

**To: The Deputy Leader and Members of the
Community and Environment Board**

**(Councillors Bell, Chambers, Gosling, M
Humphreys, Jenns, Jordan, Parker, H Phillips,
Macdonald, Rose, L Smith and S Smith)**

For the information of other Members of the Council

For general enquiries please contact Democratic Services, on 01827 719450/719221 or via e-mail democraticservices@northwarks.gov.uk.

For enquiries about specific reports please contact the officer named in the reports.

The agenda and reports are available in large print and electronic accessible formats if requested.

COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT BOARD AGENDA

26 July 2021

The Community and Environment Board will meet in The Chamber, The Council House, South Street, Atherstone on Monday 26 July 2021 at 6.30 pm.

The meeting can also be viewed on the Council's YouTube channel at [NorthWarks - YouTube](#).

AGENDA

- 1 Evacuation Procedure.**
- 2 Apologies for Absence / Members away on official Council business.**

3 Disclosable Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

4 Public Participation

Up to twenty minutes will be set aside for members of the public to put questions to elected Members.

Members of the public wishing to address the Board must register their intention to do so by 9:30am two working days prior to the meeting. Participants are restricted to five minutes each.

If you wish to put a question to the meeting, please register by email to democraticservices@northwarks.gov.uk or telephone 01827 719221 / 01827 719226.

Once registered to speak, the person asking the question has the option to either:

- a) attend the meeting in person at the Council Chamber;
- b) attend remotely via Teams; or
- c) request that the Chair reads out their written question.

If attending in person, precautions will be in place in the Council Chamber to protect those who are present however this will limit the number of people who can be accommodated so it may be more convenient to attend remotely.

If attending remotely an invitation will be sent to join the Teams video conferencing for this meeting. Those registered to speak should dial the telephone number and ID number (provided on their invitation) when joining the meeting to ask their question. However, whilst waiting they will be able to hear what is being said at the meeting. They will also be able to view the meeting using the YouTube link provided (if so, they made need to mute the sound on YouTube when they speak on the phone to prevent feedback).

5 Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 15 March 2021 – copies herewith, to be approved and signed by the Chairman.

**PUBLIC BUSINESS
(WHITE PAPERS)**

- 6 **Budgetary Control Report 2021/22 Period Ended 30 June 2021** - Report of the Corporate Director – Resources

Summary

The report covers revenue expenditure and income for the period from 1 April 2021 to 30 June 2021. The 2021/2022 budget and the actual position for the period, compared with the estimate at that date, are given, together with an estimate of the out-turn position for services reporting to this Board.

The Contact Officer for this report is Nigel Lane (719371)

- 7 **Leisure Facilities: Service Improvement Plan** – Report of the Director of Leisure and Community Development

Summary

Appended to this report, for Members' consideration, is a copy of the Service Improvement Plan (SIP), detailing activity through to the end of June 2021, through which the Board has agreed to monitor the operational performance of the leisure facilities at each of its meetings.

The Contact Officer for this report is Russell Simkiss (719257).

- 8 **Boot Hill Recreation Ground, Grendon** - Report of the Director of Leisure and Community Development

Summary

This report informs Members of the progress being made in respect of the development of Boot Hill Recreation Ground in Grendon and asks for the Board's direction on potential improvements to on-site ancillary accommodation and in respect of the potential granting of a Tenancy at Will to Grendon Football Club.

The Contact Officers for this report are Simon Powell (719352) and Evan Ross (719270).

- 9 **Minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Working Party** held on 21 June 2021 - copy herewith.

- 10 **Progress Report on Achievement of Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator Targets April 2020 to March 2021** – Report of the Chief Executive

Summary

This report informs Members of the progress with the achievement of the Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator targets relevant to the Community and Environment Board for April 2021 to March 2021.

The Contact Officer for this report is Robert Beggs (719238).

- 11 **Update on Green Bin Service – Report of the Corporate Director - Streetscape**

Summary

This report updates Members on the impact and results of the introduction of the chargeable Garden Waste Service from 1 April 2021.

The Contact Officer for this report is Richard Dobbs (719440).

- 12 **National Waste Strategy Consultation Responses – Report of the Corporate Director - Streetscape**

Summary

This report sets out the Warwickshire Waste Partnership’s joint responses to the Government’s second round of consultations on Extended Producer Responsibility, Deposit Return Schemes and Consistent Collections as set out in the National Resources and Waste Strategy.

The Contact Officer for this report is Richard Dobbs (719440).

- 13 **Exclusion of the Public and Press**

Recommendation:

To consider whether, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined by Schedule 12A of the Act.

- 14 **Polesworth Sports Centre – Report of the Director of Leisure and Community Development**

The Contact Officer for this report is Simon Powell (719352).

STEVE MAXEY
Chief Executive

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT BOARD

15 March 2021

Present: Councillor Bell in the Chair.

Councillors Chambers, Gosling, M Humphreys, Jarvis, Jenns, Lees, Morson, H Phillips, Rose, Smith and A Wright.

Councillors D Clews, Farrow and Symonds were also in attendance.

23 **Disclosable Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests**

Councillor M Humphreys declared a non-pecuniary interest in Minute No 28 Financial Assistance to Outside Organisations.

24 **Minutes of the Meeting of the Board held on 18 January 2021**

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2021, copies having been previously circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

25 **Leisure Facilities: Service Improvement Plan**

The Director of Leisure and Community Development sought Members' consideration of the revised Service Improvement Plan, detailing progress made to date against each of the proposed actions, A draft Service Improvement Plan for the 12 months period commencing April 2021 was also appended to the report of the Director of Leisure and Community Development for Member's consideration and approval.

Resolved:

- a That the progress made against the requirements identified in the revised and approved 2020/21 Leisure Facilities Service Improvement Plan be noted; and**
- b That the draft Service Improvement Plan through which operational and financial performance will be monitored through to 31 March 2022, be approved.**

26 **Leisure Facilities – 2021/22 Bank Holiday Closures**

The Director of Leisure and Community Development sought the Board's consideration of a schedule of Bank Holiday closures of leisure facilities during the 2021/22 financial year.

Resolved:

That the schedule of leisure facility closures, as set out in paragraph 4.1 of the report, be approved.

27 LEADER Programme Update

The Director of Leisure and Community Development updated Members on the progress made in respect of the delivery of the North Warwickshire and Hinckley and Bosworth LEADER programme (2015 to 2020).

Resolved:

That the progress made in respect of the delivery of the North Warwickshire and Hinckley and Bosworth LEADER programme (2015 to 2020), be noted.

28 Financial Assistance to Outside Organisations

The Director of Leisure and Community Development detailed requests for assistance through the provision of an annual grant received from Warwickshire Community and Voluntary Action (WCAVA), North Warwickshire Citizens Advice (NW CA), Live and Local, North Warwickshire Allotments Federation and North Warwickshire First Responders.

Resolved:

- a That the work undertaken by the organisations funded in 2020/21 through the Annual Grants Scheme be noted; and**
- b That the five organisations that had requested funding for 2021/22 be awarded the level of funding as detailed below:**
 - WCAVA- £11,000**
 - NW CA - £34,000**
 - Live and Local - £2,000**
 - North Warwickshire Allotments Federation - £500**
 - North Warwickshire First Responders - £4,100**

29 North Warwickshire Green Space Strategy Progress Report

The Director of Leisure and Community Development informed Members of the progress made in respect of delivery against the priorities set out in the North Warwickshire Green Space Strategy (2020 to 2033).

Resolved:

That the progress made in respect of the implementation of the priorities of the North Warwickshire Green Space Strategy (2020 to 2033) be noted.

30 Health and Wellbeing Action Plan

The Board was provided with an update on the progress being made in respect of the actions identified in the approved Health and Wellbeing Action Plan (2020 to 2023).

Resolved:

That the progress made in respect of the delivery of the commitments identified in the Health and Wellbeing Action Plan (2020 to 2023) be noted.

31 Minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Working Party Meeting held on 22 February 2021

The minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Working Party meeting held on 22 February 2021 were received and noted.

32 Climate Change Update

The Corporate Director – Streetscape updated Members on the baselining work which had been undertaken on the Council's carbon emissions and set out steps which are being undertaken to reduce the Council's carbon footprint and that of the wider Borough, as well as areas which would need to be the subject of further action in the future.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

33 Progress Report on Achievement of Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator Targets April – December 2020

Members were informed of the progress with the achievement of the Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator targets relevant to the Board for April to December 2020.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

34 **Exclusion of the Public and Press**

That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined by Schedule 12A to the Act.

35 **Confidential Extract of the minutes of the Community and Environment Board held on 18 January 2021**

The confidential extract of the minutes of the Board held on 18 January 2021 were received and noted.

Margaret Bell
Chairman

Agenda Item No 6

Community and Environment Board

26 July 2021

Report of the Corporate Director – Resources

Budgetary Control Report 2021/22 Period Ended 30 June 2021

1 Summary

- 1.1 The report covers revenue expenditure and income for the period from 1 April 2021 to 30 June 2021. The 2021/22 budget and the actual position for the period, compared with the estimate at that date, are given, together with an estimate of the out-turn position for services reporting to this Board.

Recommendation to the Board

That the report be noted and that the Board requests any further information it feels would assist it in monitoring the budgets under the Board's control.

2 Introduction

- 2.1 Under the Service Reporting Code of Practice (SeRCOP), services should be charged with the total cost of providing the service, which not only includes costs and income directly incurred, but also support costs relating to such areas as finance, office accommodation, telephone costs and IT services. The figures contained within this report are calculated on this basis.

3 Overall Position

- 3.1 The actual expenditure for budgets reporting to this Board as at 30 June 2021 is £868,840 compared with a profiled budgetary position of £1,008,406; an underspend of £139,566 over the period. Appendix A to this report provides details of the profiled and actual position for each service reporting to this Board, together with the variance for the period.

...

- 3.2 Where possible, the year-to-date budget figures have been calculated with some allowance for seasonal variations, in order to give a better comparison with actual figures. Reasons for the variations are given, where appropriate, in the detail below.

3.3 Leisure Facilities

- 3.3.1 The overall overspend of £10,051 against the profiled budget is due to lower than profiled income across all leisure sites of £72,640; partially offset by underspends on employees of £43,645; premises of £11,514; and supplies of £7,473. The underspends on premises and supplies may not continue to the

year end. The reduction in income is a result of the Covid-19 pandemic which saw the closure of all centres and restricted capacity upon reopening in accordance with Government guidance. Whilst procedures have started to return to a new “normal”, income is going to continue be affected during 2021-22. Increased safety measures have led to a reduction in numbers able to attend Leisure Centres and the cancellation of some activities such as birthday parties.

3.4 Refuse and Recycling

3.4.1 Overall refuse and recycling to date has an underspend of £107,522. This is mainly due to income above expectation from the newly chargeable green waste service of £128,615. In addition, there is higher than expected income from trade refuse of £9,031. This has been partially offset by an overspend on employees of £49,104, due to the continued requirement to use agency employees and complete additional rounds as a result of the pandemic. There has been a reduction in transport running costs of £18,606.

3.5 Streetscene Grounds Maintenance

3.5.1 The underspend of £12,794 is due to lower employee costs due to vacancies of £5,436; and lower than profiled spend on the equipment budget of £2,966. There is also an underspend on transport of £4,791 due to lower fuel, repairs and maintenance costs.

3.6 Amenity Cleaning

3.6.1 The current underspend of £33,662 relates largely to lower employee costs of £20,190 due to vacancies and to an operative working in Recycling to cover a shortfall caused by the current pandemic. There is also lower than profiled spend on equipment, general fly tipping and asbestos fly tipping of £5,460. Transport costs are £6,838 below profile due to lower fuel, repairs and maintenance costs.

3.7 Green Space Budget

3.7.1 The overspend of £6,887 is due to higher than profiled spend on professional fees of £3,186 relating to additional maintenance on play area equipment and surfacing footpaths and tree management works of £3,596.

4 Performance Indicators

4.1 In addition to the financial information provided to this Board, when the budgets were set in February, performance indicators were included as a means of putting the financial position into context. These are shown at Appendix B.

...

4.2 The majority of the Performance Indicators are comparable with the profiled position.

- 4.3 Leisure KPIs are being reported in another report on this agenda.
- 4.4 The main reason for the variance in the Domestic Refuse cost per household performance relates to increased employee costs as detailed in 3.4.1.
- 4.5 The main reason for the variance in the Cesspool Emptying cost per emptying performance mainly relates to lower number of cesspool emptying's.
- 4.6 The main reason for the variance in the Recycling cost per household performance relates to reasons as detailed in 3.4.1.
- 4.7 The main reason for the variance in the number of pitches and teams is because we have had to mark more pitches due to Covid social distancing requirements. The QE Academy has also stopped the use of their grass pitches which has meant we have taken up some of these bookings at other sites. These figures may change during the season as facilities open back up.

5 Risks to the Budget

- 5.1 The key risks to the budgetary position of the Council from services under the control of this Board are:
- Deteriorating condition of assets, particularly the Leisure Centres, and further economic and market pressure affecting the generation of income.
 - Additional costs relating to the Refuse and Recycling services.

6 Estimated Out-turn

- 6.1 Members have requested that Budgetary Control reports provide details on the likely out-turn position for each of the services reporting to this Board. The anticipated out-turn for this Board for 2021/22 is as per the approved budget of £6,216,530.
- 6.2 The figures provided are based on information available at this time of the year and are the best available estimates for this Board and may change as the financial year progresses. Members will be updated in future reports of any changes to the forecast out turn.

7 Report Implications

7.1 Finance and Value for Money Implications

- 7.1.1 Income and Expenditure will continue to be closely managed and any issues that arise will be reported to this Board at future meetings.

7.2 **Environment and Sustainability Implications**

- 7.2.1 The Council has to ensure that it adopts and implements robust and comprehensive budgetary monitoring and control, to ensure not only the availability of services within the current financial year, but in future years.

The Contact Officer for this report is Nigel Lane (719371).

Community and Environment Board
Budgetary Control Report 2021/2022 as at 30 June 2021

Cost Centre	Description	Approved Budget 2021/2022	Profiled Budget 2021/2022	Actual 30 June 2021	Variance	Comments
3072	Polesworth Sports Centre	247,740	58,841	65,485	6,644	3.3
3075	Coleshill Leisure Centre	509,610	106,513	112,776	6,263	3.3
3077	Atherstone Leisure Complex	774,960	179,195	183,195	4,000	3.3
3082/3	Memorial Hall (Sports and Cultural)	169,350	41,591	34,734	(6,857)	3.3
4002	Public Health (Commercial Pollution Control)	340,740	97,249	95,491	(1,758)	
4003	Public Health (Domestic Pollution Control)	54,020	16,753	20,099	3,346	
5000	Domestic Refuse Collection	969,720	195,497	215,792	20,295	3.4
5001	Streetscene Grounds Maintenance	122,730	54,450	41,656	(12,794)	3.5
5002	Trade Refuse Collection	(14,740)	(223,118)	(230,909)	(7,791)	3.4
5003	Cesspool Emptying	5,880	(1,053)	1,595	2,647	
5004	Recycling	1,034,380	(104,200)	(224,226)	(120,026)	3.4
5005	Animal Control	49,720	13,930	15,356	1,426	
5006	Abandoned Vehicles	7,760	3,590	3,623	33	
5010	Amenity Cleaning	715,890	175,106	141,444	(33,662)	3.6
5013	Unadopted Roads	20,440	4,683	3,098	(1,585)	
5014	Drain Unblocking and Land Drainage	20,850	5,212	5,213	0	
5015	Street Furniture	6,930	1,706	1,388	(318)	
5016	Atherstone Market	3,350	582	445	(137)	
5019	Green Space Budget	637,490	157,260	164,146	6,887	3.7
5021	Public Health Act 1984 Burials	9,200	2,300	2,300	(0)	
5023	Consultation	14,510	3,628	2,465	(1,163)	
5025	Corporate Policy	84,580	24,571	21,159	(3,413)	
5030	Rural Regeneration	77,100	19,250	18,950	(300)	
5034	Landscape	12,340	11,170	11,173	3	
5040	Marketing and Market Research	15,520	7,507	7,236	(272)	
5044	Support to Voluntary Organisations	79,480	28,880	28,880	0	
5047	Community Fund for Local Projects	-	-	-	-	
5055	Community Development Health Improvement	96,100	21,737	20,771	(965)	
5056	Community Development Safer Communities	118,760	27,840	27,149	(691)	
5064	Queen Elizabeth School - Artificial Grass Pitch	20	1,254	(500)	(1,754)	
7201	Coronavirus - Leisure	-	-	276	276	
7209	Coronavirus - Streetscape	-	11,580	11,580	-	
7361	England's Rural Heart LEADER Partnership	32,100	71,247	73,346	2,099	
7367	Meadow Street Gardens	-	1,970	1,970	-	
7371	Reopening the Highstreets Safely	-	6,535	6,535	-	
7700	Stronger & Safer Communities	-	(14,849)	(14,849)	-	
	Total Net Expenditure	6,216,530	1,008,406	868,840	(139,566)	

Original Budget	6,210,830
Vired Training Budget	3,940
Vired Recruitment Budget	1,760
Approved Budget	<u>6,216,530</u>

Key performance Indicators for Budgets Reporting to the Community and Environment Board

	Budget	Profiled budget	Actual
Domestic Refuse Collection			
Number of Households	28,800	28,800	28,872
Costs per Household	£33.62	£33.62	£33.59
Maximum missed collections per 100,000 users	40	40	40
Trade Refuse Collection			
Number of Trade Bins	484	484	492
Gross cost per bin collected	£556.07	£74.00	£72.56
Net (surplus)/cost per bin collected	-£30.45	-£460.99	-£469.33
Cespool Emptying			
Number of emptyings	1,077	269	214
Gross cost per emptying	£137.41	£128.06	£159.79
Net (surplus)/cost per emptying	£5.44	-£3.91	£7.45
Recycling			
Cost per household	£35.90	-£3.62	-£7.77
Tonnes of recycled material collected	13,340	2,223	1,907
% of waste recycled	50.0%	50.0%	43.4%
Green Space Budget			
Number of Play Areas	26	26	26
Number of play areas meeting the safety, DDA and Play Value standard	26	26	26
Number of Pitches	12	12	10
Number of Teams	25	25	15
Number of Hirers	25	25	15
Income per Team	£215.20	£215.20	£240.00

Agenda Item No 7

Community and Environment Board

26 July 2021

Report of the Director of Leisure and Community Development

Leisure Facilities: Service Improvement Plan

1 Summary

- 1.1 Appended to this report, for Members' consideration, is a copy of the Service Improvement Plan (SIP), detailing activity through to the end of June 2021, through which the Board has agreed to monitor the operational performance of the leisure facilities at each of its meetings.

Recommendation to the Board

That the Board notes and comments upon the progress made against the requirements identified in the approved 2021 / 22 Leisure Facilities Service Improvement Plan through which operational performance is monitored.

2 Consultation

- 2.1 Consultation has taken place with relevant Members and any comments received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

3 Introduction

- 3.1 In order to provide a more focused approach to service delivery, in July 2018, the Board adopted its first Leisure Facilities Service Improvement Plan (SIP). At its meeting held in March 2021, the Board approved a revised SIP, which was intended to guide activity through until the end of March 2022. A copy of the revised Plan, which details the key actions, work programmes and improvements to be achieved by March 2022, is attached at Appendix A. The Plan continues to seek to highlight those matters that the Board has determined are important in order to enhance the quality and sustainability of the service delivered through its leisure facilities.

...

4 Service Improvement Plan: Progress

- 4.1 The revised SIP (Appendix A) evidences the progress made by the leisure facilities through to the end of June 2021. The Board is invited to comment on that progress, which has obviously been made in very challenging and unique times.

- 4.2 As agreed with Members, this report does not seek to provide detailed commentary on the progress being made in respect of each action identified within the SIP. Instead, it aims to update the Board on the key areas of recent progress made within the leisure facilities. Members, however, are invited to comment and advise on any areas of activity upon which they wish Officers to focus in order to improve the operational viability of the facilities.
- 4.3 As the Board will be aware, the Authority's leisure facilities in Atherstone, Coleshill and Polesworth were able to re-open to the public, albeit with a restricted activity programme, from 12 April 2021. A further relaxation in the Government's pandemic-related guidance afforded an opportunity for fitness classes and exercise referrals to return to the service programme in May and, at the time of writing this report, it is anticipated that indoor team sports, parties and Memorial Hall events will return to a full programme with effect from 19 July. Despite the restrictions placed on the respective activity programmes, the facilities have made an encouraging return to the provision of public services, as follows:
- From re-opening until the end of June, the leisure facilities have received approximately 60,000 attendances across the three sites
 - By the end of June, health and fitness memberships had increased by 20% from the level recorded at 12 April 2021. The team is pro-actively working to continue this trend
 - Learn to Swim memberships have also recovered well, with 650 memberships being recorded at the end of June
 - Gymnastics at Coleshill and Polesworth has enjoyed a strong return, with memberships increasing by 18% by the end of June 2021
 - Outdoor bookings at The Queen Elizabeth Academy have now fully recovered and indoor bookings across the sites have also recovered well
- 4.4 The staff teams within the facilities have been working hard towards the launch of the new fitness classes timetable, which went live on 28 June 2021. The new timetable, which has been extremely well received by customers, includes the launch of the new Les Mills classes (BodyPump, BodyKombat and BodyBalance) and the new "Keiser Intelligent Cycling" experience at Atherstone Leisure Complex. VIP taster sessions were held in the weeks before the formal launch of the timetable and the new classes will also be discussed on "The Stone Channel, Atherstone" over the coming months, to further increase awareness and uptake. The new timetable also incorporates the "Active Living" programme, which highlights classes for those people who want to stay active, but to do so at a gentler pace. The team is intending to undertake a wider awareness campaign to promote Active Living classes to the local community over the coming months.

- 4.5 Alongside the timetable launch, Leisure Facilities ran a Health and Fitness Promotion (half price until October) from 14 June to 20 July 2021, in an attempt to attract previous users and new members into the service. An update on the success of this promotion will be provided to the Board at its meeting.
- 4.6 The Leisure Facilities team has been busy finalising the introduction of the new North Warwickshire Leisure App. The App, which will improve the booking experience, communication and marketing to facility users, will go live at the end of July 2021. Updates on the performance of the App will be provided to the Board at its future meetings
- 4.7 The team at Polesworth and TQEA has secured an all year round booking from Aston Villa Football Club, which will deliver three hours of football-based activities on two evenings each week. These sessions will be available to secondary school aged participants and will also aim to address anti-social behaviour within communities.
- 4.8 The same team has also implemented a revised indoor booking timetable from July 2021, which will increase service capacity. This change is expected to increase both operational and financial efficiency.
- 4.9 Holiday activities were delivered in April and May across the three sites, offering a programme of COVID-19 secure services to the community. The varied programme included dance, cheerleading and martial arts and the activities were known to be well received by participants. For the summer:
- Atherstone Leisure Complex has planned a much bigger programme than previously, and the activities will include multi sports provision, bouncy castle soft play, swimming courses and crafts sessions
 - Coleshill Leisure Centre will offer full day provision throughout the entire holidays, with dance, cheerleading and all-day activity camps
- 4.10 The Leisure Facilities Business Development team, in conjunction with relevant colleagues throughout the Authority, will continue to manage and monitor the implementation of the requirements of the SIP on a regular basis and to report accordingly to each meeting of this Board, including to its next scheduled meeting to be held in October 2021. This process will continue to afford Members an opportunity to both understand and direct relevant aspects of the performance of the Borough Council's leisure facilities.

5 Report Implications

5.1 Finance and Value for Money Implications

- 5.1.1 Whilst there is no financial implication arising directly out of this report, the SIP will enable the Board to monitor the performance of the leisure facilities at each of its meetings and to advise on activity that would improve operational sustainability.

5.2 Safer Communities Implications

5.2.1 The Authority's leisure facilities contribute to community safety by providing well-managed services that afford opportunities for positive activity and, therefore, a creative alternative to potential criminal and / or anti-social behaviour.

5.3 Legal, Data Protection and Human Rights Implications

5.3.1 There are no direct legal, data protection or human rights implications arising from this report.

5.4 Environment, Sustainability and Health Implications

5.4.1 Leisure facilities have a positive impact on the physical and mental wellbeing of individuals and the sustainability of local communities by providing opportunities for formal and informal recreation and by contributing to an improved quality of life.

5.5 Human Resources Implications

5.5.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report, other than those to which reference is made in the appended Service Improvement Plan and upon which commentary is provided therein.

5.6 Risk Management Implications

5.6.1 There are no direct risk management implications arising from this report. The activity that is included within the Service Improvement Plan, however, will be risk assessed and appropriate controls put in place, where appropriate.

5.7 Equalities Implications

5.7.1 The activity identified in the Service Improvement Plan is intended to advance the Borough Council's commitment to ensuring equality for all members of the community across its portfolio of service provision.

5.8 Links to Council's Priorities

5.8.1 The Service Improvement Plan has direct links to the following corporate priorities:

- Responsible financial and resource management
- Creating safer communities
- Improving leisure and wellbeing opportunities
- Promoting sustainable and vibrant communities

5.8.2 Additionally, the Borough Council's leisure facilities contribute directly to the priorities of the Sustainable Community Strategy to:

- Raise aspirations, educational attainment and skill levels
- Develop healthier communities
- Improve access to services

The Contact Officer for this report is Russell Simkiss (719257).

Background Papers

Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D, as substituted by the Local Government Act, 2000 Section 97

Background Paper No	Author	Nature of Background Paper	Date
1	Director of Leisure and Community Development	Report to Community and Environment Board (Leisure Facilities: Service Improvement Plan)	March 2021

North Warwickshire Leisure Facilities Service Improvement Plan - April 2021 – March 2022

Aim: To improve the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the Borough Council's Leisure Facilities

Responsible Officers Key:

D:	Director
LFM:	Leisure Facilities Manager
SSRO:	Service, Sales and Retention Officer
SAEO:	Sports, Activities and Events Officer
OO:	Operations Officer(s)
LMT:	All of the above

Last Updated: 05 July 2021

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
Recover and Reinvent Optimise the return to leisure facilities	To safely return leisure services to the public. Where necessary, reinvent the delivery of existing leisure services and introducing new services opportunities	Respond to the latest Government guidelines and plan to safely and effectively re-open services	April / May 2021 and ongoing	Provision made within the revenue budget	OO	↑	Leisure facilities have responded safely and effectively to open services promptly in line with Government guidance
		Adapt to deliver services differently or to create new services in their place with the goal to keep the community engaged, more active and living healthier, happier lives	April / May 2021 and ongoing		LMT	↑	Exercise classes, gymnastics and exercise referrals were delivered online whilst restrictions prevented face to face provision Holiday activities, bowls and other sessions have evolved in delivery to allow services to take place
		Support members, clubs and groups across the service to adapt to return to leisure activities promptly, with confidence and within Government guidance	April / May 2021 and ongoing		OO	↑	Clubs and groups have received regular communication about re-starting their bookings and provided with support as required
	Review pricing and packages	To review fees, charges and packages to meet the demands of a post-COVID environment	September 2021	To identify within the review process	LMT	→	A review of fees and charges has begun. Recommendations for any changes will be presented to the C&E Board in due course
	Explore the opportunity of optimising use of space at Colehill Leisure Centre	Review the opportunities to optimise the use of space in reception, the viewing gallery and in other areas of the facility to increase services, attendance and improve financial performance	March 2022		SAEO / OO (CLC) / LFM	→	A proposal was presented to Management Team earlier this financial year. A more detailed business case will be presented in due course.

