



# Buckinghamshire County Council

## Minutes

## *BUCKS WASTE FORUM*

---

### AGENDA ITEM: 3

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BUCKS WASTE FORUM HELD ON THURSDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2000, IN COMMITTEE ROOM 3, WYCOMBE DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES, QUEEN VICTORIA ROAD, HIGH WYCOMBE COMMENCING AT 10.30 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 12.45 PM**

### MEMBERS PRESENT

#### **Council, Organisation or Society**

Buckinghamshire County Council

Chiltern District Council

Aylesbury Vale District Council

South Bucks District Council

Wycombe District Council

#### **Officers**

Buckinghamshire County Council

Chiltern District Council

Aylesbury Vale District Council

South Bucks District Council

#### **Representative**

Mrs C M Aston  
Mr C F Robinson OBE  
Mr H G W Wilson

Mr J Warder

Mr D J Rowlands

Dr J Kennedy  
Mrs J Woolveridge

Mr C Oliver  
Mr L Taylor

Mr P Barnes  
Mr G Liddiard  
Mr R Wilkinson  
Mr J Currell  
Ms C Gray

Ms G Harding  
Mr K Lavender  
Ms H Matthews

Mr D Smedley

Mr C Popham

Wycombe District Council

Mr R Powell  
Ms S Wright

In Attendance

Mr T Gent  
Mr L Robinson  
Mr D Doherty

Midland Glass  
ReMaDe  
ReMaDe

## **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **1 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the held on 1 November 2000, copies of which had been circulated, were confirmed subject to the following amendment:-

In relation to Minute 4, 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point, please add an additional sentence after the following “In response it was noted that the number of dioxins did not present a health problem. However, new energy to waste plants produced dioxins one tenth of the level that the EU declared safe; some people had criticised the new energy to waste plants because of the dioxin risks.”

### **2 PRESENTATION BY PRINCIPAL CONSULTANT OF PROJECT ReMaDe (RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT GROUP)**

Mr Robinson undertook the following presentation in relation to the Project ReMaDe.

#### **Introduction**

- Challenges facing the UK Waste Management Industry
- Why market development was critical to successful recycling initiative in Buckinghamshire
- The Clean Washington Centre – United States

It was noted that in the future there would need to be a reduction in the use of landfill and an increase in re-use and recycling. He referred to the recycling rates required by Government and the fact that the existing average recycling rate for WCAs in England of 9% of household waste would need to increase to 33% which was a four fold increase. This was a problem because there was not sufficient demand for recycled materials on this scale, for example, the UK recovery rate for paper was only 41% and imports compounded the problem for selling recycled paper in the market place.

#### **Why Develop New and Alternative Markets?**

- Technical barriers

- recycled materials were very different from the virgin materials used to make the product
- costs of breaking the product into its various virgin components and re-manufacturing the same product was technically not feasible or economically attractive.
- Economic barriers
  - low cost of virgin feedstock
  - increase in transport costs
  - price volatility
  - markets flooded with materials.

### **Principals of Market Development**

- Finding new uses for recycled materials which were high value and more diverse for industries outside those that produced the material
- Focus on raw material conversion in elected industries
- Build on value already present in that market.

It was important to provide materials in the form that industries required it and to utilise local industries, as at present there was a monopsony (one buyer and many suppliers) in recycling.

- For example, glass could be used for:
  - blasting abrasive
  - water filter medium
  - textured wall coatings
  - concrete paving
  - cement block filler
  - abrasive wheel manufacturing

### **Buckinghamshire**

- Existing recycling strategies are unlikely to be sufficient
- Alternative outlets and additional markets should be found

### **How Big Is The Problem**

- Household waste projected growth in Buckinghamshire could be up by 79.4% for 2021
- All other authorities had similar pressures and would be competing in the same markets.

### **How Could ReMaDe be funded**

- Nationally, there were already seven ReMaDe schemes
- Funding could be undertaken through the landfill tax
- UK and European sources

- Local Authorities or County Authorities could contribute
- Commercial companies

### **How Much Would It Cost**

- Cost would be minimal with the use of landfill tax and could be approximately £20,000 per annum

### **Clean Washington Centre - the US Centre for Excellence**

- New products for recycled materials
- Assisted 350 manufacturers
- Prepared 80 technical reports for the individual use of materials
- Produced best practice guides and undertook research
- Employed more people in the recycling industry and kept money in the local community

During discussion the following points were made by the Forum:

- A representative queried whether Buckinghamshire was big enough to actually produce recycling materials so that they were economically efficient. This had been a problem experienced by Hampshire who had stated that the County was not big enough to recycle plastics unless it was heavily subsidised. Mr Robinson (ReMaDe) reported that it was important to utilise materials locally and that the materials should match the requirements required by industry. A cluster of local authorities could work together such as Northamptonshire, Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire.
- Mr Robinson (ReMaDe) reported that a Committee would need to be organised including the District Councils and the County Council. The County Council would appoint a project manager who would be paid for by landfill tax. Materials would be prioritised into specific groups such as organics and paper and glass. Enviro/ReMaDe would act as advisers and provide their experience and advice but the project would be run by Buckinghamshire.
- A representative expressed concern at the volatility of the market especially in relation to paper and that there could be risks involved in investing in capital, when the market could change significantly within a few days. It was agreed that it was essential to build flexibility into contracts to reflect changing demand.
- One of the first tasks would be to undertake a survey to find out what markets there would be in the area of Buckinghamshire and to find out which industries would be interested in using recycled materials.
- A member commented that one of the difficulties would be that landfill tax would need to be applied for every year and therefore no long term commitment could be made for funding. Mr Robinson (ReMaDe) reported that it was envisaged that the ReMaDe project would last for three years.

The Forum then discussed the ReMaDe project and whether it should be implemented in Buckinghamshire.

- A representative expressed concern about the complexity of contracts for the four District Councils and that this should be investigated. It was noted that one District Council had recently just entered a new ten year contract for paper recycling. It was agreed that this issue should be discussed at the next meeting of the Forum and that the following points should be investigated:
  - What other Counties were doing
  - What were the alternatives to using Project ReMaDe and whether these were more economically efficient
  - The pros and cons of using Project ReMaDe
  - The cost of the project.

### **3 WASTE STRATEGY FOR BUCKINGHAMSHIRE (WSB) – REVISED DRAFT HOUSEHOLDER QUESTIONNAIRE AND ISSUE PAPER**

The Forum received a report of the Interim Strategic Director of Environmental Services on the agreement to the style and content of the revised Householder Questionnaire and Explanation Notes. A glossary of technical terms was tabled and agreed.

The following comments were made on the questionnaire

- The first paragraph relating to the Waste Strategy for Buckinghamshire questionnaire should be put in bold
- In the first paragraph, instead of stating you are requested to return the questionnaire this should be amended to “would you please return”
- Question 1 should exclude composting as there was a separate question on this area already
- Question 5 should include some further explanation of the additional annual charge whether it would be per person or per household
- Question 7 and Question 7a depended on cost and that a further bullet point should be included on whether the person would choose the choice with the lowest cost
- In relation to Appendix B the term ‘reader value’ should be explained
- In Appendix B in the third paragraph there should be some mention of incineration

- At the bottom of p12 of the explanation notes the words stating that organic waste could be explosive may be frightening to the reader and should be re-worded
- On the middle of page 13 the paragraph mentioned recycling and composting and should also include other ways of getting rid of waste such as energy to waste incineration
- On page 14 in relation to waste minimisation and the real nappy campaign, this should be re-worded so that it did not refer to nappies being put into the waste stream.

Officers needed now to consider how the questionnaire would be sent out and it was noted that the questionnaire would be sent out randomly.

**The Forum agreed the content of the revised Householder Questionnaire and Explanation Notes attached to the report for the purposes of initial public consultation.**

#### **4 REQUEST OF THE COUNTY AND DISTRICT LEADERS MEETING 20 OCTOBER 2000**

The Forum considered the report of the Interim Strategic Director of Environmental Services on a request from the County and District Leaders Meeting for the Officer Working Group to prepare a report on the feasibility and options available for the creation of a joint company and ways of reducing the cost and volume of waste in Buckinghamshire, for a future meeting of the Bucks Waste Forum.

During discussion several members of the Forum considered that it would be premature at the present time to prepare such a report and that it was important first to focus on the Work Strategy for Buckinghamshire (WSB). The feasibility for the creation of a joint company should be discussed at a future meeting of the Forum once the WSB had been finalised.

**The Forum instructed the Officer Working Group to provide a report to a future meeting of the Forum that explored the feasibility and options available for the creation of a joint company and ways of reducing both the cost and volume of waste in Buckinghamshire, once the Strategy had been finalised.**

#### **5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

#### **6 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed that the date of the next meeting would be Friday, 30 March 2001 at 10.00 am in Wycombe District Council Offices.

**7 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

**It was resolved that pursuant to Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 that the public should be excluded on the grounds that disclosure of information would be prejudicial to the public interest by virtue of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted:**

**Item 10: Future Glass Contract (paragraph 9)**

**8 SUMMARY OF CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

The Forum received a report from the District Engineer of Chiltern District Council on the future glass contract.

**CONTACT OFFICER : JULIE BIERTON (01296) 383386**