

WASTE STRATEGY FOR BUCKINGHAMSHIRE (WSB): BACKGROUND AND DRAFT PROPOSALS.

Chiltern Local Committee

18 July 2001

contact officer: Graham Liddiard

(01296) 382114

1 Purpose of report

- a To inform the Committee of the content of the draft Waste Strategy for Buckinghamshire, to seek comment upon the content and the draft recommendations.

2 Proposed Action

b That the Local Committee is invited to ENDORSE:

- (i) the content of this report as setting out the principal conclusions and proposals contained in the draft WSB;
- (ii) the draft recommendations (subject to agreement by the Bucks Waste Forum at its meeting of 26 June 2001) contained in Appendix C to this report as forming the main waste management initiatives to be proposed by the WSB in the period to 2021.

3 Resources Appraisal

- c There have been no costs beyond staff time in revising these materials. The indicated cost for the public consultation on the Waste Strategy for Buckinghamshire (WSB) is some £15,000.

4 Supporting Information

- d For many years the most common form of waste management in Buckinghamshire has been the disposal of waste in landfill sites. National policy has changed and better ways of managing our waste are needed. Buckinghamshire needs to move towards more sustainable alternatives to landfill through measures to reduce the arising of waste, greater recycling, composting and recovery of value from waste. These options make better use of resources and avoid the pollution risks caused by landfill. The waste strategy examines the options to 2021 and makes

recommendations about the way forward. It is intended to guide the future investment decisions of the partner authorities

- e The context for the strategy has been the national targets for recycling, composting and recovery contained in the *Waste Strategy 2000* (May 2000) and the authority-specific "Best Value" standards contained in the recent *Guidance on Municipal Waste Management Strategies* (March 2001). These targets/standards are appended at **Appendix A** for the Committee's information.
- f The WSB is being jointly prepared by the **Bucks Waste Forum (BWF)**. This is a waste interest group, which includes members and officers from Buckinghamshire County Council, Aylesbury Vale District Council, South Bucks District Council, Chiltern District Council and Wycombe District Council. Also represented is the Environment Agency, the waste management industry (in the form of the Environmental Services Association) and the neighbouring unitary authority of Milton Keynes. The parent Forum has provided overall guidance for the strategy and an Officer Working Group (OWG) has undertaken the drafting. Implementation will be achieved by the constituent authorities using the WSB as a basis for planning the future delivery of collection and disposal services in Buckinghamshire, acting both in partnership and individually. Regular reviews will need to be undertaken in the future to keep the strategy up to date. **The draft strategy will be considered for agreement by the Forum at its meeting of 26 June 2001. Owing to Area Committee deadlines this report has had to be written in advance of that agreement. There may, as a result, be changes to the draft WSB upon which the public is consulted.**

Stakeholder Participation in Strategy Development

- g During April 2001 the partner authorities undertook a Householder Survey of waste behaviour and attitudes. This comprised a Questionnaire (with accompanying Explanation Notes) the content of which was prepared and agreed by the BWF. Most of the questions related to national waste targets but there were also a number aimed at local waste collection and recycling. The mailing and preliminary analysis of returns was undertaken by a leading market research consultant, Cooper Moruzzi, based locally.
- h Some 13,200 Buckinghamshire households were asked to complete the Questionnaire and return it in a pre-paid envelope. This sample was designed to achieve a statistically significant level of response for each of the District Council areas as well as for the County. A number of modest prizes were also offered to enhance the response rate. A very positive overall response rate of 38% was achieved. The preliminary results of the Householder survey were reported to the BWF at its meeting on the 23 May 2001 and have been used to inform the draft WSB.

Potential for Municipal Waste Arisings to Increase

- i In preparing the WSB it has been important to project the future growth in waste arisings and recycling. The OWG has therefore completed a round of spreadsheet projections of municipal waste, household waste, individual waste streams, and the future recycling performance of existing schemes to 2021.
- j Buckinghamshire's municipal is projected to rise from some 246,550 tonnes to 359,300 tonnes at 2021 (an increase of 112,750 tonnes or some 46% over the WSB period).

	Projected Municipal Waste (tonnes)	Projected Household Waste (tonnes)
2000/01	246,552	240,896
2005/06	270,473	270,473
2010/11	297,022	297,022
2015/16	326,514	326,514
2020/21	359,300	359,300

Future Waste shortfalls

- k The comparisons of projected municipal and household waste together with the projected performance of current recycling arrangements in Buckinghamshire indicate that, whilst successful, the latter will not be sufficient. **There will be shortfalls against future targets.** We shall be unable to achieve the requirements of the forthcoming SPS standards, the targets in the Government's waste strategy or EU Landfill Directive **without additional measures to increase recycling and composting and to divert waste from landfill.**
- l The indications are that Buckinghamshire, without additional initiatives, will have:

Municipal Waste

- a 149,600 tonne shortfall in the “recovery” (by recycling, composting or energy recovery) of municipal waste at 2015
- a 108,900 tonne shortfall in diverting organic household waste from landfill to other treatment processes by 2020