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
Connecting with Communities Be more outward looking and community focused	Actively consult and seek feedback to understand what communities want and to shape current and future services	Continue to ask questions and gain feedback on current and future services throughout the year. To feedback to the Board regularly about surveys, forums, mystery visits and reviewing verbal and written feedback	March 2022	Provision made within the revenue budget	OO	→	Customer feedback is regularly fed into team meetings to better shape service A customer survey is planned to take place in August to gain feedback on services during the pandemic and to understand what people want to see as restrictions are eased / removed Customer forums specific to gym and group exercise performance will take place across sites in September
	Focus on delivering services more tailored to the wants and needs of the community	Explore Net Promoter Score (NPS) as a feasible measure of performance	November 2021	Identify within the review	OO	→	Project work is yet to start on NPS
		Collaborate with Community Development, Public Health, community groups and other appropriate partners on the development and delivery of services, events and community projects. Engagements with new groups ongoing may further enhance the annual plan, which outlines the delivery timescales	Ongoing until March 2022	Provision made within the revenue budget process	SAEO / SSRO	→	Regular meetings are taking place with Community Development, Atherstone Clinic, Think Active, Everyone Health (exercise referral) and Swim England. The leisure team has also met numerous other stake holders including Kingsbury Water Park, Atherstone GFS, TQEA, The Coleshill School, The Stone Channel Atherstone and more, with the aim to be more community focused in developing and delivering services

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
		Optimise service delivery within / by communities, through securing external support for activity programmes. To update the Board at each meeting	Ongoing until March 2022		SAEO / SSRO	→	Delivery of activities at TQEA by Leisure Facilities staff took place in June as part of the Tackling Inequalities funding secured through Think Active Plans are being shaped between Leisure Facilities and Community Development, to improve cycling provision and increase exercise referral / social prescribing within the community. Further updates will be provided as plans progress
	Successfully introduce the leisure App to customers and the wider community	Plan to ensure the successful introduction of the leisure App to improve booking services, communication and service awareness	June 2021		LMT	→	Although later than planned, the App, which will improve the booking experience, communication and marketing to facility users, will go live at the end of July 2021. Once the App is live, the Leisure team will share a short video demonstrating the App, with a link allowing a download opportunity
Positive Experiences for the community, with a particular focus on:	Optimise opportunities for the community, with a particular focus on services for children and young people to be more physically active	Holiday Activities Create new coaching / activity roles to improve the quality and quantity of future services Re-establish and further develop the holiday activities offering to the community to achieve levels at or above that in 2019 (prior to Coronavirus closures).	June 2021 April / May 2021 and ongoing	Provision made within the revenue budget Process	SAEO SAEO	↑ →	The post was created and has been advertised from May through to August. Holiday activities were delivered in April and May across sites. Activities saw a positive level of attendance across the sites

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Children and Young People - Active Ageing - Disabled, Disadvantaged and Special Educational Needs (SEN) 		Parties					
		- Reinvent the use of the parties space during closure	June 2021 or earlier	Provision made within the revenue budget Process	SAEO / OO	↑	The Leisure team is planning more comprehensive activity provision for the summer as restrictions are expected to further relax During the pandemic, whilst parties have not been allowed to return, sites have made best use of sports hall space through temporarily increasing club bookings and opening up the opportunity for casual pay and play
		- Re-introduce the existing parties service offering at the facilities	Sept 2021 or earlier		SAEO / OO	→	Pending the outcome of the Stage 4 easing of Lockdown parties are planned to return from late July / early August
		Schools					
		- Retain existing and attract new schools and groups of all ages and abilities to the Pool (most schools are expected to return in September / October 2021)	October 2021	Provision made within the revenue budget process	SAEO	→	School swim attendances in the first quarter have been around 50% those seen in pre-pandemic environments; however, school swimming is expected to make a strong recovery from the new academic year, starting in September
		- Re-introduce work experience schemes and explore opportunities around the development of training and volunteer experiences that may lead to employment	August 2021		LMT	↓	Although the team was ready (restrictions allowing) and willing to take on work experience this summer, schools do not appear to have been operating the scheme this academic year

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
	<p>Explore the opportunity and start to action the improved service offering for the “active ageing” populations within in North Warwickshire</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Sports and Coaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintain a remote gymnastics service offering during Lockdown - Optimise the number of junior coached and activity sessions hosted within the facilities, both through increasing the in-house offering, and recruiting new groups (restore previous and create new opportunities). To report progress to the Board: comparing occupancy / attendances versus 2019; and informing of changes <p style="text-align: center;">Swimming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restore and where possible enhance the number of swimmers on the Learn to Swim scheme versus 2019 / 20 by January 2022 	<p>April 2021</p> <p>March 2022</p> <p>September 2021</p> <p>November 2021</p> <p>March 2022</p>		<p>SAEO</p> <p>SAEO</p> <p>SAEO / OO (ALC)</p> <p>SAEO</p>	<p>↑</p> <p>→</p> <p>→</p> <p>→</p>	<p>Zoom gymnastics sessions continued delivery through April and delivery returned back to sites in May 2021</p> <p>A triathlon club has started delivering sessions from Atherstone swimming pool two nights a week; Aston Villa FC has started delivering sessions at Polesworth Sports Centre and TQEA. The Leisure team plans to increase sessions delivered by the Authority later in the year as restrictions ease</p> <p>Learn to swim numbers have made a positive recovery with memberships of 650 on the programme at the end of June. As restrictions ease, lesson ratios will be able to increase and numbers on the scheme are expected to reflect the increase in capacity</p> <p>A review of the pool timetable is currently under way looking at short, medium- and long-term opportunities. Changes (which included the implementation of a triathlon club) will continue to progress to better meet local needs and provision</p>
	<p>Enhance the Leisure Facilities service offering to the disabled, disadvantaged and Special Educational Needs (SEN) populations of North Warwickshire</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understand the Pool timetable and plan changes to optimise the use of the Pool whilst better representing the needs of the community - Start to implement changes in service and timetabling 					

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
		<p align="center">Health and Fitness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Re-establish the Junior Gym and Fitness offering and aim to expand this market with targeted campaigns around educational terms - Explore the opportunities and demand for offering family fitness activities periodically or permanently <p>Engage community groups and with Community Development to create an action plan for the increase in service for active ageing populations with short, medium and long term goals; and; Start to implement plans with the aim to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understand the opportunities to expand this service in future years - Enhance current service quality - Increase the in-house service offering - Increase the number of groups and organisations hosted at the leisure facilities - Work with and support those community groups offering services to the active ageing population 	<p>Sept 2021 and Jan 2022</p> <p>February 2022</p> <p>November 2021</p> <p>March 2022</p>		<p>SAEO</p> <p>SSRO / OO</p> <p>SSRO</p> <p>LFM / SAEO / SSRO</p> <p>SAEO / SSRO</p>	<p>→</p> <p>→</p> <p>→</p> <p>→</p> <p>→</p>	<p>'Junior fitness' has returned well since re-opening. Due to capacities with restrictions, campaigns were not run earlier in the year, however a "junior fitness" campaign will take place in September, usually a popular time for sign-ups as students return to school / university</p> <p>This area of service will be explored later in the year. An external company (Sweaty Mama's) has delivered family fitness sessions at Atherstone Memorial Hall</p> <p>Bowls sessions have successfully re-started across facilities, sticking to governing body guidelines</p> <p>Tea Dance is hopeful to start from August pending the easing of restrictions later in July</p> <p>'Active Living' group exercise classes have been identified and highlighted on class timetables. Wider awareness campaigns will take place later in the year to promote the service offering</p> <p>Ideas have been collated from the Leisure team and some</p>

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
		<p>- Create a better awareness and signposting of all of these services delivered within North Warwickshire</p> <p>When making service updates to plan to accommodate opportunities for disabled, disadvantaged and Special Educational Needs (SEN) populations</p> <p>Secure funding for and deliver services in the community around tackling inequalities, to ensure a more diverse and inclusive service offer</p>	<p>March 2022</p> <p>March 2022</p>		<p>LFM</p> <p>LFM / SAEO / SSRO</p>	<p>→</p> <p>→</p>	<p>community group consultation has taken place, including bowls and tea dance groups</p> <p>Family bowls sessions are planned to be trialled during the summer holidays at Atherstone Memorial Hall</p> <p>Consultation will take place with more groups later in the year to better understand community needs and shape delivery plans</p> <p>Considerations are currently being made to increase gym-based exercise options whilst planning small changes in gym equipment, to be implemented later this year</p> <p>The SEAO has networked with various contacts with the aim to introduce more disabled, disadvantaged and SEN inclusive activities later this year</p> <p>Project delivery in high schools was delivered in June using funding secured last financial year</p> <p>Currently no additional funding has been secured directly, but opportunities to secure funding have been shared with groups</p>

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
		Use the “We are Undefeatable” Sport England campaign to promote the service offer and encourage participation	March 2022		SAEO / SSRO	→	and clubs within facilities and the local area This campaign will take place later in the year to support promotion of the start-up of activities
Connecting with Health and Wellbeing	To increase awareness of the importance of health and wellbeing within the community	Report to the Health and Wellbeing Working Party on the Leisure Facilities-related actions within the Health and Wellbeing Action Plan	Ongoing	Provision made within the revenue budget Process	LFM	→	Attendance and updates have been provided at each meeting this year to date
		Deliver Health and Wellbeing events and campaigns throughout the year, joining up working with other groups and organisations where possible and linking to charities to enhance the impact where appropriate	March 2022		SEAO / SSRO	→	Leisure Facilities, Community Development and Atherstone Clinic joined up to share material with members and communities around diabetes awareness in June
	To recover and further develop the choice of health and wellbeing services to strive to improve physical and mental wellbeing within the community	Working with Everyone Health, re-establish and optimise the offering around Exercise Referral, including programmes for those who have had health conditions or have been inactive as a result of the coronavirus pandemic.	July 2021		SSRO	↑	Exercise referral was re-introduced to sites from May. Monthly meetings take place with Everyone Health. The team aims to increase activities that can be referred into within facilities and the community later this year
		Working with corporate and local businesses, create a “Workplace Wellbeing” pack and service offering, targeting corporate and local / high street businesses	February 2022		SSRO	→	Project work will commence later this year
			December 2021	LFM	→		

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
		<p>Explore the opportunity to introduce Mental Health First Aiders within the service, to identify concerns, signpost to support and enhance the opportunity for suicide prevention within the community</p> <p>Periodically gain feedback on the impact existing and new services are having on the physical and mental wellbeing of the community and thereafter to improve the focus and impact of the service offer</p>	September 2021 and March 2022		OO	→	<p>Project work will commence later this year</p> <p>Customers and the community will be asked this question as part of survey and forum communications in August and September</p>
Active Environments	<p>Complete a review of opportunities to increase services in environments outside of the leisure facilities</p> <p>Start to deliver more activities, events and services in alternative environments outside of leisure facilities</p> <p>To explore digital technology in supporting service delivery</p>	<p>To create a three-year development plan that identifies how the Leisure Facilities team will expand its services utilising outdoor space and community environments</p> <p>To work with Community Development on the planning and delivery of the Borough's Cycling Plan</p> <p>Work with Community Development to include the leisure facilities as hubs for walking, running and cycling groups</p> <p>Start to increase the use of parks and outdoor spaces in the delivery of services and events</p> <p>To scope digital and technological opportunities within the service. Action plan to introduce opportunities to enhance the service offering and reduce barriers to participation (cost, time, access, other)</p>	<p>October 2021</p> <p>January 2022</p> <p>January 2022</p> <p>October 2021</p> <p>July 2021</p>	<p>To identify within the review process</p> <p>Provision made within the revenue budget Process</p> <p>To identify within the review process</p>	<p>LFM / SEAO / SSRO</p> <p>LFM / SAEO</p> <p>LFM / SSRO</p> <p>SAEO / SSRO</p> <p>LMT</p>	<p>→</p> <p>→</p> <p>→</p> <p>→</p> <p>→</p>	<p>Planning has commenced and will be finalised later this year</p> <p>Leisure Facilities and Community Development continue to work closely to progress cycling provision and opportunities within the Borough</p> <p>The pandemic has impacted the ability to deliver events effectively so far this year. However, plans are progressing well to deliver 'Learn to Ride' cycling programmes and the opportunity to deliver more outdoor provision at The Coleshill School has been discussed with the School</p>

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress			
Health and Fitness	Improve the quality of the health and fitness service across the facilities, focusing on re-engaging members, improving retention, increasing sales, and providing a positive customer experience	Review the member journey in a post-COVID-19 world and plan that journey from the point of finding out about the service to becoming a loyal member	January 2022	Provision made within the revenue budget Process	SSRO	→	Progress has been made to improve the member journey for exercise classes. A more detailed review will take place later in the year to review and improve the gym and front of house journey			
		Through consultation with staff and the community, introduce new equipment and technology to facilities to enhance the service offering	August 2022					SSRO / LFM	→	Keiser group exercise bikes and class technology were introduced in June Further equipment and technology have been planned and will be presented to Management Team later in July and, if approved, will be delivered later in the financial year
		Ensure the delivery of health and fitness marketing campaigns throughout the year to achieve sales targets	Ongoing until March 2022					SSRO	→	A 'Re-Open, Re-Start, Re-Engage' campaign ran in May to encourage the community back into facilities and activity A 50% off until October Campaign ran from 14 June to 20 July with the aim to boost memberships
		Deliver regular member engagements, incentives and service developments to optimise retention	Ongoing until March 2022					SSRO	→	From 12 April to the end of June memberships were up 192. Monthly gym challenges have taken place across facilities VIP and taster sessions were hosted in the build-up to the launch of Keiser and Les Mills

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
		<p>Group Exercise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Optimise the impact of the new Les Mills and group studio cycling service enhancements - Review the group exercise programme to ensure occupancy levels are proactively managed 	Ongoing until March 2022		SSRO	→	Nutritional, gym and group exercise engagements have been shared regularly on social media and on the 'Eat Well', 'Group Exercise' and 'Gym Fitness' Facebook groups
		Review the opportunity for funding and cost / benefit of procuring hi-tech biometric health testing scales	February 2022	To identify within the review process	SSRO	→	Staff training and class attendance were offered prior to the launch to educate the team. Taster sessions were offered to customers prior to the launch, alongside social media promotion, adverts within local circulation magazines and a feature on 'The Stone Atherstone Channel'. Uptake of the new timetable has been positive. Performance will be monitored Project work will commence later in the year
Health and Safety / Operations	To ensure appropriate levels of skilled staff are available to maintain service	Ensure staffing levels and development opportunities are appropriately managed through the year	Ongoing until March 2022	Divisional and Corporate Training Budget	OO	→	The pandemic has caused a number of staffing challenges: The requirement to self-isolate has led to more reactive cover. Qualifications have been hard to obtain due to restrictions. This has also led to a shortage of specialist qualified staff. Due to the freeze in career opportunities, the return back to
	To ensure all staff are engaged and have a clear role in maintaining service	Ensure appraisals are completed and communication structures are maintained at all levels through the year	Ongoing until March 2022		OO	→	

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
	Ensure health and safety is maintained at all times within leisure facilities	Continue to review, update and improve facility health and safety. To feedback progress and outcomes of health and safety and building audits	Ongoing until March 2022		OO	→	<p>normality has meant more staff than normal are at the stage of career progression, so turnover is high</p> <p>Despite these challenges, to date services have remained open, but more staff training has been required than in a normal year in Pool Plant, Lifeguard and First Aid to maintain operational resilience</p> <p>An online risk assessment course ran in April. A lifeguard course ran in May, a first aid course also ran in July. A Swim Teacher course runs in August</p> <p>Recruitment has taken place throughout the year as required</p> <p>Risk assessments have been reviewed and updated at each stage of the pandemic to ensure adherence to the latest guidelines</p> <p>Building Audits have continued at facilities</p> <p>Fire evacuations have taken place across sites since re-opening</p>

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
		Continue to monitor and audit health and safety knowledge and compliance. To feedback training updates and spot check results to the Board	Ongoing until March 2022		LFM	→	Internal audits have taken place to ensure compliance and create action plans to improve safety. Scores of 80%+ have been recorded to date Staff knowledge spot checks have taken place across sites
Marketing and Promotion	Ensure effective marketing to the public to optimise engagement and potential return on investment	Create an updated Marketing Plan to be proactive in service campaigns, to include events scheduled throughout the year	April 2021	Provision made within the revenue budget Process	LFM	→	Plans have been created outlining marketing throughout the year
		To update the Board on campaigns and marketing activity through the year	Ongoing until March 2022		LFM	→	Detailed above, results of the October health and fitness campaign will be shared with the Board shortly after completion
		Optimise web engagements (at or above that of 2020 / 21) and increase social media followers (Facebook 200+, Twitter 50+)	Ongoing until March 2022		LMT	→	Facebook followers are currently up 95 across sites since April. Twitter followers have not grown to date
		Deliver quarterly internal and external leisure bulletins	Ongoing until March 2022		LFM	→	Due to the pandemic, leisure bulletins have not been generated. Instead, customers and relevant internal colleagues have been updated regularly on progress via email and on social media. The first leisure bulletin is planned to circulate in August both internally and externally, also as the first push

Theme	Action	Target	Timescale	Resource / Cost	Lead Officer	RAG and DOT	Comment / Progress
							notification on the new leisure App
Monitoring, Review and Evaluation	Report on performance against the actions identified in this Service Improvement Plan to each meeting of the C&E Board		Every Community and Environment Board		D / LFM	→	Reports made to each meeting of the C&E Board

Agenda Item No 8

Community and Environment Board

26 July 2021

Report of the Director of Leisure and Community Development

Boot Hill Recreation Ground, Grendon

1 Summary

- 1.1 This report informs Members of the progress being made in respect of the development of Boot Hill Recreation Ground in Grendon and asks for the Board's direction on potential improvements to on-site ancillary accommodation and in respect of the potential granting of a Tenancy at Will to Grendon Football Club.

Recommendation to the Board

- a That Members note and comment upon the progress made in respect of the development of Boot Hill Recreation Ground in Grendon;
- b That, if the Board is minded to improve the on-site ancillary accommodation at the Recreation Ground, it determines the means by which it wishes Officers to undertake this task; and
- c That the Board considers and comments upon the principle of the Borough Council entering into a short-term agreement with Grendon Football Club, through which it could assume responsibility for the management and maintenance of Boot Hill Recreation Ground, prior to consideration of this matter at a future meeting of the Resources Board.

2 Consultation

- 2.1 Consultation has taken place with relevant Members and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

3 Boot Hill Recreation Ground, Grendon - Introduction

- 3.1 The Borough Council's Playing Pitch Strategy (2018 to 2031) was formally adopted by the Board at its meeting held in January 2019, at which time it also noted the complementary content of the Football Association's Local Football Facilities Plan (2018 to 2028) for North Warwickshire. Copies of both documents are available on the Borough Council's website www.northwarks.gov.uk/sportspitches.

- 3.2 The Strategy clearly identifies that the most significant issue is the need to improve the quality, not necessarily the quantity, of grass pitches, although there is also a need to improve the number of junior pitches, most particularly for football. The known need to improve ancillary accommodation is emphasised, as is the need to provide two 3G artificial grass pitches in the Borough, one in Atherstone and one in Polesworth.
- 3.3 Boot Hill Recreation Ground is a green space that is owned and managed by the Borough Council. It is designated as a playing field, in respect of which its predominant use has been for organised football matches. The Recreation Ground is also accessible for informal use by the local community.
- 3.4 The need to improve the quality of the adult football pitch at Boot Hill Recreation Ground, Grendon, which has not been used for the last five seasons, is recognised in the Playing Pitch Strategy. The unavailability of this pitch has had a negative impact on the well-established local Football Club, as well as other teams in the catchment community. Given this need, the Institute of Groundsmen (IoG) was commissioned to undertake a detailed site investigation of the ground conditions and future drainage needs at the site, subsequent to which an appropriate drainage scheme was procured and water discharge permission secured from the County Council's Flood Risk Management Team. The cost implications of these works, which were undertaken across the spring, summer and autumn of last year, were met through the provisions of a Section 106 Agreement related to the development of the former Sparrowdale School.
- 3.5 The pitch improvement works are now complete and the site was formally handed back to the Authority by the contractor in November 2020. In view of the investment to create a good quality playing surface, further work has been undertaken to secure the site from vehicular incursions. New bow top fencing has replaced the knee railing around the car park and a vehicle access gate and kissing gate have both been added into the fence line.
- 3.6 In conjunction with Ward Members and the local Football Club, detailed consideration has been given to the most appropriate means by which to meet the on-site ancillary accommodation and equipment needs at the Recreation Ground. Preliminary designs were produced for a two-team changing unit and the outline costs were sought for various means through which to provide the accommodation. These indicative costs are identified in the table below:

Means of Provision	Indicative Cost (£)
New brick built changing rooms	245,000 to 296,000 – Dependent upon the extent of works undertaken
Purpose designed portacabin facility	195,000, plus provision for a concrete slab and service connections (approximate cost of £20,000)
Modular designed changing rooms	£62,000, plus provision for a concrete slab and service connections (approximate cost of £20,000)
Renovation of existing brick-built facility	Approximately £40,000 – Further design and cost process required

- 3.7 Given the extent of resource provision available to complete works at the Recreation Ground (approximately £72,000), the only affordable option of those listed above is that associated with the renovation of the existing brick-built pavilion, which is currently suffering from subsidence.
- 3.8 In view of the condition of the current changing accommodation, structural engineers were commissioned to undertake an inspection of the building, which is over 30 years old. The subsequently received inspection report confirms that the building has suffered movement, which has led to the formation of “stepped cracks”. These cracks are evident throughout the internal walls, external brickwork and within the ground floor slab. The structural engineers state that the foundations need to be extended, both below ground and around the building and also that the ground floor slab would need to be replaced with a suspended floor.
- 3.9 The building will continue to move unless significant foundations works are undertaken. The engineers conclude that the repair work could be undertaken through one of three options:
- Traditional underpinning with a new suspended floor
 - Underpinning using proprietary screw piles with a new suspended floor
 - Provision of an internal and reinforced “raft” slab, which allows for the building to “float” on the heaving soils
- 3.10 The cracks to the existing masonry could be repaired using traditional crack stitching, once the foundations have been repaired. A small number of trees and bushes adjacent to the pavilion, however, would need to be removed to further protect the integrity of the building structure. None of this vegetation is

“protected”. The trees and bushes could be replaced on site, however, if the Board was minded to approve renovation works to the pavilion.

- 3.11 In view of the foregoing, the Board is asked to confirm, or otherwise, its support for the renovation of the existing on-site changing accommodation, which would be funded through the provisions of the Section 106 Agreement referred to in paragraph 3.4 above.

4 Grendon Football Club

- 4.1 Members are aware that, from September, Grendon Football Club has aspirations to return to playing its matches at Boot Hill Recreation Ground and, at its meeting held in March 2021, the Board was informed that consideration was being given to the option of entering into a Tenancy at Will with the Football Club through which it would undertake future management and maintenance of the site. In support of this process, the Football Club has worked constructively with the Borough Council over a prolonged period to ensure that the on-site improvement works meet not only its own needs, but those of the wider community and other local voluntary sector sports clubs.

- 4.2 Further to having been in discussions with local Members and Officers, Grendon Football Club is currently producing a Development Plan, which will contain the following Key Objectives:

- To ensure the sustainability, financial viability and continued growth of Grendon Football Club
- To develop the playing space at Boot Hill Recreation Ground to meet its own needs and the needs of other local football clubs
- To develop the changing facilities at Boot Hill Recreation Ground to ensure that the facilities can accommodate current and future needs
- To ensure that Boot Hill Recreation Ground continues to serve the leisure-related needs of the wider local community

- 4.3 These Key Objectives are compatible with a number of the conclusions and recommendations identified within the adopted Playing Pitch Strategy, as well as the Borough Council’s Green Space Strategy.

- 4.4 At recent meetings with Ward Councillors, the Chairman of the Community and Environment Board, the Leader of the Council and Officers, the Football Club has reaffirmed its desire to develop football pitch opportunities, both senior and junior, at Boot Hill Recreation Ground and to begin the process of working towards entering into a long-term lease with the Authority, through which it could assume responsibility for the management and operation of the site. As Members will be aware, the security of tenure provided by a long-term lease would provide the Club with an opportunity to seek to acquire external funding, through which it could further develop playing pitch opportunities.

4.5 Grendon Football Club understands that the provision of a long-term lease on an open, publicly accessible Recreation Ground would represent a significant undertaking, both for the Borough Council and the Club itself. As a precursor, therefore, the Club has expressed the desire to enter into a Tenancy at Will arrangement with the Authority, through which it could assume responsibility for the management and maintenance of the Recreation Ground in a manner that would better meet its needs and those of the wider community than has been the case to date. If the Borough Council was minded to grant a short-term Tenancy at Will, the Sports Club would seek to:

- Maintain the sports pitches at its own expense
- Seek external funding to purchase its own equipment to maintain and, subject to the availability of resources, to protect the football pitch(es)
- Continue to facilitate community access to the site

4.6 The Board will be aware that the Authority entered into a Tenancy at Will with Hurley Kings Football Club prior to entering into a formal long-term lease for its occupation of Hurley Daw Mill Sports Ground and also that it has entered into a Tenancy at Will with Atherstone Sports Club in respect of its use and development of part of Royal Meadow Drive Recreation Ground. Such an agreement is ideal in cases where two parties are working towards a more formal, longer-term arrangement. It is a temporary agreement that is terminable at any time by either party, subject to the provision of “reasonable notice”. It contains the essential clauses necessary to protect both parties and also affords an opportunity for the associated activity to be undertaken. It could also contain key milestones working towards the agreement of a formal lease arrangement.

... 4.7 Whilst permission to grant a Tenancy at Will would be determined by the Resources Board, this Board is asked to consider and comment upon the principle of this course of action, in view of its implications for the conclusions and recommendations of the Playing Pitch Strategy. To help the Board in this process, a draft Tenancy at Will is attached at Appendix A for Members’ consideration. The draft agreement does not preclude general community access to the site for informal recreation.

5 Report Implications

5.1 Finance and Value for Money Implications

5.1.1 There is no new financial implication arising directly out of this report, as the potential capital works referred to would be funded from the Section 106 Agreement related to the development of the former Sparrowdale School.

5.2 Safer Communities Implications

5.2.1 Projects advanced through the provisions of the Playing Pitch Strategy contribute to community safety by providing well-managed open space and recreation areas that afford opportunities for positive activity.

5.3 Legal, Data Protection and Human Rights Implications

5.3.1 There are no data protection or human rights implications arising directly from this report. The terms of the draft Tenancy at Will appended to the report have been approved by the Borough Council's Legal Services and provide appropriate protections to the Authority, Grendon Football Club and the wider community. As with any draft agreement, it is possible that the terms will be modified to reflect the parties' requirements. The significant terms, however, will remain broadly the same. Legal Services will provide further advice on the terms of the Tenancy at Will as required.

5.4 Environment, Sustainability and Health Implications

5.4.1 Delivery of priorities identified in the Playing Pitch Strategy contributes directly to the development of sustainable and vibrant communities, not least through the creation of opportunities to engage in activities that positively contribute to individual and collective physical and mental health and wellbeing.

5.5 Human Resources Implications

5.5.1 There are no human resources implications arising directly from this report.

5.6 Risk Management Implications

5.6.1 Any work undertaken to the existing on-site changing accommodation will be risk assessed and appropriate controls put in place, where appropriate.

5.7 Equalities Implications

5.7.1 There are no new equalities implications arising directly from this report.

5.8 Links to Council's Priorities

5.8.1 The North Warwickshire Playing Pitch Strategy has direct and positive links to the following corporate priorities:

- Responsible financial and resource management
- Creating safer communities
- Improving leisure and wellbeing opportunities
- Promoting sustainable and vibrant communities

5.8.2 Additionally, implementation of the provisions of the Playing Pitch Strategy contributes directly to the attainment of the priorities of the Sustainable Community Strategy to:

- Raise aspirations, educational attainment and skill levels
- Develop healthier communities
- Improve access to services

The Contact Officers for this report are Simon Powell (719352) and Evan Ross (719270).

Background Papers

Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D, as substituted by the Local Government Act, 2000 Section 97

Background Paper No	Author	Nature of Background Paper	Date
1	North Warwickshire Borough Council	North Warwickshire Green Space Strategy	2020 to 2033
2	North Warwickshire Borough Council	North Warwickshire Playing Pitch Strategy	2018 to 2031
3	Director of Leisure and Community Development	North Warwickshire Green Space Strategy Progress Report	March 2021

Tenancy at Will

The AGREEMENT is made on

Entered into between: North Warwickshire Borough Council (“The Landlord”)

And

Grendon Football Club (“The Tenant”)

WHEREBY IT IS AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

1 DEFINITIONS

1.1 “The Landlord” means North Warwickshire Borough Council, The Council House
South Street, Atherstone, CV9 1DE

1.2 “The Tenant” means Grendon Football Club, acting under the hand of its chairman
{insert name and address}

1.3 “The Property” means the property known as Boot Hill Recreation Ground edged red
on the Plan annexed hereto

1.4 “Permitted Use” means use of the premises for sport and recreation purposes only

1.5 “The Rent” means the amounts payable by the Tenant to the Landlord in terms of
this agreement.

2 INTERPRETATION

2.1 Clause headings in this agreement are for convenience only and shall not be taken
into account in the interpretation hereof

2.2 Where the context so indicates, reference to the singular shall be deemed to include
the plural and vice versa and reference to one gender shall be deemed to include
other genders



3 GRANT OF TENANCY AT WILL

3.1 The Landlord hereby lets and the Tenant takes on hire of the Property on a Tenancy at Will, commencing on and including the date of this agreement.

3.2 The Landlord and the Tenant hereby confirm that this agreement creates a Tenancy at Will which is terminable at any time by either of the parties, notwithstanding that the Rent is calculated and payable by reference to a period nor that the Landlord intends to demand the Rent and that the Tenant has agreed to pay the Rent by reference to that period.

