



# COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council name	<b>COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL</b>
Name and date of Committee	<b>CABINET - 1 JUNE 2020</b>
Report Number	<b>AGENDA ITEM (11)</b>
Subject	<b>GARDEN WASTE DELIVERY TO PROCESSING FACILITY</b>
Wards affected	ALL
Accountable member	Cllr. Andrew Doherty - Cabinet Member for Waste, Flooding and Environmental Health Email: <a href="mailto:Andrew.Doherty@cotswold.gov.uk">Andrew.Doherty@cotswold.gov.uk</a>
Accountable officer	Scott Williams, Business Manager - Commissioning Strategy Email: <a href="mailto:scott.williams@publicagroup.uk">scott.williams@publicagroup.uk</a>
Summary/Purpose	The purpose of this report is to present three options for the permanent delivery of garden waste collected by way of the paid-for kerbside collection service, to the processing facility at Hills Waste in Purton.
Annexes	Annex A - Letter received from Cricklade Town Council Annex B - Carbon Appraisal of Garden Waste Delivery Options
Recommendation/s	<i>That Cabinet:-</i> <i>a) Notes the content of the report;</i> <i>b) Acknowledges Option A as the default position;</i> <i>c) Reviews Options B &amp; C and decides if either option should be introduced as an alternative permanent solution for garden waste delivery to the Hills Waste processing facility - accepting the associated estimated additional costs, carbon production and risks as outlined in this report.</i>
Corporate priorities	The garden waste collection service contributes towards the Council priority: Respond to the challenges presented by the Climate Change Emergency
Key Decision	NO
Exempt	NO
Consultees/ Consultation	The following people have all been consulted on this report and the detail contained within: Cllr. Joe Harris (Leader), Cllr. Andrew Doherty (Cabinet Member) The Council's Statutory Officers and the Publica Executive Directors

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. Gloucestershire County Council (GCC), as Waste Disposal Authority (WDA), has a duty to provide adequate waste disposal facilities under contract for refuse, food and garden waste. Where a processing facility is unreasonably far from a district boundary, then GCC organises and pays for bulking and transfer or pays a contribution towards the delivery costs known as a tipping away payment.
- 1.2. Cotswold District Council (the Council) is a Waste Collection Authority (WCA) and has the responsibility to provide waste and recycling collections for the residents living within its district boundary. Prior to March 2020, the Council offered a non-statutory, weekly subscription based garden waste collection service and this material was collected along with food waste and then bulked at the Love Lane transfer station in Cirencester under its contract with GCC, for onward bulk haul to a processing facility in Dymock - which was the only facility in Gloucestershire which could receive and process this type of mixed organic material.
- 1.3. In March 2020, to coincide with when the Council implemented its improved waste and recycling service, which saw food and garden waste being collected separately, GCC's contract with the Dymock processing facility ended and was replaced with a new arrangement for open windrow composting of garden waste and a contract being let with Hills Waste at Purton. Because the location of the new facility is considerably closer to Cotswold District than the previous contractor was, GCC's position is that it is not unreasonably far from the district boundary and that the garden waste should be direct delivered to that location with no financial support (tipping away) being made available. *It is considered likely that GCC has made a saving on the new processing contract for garden waste, because it is no longer having to pay for bulk transfer, but unfortunately it is unwilling to share this information with the Council.*
- 1.4. Food waste is now being processed at a facility in Bishops Cleeve and so GCC is paying for the material to be bulked at Thamesdown Recycling and then bulk hauled to that location.
- 1.5. Because recycling materials (i.e. paper, glass, cans and plastics) have a value, these are retained by the District Council and the income generated goes to offset some of the costs of collection.
- 1.6. Food and garden waste have no value and so the Council could not sell to a third party as an alternative option.
- 1.7. Cricklade Town Council has been made aware of the new GCC contract and has expressed concern over an increase in heavy goods vehicles driving through the centre of Cricklade - as outlined at Annex A. It has requested that any direct deliveries are completed via an alternative route to the site which would be a longer distance, journey time and cost.

## 2. MAIN POINTS

- 2.1. In order to deliver the garden waste to Hills at Purton, the Council has the following options:

- Option A (**Default Position**) - Instruct Ubico to direct deliver and use the shortest route via Cricklade town centre;
- Option B - Instruct Ubico to direct deliver and use the alternative route as set out by Cricklade Town Council which is longer; or
- Option C - Enter into contract directly with the Love Lane bulking facility operator (Enovert) and pay for garden waste to be bulked at this facility and then bulk hauled to the Hills site.

### 3. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

3.1. In order to understand the financial implications of the 3 options, Ubico has provided estimated costings as follows:

- Option A - Ubico estimate that the default position of direct delivering the garden waste to Hills in Purton, using the direct route through Cricklade would increase the contract costs by approximately £68k per annum, which is primarily as a result of additional mileage and wear & tear on the vehicles.
- Option B - Ubico estimate that the cost to re-route the direct delivery vehicles around Cricklade would increase the contract costs by £103k per annum (£35k greater than the default option).
- Option C - A price of £18 per tonne has been negotiated with Enovert for them to bulk and then bulk haul the garden waste from the Love Lane Transfer Station to Hills. Using an estimated annual tonnage amount of 10k tonnes per year, this would require an increase in costs of £180k (£112k greater than the default option). *This is the third and final price received from Enovert following the negotiations - their starting price was £21.50 per tonne and they have confirmed that £18 is the lowest they would be willing to accept.*

### 4. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

4.1. There are no legal implications associated with this report. The Monitoring Officer has reviewed the report and annexes, and has no comments.

### 5. **RISK ASSESSMENT**

5.1. The risks associated with the three options are set out below;

- Option A (Default Position) - This option is the cheapest in additional expenditure and produces the second lowest carbon. It is also achievable for Ubico using the current resource levels. However, the Council has been formally contacted by Cricklade Town Council and requested not to send Ubico garden waste collection vehicles through the town, so if this was employed as a permanent solution then there may be further political and reputational risks as a result of the decision.

- Option B - This option carries more additional cost and has the highest carbon produced. There would also be an increase in time which would eat into the operating hours available to Ubico and could result in an increase in resources being required to fulfil the service far sooner than anticipated. However, it would adhere to the request made by Cricklade Town Council to not use the route through the town centre.
- Option C - This is the most expensive option but it generates the lowest amount of carbon and does not affect Ubico's available operating hours. It also partly adheres to Cricklade Town Council's request in a reduction of vehicles using the roads in their area. Whilst the Council could impress the importance of the bulk loads being delivered to the Hills site via the alternative route, as Enovert would be using a third party haulage contractor, there would be limited influence available to the Council. This option therefore carries a risk that bulk loads could be delivered to the Hills site using the shortest distance - Cricklade town centre main road. Whilst the Council could instruct Enovert that their haulier must use the alternative route, this would likely equate to an increase in costs and may jeopardise the contract being agreed.

## **6. EQUALITIES IMPACT**

- 6.1.** All 3 options for garden waste transfer to Hills Waste have a neutral effect on the different service users, customers and staff, because the front-end service provision will remain the same.

## **7. CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1.** The climate change implications of all 3 options are shown at Annex B of this report.

## **8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 8.1.** The only other option would be to stop collecting garden waste and, whilst this would be likely to lower the overall expenditure for the Council and the carbon produced, there would be significant political, reputational and performance implications.

## **9. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 9.1.** The following documents have been identified by the author of the report in accordance with section 100D.5(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 and are listed in accordance with section 100 D.1(a) for inspection by members of the public:

- Waste Service Review - Cabinet & Council, December 2018 - reports and associated minutes

(END)