	% of waste stream	Tonnes in waste stream	Predicted Performance based on 60% participation, 70% capture	Predicted Performance based on 80% participation, 70% capture
Ferrous and non Ferrous	3.57	826	347	463
Recycling rate contribution			1.08%	1.45%

I

Plastics.

Material	% of waste stream	Tonnes in waste stream	Projected Performance based on 60% participation, 80% capture	Projected Performance Based on 80% participation, 90% capture
Plastics	1.58	366	175	264
Recycling rate contribution			0.55%	0.83%

Kitchen Waste.

Material	% of waste stream	Tonnes in waste stream	Projected Performance based on 60% participation, 80% capture	Projected Performance Based on 80% participation, 90% capture
Kitchen Waste	35.19	8142	3908	5862
Recycling rate contribution			12.25%	18.38%

Appendix 2

		<u>Uttlesford</u>				<u>West Essex</u>			
Category		%Composition		Tonnes		%Composition		Tonnes	
Paper and card	Newspaper and magazines	6.63	20.07	1,535	4,643	14.84	30.67	19,627	40,551
	Catalogues and directories	1.44		333		1.98		2,620	
	Other recyclable paper	1.12		260		1.61		2,133	
	Non recyclable paper	5.92		1,369		5.77		7,632	
	Liquid cartons	0.32		73		0.35		465	
	Corrugated cardboard	0.82		189		1.99		2,635	
	Other card packaging	3.30		763		3.70		4,886	
	Card non packaging	0.52		120		0.42		553	
Plastic film	Refuse sacks and other film	2.04	5.49	471	1,271	1.01	4.05	1,337	5,360
	Packaging film and carrier bags	3.46		800		3.04		4,024	
Denise plastic	Denise plastic bottles	1.58	5.84	367	1,351	2.22	6.74	2,931	8,907
	Polystyrene	0.36		84		0.25		328	
	Other plastic packaging	2.39		554		2.30		3,041	
	Other dense plastic	1.50		347		1.97		2,607	
Textiles	Natural fibres	0.99	2.08	228	481	1.05	2.36	1,391	3,120
	Man made fibres	1.09		252		1.31		1,730	
Misc. combustible	Disposable nappies and sanitary items	3.90	5.39	902	1,247	2.92	4.93	3,858	6,514
	Shoes	0.78		181		0.52		683	
	Wood	0.34		79		0.94		1,243	
	Other	0.37		85		0.55		731	
Misc. non combustible	Rubble and concrete	1.79	2.09	413	484	0.52	1.15	691	1,523
	Other	0.31		71		0.63		833	
Glass	Clear packaging	3.05	7.60	706	1,758	3.27	7.27	4,318	9,614
	Green packaging	3.53		816		2.90		3,832	
	Brown packaging	0.62		144		0.75		991	
	Other glass	0.39		91		0.36		473	
Ferrous metal	Ferrous packaging	1.53	2.54	355	587	1.98	2.55	2,611	3,377
	Other ferrous	1.00		232		0.58		766	
Non ferrous metal	No ferrous packaging	0.91	1.03	210	239	0.86	1.00	1,136	1,328
	Other non ferrous	0.12		29		0.15		193	
Putrescibles	Garden waste and vase flowers	5.05	44.57	1,169	10.31	8.22	36.31	10,863	48,015
	Raw fruit and vegetables inc peelings	19.37		4,482		12.04		15,920	
	Cooked and prepared food	15.82		3,660		12.86		16,997	
	Other (inc soil and woody garden waste)	4.33		1,002		3.20		4,235	
Fines	Fines (particles <10mm)	2.48	2.48	574	574	1.97	1.97	2,610	2,610
WEEE	WEEE	0.42	0.42	98	98	0.63	0.63	827	827
Potentially hazardous	Potentially hazardous	0.41	0.41	94	94	0.35	0.35	469	469
TOTAL		100	100	23,140	23,140	100	100	312,218	132,218