4 RENT PAYMENTS

4.1 The Rent shall be £0 for a maximum period of twelve months from the date of this agreement subject to the provisions of clause 5 below or until a formal lease has been agreed between the Parties to this agreement whichever shall be the sooner. In the event that the Tenant fails to comply with the provisions of clause 5 rent equivalent to pitch hire fees of £464 in respect of the 2020/21 season will become payable.

5 TENANTS OBLIGATIONS

5.1 The Tenant shall not use the Property for any other purpose other than the Permitted Use.

5.2 Once appropriate access arrangements have been completed, the Tenant shall carry out the pitch line marking at its own expense including the provision of all necessary equipment and materials for all matches scheduled at the ground during the playing season.

5.3 The tenant shall keep the Landlord fully indemnified against all losses arising directly or indirectly out of any act, omission or negligence of the Tenant, or any persons at the Premises expressly or impliedly with its authority, or any breach or non-observance by the Tenant of the covenants, conditions or other provisions of the agreement.

5.4 The Tenant shall affect public liability insurance in respect of the Premises and activities held there.

5.5 The Tenant shall attend a minimum of three meetings called by the Landlord at no less than two weeks' notice at which the tenant shall evidence progress made in respect of the management of the facilities.

5.6 The Tenant shall agree the terms of a Lease for the Property which terms shall be ratified by the Landlord.

5.7 The Tenant shall not make any alterations and/or additions and/or structural changes of whatsoever nature to the Property without the prior written consent of the Landlord; such consent shall not unreasonably be withheld.

- 5.8 The Tenant shall not do or permit to be done on the Property any dangerous or noxious activity not normal to the Permitted Use of the Property and shall not do, or permit to be done, or omit to do anything which causes or which may cause a nuisance, annoyance, disturbance, inconvenience, injury and/or damage to the Landlord, the Tenant and/or the neighbours to the Property.
- 5.9 The Tenant shall not sublet, underlet, or otherwise dispose of the Property, in whole or in part.
- 5.10 The Tenant shall not permit the Property or any part of the Property to be occupied at any time by any person other than the Tenant and such other clubs or organisations that have hired the use of pitches or Property by agreement with the Landlord.
- 5.11 The Tenant shall allow the Landlord and/or his representatives, agents and contractors access to the Property at all reasonable hours for the purpose of ascertaining whether the terms of this agreement have been complied with and or for any other purpose connected with the Landlord's interest in the Property.
- 5.12 The Tenant shall keep the Landlord informed of intended use of the pitches to facilitate pitch maintenance until the Tenant is able to undertake these duties.

6 LANDLORD'S OBLIGATIONS

- 6.1 The Landlord shall meet the cost of the rent during the period of this agreement.
- 6.2 The Landlord shall undertake all grounds maintenance and tree management at the Property until such time as appropriate equipment has been procured enabling the Tenant to undertake grass cutting, pitch line marking and other required works.
- 6.3 The Landlord shall keep the Tenant fully indemnified against all losses arising directly or indirectly out of any act, omission or negligence of the Landlord, or any persons at the Premises expressly or impliedly with its authority, or any breach or non-observance by the Landlord of the covenants, conditions or other provisions of the agreement.
- 6.4 The Landlord shall maintain its public liability and property insurance in respect of the Premises and activities held there.
- 6.5 The Landlord shall arrange and attend a minimum of three meetings with the Tenant at which the tenant shall evidence progress made in respect of the management of the facility.

7 SIGNATORIES

7.1

EXECUTED as a DEED by affixing the

COMMON SEAL of NORTH
WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH
COUNCIL in the presence of:-

Designated Officer

7.2

SIGNED as a DEED by the said
GRENDON FOOTBALL CLUB:-

Chairman

In the presence of:-

Agenda Item No 9

Health and Wellbeing Working Party Minutes

21 June 2021, 10.00am to 12 noon

Present: Cllr. M Humphreys (retiring Chairperson), Cllr. Macdonald (new Chairperson), Cllr. Chambers, Becky Evans, Emma Ecob, Russell Simkiss, Dorothy Barratt (all NWBC), Garry Palmer, Lori Harvey (both WCC), Yasser Din (Public Health England)

Part: Cllr. D Reilly (NWBC), Helen Miller (George Eliot Hospital)

Apologies for Absence: Simon Powell and Matthew Green (both NWBC)

Item	Notes	Action
2	<p>Minutes of the Last Meeting (27 April 2021)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2021 were agreed as an accurate record of the proceedings.</p> <p>Emma Ecob had printed both the Director of Public Health's 2020 / 21 Annual Report and the Warwickshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy and placed copies in Members' pigeonholes. Some Members reported that they had not received the documents. EE to ensure that all Working Party Members had copies placed in their pigeonholes.</p>	EE
*	<p>Cllr M Humphreys stepped down as Chairperson of the Health and Wellbeing Working Party at the start of the meeting, with Cllr Macdonald taking over as Chairperson.</p>	
3	<p>Local Transport Plan</p> <p>Garry Palmer (Lead Commissioner (Strategy and Policy) at Warwickshire County Council) attended to update the Working Party on the "Killed and Seriously Injured on the Roads" developments, and the Local Transport Plan. GP reported that there was currently no national target to reach for "vehicles involved in a collision" or "casualties from collisions", but that there had not been an increase or significant gains over the past five years. When asked about the highest risks of road collisions on junctions, GP reported that North Warwickshire is on a par with the rest of the county, although 20% of the cluster sites / routes prone to collisions were located in North Warwickshire. Cllr. Reilly outlined that "killed or seriously injured on the roads" is one of the top three health priorities for North Warwickshire, and that the top five cluster sites / routes for collisions are all based in North Warwickshire and is, therefore, a local concern.</p> <p>GP also reported that the Road Safety Partnership is developing a draft strategy to target these key areas. It was requested by the Working Party that the cluster sites / routes list be shared, that any Warwickshire County Council / Highways England plans (including the draft Road Safety Partnership Strategy) to address the sites noted be shared, and that an update be provided at a future meeting.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the concern that this issue has been prevalent across North Warwickshire for a significant period of time, it was suggested that the issue be raised at the Community and Environment Board, and potentially an upcoming Full Council meeting.</p>	GP/DR

Item	Notes	Action
	<p>EE updated the Working Party regarding the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan consultation (see link) https://warwickshirelwcwip.commonplace.is/ . MH reported that she had sent the consultation to all Parish Councils and that all Working Party Members would be invited to complete and share the consultation link.</p>	
4	<p>Health and Wellbeing Action Plan Update</p> <p>Helen Miller (Integrated Sexual Health Team Leader for Warwickshire North) provided an update to the Working Party around the Health Store and the recent history of sexual health provision across North Warwickshire, as well as the plans for ISH services in the Borough moving forward out of lockdown. ISH services continued throughout the various lockdowns, but all services moved to the GEH. Services will remain at the GEH moving out of lockdown, with Atherstone Clinic being offered to people should they not be able to travel to GEH.</p> <p>Helen is meeting with the head of Polesworth School to discuss the re-opening of the clinic at the school – Helen to provide feedback (either in person or via email to EE).</p> <p>Helen also reported that a questionnaire is to be sent to all North Warwickshire secondary schools to ask young people where they access sexual health services, as well as the postcodes of where people access serves, to identify gaps in service provision. Helen to send the link to the questionnaire to EE for sharing across social media. It was requested by the Working Party that feedback / results from these questionnaires be shared, and that this item remain on the agenda of future meetings.</p> <p>MH raised questions regarding the funding of Health Store (as the Working Party had previously funded the service), however it was determined that no payment had been made this financial year due to the pandemic, and that since the Health Store would not be re-opening, no future payments would be required.</p>	<p>HM/EE</p> <p>HM/EE</p>
5	<p>Public Health/JSNA Update</p> <p>Yasser Din reported that Liann Brooks-Smith had left as Public Health Consultant for Warwickshire North. YD outlined a range of COVID-19 statistics for North Warwickshire stating that general trends of cases across North Warwickshire are increasing, but not at an alarming rate.</p> <p>Cllr Macdonald asked how younger people were to be engaged and encouraged to get the vaccine when able. YD explained that a range of targeted engagement interventions were being amalgamated, and that a communications pack would be send to the Communications team at North Warwickshire Borough Council for promotion.</p> <p>YD also reported that Steve Maxey had taken over as Chairman of the Warwickshire North Health and Wellbeing Partnership and is looking to re-establish a Delivery Group.</p>	<p>YD</p>
6	<p>Warwickshire County Council Localities Update</p> <p>Lori updated the Working Party regarding her new working area (she is now covering North Warwickshire, Nuneaton and Bedworth and Rugby until at least September). Lori also reported that the long COVID support group had been running for seven weeks and had attendees from across the county. Issues that the group had highlighted included loss of identity, not knowing where to go for support, exhaustion and a disconnect between ability</p>	<p>LH</p>

Item	Notes	Action
	<p>and expectations. Another group will start soon, with the groups likely moving online. There is training available for facilitators – Lori to send the link for dissemination.</p> <p>The Living Well with Dementia in Warwickshire website is being updated across the county – EE to ensure it is up-to-date for North Warwickshire.</p> <p>LH also promoted the recent round of County Councillor grants (closing on the 11th July), and the Care Companion tool – both links to be shared.</p>	<p>EE</p> <p>EE/LH</p>
7	<p>Leisure Facilities</p> <p>Russell Simkiss reported that there were three defibrillators across the leisure centres that require new batteries and maintenance, and RS asked the Working Party to consider allocating funds to provide the batteries / maintenance. It was decided that before the funds were allocated, a conversation needs to occur between Steve Maxey, Cllr M Bell and Cllr Macdonald to secure the best option for funding.</p> <p>RS updated the Working Party that attendance, memberships and engagement had all increased throughout May and that the “Active Living” (lower intensity) exercise classes were due to launch. Exercise referral clients have returned to the leisure centres for 1-2-1 exercise sessions. The Working Party was also informed that all year round bookings had been confirmed with Aston Villa Football Club at TQEA and Polesworth Sports Centre to deliver its project targeting anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>The Leisure Facilities App is due to launch in mid-July. RS will keep the Working Party updated on downloads, usage figures, etc.</p>	RS
8	<p>Air Quality</p> <p>Matt Green was not able to attend the meeting and will provide an update to EE via email. This will be included in the minutes / sent out once received.</p>	MG
9	<p>Feedback from Relevant Partnership Meetings</p> <p>EE fed back information regarding the refurbishment of the Atherstone Clinic and will keep the Working Party informed on progress. JC suggested linking the Atherstone Town Council clerk into these conversations, to ensure information is passed on to Atherstone Town Councillors.</p> <p>JC raised the need for a targeted and focused approach towards air quality interventions and improvements across North Warwickshire, and that a strategy or organisational plan should be developed (if not already) around air quality. JC has also devised 5 questions to be raised in regards to air quality (click link) to support the need for interventions and a targeted approach which were supported by the Working Party.</p> <p>It was decided to highlight air quality, climate change, and planning links at future Working Party meetings.</p>	<p>EE</p> <p>EE</p>
9	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>None.</p>	

Item	Notes	Action
10	Future Meeting Dates 16 September 10:00am to 12:30pm, Microsoft Teams and Committee Room	

Agenda Item No 10

Community and Environment Board

26 July 2021

Report of the Chief Executive

Progress Report on Achievement of Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator Targets April 2020 – March 2021

1 Summary

- 1.1 This report informs Members of the progress with the achievement of the Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator targets relevant to the Community and Environment Board for April 2020 to March 2021.

Recommendation to the Board

That Members consider the performance achieved and highlight any areas for further investigation.

2 Consultation

- 2.1 Consultation has taken place with the relevant Members and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

3 Background

- 3.1 This report shows the year end position with the achievement of the Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator targets for 2020/21. This is the fourth report showing the progress achieved so far during 2020/21.

4 Progress achieved during 2020/21

- 4.1 Attached at Appendices A and B are reports outlining the progress achieved for all the Corporate Plan targets and the performance with the local performance indicators during April 2020 to March 2021 for the Community and Environment Board.

- 4.2 Members will recall the use of a traffic light indicator for the monitoring of the performance achieved.

Red – target not achieved (shown as a red triangle)

Green – target achieved (shown as a green star)

5 Performance Indicators

- 5.1 The year end returns are subject to review by Internal Audit and therefore maybe subject to changes. Any amendments to the returns will be reported to a future meeting of the board.
- 5.2 Members are asked to note that work is underway to review and improve the performance reports following discussions at Executive Board.

6 Overall Performance

- 6.1 The Corporate Plan performance report shows that 62% of the Corporate Plan targets and 27% of the performance indicator targets have been achieved. The target for improved working with the Highways England and the Highways Authority has not been able to be achieved, other targets subject to delays during the year include the implementation of the Strategic Leisure Review, additional cycling events, work with the North Warwickshire Community Partnership, preparation of the Financial Inclusion Partnership report, work regarding climate change and improving opportunities for walking and cycling. The performance indicators for food inspections and enforcement, the net cost per swim / visit, street cleaning surveys, play area standards and community development related activities have not been fully achieved due to impacts from the COVID 19 related restrictions. The inspections of amenity cleaning have also not been possible due to impacts of the restrictions. The report shows that individual targets that have been classified as red or green. Individual comments from the relevant division have been included where appropriate. The table below shows the following status in terms of the traffic light indicator status:

Corporate Plan

Status	Number	Percentage
Green	15	62%
Red	9	38%
Total	24	100%

Performance Indicators

Status	Number	Percentage
Green	4	27%
Red	11	73%
Total	15	100%

7 **Summary**

- 7.1 Members may wish to identify any areas that require further consideration where targets are not currently being achieved.

8 **Report Implications**

8.1 **Safer Communities Implications**

- 8.1.1 There are Safer Communities related actions highlighted in the report including improving community life, health and well-being and adult safeguarding.

8.2 **Legal and Human Rights Implications**

- 8.2.1 The national indicators were specified by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. They have now been ended and replaced by a single list of data returns to Central Government from April 2011.

8.3 **Environment and Sustainability Implications**

- 8.3.1 Improvements in the performance and quality of services will contribute to improving the quality of life within the community. There are a number of specific actions and indicators included within the report which contribute towards improving the environment and sustainability under the priority of promoting sustainable and vibrant communities.

8.4 **Risk Management Implications**

- 8.4.1 Effective performance monitoring will enable the Council to minimise associated risks with the failure to achieve targets and deliver services at the required performance level.

8.5 **Equality Implications**

- 8.5.1 There are equality related actions and indicators highlighted in the report including developing access to community services, tackling health inequalities and raising aspirations work.

8.6 **Links to Council's Priorities**

- 8.6.1 There are targets and performance indicators contributing towards the priorities of improving leisure and well-being opportunities, promoting sustainable and vibrant communities and supporting employment and businesses.

The Contact Officer for this report is Robert Beggs (719238).

Background Papers

Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D, as substituted by the Local Government Act, 2000 Section 97

Background Paper No	Author	Nature of Background Paper	Date
National Indicators for Local Authorities and Local Authority Partnerships	Department for Communities and Local Government	Statutory Guidance	February 2008

Community and Environment Board 20/21										
New No	Action	Priority	Board	Reporting Officer	Quarter 3	Status	Direction	Quarter 4	Status	Direction
19	To carry out the Council's obligations as a "relevant agency" and partner within Warwickshire Safeguarding, including those relating to the implementation of the Authority's Child Protection and Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults Policy, and to report on progress by March 2021.	Creating Safer Communities	Community & Environment Board	Simon Powell/Angela Coates	The Borough Council continues to be closely engaged with Warwickshire Safeguarding and is undertaking its obligations as a "Relevant Agency" and partner. The Authority is also implementing the provisions of its approved Safeguarding Policy	Green	↔	The Borough Council continues to be closely engaged with Warwickshire Safeguarding and is undertaking its obligations as a "Relevant Agency" and partner. The Authority is also implementing the provisions of its approved Safeguarding Policy	Green	↔
26	To maintain a very high standard of street cleanliness (95%) throughout the Borough and to continue to raise awareness (both of the public and other agencies) of the problems of litter, fly-posting and dog fouling	Protecting our Countryside & Heritage	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	Street cleaning operations continue while still operating under Covid secure conditions. No new surveys have been carried out since the start of the pandemic	Amber	↔	Street cleaning operations continue while still operating under Covid secure conditions. No new surveys have been carried out since the start of the pandemic	Red	↔
27	To continue to investigate and implement ways to improve the responsiveness and efficiency of the street cleaning service, working more closely with Environmental Health on enforcement in the Borough	Protecting our Countryside & Heritage	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	This activity is on hold until Covid restrictions have been relaxed and operations return to normal	Amber	↔	This activity continues to be on hold, but it is anticipated that work in this area will resume over the coming months.	Red	↔
29	To work in partnership with the Highways Authority, Highways England and other partners to improve both the appearance and safety of the Borough's main roads. To work with partners so as to reduce the number of fatalities and injuries on roads in North Warwickshire (see also Safer Communities priorities)	Protecting our Countryside & Heritage	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	This work is still delayed due to operational disruption caused by Covid	Amber	↔	This work is still delayed due to operational disruption caused by Covid	Red	↔
31	In accordance with the priorities established by relevant Boards, continue to implement the approved outcomes of the Strategic Leisure Review process including, in particular, the need to determine and advance the long-term future of leisure facility provision and delivery in Atherstone, Coleshill and Polesworth and report on progress by March 2021	Improving Leisure & Wellbeing Opportunities	Community & Environment Board	Simon Powell	Work has continued in respect of the implementation of the approved outcomes of the Strategic Leisure Review, including in respect of the long-term future of leisure facility provision in Atherstone, Coleshill and Polesworth, as well as with regard to the implementation of a revised and COVID-19 compliant Service Improvement Plan	Green	↔	Work has continued in respect of the implementation of the approved outcomes of the Strategic Leisure Review, including in respect of the review of the long-term future of leisure facility provision in Atherstone, Coleshill and Polesworth. Whilst work is continuing, aspects of the review, including marketplace considerations, have been delayed due to the pandemic	Red	↓
32	Continue to implement the North Warwickshire Green Space and Playing Pitch Strategies, and the accompanying Local Football Facilities Plan, in accordance with their associated Action and Funding Plans and report on progress by March 2021	Improving Leisure & Wellbeing Opportunities	Community & Environment Board	Simon Powell	Work is progressing in respect of the implementation of the adopted Green Space and Playing Pitch Strategies, including in respect of projects being undertaken with sports clubs in both Atherstone and Grendon, the progression of a multi-agency Green Recovery Plan that includes planned improvements in Cole End Park, Coleshill, and the implementation of the next stage of the Play Area Development Programme, in respect of which appropriate reports have been submitted to the C&E Board	Green	↔	Work is progressing in respect of the implementation of the adopted Green Space and Playing Pitch Strategies, including with regard to projects being undertaken with sports clubs in Atherstone and Grendon, the progression of a multi-agency Green Recovery Plan that includes proposed improvements in Cole End Park, Coleshill, and the implementation of the next stage of the Play Area Development Programme. Appropriate reports have been submitted to the C&E Board	Green	↔
34	To continue to work in partnership with other agencies to tackle health inequalities and specifically to renew and thereafter co-ordinate the sustainable implementation of the corporate Health and Wellbeing Action Plan. Report progress to each Health and Wellbeing Board	Improving Leisure & Wellbeing Opportunities	Community & Environment Board	Simon Powell	A new Health and Wellbeing Action Plan (2020 to 2023) has been developed by the Health and Wellbeing Working Party and was approved by the C&E Board in March 2020, subsequent to which its provisions are being advanced through work being undertaken across the Authority. A number of health services have had to change their delivery arrangements as a result of the pandemic, but all services are still available	Green	↔	The latest Health and Wellbeing Action Plan (2020 to 2023) was developed by the Health and Wellbeing Working Party and approved by the C&E Board in March 2020, subsequent to which its provisions have been advanced through work being undertaken across the Authority and in conjunction with key partners. Progress is reported to each meeting of both the Working Party and the Board	Green	↔
35	In conjunction with WCC and other partners, to ensure the success of North Warwickshire's involvement in appropriate national cycle events and initiatives, such as the National Time Trials, Velo and Commonwealth Games road races, having taken due account of the potential impact on local residents and the business community	Improving Leisure & Wellbeing Opportunities	Community & Environment Board	Simon Powell	All national cycling events due to impact upon the Borough were cancelled in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic	Amber	↔	All national cycling events due to impact upon the Borough were cancelled in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic	Red	↓
36 (a)	In order to promote, support and strengthen community life (including new communities formed by housing growth), the Borough Council:- a) Will work in conjunction with partners through the North Warwickshire Community Partnership in order to advance the priorities and objectives of the North Warwickshire Sustainable Community Strategy, including in respect of the commitment to improve access to opportunities, services and facilities for local residents and will report in March on progress. Priorities will be formed by Partnership Day 13 and include emerging issues such as climate change, as well as ongoing economic priorities	Promoting Sustainable & Vibrant Communities	Community & Environment Board	Steve Maxey	It still has not been possible to hold the Partnership Day and so the formal work of the partnership is on hold	Amber	↔	It still has not been possible to hold the Partnership Day and so the formal work of the partnership is on hold. Work to support businesses during the lockdown restrictions has taken place.	Red	↔

New No	Action	Priority	Board	Reporting Officer	Quarter 3	Status	Direction	Quarter 4	Status	Direction
36 (b)	b) Will continue to implement the focussed way of working in Community Development, through which activity will be targeted in locations determined by Members (Atherstone/Mancetter, Dordon and Arley and Whitacre) and in which communities are central to the identification of their own needs and the means by which those needs are met and to report on progress by March 2021	Promoting Sustainable & Vibrant Communities	Community & Environment Board	Simon Powell	Significant work continues to be undertaken with the community and voluntary sector across the Borough in support of the response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, and working within the related restrictions, community development activity continues to be advanced in the communities of Atherstone / Mancetter, Dordon and Arley / Whitacre	Green	↔	The Board approved approach to targeted Community Development activity had to be modified due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Nevertheless, significant work has been undertaken with community and voluntary sector organisations across the Borough in support of the corporate response to the pandemic itself, including within the communities of Atherstone / Mancetter, Dordon and Arley / Whitacre	Green	↔
38	To review the refuse and recycling service, with particular emphasis on options around recycling to ensure the sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the service while building sufficient capacity to accommodate future housing growth and explore how use of in-cab technology can support more efficient service delivery by October 2020	Promoting Sustainable & Vibrant Communities	Resources Board Community and Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	Work in this area is currently focussing on the implementation of the garden waste service	Green	↔	Now the garden waste service has been successfully implemented, work on developing in-cab has been restarted and is progressing well with a potential solution now identified and currently being assessed	Green	↑
39	To explore how waste services are delivered to reduce net cost and by using technology to make collection operations as efficient and sustainable as possible, while accommodating future housing growth	Promoting Sustainable & Vibrant Communities	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	Work continues on this but resources are focussed on green waste service implementation at present	Green	↔	The implementation of in-cab integrated into the existing route optimisation system will greatly help in this area	Green	↑
40	To contribute as a full member of the Multi Recycling Facility project in order to have a fully operational facility in place by 2023	Promoting Sustainable & Vibrant Communities	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs/Sue Garner	Work continues to progress well on this project with Financial Close due at the end of the month.	Green	↔	The project is progressing well - all contracts have been signed, the company SRL has been incorporated, the necessary planning permissions are in place and ground preparation on site has begun. The facility is on-track to open in mid-2023	Green	↔
44	To report in December 2020 on the work of the local Financial Inclusion Partnership, including to advise on actions and initiatives undertaken to mitigate local impact of the Welfare Reform programme and other economic changes in order to maximise the collection of monies due to the Council and best support customers to find solutions to help themselves	Promoting Sustainable & Vibrant Communities	Community & Environment Board	Sue Garner	Due to time constraints, the report will be taken to the March meeting of the Board.	Green	↔	The report was not completed in time for the March Board, so will be taken to Resources Board in 2021.	Red	↓
46	In partnership with Job Centre Plus, manage the ongoing migration of existing benefit customers onto Universal Credit and input into the Universal Support/Delivery local agenda, to support residents by providing support and advice and to report on progress by March 2021	Promoting Sustainable & Vibrant Communities	Community & Environment Board	Sue Garner	We continue to support residents by providing advice and guidance as required.	Green	↔	We continue to support residents by providing advice and guidance as required.	Green	↔
47	To work with public, voluntary and business partners to deliver ongoing food-related projects to continue to support individuals and community organisations supported by Ediblelinks. This will also incorporate support to veterans via the Armed Forces Covenant work. Quarterly reports on progress will be made to the North Warwickshire Community Partnership and an annual report will be made to the Community & Environment Board in March 2021	Promoting Sustainable & Vibrant Communities	Community & Environment Board	Sue Garner	The Council operated a Shielding Hub during the early part of the pandemic. We continue to support a number of community organisations with food related projects. Work with Edible Links has also continued.	Green	↔	The Council operated a Shielding Hub during the early part of the pandemic. We continued to support a number of community organisations with food related projects for the rest of the year. Work with Edible Links also continued.	Green	↔
53	In partnership with the Local Action Group and Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, to continue to ensure the successful management, monitoring and evaluation of the local LEADER programme and report on progress by March 2021	Supporting Employment & Business	Community & Environment Board	Simon Powell	The LEADER programme has committed all of the available funds, including an additional sum allocated to the programme by the Rural Payments Agency (RPA). As the Accountable Body, the Authority is continuing to manage the programme through to a successful conclusion	Green	↔	The LEADER programme has committed all of the available funds, including an additional sum allocated to the programme by the Rural Payments Agency (RPA). The Authority is managing the programme through to a successful conclusion, in respect of which a report was presented to the C&E Board in March 2021	Green	↔
55	To seek the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement into North Warwickshire at the earliest opportunity as part of steps to improve and increase, amongst other things, parking in our town centres	Supporting Employment & Business	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	Work on this project is on track. The Task & Finish Group has reconvened and reports will be presented to Board in May	Green	↔	A report setting out the new Parking Places Order and Schedule is going to Resources Board on 14 June. Implementation of CPE is expected in November, 2021	Green	↔
56	Audit the Council's current carbon emissions and measures already in place to address climate change	Tackle Climate Change	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	The baseline data has now been compiled, independently verified and submitted	Green	↑	The Climate Change Member Group is currently in the process of developing the Action Plan based on themed areas of activity. Work to reduce NWBC's carbon footprint is ongoing across a number of divisions.	Green	↔
57	Develop an action plan by July 2020 to reduce the Council's net carbon emissions to a sustainable level	Tackle Climate Change	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	The Climate Change Member Group continues to meet and an action plan is being developed, however like a number of other local authorities this is taking longer to develop due to capacity pressures	Amber	↔	The action plan is currently being developed	Green	↑

New No	Action	Priority	Board	Reporting Officer	Quarter 3	Status	Direction	Quarter 4	Status	Direction
58	Explore ways to reduce net carbon emissions across the Borough and to mitigate and adapt to future changes in the climate through procurement, planning, transport operations, and other measures	Tackle Climate Change	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	This work is ongoing. Progress will be reported back through the Member Group	Amber	↔	This work is ongoing and is linked to the other activity in this area overseen by the Member Group	Green	↑
59	Engage with local businesses, residents, workers and visitors on the issue of climate change to encourage greater understanding of the issues and steps which can be taken to tackle it	Tackle Climate Change	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	Engagement will begin once the Council's action plan has been finalised and agreed	Amber	↔	Engagement will begin once the Council's action plan has been finalised and agreed	Red	↔
60	Encourage cycling and walking in order to reduce air pollution and climate change impacts of other modes of transport	Tackle Climate Change	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	The Council is working with WCC on the development of LTP4 which will tackle this in detail	Amber	↑	The Council is working with WCC on the development of LTP4 which will tackle this in detail.	Red	↔
61	Monitor and improve air quality in North Warwickshire, in line with Air Quality SPD	Tackle Climate Change	Community & Environment Board	Richard Dobbs	This work is ongoing	Green	↔	This work is ongoing	Green	↔

NWPI Community & Environment Board 20/21

Ref	Description	Section	Priority	Year End Target 2020/21	Outturn 2019/20	April - Mar Performance	Traffic Light	Direction of Travel	Comments
NWLPI 007	The percentage of food premises inspections that should have been carried out that were carried out for high risk premises.	Env Health (C, L & HP)	Health and Well-being	100	99	18.00%	Red	↓	Many food businesses and the hospitality sector have been closed for many months during this year due to Corona Virus. It has therefore been impossible to inspect them. The Environmental Health Food Team have been tasked with enforcing the Coronavirus regulations which has taken up a large proportion of officer time. There has also been a 250% increase in the number of registered new food premises.
NWLPI 157	The percentage of food premises interventions that should have been carried out that were carried out for low risk premises	Env Health (C, L & HP)	Health and Well-being	100	94	5.00%	Red	↓	Many food businesses and the hospitality sector have been closed for many months during this year due to Corona Virus. It has therefore been impossible to inspect them. The Environmental Health Food Team have been tasked with enforcing the Coronavirus regulations which has taken up a large proportion of officer time. There has also been a 250% increase in the number of registered new food premises.
NWLPI 085	Swimming pools and sports centres: The net cost per swim/visit	Leisure Facilities	Health and Well-being	0.84	1.66	£16.33	Red	↓	The Leisure Facilities were only open for four months of the year and even then with restrictions in place to manage the risks associated with the pandemic. This has obviously affected visitor numbers and, therefore, performance in respect of this indicator
NWLPI 086	Leisure Centres - Total income per visit	Leisure Facilities	Health and Well-being	3.31	3.33	£3.33	Green	↑	The Leisure Facilities were only open for four months of the year and even then with restrictions in place to manage the risks associated with the pandemic. This has obviously affected visitor numbers and income levels and, therefore, performance in respect of this indicator
NWLPI 119	Number of collections missed per 100,000 collections of household waste (former BV88)	Refuse & Recycling	Recycling	125	35.83	22.63	Green	↑	
@NW:NI192	The percentage of household waste arisings which have been sent by the Authority for reuse, recycling, composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion.	Refuse & Recycling	Recycling	45	48.35%	46.62%	Green	↑	
@NW:NI195a	The percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having deposits of litter that fall below an acceptable level. Only the level of litter is monitored and excludes detritus	Streetscape	Environment	5	Not completed	Not completed	Red	↓	This activity has been suspended during the pandemic so while street cleaning operations have continued (In a covid secure way) cleanliness levels have not been monitored over this period
New	Average Time Taken to Remove Fly-tipping	Streetscape	Environment	2	1.02	0.92	Green	↑	

Ref	Description	Section	Priority	Year End Target 2020/21	Outturn 2019/20	April - Mar Performance	Traffic Light	Direction of Travel	Comments
New	Number of Borough Council led activities	Community Development	Health & Well-being	30	38	0	Red	↔	The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in there being no direct Community Development led activities in 2020 / 21. Nevertheless, the Section gave considerable support to the community and voluntary sector and local business throughout the year
New	Number of people who attended Borough Council led activities	Community Development	Health & Well-being	7,000	6,571	0	Red	↔	The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in there being no direct Community Development led activities in 2020 / 21. Nevertheless, the Section gave considerable support to the community and voluntary sector in its response to the pandemic
New	Number of co-led activities (those activities that are delivered with the community)	Community Development	Health & Well-being	20	15	0	Red	↔	The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in there being no co-led Community Development activities in 2020 / 21
New	Number of people who attended co-led activities	Community Development	Health & Well-being	500	693	0	Red	↔	The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in there being no co-led Community Development activities in 2020 / 21
New	Number of community led activities	Community Development	Health & Well-being	15	26	0	Red	↔	The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in there being no community-led Community Development activities in 2020 / 21. There was, however, an enormous community and voluntary sector response to the pandemic, which was supported by the Community Development section
New	Number of discovered people (those members of the community who are engaged to lead on local activity)	Community Development	Health & Well-being	50	40	0	Red	↔	The absence of Community Development activity meant that there were no "discovered people" in 2020 / 21. High levels of community engagement and leadership were evident, however, throughout the pandemic
NWLPI 111	% of Play Areas meeting BS/EN and DDA standards	Landscape Management	Health & Well-being	100	97%	97%	Red	↔	Brendan Close play area is still to be removed

Agenda Item No 11

Community & Environment Board

26 July 2021

**Report of the Corporate Director –
Streetscape**

Update on Green Bin Service

1 Summary

- 1.1 This report updates Members on the impact and results of the introduction of the chargeable Garden Waste Service from 1 April 2021.