Household Waste

- a 25,000 tonne shortfall in the recycling and composting of household waste at 2003/04

- a 36,800 tonne shortfall in the recycling and composting of household waste at 2005/06
- m The "Best Value" Statutory Performance Standards (SPS) contained in the *Guidance* are also applied at the district council level. **Table 2** below shows the respective performance of the authorities when the projected household waste arisings and the projected output from existing recycling schemes are compared to the individual performance standards.
- n Each district area will have a shortfall against its SPS targets for 2003/04 and 2005/06. The extent of the shortfall varies considerably between the districts, with the greatest shortfalls occurring in WDC (some 14,500 tonnes) and AVDC (some 14,300 tonnes) at 2005/06. This relates to the lower recycling performance of the larger urban areas of High Wycombe and Aylesbury.

Table 2
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE: INDICATED RECYCLING SHORTFALLS AT
2003/04 AND 2005/06 AGAINST STATUTORY PERFORMANCE
STANDARDS.

	Projected Household Waste (HW) Arising * (tonnes)	Projected HW Recycled/ Composted under existing programmes (tonnes)	Statutory Performance Standard (percent)	SPS Requirement (tonnes)	Indicated Shortfall (tonnes)
AVDC					
2003/04	60,910	8,366	26%	15,837	7,471
2005/06	63,994	8,780	36%	23,038	14,258
CDC					
2003/04	33,112	8,804	33%	10,927	2,123
2005/06	34,113	9,070	40%	13,645	4,575
SBDC					
2003/04	27,021	5,143	33%	8,917	3,774
2005/06	27,838	5,298	40%	11,135	5,837
WDC					
2003/04	70,798	7,707	20%	14,160	6,453
2005/06	74,382	7,862	30%	22,315	14,453

HWRCs

2003/04	68,763	28,988	N/A	N/A	N/A
2005/06	70,145	29,570	N/A	N/A	N/A

COUNTY

2003/04	254,514	59,006	33%	83,990	24,894
2005/06	270,473	60,580	36%	97,370	36,790

- o The WSB therefore goes on to propose additional and new ways of managing our waste to meet our performance standards and national targets

Waste Management to 2010

- p The WSB firstly considers additional and new ways of managing our waste to meet our local performance standards and national targets to 2010. It contains a number of identified *options* which could address the indicated shortfalls against standards and targets through the present decade. This period therefore embraces the 2003/04 and 2005/06 Statutory Performance Standards (the "Best Value standards"), the national municipal waste recovery targets for 2005 and 2010, and the first Landfill Directive target. The year 2010 has a particular significance since the forthcoming system of tradable landfill permits introduces the possibility of financial penalties for non-compliance at that time. **The WSB, therefore, aims to meet the targets set throughout this period.** The OWG devised a series of *options* for evaluation which could meet these requirements (see **Appendix B**). The close co-operation needed implies the need for a *Memorandum of Understanding* between the authorities so that implemented projects may "dovetail" for increased effectiveness.
- q A number of aims guided the option generating process. The options in Appendix B are consistent with:
 - minimising waste in the first instance and, thereafter, to stimulate recycling and recovery of waste so as to increasingly reduce the need to landfill. Disposal at landfill will normally be the last resort;
 - getting more material from existing schemes ("enhancement") and the provision of additional bring facilities;
 - increasing the recycling of waste materials through the separate kerbside collection of more (pre-sorted) recyclable materials from residents' homes;
 - maximising recycling and the segregation of Green Waste for composting at the HWRCs;

- considering the kerbside collection of separated Green Waste (garden waste) from most Buckinghamshire households and processing it at managed central composting facilities.
- continuing to landfill to around the permitted level whilst this remains cost-effective.

The Way Forward

- r The OWG has considered the *options* (see **Appendix B**) at length against the projected recycling and landfill diversion shortfalls and has developed a series of (officer) **recommendations to 2010** which can be found in **Appendix C** to this report. **At the time of writing this report the draft recommendations had yet to be considered by the Forum and so they are presented here as provisional and yet to be agreed. There may be changes requested by the Forum at its meeting on 26 June 2001 when it will be asked to agree the draft WSB for the purposes of public consultation. An oral update will be given to the Committee at the meeting.**
- s Turning first to the options identified for the County Council's HWRCs, these should be implemented to maximise the sites' contribution to overall recycling and composting within Buckinghamshire (**REC 01**). Next, it is clearly a very cost-effective strategy for the district councils to "enhance" (i.e. increase local resident participation in) existing recycling schemes. Under this heading we would also include the provision of additional bring sites. Therefore we see the enhancement of existing services and the provision of more bring sites as early priorities (**REC 02**).
- t The next priority for action is the kerbside collection of dry recyclable materials because they have existing markets and are have considerable potential for further diversion. Paper has an additional advantage since it is a biodegradable waste. Options for glass, paper, and plastic, glass & cans are all desirable options which should be progressed at the earliest stage (**REC03**).
- u A major "theme" in the options advanced for consideration has been the possible adoption of kerbside collection of Green Waste by each of the district councils, accompanied by the contingent provision by the County Council of composting facilities at the High Heavens and Amersham HWRC sites. However this would be relatively expensive (with an overall capital cost of £2.580M to £3.166M and annual revenue costs of £3.285M to £3.586M) to achieve an additional 26,500 tonnes of BMW.
- v The OWG has therefore considered the practicability of meeting the SPS targets for 2003/04 and 2005/06 for Chiltern, South Bucks and Aylesbury Vale districts without the implementation of Green Waste collection schemes. It has concluded that this would be possible. These authorities could then go straight to a recovery process that (after minimisation and

source separation) can handle mixed waste. There are two main opportunities:

- (i) The proposed Colnbrook energy from waste (EfW) incinerator which is expected to be in operation by 2005-07. This could be the most cost-effective way to manage waste arisings (including biodegradable municipal waste) within South Bucks and Chiltern districts post 2005/06.
 - (ii) The Shanks Waste Services proposals at West Bletchley (Newton Longville), developing from a "Bio-drying" plant of 60,000 tonnes per annum capacity from mid-2004 (with other phases to follow as demand grows). This could be an effective treatment for waste (including biodegradable waste) collected within Aylesbury Vale district.
- w Although compliance with the Landfill Directive will be necessary at 2010 it would be possible, in the event of delay in progressing these major projects during the period up to 2010, to buy *landfill permits* (under new Government proposals) as a temporary "safety-valve". Current expectations are that these will settle down at a cost equivalent to the difference in cost between the high tech solutions and prevailing landfill costs. Given the potential pitfalls associated with green waste collection schemes and the emergence of the permit system, there is a strong case to consider the adoption of higher waste technologies sooner than the Landfill Directive targets actually requires. Buckinghamshire could then bank permits for use later on or to trade with other authorities to help reduce the costs that partner authorities might bear in adopting higher technology.
- x In the light of the above the OWG has therefore concluded that options for the kerbside collection of Green Waste in Aylesbury Vale, Chiltern and South Bucks districts should not be progressed as a means of meeting the 2003/04 and 2005/06 SPSs. **(REC 04)**
- y Instead the County Council should seek to secure, from the date of its opening (after 2005/06), capacity at the Colnbrook EfW facility to cater for a significant proportion of the household waste arising in South Bucks and Chiltern districts **(REC 05)**. In addition, if the scheme is implemented, the County Council should seek to secure, from the date of its opening (earliest mid-2004), capacity at the Newton Longville facility to cater for a significant proportion of the household waste arising in Aylesbury Vale district **(REC 06)**.
- z However, Wycombe district is projected to have a major shortfall between the performance of existing programmes and the 2003/04 SPS target. It will therefore need to progress those waste options that can divert a significant tonnage by 2003/04. The early introduction of a Green Waste collection service will be important. .

- aa In consequence, the OWG recommends that WDC should introduce options 24 and 25 for a wheeled bin kerbside Green Waste collection in Wycombe district (**REC 07**). Contingent upon this, the County Council should introduce a central composting facility (option 05) at High Heavens to accommodate the composting of WDC's Green Waste collections (**REC 08**).

The Longer-term (2010 to 2021)

- bb It is clear from the projections that in the longer-term (i.e. beyond 2010, and certainly by 2013) use of high technology processes will be required to meet the national recovery targets and the Landfill Directive requirements. The Strategy discusses various innovative treatments (eg pyrolysis, gasification), and Anaerobic Digestion). However the prospects for these technologies is not clear as yet and we conclude that the likely demand (beyond what can be recycled or composted) should fall upon the Colnbrook and West Bletchley facilities (if these are in place).

Southern Buckinghamshire

- cc Given that the facility has planning consent and the commercial interest that is being shown in such schemes by the waste management industry, the OWG is of the view that the EfW plant at Colnbrook is likely to be built. It is sufficiently well placed for the Chiltern and South Bucks areas to be consistent with the "proximity principle". Municipal waste arising in Chiltern and South Bucks districts that was not recycled or composted at that time could be taken to the proposed EfW plant at Colnbrook.

North Buckinghamshire

- dd The West Bletchley facility is at an early stage in the planning process however there is a demand for the project as a regional waste facility that is adjacent to North Buckinghamshire. The OWG recommends that all the municipal waste that arises in Aylesbury Vale, that is not recycled or composted, be taken to the this facility.

Mid-Buckinghamshire

- ee The middle of the county offers a number of opportunities for transfer facilities from which waste could be moved to either the Colnbrook/West Bletchley facilities or to landfill (permitted levels) at Wapseys Wood (Gerrards Cross). In addition, it might be appropriate to site Biodrying plants at strategic locations to transfer the stabilised products.

Industrial and commercial waste

- ff Finally, the draft strategy makes some recommendations in relation to industrial and commercial waste although the partner authorities do not have direct influence in this area. Nevertheless the private sector does

have representation upon the BWF and it is hoped that encouragement for more self-sufficiency and less landfill/export of waste will be effective.

In Conclusion

gg The views of the Committee are sought on the draft proposals and recommendations contained in this report.

5 BACKGROUND PAPERS

None