Recommendations to the Board

That Members note the contents of the report.

2 Background

- 2.1 The collection of garden waste is a discretionary service which costs the Borough Council in the region of £498,000 per annum to provide to its residents. To offset those costs, in February 2020 the Council agreed to bring in a charge for the collection of garden waste with effect from 1 June 2020. Due to the onset of the Covid pandemic, the introduction of the charge was delayed until April 2021.
- 2.2 The annual charge is £40 per green bin in line with the Council's existing charge for additional green bin collections and other Warwickshire local authorities which operate similar schemes.

3 Take-Up

- 3.1 The scheme was extensively publicised through the delivery of bin tags to every eligible household in the Borough, promotion on the website and through social media and using banners on the sides of the Council's fleet of refuse vehicles. Around 25,000 bin tags were delivered in the last two weeks of February.
- 3.2 Residents were encouraged to sign up online through the Council's website which was the preferred method for the majority of residents (74%). The remaining applications (26%) have come in via telephone calls to the Contact Centre. All residents signing up to the scheme have paid by credit or debit card with only a handful of customers paying by cash or cheque (for which special arrangements were put in place).
- 3.3 At the time of writing, 16,694 permits had been delivered to residents. Of those, 190 were replacements and 183 were subsequently cancelled giving a net

figure of 16,321. Most permits were for single bins (15,037) but 530 households ordered two permits and 52 households purchased three or more. The reasons

for cancellation were primarily due to duplication while replacements were for numerous reasons, the main ones being loss or damage or where a property had a bin replaced. Cancelled and replacement permits accounted for just over 2% of all permits delivered.

- 3.4 The printing and delivery of the permits was handled by an external company which specialises in this type of service. The integration of the Council's online and CRM systems with the bespoke portal provided by the company as part of its service agreement with the Council meant that customer orders could be tracked easily and any delays or errors quickly rectified, giving a first time completion rate of nearly 98%. Only 15 permits were sent out with incorrect addresses and subsequent changes to the online form should reduce that number still further in future.
- 3.5 In total, so far 15,619 households have subscribed to the service, a take-up rate of 55% of all households in the Borough. Once households without gardens are taken into account the participation rate rises to around 60%. This is at the higher end of the anticipated subscription level (which was estimated at between 40% and 55%).
- 3.6 Demand for permits remained steady during the early weeks of the service and while take-up was understandably highest in February and March householders continue to subscribe to the service with around 75 new permits still being issued weekly. During the first weeks of the new service, residents who presented green bins for collection but who had not paid still had their bins emptied but were left with "Oops!" stickers to encourage them to join the scheme. To date, around 1,200 such stickers have been placed on bins at a rate of about 75 per week. It is estimated that non-collection of bins without permits results in about 50 missed bin reports per month.

4 North Warwickshire Gardeners Club

- 4.1 To add value and offset the cost to residents of chargeable garden waste collections, every permit sent out to residents entitled the householder to claim discount vouchers worth over £100 at Planters Garden Centres.
- 4.2 By the time of writing this report, Planters had already redeemed just under 5,000 vouchers which equates to nearly a third of households who have signed up to the service.

5 Impacts of the New Scheme

- 5.1 The introduction of the new chargeable garden waste service understandably generated a great deal of interest from the public. Call volumes to the Contact Centre in February and March rose by 50% over the same period the previous

year. However, most calls and enquiries resulted in residents signing up to the new service with only three complaints logged by the Contact Centre and two corporate complaints lodged about the new service. In addition to the calls dealt with by the Contact Centre, the refuse team dealt with around 350 enquiries, complaints and requests for service.

- 5.2 Following the introduction of the chargeable service, the quality of waste in the bins has improved with very little contamination found by the crews. Although we are only a few months into the new scheme, early data suggests that the amount of material being collected has so far remained largely unchanged:-

Comparison of Q1 Waste Arisings 2019 to 2021

Waste Type	Apr – Jun 2019	Apr – Jun 2020	Apr – Jun 2021
Green	741.56	780.28	744.48
Residual	1132.98	1227.50	1234.96
Dry Recycling	400.74	498.80	472.05
Total	2275.28	2506.58	2451.49

- 5.3 More data will be needed to establish exactly what impact on the amount and types of waste are being collected and these figures will be kept under review but, so far, green waste weights are holding steady compared to previous years and there are no signs that green waste is being placed in the black bins to any great extent. The effect of the pandemic and the impact of changing work patterns will also make the available data harder to interpret (residual waste and dry recycling levels both rose in the first few weeks of the lockdown which is likely to be as a result of more residents working from home).
- 5.4 There is also early evidence that operating a subscriber service for garden waste has started to deliver the anticipated efficiencies in collection operations and thereby reducing the Council’s carbon emissions. The following table sets out mileage covered, tonnages collected and fuel consumed:-

Mileage and Fuel Efficiency – Green Waste

Period	Total Fuel Used (litres)	Kg of green waste per mile	Kg of green waste per litre of fuel
May 2019	9,275	58.8	79.95
May 2020*	7,685	75.2	101.53
May 2021	6,900	103.4	107.90

*Green waste collections were suspended for part of this period due to the impact of the pandemic.

- 5.5 A saving of 2,375 litres of fuel in the Council’s refuse vehicles is the equivalent of 3.76 tonnes of CO₂.

6 Report Implications

6.1 Financial Implications

6.1.1 The cost of promoting the scheme, printing and delivering the permits is around £24,500.

6.2 Environment, Sustainability and Climate Change Implications

6.2.1 By only collecting garden waste from households which subscribe to the service, the Council is able to increase the efficiency of collection rounds thereby saving on fuel and CO₂ emissions. For those households which do not wish to subscribe to the service, sustainable ways of dealing with green waste such as home composting are promoted.

The Contact Officer for this report is Richard Dobbs (719440).

Agenda Item No 12

**Community and Environment
Board**

26 July 2021

**Report of the Corporate Director –
Streetscape**

**National Waste Strategy
Consultation Responses**

1 Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out the Warwickshire Waste Partnership's joint responses to the Government's second round of consultations on Extended Producer Responsibility, Deposit Return Schemes and Consistent Collections as set out in the National Resources and Waste Strategy.

Recommendations to the Board

That Members note the contents of the report.

2 Background

- 2.1 The Government's National Resources and Waste Strategy was launched in December 2018. Following publication of that strategy, the Government has introduced the Environment Bill, which is progressing through the House of Commons. This will be the primary legislation which will underpin many new environmental regulations, including a suite of new waste regulation. Three consultations were carried out in the Spring of 2019 to which the Warwickshire Waste Partnership gave a joint response. The Government have been holding regular discussions with stakeholders to develop the regulations and issued a new round of consultations in the Spring.
- 2.2 Following a detailed assessment of the consultation documents and in depth discussions between Borough, District and County Council Officers and after consultation with all the relevant Member leads for Waste and the Environment, the Warwickshire Waste Partnership responded jointly on 3rd June, 2021 to the Deposit Return Scheme and Extended Producer Responsibility consultations. A further consultation response on Consistent Collections was coordinated between officers and lead Members and was submitted by the deadline of 4 July 2021.

3 **Extended Producer Responsibility**

3.1 The Extended Producer Responsibility proposal for packaging is an overhaul of the current producer responsibility for packaging legislation. It aims to ensure that the total cost of collecting, transporting, sorting and recycling / reprocessing / disposing of the packaging is covered. The regulations should provide local authorities with 'Full Net Costs' recovery for the management of packaging waste including recycling, disposal and litter collections. The proposal is for the 'Brand Owner' to pay this cost. The less packaging a product has, the lower the fee will be. The more recyclable the packaging is, the lower the fee will be. Local Authorities will be given the costs of managing packaging waste but will have to demonstrate an 'efficient and effective' waste collection and disposal system.

3.2 The WWP's response in relation to Extended Producer Responsibility strongly supports the principles in the consultation and how the proposals incentivise resource efficiency. The Partnership believes that moving to the producer pays principle for waste management and ensuring that local authorities get back full net costs for dealing with packaging waste is fair and will contribute to both reducing waste and increasing recycling. The response states a preference for recycling labelling on packaging to be of one mandatory, unambiguous, clear style, to help householders and to increase correct recycling. The partnership officers welcomed the ambition to collect plastic films but were unsure if a comprehensive collection service can be enacted by 2026/27, due to end market uncertainty. The WWP has also highlighted issues with new compostable products that are appearing on the market and agreed with mandatory take-away cup take-back. The consultation response gave detailed feedback on how the return of full net costs to Local Authorities can be transparent, fair and equitable.

3.3 Defra's second consultation on Extended Producer Responsibility can be found at:

https://consult.defra.gov.uk/extended-producer-responsibility/extended-producer-responsibility-for-packaging/supporting_documents/23.03.21_EPR_Consultation.pdf

... The full text of the Warwickshire Waste Partnership's response to the second round of consultation on EPR is set out at Appendix A.

4 **Deposit Return Scheme**

4.1 The Deposit Return System proposal is for beverage containers only. At the point of purchase, a deposit will be paid on the drinks container. At the point of return for recycling, the deposit is redeemed. Country-wide return infrastructure will be created by way of a network of Reverse Vending Machines in shops and other municipal locations. The barcode of the product will be read and the item 'posted' into the container for onward recycling. Smaller shops will be able to offer manual returns. Online retailers will also collect returned containers. Plastic bottles and metal cans will be covered, possibly also glass bottles. Local Authorities may be able to access the deposits on items where the purchaser has foregone the deposit and decided to recycle at the kerbside, put in general

waste, litter bin or litter. The main drivers for this scheme are reduced litter, improved capture for recycling and improved quality of material for recycling.

4.2 The full text of the second consultation on Deposit Return Schemes (DRS) can be found at: https://consult.defra.gov.uk/environment/consultation-on-introducing-a-drs/supporting_documents/DRS_Consultation_FINAL.pdf

4.3 The Partnership's response in relation to the Deposit Return Scheme proposals is supportive of the scheme and the potential for it to reduce litter, improve capture for recycling and improve quality of material for recycling. It is clear how a system to capture small drinks containers consumed 'on the go' could work well. However, officers have reservations over an 'all in' system, where any size drinks container can be returned. There is potential for this to significantly change the kerbside recycling collection service and have impacts on smaller retailers and the street scene. Moreover, there is a concern for how this might impact low-income families. We have offered feedback on a proposed digital return system, asking for assurances of how fraud would be prevented in such a system. The response offers knowledge on how Local Authorities will be able to collect data in order to retrieve funds from the handling of containers where the deposit is unclaimed and the item has passed through the kerbside or litter system. The full text of the Warwickshire Waste Partnership's response to the second round of consultation on DRS is set out at Appendix B.

...

5 Consistent Collections

5.1 The Consistent Collections consultation was launched on 8 May 2021. It covers the stated ambition to improve waste collections in England from both households and businesses. New stipulations that are not covered by payments to the local authority through the EPR mechanism will be covered by the government as a 'new burden'. The partnership's response asks government to ensure the full costs for new burdens are provided up-front for initial set up costs for the new requirements as well as ongoing operational and communication costs.

5.2 Headline proposals include the consistent inclusion of beverage cartons from 2023/24 and of plastic films from 2026/27. The Partnership supports the principle, but urges government to ensure that sorting capacity and, most importantly for Warwickshire, reprocessing and end market capacity, are in place before making it mandatory for these material types to be collected. A cornerstone proposal is the provision of separate weekly food waste collections to every household. The Partnership's support of this is caveated with the warning that this will not be straight-forward in very rural areas or for flats and houses of multiple occupancy. The Partnership opposes the proposal to offer all households a free garden waste collection, putting forward that the option to charge for this service should be a local decision. The Partnership also urges for local decisions on the frequency of residual waste collection (a requirement to collect residual waste fortnightly as a minimum had been suggested), pointing out that the other suite of proposals will remove all food waste and a large proportion of other materials from general waste, reducing the amount of residual waste and therefore the need for it to be collected frequently.

5.3 The Partnership welcomed the proposals regarding the collection of business waste, in principle. However, it believes that there is a lot more thinking required in this area and pointed out that local government is well placed to shape this strategy and provide services in this area.

5.4 The full text of the second consultation on Consistent Collections can be found at:

<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/waste-and-recycling/consistency-in-household-and-business-recycling/>. The full text of the Warwickshire Waste Partnership’s response to the second round of consultation on Consistent Collections is set out at Appendix C.

...

6 Report Implications

6.1 Financial Implications

6.1.1 While there are no financial implications in the consultation responses, the final form of the regulations and the requirements placed on local authorities, waste producers, retailers and manufacturers may have significant financial implications which will be reported to the Board once the full scope and impacts of the final legislation becomes clearer.

6.2 Environment, Sustainability and Climate Change Implications

6.2.1 Again, there are no implications arising from the various Warwickshire Waste Partnership responses to the different consultations but the legislation which emerges from the Government’s ongoing engagement with stakeholders is likely to have significant environmental implications

The Contact Officer for this report is Richard Dobbs (719440).

Background Papers

Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D, as substituted by the Local Government Act, 2000 Section 97

Background Paper No	Author	Nature of Background Paper	Date
https://consult.defra.gov.uk/environment/consultation-on-introducing-a-drs/supporting_documents/DRS_Consultation_FINAL_.pdf	Defra	Consultation Paper on DRS	March 2021
https://consult.defra.gov.uk/extended-producer-responsibility/extended-producer-responsibility-for-packaging/supporting_documents/23.03.21_EPR_Consultation.pdf	Defra	Consultation Paper on EPS	March 2021

https://consult.defra.gov.uk/waste-and-recycling/consistency-in-household-and-business-recycling/supporting_documents/Recycling%20Consistency%20Final%20Consultation_May%202021.pdf	Defra	Consultation Paper on Consistent Collections	May 2021
---	-------	--	----------

DRS Consultation – Warwickshire Waste Partnership final draft, 26 May 2021

- Q1 Name
Warwickshire Waste Partnership
- Q2 Email address
waste@warwickshire.gov.uk
- Q3 Organisation type
Local Authority
- Q4 Organisation Detail
This consultation response is submitted on behalf of the Warwickshire Waste Partnership and should be read as equal to six responses from: North Warwickshire Borough Council, Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council, Rugby Borough Council, Stratford District Council, Warwick District Council, Warwickshire County Council.
- Q5 Would you like your response to be confidential?
No

A deposit return scheme in a post Covid context

- Q6 Given the context of the Covid-19 pandemic we are currently experiencing; do you support or oppose our proposals to implement a deposit return scheme for drinks containers in 2024? (P16)
- a.) **Support**
 - b.) *Neither support nor oppose*
 - c.) *Oppose*
 - d.) *Not sure*

Assuming that Government go ahead with a countrywide DRS scheme, we would like to see it rolled out as soon as is feasible to sit alongside the collection consistency and Extended Producer Responsibility policy changes starting in 2023. Assumptions made, and responses given in the 2019 consultations, will naturally have altered now, since the pandemic. Householder shopping and working habits have greatly changed and behaviours may change long term after social distancing is eased. Greater home delivery of groceries and other shopping is likely to continue. Therefore, fewer householders will make regular visits to supermarkets and civic centres and the RVM model for DRS is less applicable, especially if the 'All in' model is adopted. New modelling is needed to assess this change in consumer habits, triggered to move faster due to Covid. Many businesses, especially SMEs are under greater pressure than before and placing additional burdens of a DRS before the economy has settled must be taken into account. The outcome of digital kerbside trials; feedback from the EPR and consistent collections consultations and further work around householder behaviour post Covid must feed into the scheme design.

- Q7 Do you believe the introduction of a deposit return scheme will have an impact on your everyday life? (P16)
- a.) **Yes, a detrimental impact**
 - b.) No, there will be no impact.

If you answered yes the scheme would have a detrimental impact, how significant would this impact be?

- a.) No significant impact
- b.) **Some impact but manageable**
- c.) Large impact but still manageable
- d.) Large impact and impossible to comply with

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that local authorities will be on the receiving end of many of the enquiries about DRS when it is rolled out, especially regarding any Reverse Vending Machines that are sited in public spaces (as opposed to in commercial buildings). We will have to provide extra customer service support to cope with this.

Many residents, especially in flats, apartments and houses of multiple occupancy have very limited storage within the dwellings to separate and store multiple waste streams for recycling. Adding an additional waste stream which needs to be transferred to a collection point may cause problems for households where space is limited and they may complain to the council. If residents have limited storage, they may choose to place beverage containers in the kerbside recycling and then ask the council for this money back. Or their purchasing habits will change to choose products which do not have a deposit and therefore most likely to be harder to recycle, reducing the council's recycling performance.

If residents are generally making fewer journeys to stores post Covid-19, journeys may be made solely to redeem deposits which may adversely impact local air quality and increase carbon emissions. The councils of Warwickshire Waste Partnership are seeking to improve air quality and reduce local carbon emissions, and this will undermine these efforts. If people are making fewer journeys, the need to redeem a deposit could also be discriminatory against social groups which may rely on a regular deposit return for cash flow or have limited space for storage and need to make additional journeys to redeem the deposit or free up storage space.

- Q8 Have your views towards implementation of a deposit return scheme been affected following the economic and social impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic? (P17)
- a) Yes – because of economic impacts
 - b) Yes – because of social impacts
 - c) **Yes – because of both economic and social impacts**
 - d) No
 - e) Not sure

Kerbside recycling services across the UK have continued throughout the pandemic whereas the deliverability of a DRS over the past 12 months would have failed and moreover supply chains dependent on material flows would have been significantly disrupted.

Scope

Q9 Do you agree that the cap should be included as part of the deposit item in a deposit return scheme for: (P19)

a) *Plastic bottle caps on plastic bottles – yes/no*

b) *Aluminium bottle caps on glass bottles – yes/no*

c) *Corks in glass bottles – yes/no*

d) *Foil on the top of a can / bottle or used to preserve some drinks – yes/no*

*Caps which can easily be secured back on the packaging could be included as there is potential for this material to also be recycled and reduce the litter risk. So including the lid in any case should be allowed and encouraged via improved packaging design and national communications to prevent litter, but it should not be required.

To make it easier for the consumer, the systems should enable containers to be taken back with the cap on or off and the deposit to be paid regardless of whether a cap is present or not. The collections and sorting systems supporting RVMs must be capable of dealing with caps and lids. Further clarification is needed on how this could be managed at RVMs or digital solutions if redeeming the deposit is reliant on the lid being present.

Communications could be designed to tell householders not to include corks, to help reduce non-target materials. But as with kerbside systems now, sorting systems need to be able to cope with realistic levels of non-target items, as consumers do not always follow guidance.

Q10 Do you believe we have identified the correct pros and cons for the all-in and on-the-go schemes described above? (P26)

a.) *Yes Please elaborate on your answer*

b.) *No Please elaborate on your answer*

The DRS proposed requires extensive investment and will only result in good value for money in terms of gain in total recycling, recycling quality and reduced littering if designed well.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is less convinced by the benefits of an 'all in' model than by the 'on the go' concept. We believe that a very comprehensive and universal recycling kerbside service led by the collection consistency policy, alongside much improved packaging labelling enforced by the EPR policy, will lead to large improvements in both the quantity and quality of household packaging material presented at the kerbside. Demand for recycled content, including plastic through the plastic tax policy, will lead to improvements in MRF technology, further enhancing quality. Consumers should not be in any way confused if there is clear and unambiguous labelling for in-scope containers, alongside a national promotional campaign. An 'on the go' solution will be cheaper and quicker to implement in terms of RVM infrastructure and will have less impact on established kerbside collections.

Areas where we do not think enough consideration has been given are:

The impact of Covid-19 and change in behaviours long term.

Impact of an 'all in' system on small shops with little storage space operating a manual return system.

The impact on families on low income of the cost of the initial shop the first week or month that an 'all in' DRS is introduced and further impacts if they are not able to frequently redeem deposits. The unintended consequence of increased littering where some people may leave items in easily accessible and visible locations, enabling others to collect and redeem the deposit. There could be an increase in 'bin diving' where bins are partially emptied in search of redeemable containers, which again can lead to littering.

Other items, such as takeaway cups, food packaging and plastic films are also commonly littered. These items will need to be cleared and the impact on authorities of reduced litter does not

directly correlate with a reduction in cost, as crew have to make the same number of journeys and cover the same area to collect the litter.

There is no information about whether, when a network of external RVMs is installed, the risk of anti-social behaviour (theft, vandalism and littering due to broken RVMs etc) is increased. It is unclear if this has been included in the running costs of the scheme and associated remedial work and the complaints local authorities would have to deal with associated to this.

The potential for schemes to be different across nations and varying costs of deposits, such as multipacks, could be confusing for residents. Whilst the DMO will have responsibility for communications, local authorities will inevitably receive direct liaison from residents for complaints and queries, which will be an additional burden.

Q11 Do you foresee any issues if the final scope of a deposit return scheme in England and Northern Ireland does not match the all-in decision taken in Wales? E.g. an on-the-go scheme in England and an all-in scheme in Wales. (P26)

a) Yes

b) No

This would add another layer of complexity to managing the system if there is a mix of 'on the go' and 'all in' systems. Communications could be challenging and could lead to confusion especially for areas where there is regular movement across borders. The system could be less efficient and could lead to additional costs as multiple systems are managed. These issues could also apply between Scotland and England where schemes could also be different.

Q12 Having read the rationale for either an all-in or on-the-go scheme, which do you consider to be the best option for our deposit return scheme? (P27)

a) All-in

b) on-the-go

Please elaborate on your answer.

A DRS should be part of an integrated system of resource and waste management that does not compete with existing recycling services which have proven to be highly successful in delivering significant increases in recycling. Recycling rates for some materials within scope of the proposed DRS, such as metal and glass, are already high. Warwickshire Waste Partnership therefore believes there is likely to be little net overall gain in the capture of glass through inclusion in a DRS.

One of the key objectives for the scheme is to reduce littering. An 'on the go' scheme will contribute to this whereas an 'all in' scheme is likely to have less benefit, as the items will be more commonly consumed at home and therefore the potential for it to be littered very low.

We are concerned that an 'all-in' scheme would change the public's perception of recycling. People may prioritise recycling DRS material as there is a financial incentive and think that, because other materials do not have this incentive, recycling those materials is less important.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership considers an 'on the go' scheme is a fairer system for residents where there is a greater choice in whether to pay a deposit, by giving the option to use reusable items from home. An 'all in' system will also include more frequently purchased items where the deposit is therefore much harder to avoid, having a greater impact on those on lower incomes.

Q13 Given the impact Covid-19 has had on the economy, on businesses and consumers, and on everyday life, do you believe an on-the-go scheme would be less disruptive to consumers? (P27)

a) Yes

b) No

*An 'on the go' DRS would be less disruptive, on the grounds it would have fewer materials and therefore less tonnage in scope. The footprint of an 'on the go' DRS would be smaller, the installation and ongoing costs would be lower, and the logistics of managing closed loop systems would be smaller.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believe consumers have greater opportunity to choose to avoid paying the deposit by changing behaviours with an 'on the go' scheme. An 'all-in' system reduces this potential and could be more disruptive to those especially on lower incomes, who, given the impact of COVID-19, could be struggling more.

It is probable that people will continue to make more online purchases than they did pre Covid-19, with fewer trips to retailers. Also more people are likely to be working from home. at least some of the time. This may therefore require an additional journey specifically to redeem deposits.

An 'all in' system will require residents to separately store this material until a visit to a return point or potentially require an additional journey. 'On the go' is likely to be less disruptive, as there is potentially greater opportunity to return the item before returning home.

Q14 Do you agree with our proposed definition of an on-the-go scheme (restricting the drinks containers in-scope to less than 750ml in size and excluding multipack containers)? (P27)

a.) Yes

b.) No - If no, how would you change the definition of an on-the-go scheme?

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the size should be altered to less than 700ml, as this would make sure that spirit bottles of 70cl capacity would be excluded. This would ensure that the majority of glass containers would be outside of scope and would alleviate a lot of the health and safety concerns over broken glass and noise at deposit points. It would also make sure that most 'on the go' type plastic and metal containers were still within scope.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that multipack containers should be in the 'on the go' scope, as these items are regularly consumed away from the home and littered. It is also a clearer message for residents that all cans and individual-drink plastic bottles are covered under the scheme.

Q15 Do you agree that the size of containers suggested to be included under an on-the-go scheme are more commonly consumed out of the home than in it? (P27)

a) Yes

b) No

c) Difficult to say

*Research would be needed to analyse people's behaviours to show if this is more commonly the case. The size of containers proposed for 'on the go' are items which are regularly littered, although larger plastic bottles are also littered.

Materials

Q16 Please provide any information on the capability of reverse vending machines to compact glass? (P29)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not have knowledge of the suitability of RVMs to compact glass. There are concerns about how intact the glass will remain and if it is broken too much this may preclude it then being used for remelt and may cause quality issues for other materials placed in a RVM.

Q17 Do you agree that the scope of a deposit return scheme should be based on container material rather than product? (P31)

a. Yes

b. No

*The DRS scheme should align with EPR and consistent collections policies to be clear which products are covered under each respective programme. If the consistent collections requirements and EPR are based on products rather than material type, there could be confusion and duplication. The system needs to be easy to use, if consumers have a poor understanding of materials in scope and regularly have products rejected, this could lead to low engagement with the scheme and increased complaints to local authorities.

In general, local authority recycling information details the types of products that can be recycled without referring to polymer resin codes, as these can be confusing and misleading. If the DRS in-scope items are to be determined by the material rather than the product, this could be confusing to residents and would rely heavily on clear labelling and the vast majority of consumers being able to understand the label, including those where English is not their first language. A poor understanding of what materials are in scope could potentially lead to an unintended consequence of out of scope containers being returned and rejected at RVMs or return points which may then be littered rather than returned to the home for correct disposal/recycling.

There is a greater incentive provided to producers to use different materials in the product to avoid the DRS charges. The alternatives, for example greater use of cartons, cups, pouches or bioplastics may not be recyclable through kerbside and could lead to greater contamination levels and rejected loads.

Q18 Do you agree with the proposed list of materials to be included in scope? (P31)

a. Yes

b. No

*Cartons

Warwickshire Waste Partnership recognises that cartons are to be excluded due to potential capacity issues of current recycling infrastructure. This raises concerns because cartons are included in scope for kerbside collections in the consistent collections consultation. We would only support cartons being excluded from DRS and included in kerbside collections if sorting and reprocessing infrastructure is in place and a guaranteed long-term market is available for the material. There is the potential for the use of cartons to increase, if out of scope, as there could be a 'material shift' to any out of scope material to avoid applying a deposit, including cartons, cups, pouches and bio-plastics.

Glass

Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that the inclusion of glass drinks containers in a DRS can naturally be reduced by reducing the maximum size to **below** 700ml. We are aware that there is a potential health and safety issue around the noise associated with collecting glass via DRS, as well

as the potential for broken glass at collection points. However, there is a strong desire to retain smaller glass containers in a 'on the go' scope, as littered glass causes fires and is a danger to people and animals.

Q19 Do you consider there will be any material switching as a result of the proposed scope? Please provide evidence to support your response. (P19)

- a. Yes
- b. No

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is concerned that producers could switch to materials out of scope of a DRS for the drinks packaging and consumers may seek out non-scope packaging to avoid the deposit fee. This could be a switch to cartons, cups or pouches or to novel paper or bioplastic bottles. A similar example is where supermarkets have shifted to using bioplastics due to customer demand for less plastic use. This has created contamination of kerbside recycling systems where it is not compatible in either the organic or the dry recycling collections.

Consumers may also choose to buy larger containers to avoid the deposit fee. For less healthy options such as fizzy drinks, this could have unintended health consequences as more of the product would be consumed than normally would have been through purchasing the smaller bottle. There is also the likelihood that more product will be wasted as a result of buying more than is needed.

Targets

Q20 Which of the following approaches do you consider should be taken to phase in a 90% collection target over 3 years? (P33)

- a) 70% in year 1, 80% in year 2, 90% in year 3 and thereafter
- b) 75% in year 1, 80% in year 2, 90% in year 3 and thereafter
- c) 75% in year 1, 85% in year 2, 90% in year 3 and thereafter
- d) 80% in year 1, 85% in year 2, 90% in year 3 and thereafter

*The investment required for the DRS to operate is significant. An ambitious recycling rate is necessary to achieve the outcomes anticipated, whilst generating the required income to manage the scheme. There are doubts about such targets being achieved in the UK, when there is already a comprehensive kerbside collection system for the vast majority of containers and material recycling rates of 65% to 70% are already being achieved.

Q21 What collection rate do you consider should be achieved as a minimum for all materials after 3 years? (P33)

- a) 80%
- b) 85%
- c) 90% collection rate should be achieved for all materials

*To make the DRS system worthwhile, it should achieve a high capture rate. The less effective a DRS is in collecting targeted material, the more duplication it will have with the existing kerbside collection system and the higher producer costs will be.

Q22 Is it reasonable to assume that the same collection targets could be met with an on-the-go scheme as those proposed for an all-in scheme for in-scope materials? (P33)

- a. Yes
- b. No

For the DRS scheme to be effective and financially viable, a very high return rate is necessary for either option. Further research would be required to establish people's behaviours and likely

capture from either proposed scheme. If the scheme is to operate without a digital option, it is likely a higher rate of capture would be achieved from 'on the go' as it is likely to be more convenient to return the product.

Q23 Who should report on the volumes of deposit return scheme material placed on the market in each part of the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland) for the proposed deposit return scheme, and what would be the implications of these obligations? (P34)

a) **The producer/importer**

b) *The retailer*

c) *Both the producer/importer and retailer*

The producer should be responsible for reporting volumes placed on the market. The in-scope items are unlikely to be held in storage for any considerable period and is therefore likely to be a reasonably representative annual figure. Reporting by the retailer, especially small retailers would be an additional burden and a considerable administrative addition for the DMO.

Q24 What evidence will be required to ensure that all material collected is passed to a reprocessor for the purpose of calculating the rate of recycling of deposit return scheme material? (P35)

The waste Duty of Care applies, it is therefore essential to track that all material is issued to an authorised reprocessor and it will undergo the correct processes until end-of-waste status is achieved. Reporting requirements could be similar to those required for local authorities for Waste Data Flow.

Scheme Governance

Q25 What length of contract do you think would be most appropriate for the successful bidder to operate as the Deposit Management Organisation? (P39)

a) *3-5 years*

b) *5 – 7 years*

c) *7 – 10 years*

d) **10 years +**

*A contract of this magnitude needs long-term security to make the initial required investments for the scheme to operate successfully.

After the first contract period, consideration should be given to making the contracts 8 to 10 years in length, to mirror the planned contract lengths of the EPR Scheme Administrator.

Q26 Do you agree that the above issues should be covered by the tender process? (P41)

a. **Yes**

b. *No*

The potential implications to local authorities of a DRS scheme could be significant. If local authorities are not represented on the DMO, then it is essential for the tender process to refer to the need to liaise with local authorities and have a formalised dispute resolution process. The case for the digital option for kerbside collections will depend on the results of the trials in Wales and Northern Ireland.

Q27 Do you agree that the above issues should be monitored as Key Performance Indicators? (P42)

a. Yes

b. No

Please list any further issues you believe should be covered by Key Performance Indicators.

The contract for the DMO needs to be operated and assessed in a transparent and effective manner. KPIs and other measurements should be designed with this in mind.

Included within a suite of KPIs should be ones that encompass issues related to contamination and littering, including around RVMs. Warwickshire Waste Partnership would like to see KPIs that measure the availability of RVMs – how much time they are available for use and not full etc.

Q28 Do you agree that Government should design, develop and own the digital infrastructure required to register, and receive evidence on containers placed on the market on behalf of the Deposit Management Organisation and regulators? (P43)

a. Yes

b. No

There needs to be consistency with other data reporting systems such as Waste Data Flow, so it makes sense for Government to initially control the digital infrastructure for reporting. This is also key to the potential digital infrastructure for local authority kerbside collections.

Q29 Government will need to understand the needs of users to build digital services for deposit return scheme. Would you like your contact details to be added to a user panel for deposit return scheme so that we can invite you to participate in user research (e.g. surveys, workshops interviews) or to test digital services as they are designed and built? (P43)

a. Yes

b. No

Financial Flows

Q30 What is an appropriate measure of small producers for the purposes of determining the payment of registration fees? (P45)

a. Taxable Turnover

b. Drinks containers placed on the market

c. Any other

Q31 Is a high level of unredeemed deposits funding the scheme problematic? (P46)

a. Yes

b. No.

A high level of unredeemed deposits for any DRS would be problematic, as it means that the scheme is not working as envisaged. This would mean the scheme has low recycling rates, is operating inefficiently and is costing producers more than envisaged.

The consultation indicates the importance of producers paying costs proportionate to the types of materials they place on the market, to reflect the different costs involved in collecting, separating, and treating different material types. Producing materials which can be easily captured and recycled would therefore be incentivised. This is contrary to producer fees being set around unredeemed deposits where a poor capture rate is rewarded to producers by lower fees.

Q32 Which option to treatment of unredeemed deposits do you support? (P48)

Option 1

Option 2

*Producers should not benefit from low capture rates by having lower fees and the proposal that a floor on producer fees is supported, with any surpluses being fed directly back into the scheme to improve the capture rate.

Q33 With option 2, do you foresee any unintended consequences of setting a minimum percentage of the net costs of the deposit return scheme that must be met through the producer fee? (P48)

No

Q34 If a floor is set do you consider that this should be set at: (P48)

a) 25% of net costs

b) 33% of net costs

c) 50% of net costs

d) Other

Q35 Do you agree that any excess funds should be reinvested in the scheme or spent on other environmental causes?

Invested in the scheme

other environmental causes? (P48)

*Any excess funds should be used to increase the environmental outcomes of the scheme, which could be to increase the recycling rate or other positive environmental outcomes such as providing support to local authorities to improve kerbside collections or support to producers to reduce carbon emissions. The DRS only considers the waste aspects; in line with the waste hierarchy and circular economy principles, producers should also be encouraged to consider package design and reduction. Unredeemed deposits could be used to provide such incentives.

Q36 What should be the minimum deposit level set in legislation? (P50)

a.) 10p

b.) 15p

c.) 20p

d.) Other

Q37 Do you agree that there should be a maximum deposit level set in legislation? (P50)

a. Yes

b. No

If yes, what should be the maximum deposit level set in legislation?

a.) 30p

b.) 40p

c.) 50p

d.) Other

If the level is set too high, those on lower incomes will be impacted the most. Although the deposit can be redeemed, there may be situations where the packaging cannot be redeemed immediately, or it makes the initial purchase price too high for some. If a variable deposit level is introduced, to take into account multipacks and larger beverage packaging so the charge is in

proportion to the volume purchased, there is the potential for the maximum deposit level to be much higher than if a single rate is applied.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that having local authority representation, either as part of the DMO or very close links as a key stakeholder, would be important when it comes to things such as setting deposit levels.

There are concerns regarding how deposit levels may vary from those in Scotland. Any differences will raise questions in the eyes of consumers and may lead to a drop in public confidence in DRS as a policy and therefore in the use of the DRS systems. If deposit levels do differ from Scotland, then very careful consideration will be needed to be given to how the reasons are communicated.

Q38 Recognising the potentially significant deposit costs consumers could pay on a multipack purchase, how best can we minimise the impact of the scheme on consumers buying multipacks? (P51)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would support the introduction of a variable deposit to minimise the multipack impact. A variable deposit level could be introduced where the charge is in proportion to the volume purchased. This could help to minimise the deposit cost of multipacks and larger beverage packaging.

Q39 Do you agree with our approach to letting the Deposit Management Organisation decide on whether to adopt a fixed or variable deposit level, particularly with regards to multipacks? (P51)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would support the DMO being directed to introduce a variable deposit to minimise the multipack impact. A variable deposit level on multipacks could help to minimise the deposit cost of multipacks and larger beverage packaging.

Return Points

Q40 Do you agree that all retailers selling in-scope drinks containers should be obligated to host a return point, whether it is an all-in or on-the-go deposit return scheme? (P54)

No

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees that all retailers should be obligated to ensure a wide network of return points. That said, there does need to be consideration of how very small businesses and on-street sellers are impacted. It seems reasonable that “retailers” on this scale are treated separately to larger retail sites.

The consultation outlines that the third sector could host voluntary return points. If the third sector may be required to provide an extensive collection network, greater clarity on the payment mechanism is needed.

Q41 Given the proposed extensive distribution and availability of return points for consumers to return bottles to, do you think customers would be likely to experience delays / inconveniences in returning drinks containers? If so, how long or how frequently would such delays be likely to arise for? (P54)

Yes

It is almost inevitable that there will be delays some of the time for high demand return points such as supermarkets, especially during busy periods. The equipment could experience technical malfunction or become full. The delays will also largely be determined by the number of items being returned. As it is unknown what consumer behaviour is likely to be, i.e. will larger number of items be stored before being returned - more likely if an ‘all in ‘ system is adopted. This also relates to potential changes in behaviours post Covid-19 and the potential incorporation of a digital solution.

Q42 Do you have a preference, based on the 3 options described above, on what the schemes approach to online takeback obligations should be? (P57)

Option 2 is preferred.

Option 3 outlines the potential for extra journeys being required by the retailer to take-back in-scope material, which could have negative environmental consequences. There is however also the potential that residents may have to make additional journeys to redeem the deposit if an online takeback solution is not an option. Option 2 therefore provides a reasonable and fair solution requiring all retailers over the de minimis threshold including online retailers to have responsibility to take back containers.

Q43 Do you agree with the proposed criteria for the calculation of the handling fee? (P57)

a. Yes

b. No

If no, would you propose any additional criteria are included for the calculation of the handling fee?

Q44 Please tick which exemptions you agree should be included under the scheme: (P60)

a. Close proximity

b. Breach of safety

Close Proximity - No

Whilst the rationale for this proposal is clear, an exemption on the basis of close proximity to a nearby return point could encourage free riders to the detriment of early adopters. For example, if there are two neighbouring retailers and one installs equipment early in the scheme mobilisation, there is little incentive for the second retailer to follow suit if an exemption is available. The criteria that would be applied in determining the exemption and the robustness of any subsequent monitoring to ensure its ongoing validity would need to mitigate these sort of free rider circumstances.

Breach of Safety – Yes under a suitable system

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would not want to see this reason for exemption used to circumvent retailer compliance and obligations. As above there needs to be in place a robust set of criteria that must be met in order for an exemption to be granted. This would need to include regular review and monitoring.

Q45 Please can you provide any evidence on how many small and micro sized retail businesses we might likely expect to apply for an exemption to hosting a return point, on the grounds of either close proximity to another return point or on the compromise of safety considerations? (P60)

No comment

Q46 Do you think obligations should be placed on retailers exempted from hosting a return point to display specific information informing consumers of their exemption? (P60)

If yes, please tick what information retailers should be required to display:

a.) Signage to demonstrate they don't host a return point;

b.) Signage to signpost consumers to the nearest return point;

c.) Anything else?

No comment

Q47 Do you agree with our rationale for not requiring retailers exempted on the basis of a breach of safety not to be required to signpost to another retailer? (P61)
Yes / No
Please explain your answer.

No comment

Q48 How long do you think exemptions should be granted for until a review date is required to ensure the exemption is still required? (P61)
a.) 1 year
b.) 3 years
c.) 5 years or longer

Q49 Do you think the scheme could benefit from technological solutions being incorporated as a method of return, alongside reverse vending machines and manual return points? (P64)
a. Yes
b. No

*Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that technological solutions will be vital to ensure that online shopping customers are able to collect deposits on containers that they have previously bought online. A handheld device can be used to scan items when the next delivery is delivered. If a 'on the go' system is adopted, then returns via the kerbside system that are digitally enabled would be an unnecessary additional step. If 'all in' is adopted and digital forms a significant part of the strategy, many people will not have the smartphone necessary, or the ability to get and use the app to scan their items.

Adding digital deposit return to an already extremely expensive scheme to set up, would likely involve adding a barcode or chip to the recycling bin or bins of every household. It is felt that the public will not welcome this. It would also be necessary to give every beverage container a unique code and the ability of the system to know that the items had been purchased, otherwise some unscrupulous people will scan bottles in the shop to redeem deposits on items that they have no intention of buying. A digital kerbside method, with the scanning of a recycling bin, gives no guarantee that the item will subsequently be put in the correct bin. Nor will it ensure any kind of improved quality, as it will not prevent contamination.

We can see that a digital solution for the kerbside would be easy for residents and would increase capture rates and reduce carbon emissions of special trips to return containers, especially in rural areas. However, we do not know if any digital method that can surmount the problems listed above.

If a digital kerbside DRS were to be taken forward, then there would need to be a review of how payments to local authorities worked under the DRS and EPR system. There could be merit in the DRS DMO, rather than being stand alone, being part of the EPR SA. A digital DRS would lend itself to option two of the DRS payments to local authorities, the option based on compositional analysis, which is the payment system Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports.

Q50 How could a digital deposit return scheme solution be integrated into existing waste collection infrastructure? Please explain your answer. (P64)

Most local authorities collect all of the types of beverage packaging that is in scope for DRS. However, there is so much potential for accidental or deliberate misuse of a very simple scan and bin digital method, that a lot of extra infrastructure and tracking would have to be in place to prevent deposits being paid for material that has not been correctly deposited.

Each household would require a unique bar code or chip to be provided (preferably on the recycling bin/crate) to allow the deposit to be redeemed. This would be needed at roll out and for replacement bins. This bar code would have to be indelible and not possible to copy, so an unscrupulous person could not just take a photo of it and then use it in the park and still litter their items.

It would also be necessary to give every beverage container an unique code and the system the ability to know that the items had been purchased, otherwise some unscrupulous people will scan bottles in the shop (taking a copy of their bin barcode with them) to redeem deposits on items that they have no intention of buying.

If the different material types were required to be collected separately, that would require a significant additional investment.

The digital system would need a mechanism for dealing with faulty or damaged bar codes or the only option would be to redeem these products by return to store, creating complaints to local authorities.

There would be issues associated with blocks of flats, making sure that that the correct bin barcode is allocated to the correct household.

Due to the above points and other likely un-envisaged issues, Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that a workable digital kerbside DRS will be possible in the near future.

Q51 What are the potential fraud control measures a digital deposit return scheme could bring? Please explain your answer. (P64)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that a workable digital kerbside DRS will be possible in the near future, as we cannot envisage that the many fraud challenges it poses can be overcome.

The barcode the container would need to recognise when the deposit has been redeemed to prevent multiple deposit requests being made, so each product would need a unique code. Systems would also be required to confirm that the product, once scanned, ends up in the correct recycling collection box/bin and not placed in the wrong container, residual waste, or littered. It would need to be impossible for the bin barcode to be copied for misuse. There would need to be controls that prevent items being scanned in the shop, but not purchased and then the deposit requested via the kerbside system.

Any enforcement over these elements should not be for local authorities to resolve and should fall to the DMO to manage.

Q52 Do you think a digital deposit return scheme could ensure the same level of material quality in the returns compared to a tradition return to retail model, given containers may not be returned via a reverse vending machine or manual return point where there is likely to be a greater scrutiny on quality of the container before being accepted? (P64)

Yes

No

Please explain your answer.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that a digital return system without some very complicated controls in place could lead to containers being littered yet still having the deposit returned. Equally, the container could still be placed in the residual waste or litter bin, or be put in the wrong recycling bin in a kerbside sort system. If in-scope materials were captured through a comingled dry recycling scheme, MRFs could generate material streams of sufficient quality for most end market recycling. However, a Reverse Vend Machine will naturally produce greater quality, as the equipment should be able to prevent contamination and ensure a one, two or three material stream only.

Q53 If the digital deposit return scheme system can be integrated into the existing waste collection infrastructure would its implementation and running costs be lower? Please provide evidence to support your answer. (P64)

Local authorities have efficient collecting systems in place, providing an acceptable quality recyclate to reprocessors. Including a digital solution to the DRS system to incorporate kerbside collections could reduce the running costs of the scheme, as most of the infrastructure is already in place to collect this material. However, Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that the areas for fraud are great and therefore, very expensive measures would need to be put in place to prevent fraud and the costs fully covered. This would likely be so costly it would outweigh the saving made on potentially needing fewer RVMs.

Q54 Do you support the proposal to introduce a new permitted development right for reverse vending machines, to support the ease of implementation for the scheme? (P65)

a. Yes

b. No

Do you have any amendments or additional parameters you would propose are reflected in the permitted development right?

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that RVMs should require planning permission. This will allow councils to apply strict criteria for size, location and design for installation and ensure that this is adhered to. The work that will need to take place to grant planning permission in a controlled way is envisaged to be considerably less than the resources that would have to go into dealing with complaints arising from RVMs being placed in unsuitable locations or being an unsuitable design or size.

Labelling

Q55 Do you agree that the following should be part of a mandatory label for deposit return scheme products? (P68)

a) *an identification marker that can be read by reverse vending machines and manual handling scanners.*

b) *a mark to identify the product as part of a deposit return scheme.*

c) *the deposit price.*

Yes.

*The labelling serves two purposes, consumer information and then audit trail/repayment.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that an OPRL-style label could fulfil the consumer information aspect, providing essential public information that the product is in scope of the DRS and the price. Scanning capability on the labelling is also essential to minimise the potential for fraud and for audit trails.

Q56 Are you aware of further measures that can be taken to reduce the incidence and likelihood of fraud in the system? (P68)

No

Q57 Do you agree with our proposals to introduce mandatory labelling, considering the above risk with regards to containers placed on the market in Scotland? (P69)

a. Yes

b. No

*Mandatory labelling should minimise the potential for fraud. It is recognised this could potentially conflict with Scotland and lead to an element of confusion if there is cross-nation

movement of in-scope packaging. However, without the mandatory labelling in place the consequences could be greater, with more widespread inconsistent messaging.

Q58 Do you consider the risk of incorrectly labelled products entering the markets of England, Wales or Northern Ireland via Scotland to be a significant risk? Please provide any evidence to support your answer. (P69)

Mandatory labelling should minimise the potential for fraud or confusion. It is recognised this could potentially conflict with Scotland and lead to an element of confusion if there is cross-nation movement of in-scope packaging. However, without the mandatory labelling in place the consequences could be greater with more widespread inconsistent messaging.

Q59 Do you consider leaving any labelling requirements to industry to be a better option than legislating for mandatory labelling requirements? Please explain your answer. (P69)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the scheme should mandate the labelling content and design. Providing ad hoc labelling by industry could provide conflicting messages, which may result in local authorities having to manage queries and complaints resulting from confusing packaging labels.

Q60 Are you aware of any other solutions for smaller producers who may not currently label their products? Please explain your answer. (P69)

Providing smaller producers with stickers is a reasonable approach and would allow for any digital solutions to be easily adopted.

Q61 We believe 18 months is a sufficient period of time for necessary labelling changes to be made. Do you agree? (P70)

a.) Yes

b.) No

Can you provide any evidence to support your answer?

Q62 Will your processes change as a result of mandatory labelling? (P70)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Don't know

Please explain your answer.

This question is not applicable to Warwickshire Waste Partnership.

Q63 Do you agree that our proposed approach to labelling will be able to accommodate any future changes and innovation?

Yes / No / Don't know

Are you aware of any upcoming technology in the field of labelling? (P70)

Local Authorities and Local Councils

Q64 Do you agree that local authorities will be able to separate deposit return scheme containers either themselves or via agreements with material recovery facilities to regain the deposit value? (P75)

a. Yes

b. No

Please explain your answer

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not support Option 1.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that it would be prohibitively expensive to separate DRS containers at the kerbside, as well as being inconvenient and confusing for the householder. Some MRFs will have the ability to identify and separate some DRS material, but none will be able to do this comprehensively and most will not be able to at all. Even with the most sophisticated equipment, some DRS containers will be missed as they will be broken, dirty or unrecognisably crushed. If in-scope items are required to have the caps on to be eligible for the deposit, this is not something a MRF would be able to check for. It is likely that agreements with the MRF could also be difficult.

Compositional analysis which will be in place for EPR will help to identify averages for DRS scope material over time, which fits with Option 2.

Litter and residual DRS material is excluded from Option 1, to align with EPR principles and full net cost recovery these elements need to be covered.

Q65 Do you agree that local authorities will be able to negotiate agreements with material recovery facilities to ensure gate fees reflect the increased deposit values in waste streams or a profit sharing agreement on returned deposit return scheme containers was put in place? (P75)

a. Yes

b. No

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not support payment option one.

We are not confident that agreements could be easily or equitably renegotiated. If MRFs need to put in place additional sorting infrastructure to separate out DRS materials, these costs would be reflected in the gate fees and therefore could represent a cost rather than a saving, especially in the short term. If additional sorting is required at the MRF, these costs should not be met by the local authorities in terms of higher gate fees.

Local authorities should receive the deposit for the material collected by them and will rely on accurate reporting from the MRF. If a digital solution is adopted for kerbside collections, the deposit will have been redeemed by the resident and so will not need paying to the local authority. Instead, it is the costs for collecting and processing the material that would need to be covered. With the digital system, there is an issue of the kerbside containers containing some items that have been scanned and the deposit redeemed and some where they have not been scanned. How would the amount that the LA should get back for the unscanned items be worked out?

Q66 In order to minimise the risk of double payments from the Deposit Management Organisation to local authorities, where should data be collected regarding the compositional analysis to prevent the containers then being allowed to be redeemed via return points? (P77)

The principle of Option 2 sounds reasonable if material cannot be reasonably separated out, although the payment mechanism and associated costs for an 'efficient and effective collection' and the various payment groups would require further consultation and agreement. There should also be capacity for an appeals system if a local authority can demonstrate it has been inappropriately categorised or the payments do not reflect the costs incurred.

Compositional analysis would be required at the MRF, checking individual bins is a very expensive process and is likely to be less representative due to a smaller sample size. Compositional analysis at the MRF does potentially open the system up to fraud where local authorities may receive a relatively constant payment and the MRFs claim any excess deposits if there are any. It should not be the local authority having to undertake the compositional analysis.

It is noted that an assumption has been made that the proportion of 70% of recycling of drinks beverage packaging would continue once the DRS material has been removed. Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes this is unlikely to remain constant as residents who currently recycle well may be more likely to use the DRS return options. The 7% estimation for the kerbside recycling may therefore not be representative if the high DRS rate of 90% is achieved, furthermore the proportion in the residual stream could also be higher. Further modelling and compositional analysis once the DRS system is in place would be required to ensure LA payments were representative of the materials being collected.

Q67 How difficult do you think this option would be to administer, given the need to have robust compositional analysis in place? (P78)

Please explain your answer.

This option is only a potential approach if the majority of LAs can separate DRS material, which will rely on MRFs to provide the data. Having reliance on compositional analysis is expensive and would need to be carried out on a regular basis to ensure it is representative. If a variable deposit is introduced, this would be very difficult to verify in a standard compositional analysis and would require even greater monitoring.

A simpler and cheaper alternative is to consider mass balance. If it is known what has been placed on the market, the vast majority of this will have a relatively quick turnover. It would therefore be reasonable to assume that once the deposits have been reclaimed at return points most of the remaining material will be collected by local authorities either be in the kerbside recycling, residual bin or littered. Occasional compositional analysis could be completed to confirm this. Warwickshire Waste Partnership considers it will be difficult to administer this option and does not support it.

Q68 What option do you think best deals with the issue of deposit return scheme containers that continue to end up in local authority waste streams? (P78)

a. Option 1

b. Option 2

c. Option 3

Please briefly state the reasons for your response. Where available, please share evidence to support your view.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership strongly supports option 2.

Option 2 maximises the potential return of DRS material and offers a fair system of payment to cover all the DRS material local authorities collect (recycling, litter, and residual).

The DMO will be able to determine the weight/quantity of all in-scope material placed on the market and, through return points, determine the proportion that has been redeemed. Assuming that the system is sufficiently effective to minimise or eradicate material 'leakage', and that reporting timescales account for material that may be retained by the householder with the intention of redeeming deposits in future (stockpiling), it can be reasonably stated that all remaining material will fall upon the local authority to deal with, through kerbside recycling, residual waste containers, HWRCs, litter (on street and in litter bins) and also illegal waste disposal (fly-tipping). A local authority should not be financially disadvantaged for failures in the DRS that the local authority cannot control.

Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement

Q69 Are there any other producer obligations you believe the Environmental Regulators should be responsible for monitoring and enforcing? (P81)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agree that the proposed areas for monitoring and enforcement by the Environmental Regulators is reasonable.

Q70 Are local authorities (through the role Trading Standards and the Primary Authority Scheme) best placed to enforce certain retailer obligations? (P82)

a. Yes

b. No

Please give any alternative suggestions.

To what extent will local authorities be able to add monitoring and enforcement work for the deposit return scheme to existing duties they carry out with retailers?

Warwickshire County Council believes that the additional obligations placed on Trading Standards could be significant, particularly in the short term as the scheme is set up. The consultation refers to staff time being covered for managing return points. Further information should be provided on a payment model for this. It needs to be recognised that this would be a new burden and so should be funded by obligated producers (as is proposed with enforcement of the EPR requirements by the Environment Agency).

This is a new burden on local authorities and appropriate funding needs to be provided. It is crucial that any new duties are matched with commensurate funds. It would be helpful if the amount provided can be clarified in writing.

DEFRA should consider if the funding to cover the enforcement role should arrive via the local authority block grant or better via a ring-fenced sum specifically for DRS. Even if it not possible to formally ring fence such funds, due to existing funding rules, a known and specified amount will enable the Head of Service to make an internal bid for such funds within Warwickshire.

The consultation proposes that the cost burden of enforcement undertaken by local authorities is largely addressed through the Primary Authority scheme. However, this is voluntary and does not necessarily ensure that enforcement would not be needed against participating retailers (with the cost of this not covered in that event). The businesses that are most likely to commit offences are less likely to be involved in the scheme (either individually or through a trade association).

It must be noted that Warwickshire Trading Standards services do not undertake many routine inspections, so simply checking "while you are there" is unlikely to happen. Trading Standards work is intelligence led, so work in this area would most likely focus on responding to complaints or other intelligence about breaches and supporting and advising local businesses with advice as well as broader public and business awareness raising.

Primary Authorities would have a role in providing assured advice to a business about how they can legally implement such schemes, but would not be responsible for taking enforcement action for breaches.

We are aware that District & Borough Environment Health colleagues may do more routine inspections of premises where this will be required, but believe that increasing enforcement powers across all local authorities could lead to confusion and should stay with Trading Standards; Environmental Health colleagues can flag any suspected breaches with Warwickshire Trading

Standards for investigation. Licensing Officers can be included in this as they do regularly visit off-licences.

Finally, if enforcement powers rest with Trading Standards then it is recommended that Citizens Advice are contacted as there will be a need to create some new codes so we can deal with this properly, otherwise such complaints may come through as pricing related for example. Clear coding from the outset will help establish set reports which can be run to cover any FOI requests received after implementation.

Q71 In addition to those in the table, are there any other types of breaches not on this list that you think should be? If so, what are they? These may include offences for participants not listed e.g. reprocessors or exporters. (P84)

Warwickshire Trading Standards recommend the need to ensure that these breaches are held against the company, directors, partners and vicariously to managers of premises e.g. store manager of a national chain of shops/supermarkets not doing their job properly (wilfully deviating from company procedures etc.)

Q72 Are there any vulnerable points in the system? (P84)
Please explain your answer.

Warwickshire County Council thinks there is an opportunity to build up the intelligence picture – being proactive rather than reactive – e.g. asking District and Borough Environmental Health colleagues to liaise with Trading Standards. A vulnerability would instead be to carry out reactive work in the face of complaints or provide guidance after the event.

Q73 Do you see a role for the Deposit Management Organisation to seek compliance before escalating to the Regulator? (P84)

Warwickshire County Council agrees that there should be an informal approach by the DMO to establish if less significant issues can be resolved before escalating to the formal enforcement process. The Regulator should be responsible for providing strict guidance around this to minimise the risk of inconsistencies which could create difficulties for potential prosecutions if incorrect information has been given by the DMO.

Q74 Do you agree with the position set out regarding enforcement response options? If not, please expand your answer. (P85)

Warwickshire County Council agrees to the tiered approach to enforcement, offering resolution of increasing significance before relying on more time-consuming legal approaches.

Implementation Timeline

Q75 Do you have any comments on the delivery timeline for the deposit return scheme? Please pose any views on implementation steps missing from the above? (P87)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership think that the DRS scheme should be rolled out as soon as possible, to work alongside the new EPR and consistent collection changes. It is important that the system is designed well, but any unnecessary delays will not address the litter issue, which is one of the most important drivers for this policy. Delays will not escalate an improvement in capture and quality and the environmental and climate change improvements that come with increased quantity and quality of recycling.

Q76 How long does the Deposit Management Organisation need from appointment to the scheme going live, taking into account the time required to set up the necessary infrastructure? Please provide evidence to support your answer. (P88)

a.) 12 months

b.) 14 months

c.) 18 months

d.) Any other (please specify)

There are so many unknowns at this point it is difficult to assess with any degree of accuracy how long it will take the DMO to set up the required infrastructure. However, given the size and scale of the task and the changes under EPR and consistent collections also taking place, it would be seem that a period of 24 months is more realistic.

Q77 Depending on the final decision taken on the scope of the scheme in England and Northern Ireland – all-in or on-the-go – what, if any, impact does this have on the proposed implementation period? (P88)

The impacts on the implementation period depends on which option is selected regarding data requirements for local authorities. For an ‘all in’ system, this needs a greater lead in time to amend contracts with MRFs to separate and report on the in-scope materials separated and issued to the DMO.

Q78 Do you agree with the analysis presented in our Impact Assessment? (P94)

a. Yes

b. No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response. Where available, please share evidence to support your view.

If the digital solution is to be incorporated into the scheme design, this represents a significant change in how the scheme would be managed. This option should therefore be fully evaluated as it is likely to substantially change the impacts/costs. Without this information the impact assessment is incomplete.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not agree with the analysis presented on littering and thinks there is unlikely to be a cost saving related to operational aspects of litter collection. The impact assessment makes a direct correlation between the reduction in litter and cost savings in terms of manual sweeping, litter picking and emptying bins. We do not believe this is an accurate reflection, as staff will be required to cover the same area to litter pick and bins will probably have to be emptied with the same frequency. Similarly, it is unlikely there will be a reduction in transport movement either.

It is not clear to what extent post-pandemic behaviours/consumption patterns and limitations to return points have been incorporated into modelling. If, as expected, some of the behaviours observed during 2020 and 2021, which are reflected in kerbside yields and compositions, become sustained, this could have a significant bearing on the feasibility of a DRS as currently modelled. It is difficult to comment fully as the scale and cost of key scheme requirements, such as compositional analysis and monitoring of return points, differ across the scenarios. The information presented is not of sufficient detail to determine the impact of key scheme variables presented throughout the consultation.

DRS Consultation – Warwickshire Waste Partnership final draft, 26 May 2021

- Q1 Name
Warwickshire Waste Partnership
- Q2 Email address
waste@warwickshire.gov.uk
- Q3 Organisation type
Local Authority
- Q4 Organisation Detail
This consultation response is submitted on behalf of the Warwickshire Waste Partnership and should be read as equal to six responses from: North Warwickshire Borough Council, Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council, Rugby Borough Council, Stratford District Council, Warwick District Council, Warwickshire County Council.
- Q5 Would you like your response to be confidential?
No

A deposit return scheme in a post Covid context

- Q6 Given the context of the Covid-19 pandemic we are currently experiencing; do you support or oppose our proposals to implement a deposit return scheme for drinks containers in 2024? (P16)
- a.) **Support**
 - b.) *Neither support nor oppose*
 - c.) *Oppose*
 - d.) *Not sure*

Assuming that Government go ahead with a countrywide DRS scheme, we would like to see it rolled out as soon as is feasible to sit alongside the collection consistency and Extended Producer Responsibility policy changes starting in 2023. Assumptions made, and responses given in the 2019 consultations, will naturally have altered now, since the pandemic. Householder shopping and working habits have greatly changed and behaviours may change long term after social distancing is eased. Greater home delivery of groceries and other shopping is likely to continue. Therefore, fewer householders will make regular visits to supermarkets and civic centres and the RVM model for DRS is less applicable, especially if the 'All in' model is adopted. New modelling is needed to assess this change in consumer habits, triggered to move faster due to Covid. Many businesses, especially SMEs are under greater pressure than before and placing additional burdens of a DRS before the economy has settled must be taken into account. The outcome of digital kerbside trials; feedback from the EPR and consistent collections consultations and further work around householder behaviour post Covid must feed into the scheme design.

Q7 Do you believe the introduction of a deposit return scheme will have an impact on your everyday life? (P16)

a.) Yes, a detrimental impact

b.) No, there will be no impact.

If you answered yes the scheme would have a detrimental impact, how significant would this impact be?

a.) No significant impact

b.) Some impact but manageable

c.) Large impact but still manageable

d.) Large impact and impossible to comply with

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that local authorities will be on the receiving end of many of the enquiries about DRS when it is rolled out, especially regarding any Reverse Vending Machines that are sited in public spaces (as opposed to in commercial buildings). We will have to provide extra customer service support to cope with this.

Many residents, especially in flats, apartments and houses of multiple occupancy have very limited storage within the dwellings to separate and store multiple waste streams for recycling. Adding an additional waste stream which needs to be transferred to a collection point may cause problems for households where space is limited and they may complain to the council. If residents have limited storage, they may choose to place beverage containers in the kerbside recycling and then ask the council for this money back. Or their purchasing habits will change to choose products which do not have a deposit and therefore most likely to be harder to recycle, reducing the council's recycling performance.

If residents are generally making fewer journeys to stores post Covid-19, journeys may be made solely to redeem deposits which may adversely impact local air quality and increase carbon emissions. The councils of Warwickshire Waste Partnership are seeking to improve air quality and reduce local carbon emissions, and this will undermine these efforts. If people are making fewer journeys, the need to redeem a deposit could also be discriminatory against social groups which may rely on a regular deposit return for cash flow or have limited space for storage and need to make additional journeys to redeem the deposit or free up storage space.

Q8 Have your views towards implementation of a deposit return scheme been affected following the economic and social impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic? (P17)

a) Yes – because of economic impacts

b) Yes – because of social impacts

c) Yes – because of both economic and social impacts

d) No

e) Not sure

Kerbside recycling services across the UK have continued throughout the pandemic whereas the deliverability of a DRS over the past 12 months would have failed and moreover supply chains dependent on material flows would have been significantly disrupted.

Scope

Q9 Do you agree that the cap should be included as part of the deposit item in a deposit return scheme for: (P19)

a) *Plastic bottle caps on plastic bottles – yes/no*

b) *Aluminium bottle caps on glass bottles – yes/no*

c) *Corks in glass bottles – yes/no*

d) *Foil on the top of a can / bottle or used to preserve some drinks – yes/no*

*Caps which can easily be secured back on the packaging could be included as there is potential for this material to also be recycled and reduce the litter risk. So including the lid in any case should be allowed and encouraged via improved packaging design and national communications to prevent litter, but it should not be required.

To make it easier for the consumer, the systems should enable containers to be taken back with the cap on or off and the deposit to be paid regardless of whether a cap is present or not. The collections and sorting systems supporting RVMs must be capable of dealing with caps and lids. Further clarification is needed on how this could be managed at RVMs or digital solutions if redeeming the deposit is reliant on the lid being present.

Communications could be designed to tell householders not to include corks, to help reduce non-target materials. But as with kerbside systems now, sorting systems need to be able to cope with realistic levels of non-target items, as consumers do not always follow guidance.

Q10 Do you believe we have identified the correct pros and cons for the all-in and on-the-go schemes described above? (P26)

a.) *Yes Please elaborate on your answer*

b.) *No Please elaborate on your answer*

The DRS proposed requires extensive investment and will only result in good value for money in terms of gain in total recycling, recycling quality and reduced littering if designed well.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is less convinced by the benefits of an 'all in' model than by the 'on the go' concept. We believe that a very comprehensive and universal recycling kerbside service led by the collection consistency policy, alongside much improved packaging labelling enforced by the EPR policy, will lead to large improvements in both the quantity and quality of household packaging material presented at the kerbside. Demand for recycled content, including plastic through the plastic tax policy, will lead to improvements in MRF technology, further enhancing quality. Consumers should not be in any way confused if there is clear and unambiguous labelling for in-scope containers, alongside a national promotional campaign. An 'on the go' solution will be cheaper and quicker to implement in terms of RVM infrastructure and will have less impact on established kerbside collections.

Areas where we do not think enough consideration has been given are:

The impact of Covid-19 and change in behaviours long term.

Impact of an 'all in' system on small shops with little storage space operating a manual return system.

The impact on families on low income of the cost of the initial shop the first week or month that an 'all in' DRS is introduced and further impacts if they are not able to frequently redeem deposits. The unintended consequence of increased littering where some people may leave items in easily accessible and visible locations, enabling others to collect and redeem the deposit. There could be an increase in 'bin diving' where bins are partially emptied in search of redeemable containers, which again can lead to littering.

Other items, such as takeaway cups, food packaging and plastic films are also commonly littered. These items will need to be cleared and the impact on authorities of reduced litter does not

directly correlate with a reduction in cost, as crew have to make the same number of journeys and cover the same area to collect the litter.

There is no information about whether, when a network of external RVMs is installed, the risk of anti-social behaviour (theft, vandalism and littering due to broken RVMs etc) is increased. It is unclear if this has been included in the running costs of the scheme and associated remedial work and the complaints local authorities would have to deal with associated to this.

The potential for schemes to be different across nations and varying costs of deposits, such as multipacks, could be confusing for residents. Whilst the DMO will have responsibility for communications, local authorities will inevitably receive direct liaison from residents for complaints and queries, which will be an additional burden.

Q11 Do you foresee any issues if the final scope of a deposit return scheme in England and Northern Ireland does not match the all-in decision taken in Wales? E.g. an on-the-go scheme in England and an all-in scheme in Wales. (P26)

a) Yes

b) No

This would add another layer of complexity to managing the system if there is a mix of 'on the go' and 'all in' systems. Communications could be challenging and could lead to confusion especially for areas where there is regular movement across borders. The system could be less efficient and could lead to additional costs as multiple systems are managed. These issues could also apply between Scotland and England where schemes could also be different.

Q12 Having read the rationale for either an all-in or on-the-go scheme, which do you consider to be the best option for our deposit return scheme? (P27)

a) All-in

b) on-the-go

Please elaborate on your answer.

A DRS should be part of an integrated system of resource and waste management that does not compete with existing recycling services which have proven to be highly successful in delivering significant increases in recycling. Recycling rates for some materials within scope of the proposed DRS, such as metal and glass, are already high. Warwickshire Waste Partnership therefore believes there is likely to be little net overall gain in the capture of glass through inclusion in a DRS.

One of the key objectives for the scheme is to reduce littering. An 'on the go' scheme will contribute to this whereas an 'all in' scheme is likely to have less benefit, as the items will be more commonly consumed at home and therefore the potential for it to be littered very low.

We are concerned that an 'all-in' scheme would change the public's perception of recycling. People may prioritise recycling DRS material as there is a financial incentive and think that, because other materials do not have this incentive, recycling those materials is less important.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership considers an 'on the go' scheme is a fairer system for residents where there is a greater choice in whether to pay a deposit, by giving the option to use reusable items from home. An 'all in' system will also include more frequently purchased items where the deposit is therefore much harder to avoid, having a greater impact on those on lower incomes.

Q13 Given the impact Covid-19 has had on the economy, on businesses and consumers, and on everyday life, do you believe an on-the-go scheme would be less disruptive to consumers? (P27)

a) Yes

b) No

*An 'on the go' DRS would be less disruptive, on the grounds it would have fewer materials and therefore less tonnage in scope. The footprint of an 'on the go' DRS would be smaller, the installation and ongoing costs would be lower, and the logistics of managing closed loop systems would be smaller.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believe consumers have greater opportunity to choose to avoid paying the deposit by changing behaviours with an 'on the go' scheme. An 'all-in' system reduces this potential and could be more disruptive to those especially on lower incomes, who, given the impact of COVID-19, could be struggling more.

It is probable that people will continue to make more online purchases than they did pre Covid-19, with fewer trips to retailers. Also more people are likely to be working from home. at least some of the time. This may therefore require an additional journey specifically to redeem deposits.

An 'all in' system will require residents to separately store this material until a visit to a return point or potentially require an additional journey. 'On the go' is likely to be less disruptive, as there is potentially greater opportunity to return the item before returning home.

Q14 Do you agree with our proposed definition of an on-the-go scheme (restricting the drinks containers in-scope to less than 750ml in size and excluding multipack containers)? (P27)

a.) Yes

b.) No - If no, how would you change the definition of an on-the-go scheme?

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the size should be altered to less than 700ml, as this would make sure that spirit bottles of 70cl capacity would be excluded. This would ensure that the majority of glass containers would be outside of scope and would alleviate a lot of the health and safety concerns over broken glass and noise at deposit points. It would also make sure that most 'on the go' type plastic and metal containers were still within scope.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that multipack containers should be in the 'on the go' scope, as these items are regularly consumed away from the home and littered. It is also a clearer message for residents that all cans and individual-drink plastic bottles are covered under the scheme.

Q15 Do you agree that the size of containers suggested to be included under an on-the-go scheme are more commonly consumed out of the home than in it? (P27)

a) Yes

b) No

c) Difficult to say

*Research would be needed to analyse people's behaviours to show if this is more commonly the case. The size of containers proposed for 'on the go' are items which are regularly littered, although larger plastic bottles are also littered.

Materials

Q16 Please provide any information on the capability of reverse vending machines to compact glass? (P29)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not have knowledge of the suitability of RVMs to compact glass. There are concerns about how intact the glass will remain and if it is broken too much this may preclude it then being used for remelt and may cause quality issues for other materials placed in a RVM.

Q17 Do you agree that the scope of a deposit return scheme should be based on container material rather than product? (P31)

a. Yes

b. No

*The DRS scheme should align with EPR and consistent collections policies to be clear which products are covered under each respective programme. If the consistent collections requirements and EPR are based on products rather than material type, there could be confusion and duplication. The system needs to be easy to use, if consumers have a poor understanding of materials in scope and regularly have products rejected, this could lead to low engagement with the scheme and increased complaints to local authorities.

In general, local authority recycling information details the types of products that can be recycled without referring to polymer resin codes, as these can be confusing and misleading. If the DRS in-scope items are to be determined by the material rather than the product, this could be confusing to residents and would rely heavily on clear labelling and the vast majority of consumers being able to understand the label, including those where English is not their first language. A poor understanding of what materials are in scope could potentially lead to an unintended consequence of out of scope containers being returned and rejected at RVMs or return points which may then be littered rather than returned to the home for correct disposal/recycling.

There is a greater incentive provided to producers to use different materials in the product to avoid the DRS charges. The alternatives, for example greater use of cartons, cups, pouches or bioplastics may not be recyclable through kerbside and could lead to greater contamination levels and rejected loads.

Q18 Do you agree with the proposed list of materials to be included in scope? (P31)

a. Yes

b. No

*Cartons

Warwickshire Waste Partnership recognises that cartons are to be excluded due to potential capacity issues of current recycling infrastructure. This raises concerns because cartons are included in scope for kerbside collections in the consistent collections consultation. We would only support cartons being excluded from DRS and included in kerbside collections if sorting and reprocessing infrastructure is in place and a guaranteed long-term market is available for the material. There is the potential for the use of cartons to increase, if out of scope, as there could be a 'material shift' to any out of scope material to avoid applying a deposit, including cartons, cups, pouches and bio-plastics.

Glass

Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that the inclusion of glass drinks containers in a DRS can naturally be reduced by reducing the maximum size to **below** 700ml. We are aware that there is a potential health and safety issue around the noise associated with collecting glass via DRS, as well

as the potential for broken glass at collection points. However, there is a strong desire to retain smaller glass containers in a 'on the go' scope, as littered glass causes fires and is a danger to people and animals.

Q19 Do you consider there will be any material switching as a result of the proposed scope? Please provide evidence to support your response. (P19)

- a. Yes
- b. No

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is concerned that producers could switch to materials out of scope of a DRS for the drinks packaging and consumers may seek out non-scope packaging to avoid the deposit fee. This could be a switch to cartons, cups or pouches or to novel paper or bioplastic bottles. A similar example is where supermarkets have shifted to using bioplastics due to customer demand for less plastic use. This has created contamination of kerbside recycling systems where it is not compatible in either the organic or the dry recycling collections.

Consumers may also choose to buy larger containers to avoid the deposit fee. For less healthy options such as fizzy drinks, this could have unintended health consequences as more of the product would be consumed than normally would have been through purchasing the smaller bottle. There is also the likelihood that more product will be wasted as a result of buying more than is needed.

Targets

Q20 Which of the following approaches do you consider should be taken to phase in a 90% collection target over 3 years? (P33)

- a) 70% in year 1, 80% in year 2, 90% in year 3 and thereafter
- b) 75% in year 1, 80% in year 2, 90% in year 3 and thereafter
- c) 75% in year 1, 85% in year 2, 90% in year 3 and thereafter
- d) 80% in year 1, 85% in year 2, 90% in year 3 and thereafter

*The investment required for the DRS to operate is significant. An ambitious recycling rate is necessary to achieve the outcomes anticipated, whilst generating the required income to manage the scheme. There are doubts about such targets being achieved in the UK, when there is already a comprehensive kerbside collection system for the vast majority of containers and material recycling rates of 65% to 70% are already being achieved.

Q21 What collection rate do you consider should be achieved as a minimum for all materials after 3 years? (P33)

- a) 80%
- b) 85%
- c) 90% collection rate should be achieved for all materials

*To make the DRS system worthwhile, it should achieve a high capture rate. The less effective a DRS is in collecting targeted material, the more duplication it will have with the existing kerbside collection system and the higher producer costs will be.

Q22 Is it reasonable to assume that the same collection targets could be met with an on-the-go scheme as those proposed for an all-in scheme for in-scope materials? (P33)

- a. Yes
- b. No

For the DRS scheme to be effective and financially viable, a very high return rate is necessary for either option. Further research would be required to establish people's behaviours and likely

capture from either proposed scheme. If the scheme is to operate without a digital option, it is likely a higher rate of capture would be achieved from 'on the go' as it is likely to be more convenient to return the product.

Q23 Who should report on the volumes of deposit return scheme material placed on the market in each part of the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland) for the proposed deposit return scheme, and what would be the implications of these obligations? (P34)

a) **The producer/importer**

b) *The retailer*

c) *Both the producer/importer and retailer*

The producer should be responsible for reporting volumes placed on the market. The in-scope items are unlikely to be held in storage for any considerable period and is therefore likely to be a reasonably representative annual figure. Reporting by the retailer, especially small retailers would be an additional burden and a considerable administrative addition for the DMO.

Q24 What evidence will be required to ensure that all material collected is passed to a reprocessor for the purpose of calculating the rate of recycling of deposit return scheme material? (P35)

The waste Duty of Care applies, it is therefore essential to track that all material is issued to an authorised reprocessor and it will undergo the correct processes until end-of-waste status is achieved. Reporting requirements could be similar to those required for local authorities for Waste Data Flow.

Scheme Governance

Q25 What length of contract do you think would be most appropriate for the successful bidder to operate as the Deposit Management Organisation? (P39)

a) *3-5 years*

b) *5 – 7 years*

c) *7 – 10 years*

d) **10 years +**

*A contract of this magnitude needs long-term security to make the initial required investments for the scheme to operate successfully.

After the first contract period, consideration should be given to making the contracts 8 to 10 years in length, to mirror the planned contract lengths of the EPR Scheme Administrator.

Q26 Do you agree that the above issues should be covered by the tender process? (P41)

a. **Yes**

b. *No*

The potential implications to local authorities of a DRS scheme could be significant. If local authorities are not represented on the DMO, then it is essential for the tender process to refer to the need to liaise with local authorities and have a formalised dispute resolution process. The case for the digital option for kerbside collections will depend on the results of the trials in Wales and Northern Ireland.

Q27 Do you agree that the above issues should be monitored as Key Performance Indicators? (P42)

a. Yes

b. No

Please list any further issues you believe should be covered by Key Performance Indicators.

The contract for the DMO needs to be operated and assessed in a transparent and effective manner. KPIs and other measurements should be designed with this in mind.

Included within a suite of KPIs should be ones that encompass issues related to contamination and littering, including around RVMs. Warwickshire Waste Partnership would like to see KPIs that measure the availability of RVMs – how much time they are available for use and not full etc.

Q28 Do you agree that Government should design, develop and own the digital infrastructure required to register, and receive evidence on containers placed on the market on behalf of the Deposit Management Organisation and regulators? (P43)

a. Yes

b. No

There needs to be consistency with other data reporting systems such as Waste Data Flow, so it makes sense for Government to initially control the digital infrastructure for reporting. This is also key to the potential digital infrastructure for local authority kerbside collections.

Q29 Government will need to understand the needs of users to build digital services for deposit return scheme. Would you like your contact details to be added to a user panel for deposit return scheme so that we can invite you to participate in user research (e.g. surveys, workshops interviews) or to test digital services as they are designed and built? (P43)

a. Yes

b. No

Financial Flows

Q30 What is an appropriate measure of small producers for the purposes of determining the payment of registration fees? (P45)

a. Taxable Turnover

b. Drinks containers placed on the market

c. Any other

Q31 Is a high level of unredeemed deposits funding the scheme problematic? (P46)

a. Yes

b. No.

A high level of unredeemed deposits for any DRS would be problematic, as it means that the scheme is not working as envisaged. This would mean the scheme has low recycling rates, is operating inefficiently and is costing producers more than envisaged.

The consultation indicates the importance of producers paying costs proportionate to the types of materials they place on the market, to reflect the different costs involved in collecting, separating, and treating different material types. Producing materials which can be easily captured and recycled would therefore be incentivised. This is contrary to producer fees being set around unredeemed deposits where a poor capture rate is rewarded to producers by lower fees.

Q32 Which option to treatment of unredeemed deposits do you support? (P48)

Option 1

Option 2

*Producers should not benefit from low capture rates by having lower fees and the proposal that a floor on producer fees is supported, with any surpluses being fed directly back into the scheme to improve the capture rate.

Q33 With option 2, do you foresee any unintended consequences of setting a minimum percentage of the net costs of the deposit return scheme that must be met through the producer fee? (P48)

No

Q34 If a floor is set do you consider that this should be set at: (P48)

a) 25% of net costs

b) 33% of net costs

c) 50% of net costs

d) Other

Q35 Do you agree that any excess funds should be reinvested in the scheme or spent on other environmental causes?

Invested in the scheme

other environmental causes? (P48)

*Any excess funds should be used to increase the environmental outcomes of the scheme, which could be to increase the recycling rate or other positive environmental outcomes such as providing support to local authorities to improve kerbside collections or support to producers to reduce carbon emissions. The DRS only considers the waste aspects; in line with the waste hierarchy and circular economy principles, producers should also be encouraged to consider package design and reduction. Unredeemed deposits could be used to provide such incentives.

Q36 What should be the minimum deposit level set in legislation? (P50)

a.) 10p

b.) 15p

c.) 20p

d.) Other

Q37 Do you agree that there should be a maximum deposit level set in legislation? (P50)

a. Yes

b. No

If yes, what should be the maximum deposit level set in legislation?

a.) 30p

b.) 40p

c.) 50p

d.) Other

If the level is set too high, those on lower incomes will be impacted the most. Although the deposit can be redeemed, there may be situations where the packaging cannot be redeemed immediately, or it makes the initial purchase price too high for some. If a variable deposit level is introduced, to take into account multipacks and larger beverage packaging so the charge is in

proportion to the volume purchased, there is the potential for the maximum deposit level to be much higher than if a single rate is applied.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that having local authority representation, either as part of the DMO or very close links as a key stakeholder, would be important when it comes to things such as setting deposit levels.

There are concerns regarding how deposit levels may vary from those in Scotland. Any differences will raise questions in the eyes of consumers and may lead to a drop in public confidence in DRS as a policy and therefore in the use of the DRS systems. If deposit levels do differ from Scotland, then very careful consideration will be needed to be given to how the reasons are communicated.

Q38 Recognising the potentially significant deposit costs consumers could pay on a multipack purchase, how best can we minimise the impact of the scheme on consumers buying multipacks? (P51)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would support the introduction of a variable deposit to minimise the multipack impact. A variable deposit level could be introduced where the charge is in proportion to the volume purchased. This could help to minimise the deposit cost of multipacks and larger beverage packaging.

Q39 Do you agree with our approach to letting the Deposit Management Organisation decide on whether to adopt a fixed or variable deposit level, particularly with regards to multipacks? (P51)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would support the DMO being directed to introduce a variable deposit to minimise the multipack impact. A variable deposit level on multipacks could help to minimise the deposit cost of multipacks and larger beverage packaging.

Return Points

Q40 Do you agree that all retailers selling in-scope drinks containers should be obligated to host a return point, whether it is an all-in or on-the-go deposit return scheme? (P54)

No

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees that all retailers should be obligated to ensure a wide network of return points. That said, there does need to be consideration of how very small businesses and on-street sellers are impacted. It seems reasonable that “retailers” on this scale are treated separately to larger retail sites.

The consultation outlines that the third sector could host voluntary return points. If the third sector may be required to provide an extensive collection network, greater clarity on the payment mechanism is needed.

Q41 Given the proposed extensive distribution and availability of return points for consumers to return bottles to, do you think customers would be likely to experience delays / inconveniences in returning drinks containers? If so, how long or how frequently would such delays be likely to arise for? (P54)

Yes

It is almost inevitable that there will be delays some of the time for high demand return points such as supermarkets, especially during busy periods. The equipment could experience technical malfunction or become full. The delays will also largely be determined by the number of items being returned. As it is unknown what consumer behaviour is likely to be, i.e. will larger number of items be stored before being returned - more likely if an ‘all in ‘ system is adopted. This also relates to potential changes in behaviours post Covid-19 and the potential incorporation of a digital solution.

Q42 Do you have a preference, based on the 3 options described above, on what the schemes approach to online takeback obligations should be? (P57)

Option 3 is preferred.

Option 3 outlines the potential for extra journeys being required by the retailer to take-back in-scope material, which could have negative environmental consequences. There is however also the potential that residents may have to make additional journeys to redeem the deposit if an online takeback solution is not an option. Option 2 therefore provides a reasonable and fair solution requiring all retailers over the de minimis threshold including online retailers to have responsibility to take back containers.

Q43 Do you agree with the proposed criteria for the calculation of the handling fee? (P57)

a. Yes

b. No

If no, would you propose any additional criteria are included for the calculation of the handling fee?

Q44 Please tick which exemptions you agree should be included under the scheme: (P60)

a. Close proximity

b. Breach of safety

Close Proximity - No

Whilst the rationale for this proposal is clear, an exemption on the basis of close proximity to a nearby return point could encourage free riders to the detriment of early adopters. For example, if there are two neighbouring retailers and one installs equipment early in the scheme mobilisation, there is little incentive for the second retailer to follow suit if an exemption is available. The criteria that would be applied in determining the exemption and the robustness of any subsequent monitoring to ensure its ongoing validity would need to mitigate these sort of free rider circumstances.

Breach of Safety – Yes under a suitable system

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would not want to see this reason for exemption used to circumvent retailer compliance and obligations. As above there needs to be in place a robust set of criteria that must be met in order for an exemption to be granted. This would need to include regular review and monitoring.

Q45 Please can you provide any evidence on how many small and micro sized retail businesses we might likely expect to apply for an exemption to hosting a return point, on the grounds of either close proximity to another return point or on the compromise of safety considerations? (P60)

No comment

Q46 Do you think obligations should be placed on retailers exempted from hosting a return point to display specific information informing consumers of their exemption? (P60)

If yes, please tick what information retailers should be required to display:

a.) Signage to demonstrate they don't host a return point;

b.) Signage to signpost consumers to the nearest return point;

c.) Anything else?

No comment

Q47 Do you agree with our rationale for not requiring retailers exempted on the basis of a breach of safety not to be required to signpost to another retailer? (P61)
Yes / No
Please explain your answer.

No comment

Q48 How long do you think exemptions should be granted for until a review date is required to ensure the exemption is still required? (P61)
a.) 1 year
b.) 3 years
c.) 5 years or longer

Q49 Do you think the scheme could benefit from technological solutions being incorporated as a method of return, alongside reverse vending machines and manual return points? (P64)
a. Yes
b. No

*Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that technological solutions will be vital to ensure that online shopping customers are able to collect deposits on containers that they have previously bought online. A handheld device can be used to scan items when the next delivery is delivered. If a 'on the go' system is adopted, then returns via the kerbside system that are digitally enabled would be an unnecessary additional step. If 'all in' is adopted and digital forms a significant part of the strategy, many people will not have the smartphone necessary, or the ability to get and use the app to scan their items.

Adding digital deposit return to an already extremely expensive scheme to set up, would likely involve adding a barcode or chip to the recycling bin or bins of every household. It is felt that the public will not welcome this. It would also be necessary to give every beverage container a unique code and the ability of the system to know that the items had been purchased, otherwise some unscrupulous people will scan bottles in the shop to redeem deposits on items that they have no intention of buying. A digital kerbside method, with the scanning of a recycling bin, gives no guarantee that the item will subsequently be put in the correct bin. Nor will it ensure any kind of improved quality, as it will not prevent contamination.

We can see that a digital solution for the kerbside would be easy for residents and would increase capture rates and reduce carbon emissions of special trips to return containers, especially in rural areas. However, we do not know if any digital method that can surmount the problems listed above.

If a digital kerbside DRS were to be taken forward, then there would need to be a review of how payments to local authorities worked under the DRS and EPR system. There could be merit in the DRS DMO, rather than being stand alone, being part of the EPR SA. A digital DRS would lend itself to option two of the DRS payments to local authorities, the option based on compositional analysis, which is the payment system Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports.

Q50 How could a digital deposit return scheme solution be integrated into existing waste collection infrastructure? Please explain your answer. (P64)

Most local authorities collect all of the types of beverage packaging that is in scope for DRS. However, there is so much potential for accidental or deliberate misuse of a very simple scan and bin digital method, that a lot of extra infrastructure and tracking would have to be in place to prevent deposits being paid for material that has not been correctly deposited.

Each household would require a unique bar code or chip to be provided (preferably on the recycling bin/crate) to allow the deposit to be redeemed. This would be needed at roll out and for replacement bins. This bar code would have to be indelible and not possible to copy, so an unscrupulous person could not just take a photo of it and then use it in the park and still litter their items.

It would also be necessary to give every beverage container an unique code and the system the ability to know that the items had been purchased, otherwise some unscrupulous people will scan bottles in the shop (taking a copy of their bin barcode with them) to redeem deposits on items that they have no intention of buying.

If the different material types were required to be collected separately, that would require a significant additional investment.

The digital system would need a mechanism for dealing with faulty or damaged bar codes or the only option would be to redeem these products by return to store, creating complaints to local authorities.

There would be issues associated with blocks of flats, making sure that that the correct bin barcode is allocated to the correct household.

Due to the above points and other likely un-envisaged issues, Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that a workable digital kerbside DRS will be possible in the near future.

Q51 What are the potential fraud control measures a digital deposit return scheme could bring? Please explain your answer. (P64)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that a workable digital kerbside DRS will be possible in the near future, as we cannot envisage that the many fraud challenges it poses can be overcome.

The barcode the container would need to recognise when the deposit has been redeemed to prevent multiple deposit requests being made, so each product would need a unique code. Systems would also be required to confirm that the product, once scanned, ends up in the correct recycling collection box/bin and not placed in the wrong container, residual waste, or littered. It would need to be impossible for the bin barcode to be copied for misuse. There would need to be controls that prevent items being scanned in the shop, but not purchased and then the deposit requested via the kerbside system.

Any enforcement over these elements should not be for local authorities to resolve and should fall to the DMO to manage.

Q52 Do you think a digital deposit return scheme could ensure the same level of material quality in the returns compared to a tradition return to retail model, given containers may not be returned via a reverse vending machine or manual return point where there is likely to be a greater scrutiny on quality of the container before being accepted? (P64)

Yes

No

Please explain your answer.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that a digital return system without some very complicated controls in place could lead to containers being littered yet still having the deposit returned. Equally, the container could still be placed in the residual waste or litter bin, or be put in the wrong recycling bin in a kerbside sort system. If in-scope materials were captured through a comingled dry recycling scheme, MRFs could generate material streams of sufficient quality for most end market recycling. However, a Reverse Vend Machine will naturally produce greater quality, as the equipment should be able to prevent contamination and ensure a one, two or three material stream only.

Q53 If the digital deposit return scheme system can be integrated into the existing waste collection infrastructure would its implementation and running costs be lower? Please provide evidence to support your answer. (P64)

Local authorities have efficient collecting systems in place, providing an acceptable quality recyclate to reprocessors. Including a digital solution to the DRS system to incorporate kerbside collections could reduce the running costs of the scheme, as most of the infrastructure is already in place to collect this material. However, Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that the areas for fraud are great and therefore, very expensive measures would need to be put in place to prevent fraud and the costs fully covered. This would likely be so costly it would outweigh the saving made on potentially needing fewer RVMs.

Q54 Do you support the proposal to introduce a new permitted development right for reverse vending machines, to support the ease of implementation for the scheme? (P65)

a. Yes

b. No

Do you have any amendments or additional parameters you would propose are reflected in the permitted development right?

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that RVMs should require planning permission. This will allow councils to apply strict criteria for size, location and design for installation and ensure that this is adhered to. The work that will need to take place to grant planning permission in a controlled way is envisaged to be considerably less than the resources that would have to go into dealing with complaints arising from RVMs being placed in unsuitable locations or being an unsuitable design or size.

Labelling

Q55 Do you agree that the following should be part of a mandatory label for deposit return scheme products? (P68)

a) *an identification marker that can be read by reverse vending machines and manual handling scanners.*

b) *a mark to identify the product as part of a deposit return scheme.*

c) *the deposit price.*

Yes.

*The labelling serves two purposes, consumer information and then audit trail/repayment.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that an OPRL-style label could fulfil the consumer information aspect, providing essential public information that the product is in scope of the DRS and the price. Scanning capability on the labelling is also essential to minimise the potential for fraud and for audit trails.

Q56 Are you aware of further measures that can be taken to reduce the incidence and likelihood of fraud in the system? (P68)

No

Q57 Do you agree with our proposals to introduce mandatory labelling, considering the above risk with regards to containers placed on the market in Scotland? (P69)

a. Yes

b. No

*Mandatory labelling should minimise the potential for fraud. It is recognised this could potentially conflict with Scotland and lead to an element of confusion if there is cross-nation

movement of in-scope packaging. However, without the mandatory labelling in place the consequences could be greater, with more widespread inconsistent messaging.

Q58 Do you consider the risk of incorrectly labelled products entering the markets of England, Wales or Northern Ireland via Scotland to be a significant risk? Please provide any evidence to support your answer. (P69)

Mandatory labelling should minimise the potential for fraud or confusion. It is recognised this could potentially conflict with Scotland and lead to an element of confusion if there is cross-nation movement of in-scope packaging. However, without the mandatory labelling in place the consequences could be greater with more widespread inconsistent messaging.

Q59 Do you consider leaving any labelling requirements to industry to be a better option than legislating for mandatory labelling requirements? Please explain your answer. (P69)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the scheme should mandate the labelling content and design. Providing ad hoc labelling by industry could provide conflicting messages, which may result in local authorities having to manage queries and complaints resulting from confusing packaging labels.

Q60 Are you aware of any other solutions for smaller producers who may not currently label their products? Please explain your answer. (P69)

Providing smaller producers with stickers is a reasonable approach and would allow for any digital solutions to be easily adopted.

Q61 We believe 18 months is a sufficient period of time for necessary labelling changes to be made. Do you agree? (P70)

a.) Yes

b.) No

Can you provide any evidence to support your answer?

Q62 Will your processes change as a result of mandatory labelling? (P70)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Don't know

Please explain your answer.

This question is not applicable to Warwickshire Waste Partnership.

Q63 Do you agree that our proposed approach to labelling will be able to accommodate any future changes and innovation?

Yes / No / Don't know

Are you aware of any upcoming technology in the field of labelling? (P70)

Local Authorities and Local Councils

Q64 Do you agree that local authorities will be able to separate deposit return scheme containers either themselves or via agreements with material recovery facilities to regain the deposit value? (P75)

a. Yes

b. No

Please explain your answer

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not support Option 1.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership thinks that it would be prohibitively expensive to separate DRS containers at the kerbside, as well as being inconvenient and confusing for the householder. Some MRFs will have the ability to identify and separate some DRS material, but none will be able to do this comprehensively and most will not be able to at all. Even with the most sophisticated equipment, some DRS containers will be missed as they will be broken, dirty or unrecognisably crushed. If in-scope items are required to have the caps on to be eligible for the deposit, this is not something a MRF would be able to check for. It is likely that agreements with the MRF could also be difficult.

Compositional analysis which will be in place for EPR will help to identify averages for DRS scope material over time, which fits with Option 2.

Litter and residual DRS material is excluded from Option 1, to align with EPR principles and full net cost recovery these elements need to be covered.

Q65 Do you agree that local authorities will be able to negotiate agreements with material recovery facilities to ensure gate fees reflect the increased deposit values in waste streams or a profit sharing agreement on returned deposit return scheme containers was put in place? (P75)

a. Yes

b. No

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not support payment option one.

We are not confident that agreements could be easily or equitably renegotiated. If MRFs need to put in place additional sorting infrastructure to separate out DRS materials, these costs would be reflected in the gate fees and therefore could represent a cost rather than a saving, especially in the short term. If additional sorting is required at the MRF, these costs should not be met by the local authorities in terms of higher gate fees.

Local authorities should receive the deposit for the material collected by them and will rely on accurate reporting from the MRF. If a digital solution is adopted for kerbside collections, the deposit will have been redeemed by the resident and so will not need paying to the local authority. Instead, it is the costs for collecting and processing the material that would need to be covered. With the digital system, there is an issue of the kerbside containers containing some items that have been scanned and the deposit redeemed and some where they have not been scanned. How would the amount that the LA should get back for the unscanned items be worked out?

Q66 In order to minimise the risk of double payments from the Deposit Management Organisation to local authorities, where should data be collected regarding the compositional analysis to prevent the containers then being allowed to be redeemed via return points? (P77)

The principle of Option 2 sounds reasonable if material cannot be reasonably separated out, although the payment mechanism and associated costs for an 'efficient and effective collection' and the various payment groups would require further consultation and agreement. There should also be capacity for an appeals system if a local authority can demonstrate it has been inappropriately categorised or the payments do not reflect the costs incurred.

Compositional analysis would be required at the MRF, checking individual bins is a very expensive process and is likely to be less representative due to a smaller sample size. Compositional analysis at the MRF does potentially open the system up to fraud where local authorities may receive a relatively constant payment and the MRFs claim any excess deposits if there are any. It should not be the local authority having to undertake the compositional analysis.

It is noted that an assumption has been made that the proportion of 70% of recycling of drinks beverage packaging would continue once the DRS material has been removed. Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes this is unlikely to remain constant as residents who currently recycle well may be more likely to use the DRS return options. The 7% estimation for the kerbside recycling may therefore not be representative if the high DRS rate of 90% is achieved, furthermore the proportion in the residual stream could also be higher. Further modelling and compositional analysis once the DRS system is in place would be required to ensure LA payments were representative of the materials being collected.

Q67 How difficult do you think this option would be to administer, given the need to have robust compositional analysis in place? (P78)

Please explain your answer.

This option is only a potential approach if the majority of LAs can separate DRS material, which will rely on MRFs to provide the data. Having reliance on compositional analysis is expensive and would need to be carried out on a regular basis to ensure it is representative. If a variable deposit is introduced, this would be very difficult to verify in a standard compositional analysis and would require even greater monitoring.

A simpler and cheaper alternative is to consider mass balance. If it is known what has been placed on the market, the vast majority of this will have a relatively quick turnover. It would therefore be reasonable to assume that once the deposits have been reclaimed at return points most of the remaining material will be collected by local authorities either be in the kerbside recycling, residual bin or littered. Occasional compositional analysis could be completed to confirm this. Warwickshire Waste Partnership considers it will be difficult to administer this option and does not support it.

Q68 What option do you think best deals with the issue of deposit return scheme containers that continue to end up in local authority waste streams? (P78)

a. Option 1

b. Option 2

c. Option 3

Please briefly state the reasons for your response. Where available, please share evidence to support your view.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership strongly supports option 2.

Option 2 maximises the potential return of DRS material and offers a fair system of payment to cover all the DRS material local authorities collect (recycling, litter, and residual).

The DMO will be able to determine the weight/quantity of all in-scope material placed on the market and, through return points, determine the proportion that has been redeemed. Assuming that the system is sufficiently effective to minimise or eradicate material 'leakage', and that reporting timescales account for material that may be retained by the householder with the intention of redeeming deposits in future (stockpiling), it can be reasonably stated that all remaining material will fall upon the local authority to deal with, through kerbside recycling, residual waste containers, HWRCs, litter (on street and in litter bins) and also illegal waste disposal (fly-tipping). A local authority should not be financially disadvantaged for failures in the DRS that the local authority cannot control.

Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement

Q69 Are there any other producer obligations you believe the Environmental Regulators should be responsible for monitoring and enforcing? (P81)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agree that the proposed areas for monitoring and enforcement by the Environmental Regulators is reasonable.

Q70 Are local authorities (through the role Trading Standards and the Primary Authority Scheme) best placed to enforce certain retailer obligations? (P82)

a. Yes

b. No

Please give any alternative suggestions.

To what extent will local authorities be able to add monitoring and enforcement work for the deposit return scheme to existing duties they carry out with retailers?

Warwickshire County Council believes that the additional obligations placed on Trading Standards could be significant, particularly in the short term as the scheme is set up. The consultation refers to staff time being covered for managing return points. Further information should be provided on a payment model for this. It needs to be recognised that this would be a new burden and so should be funded by obligated producers (as is proposed with enforcement of the EPR requirements by the Environment Agency).

This is a new burden on local authorities and appropriate funding needs to be provided. It is crucial that any new duties are matched with commensurate funds. It would be helpful if the amount provided can be clarified in writing.

DEFRA should consider if the funding to cover the enforcement role should arrive via the local authority block grant or better via a ring-fenced sum specifically for DRS. Even if it not possible to formally ring fence such funds, due to existing funding rules, a known and specified amount will enable the Head of Service to make an internal bid for such funds within Warwickshire.

The consultation proposes that the cost burden of enforcement undertaken by local authorities is largely addressed through the Primary Authority scheme. However, this is voluntary and does not necessarily ensure that enforcement would not be needed against participating retailers (with the cost of this not covered in that event). The businesses that are most likely to commit offences are less likely to be involved in the scheme (either individually or through a trade association).

It must be noted that Warwickshire Trading Standards services do not undertake many routine inspections, so simply checking "while you are there" is unlikely to happen. Trading Standards work is intelligence led, so work in this area would most likely focus on responding to complaints or other intelligence about breaches and supporting and advising local businesses with advice as well as broader public and business awareness raising.

Primary Authorities would have a role in providing assured advice to a business about how they can legally implement such schemes, but would not be responsible for taking enforcement action for breaches.

We are aware that District & Borough Environment Health colleagues may do more routine inspections of premises where this will be required, but believe that increasing enforcement powers across all local authorities could lead to confusion and should stay with Trading Standards; Environmental Health colleagues can flag any suspected breaches with Warwickshire Trading

Standards for investigation. Licensing Officers can be included in this as they do regularly visit off-licences.

Finally, if enforcement powers rest with Trading Standards then it is recommended that Citizens Advice are contacted as there will be a need to create some new codes so we can deal with this properly, otherwise such complaints may come through as pricing related for example. Clear coding from the outset will help establish set reports which can be run to cover any FOI requests received after implementation.

Q71 In addition to those in the table, are there any other types of breaches not on this list that you think should be? If so, what are they? These may include offences for participants not listed e.g. reprocessors or exporters. (P84)

Warwickshire Trading Standards recommend the need to ensure that these breaches are held against the company, directors, partners and vicariously to managers of premises e.g. store manager of a national chain of shops/supermarkets not doing their job properly (wilfully deviating from company procedures etc.)

Q72 Are there any vulnerable points in the system? (P84)
Please explain your answer.

Warwickshire County Council thinks there is an opportunity to build up the intelligence picture – being proactive rather than reactive – e.g. asking District and Borough Environmental Health colleagues to liaise with Trading Standards. A vulnerability would instead be to carry out reactive work in the face of complaints or provide guidance after the event.

Q73 Do you see a role for the Deposit Management Organisation to seek compliance before escalating to the Regulator? (P84)

Warwickshire County Council agrees that there should be an informal approach by the DMO to establish if less significant issues can be resolved before escalating to the formal enforcement process. The Regulator should be responsible for providing strict guidance around this to minimise the risk of inconsistencies which could create difficulties for potential prosecutions if incorrect information has been given by the DMO.

Q74 Do you agree with the position set out regarding enforcement response options? If not, please expand your answer. (P85)

Warwickshire County Council agrees to the tiered approach to enforcement, offering resolution of increasing significance before relying on more time-consuming legal approaches.

Implementation Timeline

Q75 Do you have any comments on the delivery timeline for the deposit return scheme? Please pose any views on implementation steps missing from the above? (P87)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership think that the DRS scheme should be rolled out as soon as possible, to work alongside the new EPR and consistent collection changes. It is important that the system is designed well, but any unnecessary delays will not address the litter issue, which is one of the most important drivers for this policy. Delays will not escalate an improvement in capture and quality and the environmental and climate change improvements that come with increased quantity and quality of recycling.

Q76 How long does the Deposit Management Organisation need from appointment to the scheme going live, taking into account the time required to set up the necessary infrastructure? Please provide evidence to support your answer. (P88)

a.) 12 months

b.) 14 months

c.) 18 months

d.) Any other (please specify)

There are so many unknowns at this point it is difficult to assess with any degree of accuracy how long it will take the DMO to set up the required infrastructure. However, given the size and scale of the task and the changes under EPR and consistent collections also taking place, it would be seem that a period of 24 months is more realistic.

Q77 Depending on the final decision taken on the scope of the scheme in England and Northern Ireland – all-in or on-the-go – what, if any, impact does this have on the proposed implementation period? (P88)

The impacts on the implementation period depends on which option is selected regarding data requirements for local authorities. For an 'all in' system, this needs a greater lead in time to amend contracts with MRFs to separate and report on the in-scope materials separated and issued to the DMO.

Q78 Do you agree with the analysis presented in our Impact Assessment? (P94)

a. Yes

b. No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response. Where available, please share evidence to support your view.

If the digital solution is to be incorporated into the scheme design, this represents a significant change in how the scheme would be managed. This option should therefore be fully evaluated as it is likely to substantially change the impacts/costs. Without this information the impact assessment is incomplete.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not agree with the analysis presented on littering and thinks there is unlikely to be a cost saving related to operational aspects of litter collection. The impact assessment makes a direct correlation between the reduction in litter and cost savings in terms of manual sweeping, litter picking and emptying bins. We do not believe this is an accurate reflection, as staff will be required to cover the same area to litter pick and bins will probably have to be emptied with the same frequency. Similarly, it is unlikely there will be a reduction in transport movement either.

It is not clear to what extent post-pandemic behaviours/consumption patterns and limitations to return points have been incorporated into modelling. If, as expected, some of the behaviours observed during 2020 and 2021, which are reflected in kerbside yields and compositions, become sustained, this could have a significant bearing on the feasibility of a DRS as currently modelled. It is difficult to comment fully as the scale and cost of key scheme requirements, such as compositional analysis and monitoring of return points, differ across the scenarios. The information presented is not of sufficient detail to determine the impact of key scheme variables presented throughout the consultation.

APPENDIX C

Consistent Collections Consultation – Warwickshire Waste Partnership Final Draft 2021

Introduction (page 16)

- Q1 Warwickshire Waste Partnership
- Q2 waste@warwickshire.gov.uk
- Q3 Which best describes you?
Local Government
- Q4 Warwickshire Waste Partnership
- Q5 Would you like your response to be confidential?
No

Proposals on separate collection of dry recyclable waste from households

Proposal 1 - Collection of dry recyclable materials

- Q6 Do you agree or disagree that local authorities should be required to collect the following dry materials from all households, including flats, by the end of the financial year in which payments to local authorities under Extended Producer Responsibility for packaging commences (currently proposed to be 2023/4 subject to consultation)? (P26)

	Agree –this material can be collected in this timeframe	Disagree –this material can't be collected in this timeframe	Not sure /don't have an opinion /not applicable
Aluminium foil	Y		
Aluminium food trays	Y		
Steel and aluminium aerosols	Y		
Aluminium tubes, e.g. tomato puree tubes	Y		
Metal jar lids	Y		
Food and drink cartons, e.g. Tetrapak		Y	

- Q7 If you have disagreed with the inclusion of any of the additional materials above in the timeframe set out, please state why this would not be feasible,

indicating which dry recyclable material you are referring to in your response.
(P27)

Tubes

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees with the inclusion of aluminium tubes but raises the issue that tubes cannot be safely cleaned of all food residue. This issue will need confirming with metal reprocessors.

Cartons

Warwickshire Waste Partnership members will part-own a new, state of the art MRF, due to open mid-2023. So, in our particular case, the space and equipment to sort and store cartons for recycling will be available from the start of consistent collections. However, we are aware that the majority of other local authorities will not have access to the most up to date MRF facilities which can easily gear up to make provision for new materials. So, the partnership recognises that fellow authorities will have concerns about the sorting capability for food and drinks cartons in the UK and therefore concerns about adding them to the list of materials that should be collected from 2023/24.

The new MRF that Warwickshire will use will be capable of sorting fully comingled recycling to high quality standards and that will include being able to sort cartons, even when flattened. However, we understand the logic of asking for cartons in the plastics stream for older sorting facilities, to keep fibres cleaner and to keep cartons in their shape so they are easier to sort. Some kerbside sort vehicles can have an element of compaction on the plastics compartment. If materials are bulked before reaching the MRF then there is another opportunity for cartons to get flattened. Residents may also flatten cartons even if the local authority instruction is not to. Therefore, if older sorting facilities cannot cope with cartons that are flattened then there is less likelihood of them being recycled, despite being collected. Sorting capability in the UK overall is not robust enough to provide comprehensive coverage of MRFs that will be able to sort food and drinks cartons to a level suitable for the required end markets.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would like to see the inclusion of cartons later than proposed to ensure that there is sufficient reprocessing capacity in the UK or Europe to deal with the quantities of this material that will be sorted for recycling. There is currently only one facility able to reprocess this material in the UK, in Halifax. There is uncertainty about how DRS and EPR decisions will affect the prevalence of cartons in the waste stream or the future capacity for reprocessing of cartons in the UK. The partners are keen that there is sufficient end market capacity that none of the plastic-containing waste collected in Warwickshire is shipped beyond the EU for reprocessing. Chemical processing mentioned in the consultation as a solution to plastics end markets is less applicable when discussing cartons, as they are predominantly composed of paperboard, with plastic and metal layers.

Q8 Some local authorities may not be able to collect all these items from all households at kerbside by 2023/24. Under what circumstances might it be appropriate for these collection services to begin after this date? (P28)

Collection contracts

Sorting contracts

Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) infrastructure capacity

Cost burden

Reprocessing

End markets

Other (please specify)

Please provide the reason for your response and indicate how long local authorities require before they can collect all of these materials, following the date that funding is available from Extended Producer Responsibility.

Collection Contracts

Warwickshire collection contracts are being aligned to the availability of a new, state of the art MRF from mid-2023. However, we are aware that most local authorities will be at varying points in a collection contract, which are typically designed in length around the useful working life of the collection vehicles, typically 7 years or longer. This also applies to directly delivered services. If mandated changes force changes to collection contracts or infrastructure, this should be covered by EPR payments or new burdens.

With the associated requirement to collect food waste some local authorities may require a fundamental change in their collection arrangements, rather than just “adding in” some dry recycling materials. The most cost-effective way to do this is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on which the obligations and payments fall.

If an authority needs to move from a current co-mingled service to a source separated service, there are all the associated issues with the increase in vehicles, staff, depot space etc that will need to be taken into account and make the change much more complex and so likely to take longer to achieve.

Concerns have been raised about the ability of the market to supply services to councils and contractors if there is high demand, due to lots of contracts and vehicle replacements happening at the same time. So, there may be shortages of collection vehicles, or longer lead in times. Also, some authorities might find they have few, or even no bidders for collection contracts. This will then lead to possible value for money issues, fewer bidders generally means that less competitive bids will be made, and a higher service cost ensues.

Sorting Contracts

The most cost-effective way to change contracts or contract terms is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider as to whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on who the obligations and payments fall.

MRF Infrastructure

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the ability of most MRFs nationwide to be able to adapt within the timescales to enable consistent and thorough sorting of food and drinks cartons. Local authorities are limited to which MRFs they can supply, due to proximity. In certain places, there may be challenges with other materials also. As councils will not receive payments for EPR obligated materials until 2023/24, and MRFs gain their income through gate fees for council contracts, it is not clear how they will receive a cash flow to provide the investment to change their equipment to be ready for the EPR / consistent collection materials. A competitive procurement process will be affected by increased demand over a short timescale, for MRF capacity and for collection contractors, separated material off takers, vehicles, reprocessing – there could be significant capacity issues.

Cost burden

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is concerned that if up-front transition costs are not provided and if EPR funding and new burden funding for food waste are not aligned, there will be impacts on the whole collections system. Authorities in Warwickshire do not currently collect food waste separately, so we will look to implement one service change for food and dry recycling collections. If the funding for food waste collections is not provided up front, this will delay planned changes for the dry recycling materials.

Reprocessing

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that the reprocessing capacity is likely to be available for cartons in time in the UK and in Europe. The partners do not want material from Warwickshire to have to be shipped beyond Europe for reprocessing because the government has mandated collection of cartons before there is suitable and secure reprocessing capacity available.

End Markets

The UK currently relies on many export end markets. The vast majority are reputable and legitimate end markets where materials are recycled properly. However, there remains a lack of full transparency for a local authority to have full sight of where collected materials end up. There is the perception, partially legitimate, that export beyond Europe is undesirable, and that some material exported is not recycled. This then can put doubt in the public's mind if a local authority report that they are exporting waste beyond Europe for recycling, that the material they are putting out for collection is getting recycled. This can then erode public confidence in the recycling systems and so participation can drop off. The partnership would like to see government put in place more assurances that recycling cannot be exported illegally.

New materials for collection should not be mandated until proper end markets are securely in place.

Other – Flats/HMO

Flats and HMOs present challenges when it comes to implementing recycling collection services. There is often a lack of space for containers and use of shared facilities can make it difficult to undertake education and enforcement activities. These properties can be very different, and it will take more time to arrange to collect additional materials from them. There needs to be a recognition and acceptance that some flats and HMOs will need to have a comingled collection.

Other – Uncertainty over future carton quantities

New government policies and other market forces could be foreseen to have an impact on the number and type of cartons placed on the market, but it is difficult to predict whether the impact will mean there are more or less of they type of container. If drinks cartons are a DRS material, that may have a different impact than if they are not. EPR modulating fees will have an impact on the appeal of using cartons as a packaging option. Paper bottles are being premiered, but whether they take off is dependant on the web of policy options that are under discussion within this consultation alongside DRS and EPR, alongside consumer preference and many other factors. This uncertainty will impact on reprocessing and end market development and local authorities will be at the mercy of this.

Q9 Do you agree or disagree that food and drink cartons should be included in the plastic recyclable waste stream in regulations, to reduce contamination of fibres (paper and card)? (P28)

Agree – cartons should be included in the plastic recyclable waste stream.

Disagree – cartons should be included the paper and card recyclable waste stream.

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable.

Please provide the reason for your response and state if there are any unintended consequences that we should consider.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that food and drinks cartons should be collected in the timescale given, due to lack of reprocessing capacity. For most local authorities there will also be difficulties with MRF sorting capacity for this material in the timescales. However, in Warwickshire, there will not be an issue with being able to collect cartons in any manner and then have the ability to sort into a high-quality recycling stream in the new, state of the art MRF. Local authorities and their MRFs plus the end markets are best placed to dictate which material stream the cartons are collected with. It will ultimately depend on how the MRF is configured as to what is the best mix of materials.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership understands the rationale put forward for placing food and drinks cartons in the plastics waste stream. There could be communications problems when local authorities promote their collection services to residents.

Cartons are generally seen as paper/card products by residents and that recycling stream is likely to be the one they first think of putting cartons in to. There will be confusion introduced as residents are asked to put a paper/card item in the plastics recycling container. Communications can be effective, to a point, but with limited enforcement tools available there is only so much local authorities can do to compel residents to use collections systems correctly.

This should be included in the exemptions that Defra are proposing, to allow cartons and plastics to be collected together without the need for a written assessment to be undertaken.

Q10 Assuming food and drink cartons are included by the date that Extended Producer Responsibility commences, what would be the financial impact on gate fees and processing costs from sending mixed material streams containing cartons into a Materials Recovery Facility? (P28)

No increase

0–9% increase

10–20% increase

21-100% increase

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Please provide the reason for your response.

It is unclear what the financial impacts on gate fees will be. Given that most MRFs will need to invest in new equipment and processes to sort out drinks cartons it is not unreasonable to assume that gate fees will increase as a result.

Proposal 2 - Collection of plastic films from households

Q11 Do you agree or disagree that local authorities should adopt the collection of this material from all households, including flats, no later than 2026/27?

(P29)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership members will part-own a new, state of the art MRF, due to open mid-2023. So, in our particular case, the space and equipment to sort and store plastic film for recycling will be available from the start of consistent collections. However, we are aware that the majority of other local authorities will not have access to the most up to date MRF facilities which can easily gear up to make provision for new materials. So, the partnership recognises that fellow authorities will have concerns about the sorting capability for plastic film in the UK, concerns about contracts, and therefore concerns about adding them to the list of materials that should be collected from 2026/27.

The new MRF that Warwickshire will use will be capable of sorting fully comingled recycling to high quality standards and that will include being able to sort many types of plastic film. The plastic film explicitly mentioned in the consultation document is limited to polyethylene type material: carrier bags, bread bags and bubble wrap. More clarity on whether government intends to also include other types of film, such as crisp packets or ready meal film lids is urgently needed. Separately collected films and flexibles presents a serious litter concern due to how readily the material can be taken by the wind. Collecting this comingled in a lidded bin will allay this issue.

The introduction of film will bring with it many communication and contamination challenges for local authorities. A lot of education will be needed to help the public understand the definition of films and flexibles. Once residents find they are allowed to include plastic bags in their recycling, it is likely that many will assume it is OK to put other material for recycling into plastic bags, and this will cause difficulties for any type of recycling collection system. Residents may also wrongly assume now that any type of plastic can go into their kerbside system, and hard plastic items will become a more prevalent contamination stream. Labelling of packaging and other items will need to be mandatory and very clear to combat this. Interlocking arrows that indicate a financial contribution to recycling (or similar symbol) is not helpful or necessary and should be removed from packaging to simplify messaging. It is also likely that some residents will not separate plastic film from other packaging items, for example putting a plastic tub into the recycling with the film lid still partially attached. There is also concern that the public will be unable and unwilling to present some plastic film material in a clean form, resulting in contamination of other recycling.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is keen that there is sufficient end market capacity and that none of the plastic-containing waste collected in Warwickshire is shipped beyond the EU for reprocessing. It is felt that with ongoing developments in physical and chemical processing driven by EPR and mentioned in the consultation as a solution, adequate quality plastics end markets will be available by 2026/27. However, if they are not, the government should put back the start date.

Q12 Which of the following reasons might prevent plastic film collections being offered to all households by the end of the financial year 2026/27? (P29)

Collection contracts

Sorting contracts

Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) infrastructure capacity

Cost burden

Reprocessing

End markets

Other (please specify)

Please provide the reason for your response and provide evidence to support your answer.

Collection Contracts

Warwickshire collection contracts are being aligned to the availability of a new, state of the art MRF from mid-2023. However, we are aware that most local authorities will be at varying points in a collection contract, which are typically designed in length around the useful working life of the collection vehicles, typically 7 years or longer. This also applies to directly delivered services. If mandated changes force changes to collection contracts or infrastructure, this should be covered by EPR payments or new burdens.

With the associated requirement to collect food waste some local authorities may require a fundamental change in their collection arrangements, rather than just “adding in” some dry recycling materials. The most cost-effective way to do this is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider as to whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on who the obligations and payments fall.

If an authority needs to move from a current co-mingled service to a source separated service, there are all the associated issues with the increase in vehicles, staff, depot space etc that will need to be taken account of and make the change much more complex and so likely to take longer to achieve.

Concerns have been raised about the ability of the market to supply services to councils and contractors if there is high demand, due to lots of contracts and vehicle replacements happening at the same time. So, there may be shortages of collection vehicles, or longer lead in times. Also, some authorities might find they have few, or even no bidders for collection contracts. This will then lead to possible value for money issues, fewer bidders generally means that less competitive bids will be made, and a higher service cost ensues.

Sorting Contracts

The most cost-effective way to change contracts or contract terms is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider as to whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on who the obligations and payments fall.

MRF Infrastructure

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the ability of most MRFs nationwide to be able to adapt within the timescales to enable consistent and thorough sorting of plastic film. Local authorities are limited to which MRFs they can supply, due to proximity. In certain places, there may be challenges with other materials also. As councils will not receive payments for EPR obligated materials until 2023/24, and MRFs gain their income through gate fees for council contracts, it is possible that they will not receive enough cash flow to provide the investment to change their equipment to be ready for plastic film. A competitive procurement

process will be affected by increased demand over a short timescale, for MRF capacity and for collection contractors, separated material off takers, vehicles, reprocessing – there could be significant capacity issues.

Cost burden

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is concerned that if up-front transition costs are not provided and if EPR funding and new burden funding for food waste are not aligned, there will be impacts on the whole collections system. Authorities in Warwickshire do not currently collect food waste separately, so we will look to implement one service change for food and dry recycling collections. If the funding for food waste collections is not provided up front, this will delay planned changes for the dry recycling materials.

Reprocessing

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the reprocessing capacity is likely to be available, in the UK and in Europe, for plastic film. However, the partners do not want material from Warwickshire to have to be shipped beyond Europe for reprocessing because that government has mandated collection of cartons before there is suitable and secure reprocessing available.

End Markets

The UK currently relies on many export end markets. The vast majority are reputable and legitimate end markets where materials are recycled properly. However, there remains a lack of full transparency for a local authority to have full sight of where collected materials end up. There is the perception, partially legitimate, that export beyond Europe is undesirable, and that some material exported is not recycled. This then can put doubt in the public's mind if a local authority report that they are exporting waste beyond Europe for recycling, that the material they are putting out for collection is getting recycled. This can then erode public confidence in the recycling systems and so participation can drop off. The partnership would like to see government put in place more assurances that recycling cannot be exported illegally. New materials should for collection should not be mandated until proper end markets are securely in place. Ensuring there are sufficient end-markets within the UK & Europe also reduces the distance over which material is hauled, thereby reducing the potential carbon footprint of tackling such waste streams.

Other – Flats/HMO

Flats and HMOs present challenges when it comes to implementing recycling collection services. There is often a lack of space for containers and use of shared facilities can make it difficult to undertake education and enforcement activities. These properties can be very different, and it will take more time to arrange to collect additional materials from them. There needs to be a recognition and acceptance that some flats and HMOs will need to have a comingled collection.

Other – film from businesses

It is not clear why two different dates are being proposed for household and business streams of films and flexibles. Although there may be more opportunity for

completely separate collections of film from business, Council trade waste customers tend to be smaller businesses producing low quantities of waste with little storage space for waste. It is also doubtful if film could be collected separately or co-mingled by this date and the date should be aligned with the date for household plastic film.

Proposal 3 & 4 – Food waste

Q13 Do you agree or disagree that the above should be collected for recycling within the food waste stream? (P35)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and specify which materials should be included or excluded in this definition.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees in principle with the criteria for food waste outlined in the consultation document. There will need to be further work done to fully define food waste as the examples given in the consultation document are simplistic. For example, bones or plate scrapings are not mentioned. When the final definition is made, it would be useful if it is written in a way that can be used in public-facing messaging.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership hopes that government will talk directly to AD management companies about tea bags and the fact some have plastic elements.

Q14 Which parts of Proposal 4 do you agree or disagree with? (P36)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure or Don't have an opinion
Local authorities already collecting food waste separately must continue to collect this material for recycling at least weekly from the 2023/24 financial year	Y		
Local authorities should have a separate food waste collection service (at least weekly) in place for all household properties including flats as quickly as contracts allow	Y		
Local authorities without existing contracts in place that would be affected by introducing a separate food waste collection service should have a separate food waste collection service in place (at least weekly), for all households including flats, by the 2024/25 financial year at the latest		Y	

Local authorities with long term existing mixed food/garden waste collection or disposal contracts in place should have a separate food waste collection service in place (at least weekly) for all household properties including flats as soon as soon as contracts allow, with an end date to meet this requirement between 2024/25 and 2030/31	Y		
Local authorities with long term residual waste disposal contracts affected by introducing a separate food waste collection service (e.g. some Energy from Waste or Mechanical Biological Treatment contracts) should introduce a separate food waste collection service (at least weekly) to all households including flats as soon as contracts allow, with an end date to meet this requirement to be set between 2024/25 and 2030/31	Y		

Please provide any views on the end date for these obligations and any evidence on associated costs and benefits.

Local authorities should have a separate food waste collection service (at least weekly) in place for all household properties including flats as quickly as contracts allow.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agree in principle with the concept of collecting food waste from households and that new burdens funding will cover the cost of this. However, in some areas, particularly rural areas with spread out housing stock, we would question the requirement for weekly separate collections. Local authorities are best placed to know where separate weekly collections are viable and where they are just so impractical as to be totally inefficient and very costly. There is concern that new burdens will not take this into account adequately or be in place soon enough. For authorities with challenging locations, it could take longer than the stated timescales for the correct infrastructure to be put in place.

Equally, there are specific issues related to flats food collections that make them more challenging than collections for standard housing. This can particularly be true of flats over shops, for example.

Direct delivery authorities may not have contracts in place preventing them to make early changes, but they will have assets that are still in operation and changing use of assets early has high cost implications. For all of these reasons, government should release funds for consistent collections early, to aid a transition to the new regime.

Local authorities without existing contracts in place that would be affected by introducing a separate food waste collection service should have a separate food waste collection service in place (at least weekly), for all households including flats, by the 2024/25 financial year at the latest.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agree in principle with the concept of collecting food waste from households. However, we would question the requirement for weekly separate collections. Local authorities are best placed to know where separate collections are viable and where cost and efficiency considerations make their introduction impracticable.

We are concerned that the scale of potential service change for Warwickshire, where food waste is currently not collected separately but comingled with the green garden waste, is such that we cannot meet the implementation date of 2024/25. It would certainly not be possible without the payment of up-front transition costs to cover the new burden cost of set-up. Councils would also require the assurance of continued and adequate ongoing revenue funding.

Adding food waste in the most cost-effective manner will most likely mean altering the way in which dry recycling is also collected. This will mean a completely new collection fleet, revisions to transfer stations and new levels of staffing. We estimate that the work will take up to three years from planning to delivery. While the consultation is clear in its intent that separate food waste collections will be mandated for local authorities, it would be unreasonable for local authorities to progress this at this time without further details on the requirements and the funding that will support it.

Within Warwickshire, there will be an impact on our IVC treatment contracts that continue beyond the proposed implementation date. New burdens funding will need to cover any charges incurred because food waste has been removed from this stream meaning we fail to meet our minimum contracted tonnages. There will also be the need for the county to seek new treatment capacity for the separately collected food waste and there is no guarantee that there will be sufficient available capacity within a reasonable haulage distance from the collection points, especially when all neighbouring authorities are also going to market for similar capacity at the same time. This will at best push prices up and at worst leave some authorities with no treatment contracts at all, making the introduction of any service impossible. With so many councils going to market at the same time for caddies, vehicles and treatment infrastructure there will be price rises, delays and other issues.

We also have concerns that introducing separate food collections when we are aiming to reduce food waste may send out the wrong message.

Local authorities with long term existing mixed food/garden waste collection or disposal contracts in place should have a separate food waste collection service in place (at least weekly) for all household properties including flats as soon as soon as

contracts allow, with an end date to meet this requirement between 2024/25 and 2030/31.

It should be expected that most local authorities would be able to meet this requirement by the end of 2030/31. The issue is then more about the cost of doing so and if this will be fully funded under the new burdens process. Local authorities would need assurances that any contract change costs arising as result of meeting this timescale are fully funded through new burdens. There is a danger however, that contractors may realise that contract changes will be funded and so push contract change costs as high as possible.

Local authorities with long term residual waste disposal contracts affected by introducing a separate food waste collection service (e.g. some Energy from Waste or Mechanical Biological Treatment contracts) should introduce a separate food waste collection service (at least weekly) to all households including flats as soon as contracts allow, with an end date to meet this requirement to be set between 2024/25 and 2030/31

It should be expected that most local authorities would be able to meet this requirement by the end of 2030/31. The issue is then more about the cost of doing so and if this will be fully funded under the new burdens process. Local authorities would need assurances that any contract change costs arising as a result of meeting this timescale are fully funded through new burdens funding.

Q15 Some local authorities may experience greater barriers to introducing a separate food waste collection service to all household properties, including flats, by the dates proposed above. For what reasons might it be appropriate for these collection services to begin after this date? (P37)

Collection contracts
Treatment contracts
Cost burden
Reprocessing
End markets
Other (please specify)

If you have disagreed with any of the proposed implementation dates above, please provide examples of circumstances where it would be appropriate for this collection service to begin after these proposed dates and any supporting evidence where possible.

Collection Contracts

Collection contracts typically are designed around the useful working life of the vehicles that are utilised on them. Standard practice is usually seven years although there can be differences to this. This also applies to in-house operations.

With the associated requirements to collect certain dry materials some local authorities may require a fundamental change in their collection arrangements,

rather than just “adding in” food waste. The most cost-effective way to do this is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider as to whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on whom the obligations and payments fall.

It is often (but not always) the case that the most cost-effective way to collect food waste is on the same vehicle as another material, either recycling or residual. This makes the ability to change earlier than a collection contract finishes both more difficult and potentially more costly.

There are associated factors related to changing a collection contract if there is a move from comingled to source separation collection to facilitate cost effective food collection. The vehicle fleet is very likely to increase in size which means additional resources in terms of staff, fleet support services, depot space and associated impacts on carbon emissions. Depot space at some Warwickshire collection authorities is of particular concern and will have a high cost to remedy. At a time when most local authorities have declared Climate Emergencies and are working hard to meet net zero carbon targets, the potential impact on carbon emissions should not be underestimated.

Treatment Contracts

The availability of AD processing sites is not yet at the level that would meet the demand that England-wide food waste collections would generate. This may mean that it is more difficult for some local authorities to enter into contracts than others. It will also impact on the costs of some contracts that may initially be let with a large transport element as food waste is transported to distant plants while new facilities are built nearer to where the waste is generated. This may then also have a knock-on effect on transfer stations. Again, the potential impact on carbon emissions should not be underestimated.

Existing transfer stations may not be configured or licenced to accept food waste. If food waste must be transported longer distances then this will impact on the design and operation of a transfer station. The timetable is very tight in terms of allowing time for new transfer stations to be planned and built.

If an authority does not have any suitable collection systems already in place then it is both the collection and treatment infrastructure that need to be procured. There are doubts whether all local authorities will be able to source AD treatment contracts by 2024/25, especially those in regions where there is limited AD capacity.

Cost burden

Warwickshire Waste Partnership members have expressed concern about whether the cost burden of mandated weekly food waste collections will be fully covered on an ongoing basis. We appreciate that Defra have stated this is the case but there are no firm funding proposals in place and it will ultimately be subject to the next

spending review and financial settlement for local authorities. There has also been concern expressed that any additional funding may well be offset by reductions in funding elsewhere, meaning that ultimately the full costs of the new burden is not funded. We also believe that funds would be better spent on reducing avoidable food waste in the first place and encouraging home composting for the majority of what remains.

Reprocessing

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the reprocessing capacity is likely to become available in due course but there are concerns if there will be suitable capacity by 2023/24 or 2024/25. As highlighted above there needs to be proper consideration of the transfer station network that is needed to enable local authorities to efficiently manage food waste collection onward movement to AD plants.

The requirement to add a composting stage to AD plants to enable them to be able to fully deal with caddy liners and other compostable packaging is also a concern in relation to reprocessing capacity.

End Markets

In relation to the end markets for the outputs of AD plants, Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concern about the land bank available for the digestate. There may need to be support for the AD industry to grow such markets to the levels that can economically deal with the amount of digestate that will be produced when all councils collect food waste. With the move towards electric vehicles, it is unclear if end uses such as vehicle fuel for gas produced by AD plants is a viable long-term solution. Warwickshire Waste Partnership would encourage governments to look at how they can support end markets for AD plants for both digestate and gas. This will ensure that gate fees remain lower and the burden then on local authorities and government in relation to that cost is reduced.

Other – Flats/HMO

There are well documented issues with collecting food waste from flats. There is often a lack of space for containers and use of shared facilities can make it difficult to undertake education and enforcement activities. Education and communication can be expensive and very resource intensive. For local authorities with higher-than-average numbers of flats and HMOs it may prove more difficult to meet the stated deadlines for at least part of their area. There could also be higher costs associated with the provision of those services to these types of property which will need to be fully covered by new burdens. There are also issues related to collection in very rural areas where the spread-out nature of the housing stock leads to a very inefficient and costly service. Many places require narrow access vehicles, this could be problematic when several authorities are trying to procure these at the same time.

Other – participation

Many residents will be pleased to see the provision of a weekly food waste collection and will participate keenly. However, we expect there to be a smaller but significant proportion of residents who do not set out their food waste and continue to include it in their residual waste. We would be keen to be assisted in ensuring full

participation on food waste recycling by being given enforcement powers or encouragement methods to aid this. If only encouragement or incentivisation methods are adopted, these will be more costly and will need to be funded. There should be funds for national and local campaigns for recycling unavoidable food waste, either through home composting or a kerbside service and greatly reducing avoidable food waste.

Other – Driving down food waste

Warwickshire Waste Partnership are keen to assert that more needs to be done to reduce food waste in the first instance. An effective national campaign to reduce food waste is needed, with local authorities supporting this with local action using materials linked to the national campaign. A school of thought says that when householder is given a separate food waste recycling system, they are confronted with the extent of the avoidable food waste they create and seek to reduce it. However, another school of thought says that householders see recycling as a good thing and are proud to fill their food waste caddies with both unavoidable food waste but also avoidable food waste that is costing them and the environment. Recycling collection systems need to reflect the waste hierarchy with householders encouraged first to reduce waste rather than generating it. If both avoidable food waste was reduced and home composting was maximised, there would not be the need for costly separate food waste collections and vehicles travelling around collecting it. This is another example where weight-based targets can lead to waste management choices that are not necessarily the most highly environmentally friendly option.

Proposal 5 - Caddy Liners

Q16 Do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please provide any other comments on the use of caddy liners in separate food waste collections, including on any preferences for caddy liner material types. (P39)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees in principle that the use of caddy liners has consistently been shown in most cases to increase the capture rate of food waste from households. However, we believe that a concerted behaviour change campaign at a national level can help to reduce many issues with food waste. First, it can drive down unavoidable food waste, reducing the expense and resources involved in collecting it, including the use of liners, and most importantly reducing the environmental and climate impacts of the food waste itself, at the same time as saving householders money. For the food waste that is left, a national campaign can help citizens get over the perceived unpleasantness of collecting food waste separately and can educate them as to what food waste is and that the best option is to set it out without newspaper or caddy liners. We acknowledge that liners and paper can cause issues at some AD plants given their treatment processes and so mandating liners would not work. Warwickshire Waste Partnership would like to see caddy liners cited as possible good practice but not mandated. There are good

examples of collection systems that have high levels of food waste recycling without the use of liners.

If local authorities are mandated to use caddy liners, then they must be funded through the new burdens system. If a national campaign of reducing food waste and encouraging food waste recycling is not funded, then ongoing funding of caddy liners would likely lead to a higher capture rate of food waste. Funded paper liners may be a better avenue. We would not support using plastic bags as caddy liners as this gives the wrong message about reducing plastic use. The costs of distributing liners and dealing with ongoing requests for them would also need to be covered on a permanent basis.

Proposal 6 – Biodegradable and compostable packaging

Q17 Do you have any comments on how the collection and disposal of compostable and biodegradable materials should be treated under recycling consistency reforms? For example, this could include examples of what should be provided in guidance on the collection and disposal of these materials. (P42)

At the present time biodegradable and compostable packaging should not be considered for collection through the kerbside collection infrastructure. Only very clear, universal on-pack labelling will assist with resident communications and ensuring that the right packaging is put in the right container. Even then, it will be very difficult for collectors, sorters and reprocessors to identify contamination versus compostable items. The use of the term compostable requires much improved control and enforcement. More education needs to be funded to help both the public and businesses to understand that compostable packaging and cutlery etc cannot be recycled in the kerbside system and needs to be handled in closed systems by way of vendor takeback only. Biodegradable is a meaningless term for packaging and should be defined properly or taken out of circulation.

Q18 Do you agree or disagree that anaerobic digestion plants treating food waste should be required to include a composting phase in the treatment process? (P42)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Please provide any evidence where possible and explain any advantages and disadvantages.

If anaerobic digestion plants were required to include a composting phase this will impact on the operating costs of such plants, and therefore gate fees. These additional costs will need to be covered by new burdens funding if the government strongly believe the environmental gains to be worthwhile.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that there is value from an environmental viewpoint to ensuring that all compostable liners used in the collections are fully processed. Composting would greatly assist in that. Biodegradable liners is a term that confuses and should be taken out of circulation.

For some AD plants meeting this requirement could mean substantial changes to their plant and equipment and this will take time. Therefore, the mandated use of caddy liners is not supported at this time.

Proposal 7 – Definition of Garden Waste

Q19 Do you agree or disagree with the materials included in and excluded from this description of garden waste? (P46)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and specify which materials should be included or excluded in this definition.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership broadly agrees with the proposed definition but believes that it will require more detail. For example, the proposed definition includes “garden weeds” but there are certain weeds that local authorities request to not be placed in garden waste collection containers. The requirement not to include certain weeds, such as Japanese knotweed, is crucial if the quality of the final compost product is to be maintained. Therefore, the inclusion of garden weeds in the description of garden waste could introduce confusion for residents if council information then states that certain weeds are excluded from their collection systems. There are further complications in that many residents don't know what the different weeds are and education would be needed regarding this, adding to costs.

Proposal 8 –Free Garden waste collection

Q20 Given the above costs, recycling benefits and carbon emissions reductions, do you agree or disagree that local authorities should be required to introduce a free minimum standard garden waste collection (240 litre containers, fortnightly collection frequency and throughout the growing season), if this is fully funded by Government, and if authorities remain free to charge for more frequent collections and/or additional capacity? (P47)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Please provide any comments or evidence on the costs and benefits presented above.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership strongly believes that public funds should not be mandated to be spent on the provision of free kerbside garden waste collections.

The service would not be free in any case but would be paid for by the taxpayer in a non-equitable way. Funding the collections this way is unfair as householders who live in properties with no garden, who are very often lower income householders, subsidise the collections from those with gardens. It does not follow the producer pays waste principle. Where a subscription service is provided, payment is only from those who have a garden and do not home compost all of their garden waste. It is prudent to provide a service only to those who want it. The partnership believes strongly that this should be a local decision.

In Warwickshire, 4 out of 5 waste collection authorities charge for garden waste collections, all at £40 per year for a year-round fortnightly service in 240l bins. The introduction of these subscription services has met with minimal pushback from the public in the promotional phase, and once established, many more households with gardens have taken up the service compared with the data indicated in the consultation. Table 1 shows the percentage of subscriptions as a proportion of all households and of households with gardens and indicates the level on annual income. The expected national cost in new burdens will be estimated too low if the government’s figures of take up of services is lower than in reality. The take up levels demonstrate that households that want this service are prepared to pay for it at a reasonable price point.

	North Warwickshire	Nuneaton and Bedworth	Rugby	Stratford
% of all HH	56%	38%	53%	75%
% of HH w garden (est.)	60%	70%	56%	82%
£M income per year	£0.7M	£1.1M	£1.0M	£1.7M

Table 1 – Warwickshire garden waste subscription data

If charged-for services are to be stopped, the four authorities in Warwickshire would need to be recompensed fully through new burdens for this loss of income and so would all other authorities in the country who charge, which we understand to be up to 75% of local authorities.

The proposal is looking to fix a problem that, in Warwickshire at least, does not exist. The move to a charged-for service has not driven garden waste into the residual waste bin. Residual waste tonnages have not increased in line with the drop in garden waste received for composting by the council. There has been a small but manageable increase in green waste brought to recycling centres. There has not been an increase in domestic-type garden waste fly-tips. We believe that most of the material that is now not collected by the local authority is being home composted. We have had a huge increase in interest in home composting in the county. The information and videos we provide on our webpages has seen a big increase in visits. We have seen a doubling of sales of subsidised composting equipment.

A review of residual waste compositional analysis in Warwickshire in September 2018 showed that garden waste in residual waste in (at the time) the only charged-for area was 1.28% compared to the county average of 1.16%. It is predicted that a

change to a free service in Warwickshire would not yield any significant reduction in green waste in residual, nothing near the figures that Defra has stated could be feasible.

With a charged-for service, there is no concern in Warwickshire that it is driving waste into the residual waste stream adding to greenhouse gas outputs. In fact, the potential to reduce carbon through more efficient round restructuring is possible when some streets no longer need to be covered by the service because there are no subscribers in that area. The use of in-cab technology linking in with the subscription data could further reduce collection miles and maybe even reduce the number of rounds, helping with the provision of any extra food and recycling collection services. If a free service is mandated, new burdens should cover loss of income and the cost of collecting from every property, which in most cases will mean adding rounds.

The growing season only stipulation will not work, as councils will have already invested in contracts, vehicles, insurance, maintenance and staff to collect green waste and so will still have the costs associated with these in the winter and will need to be paid for a year round service. Garden waste is generated by the public year-round. The growing season gets longer each year due to changes in climate. It is likely that if a free garden waste service as outlined in the consultation document is introduced, very few local authorities will charge for any additional aspect. The administrative costs of doing so are likely to outweigh any income that would result.

A well promoted charged-for service will take off from the outset and lead to good take-up. In North Warwickshire, for example, the service is linked with sponsorship from a local garden centre and the offer of garden centre voucher worth more than the value of the subscription. We believe that even a service that is not promoted will increase coverage over time.

Based on the take up in Warwickshire, we believe that paid for garden waste services can contribute significantly to the national 65% recycling target in a cost-effective manner.

Warwickshire Waste Authority believes that it should be left as a local decision as to whether to charge for a garden waste service and that charging drives increased home composting and is a more equitable system. If charging is stopped, local councils will need to be recompensed fully for all associated costs, including loss of income and additional collection costs / new rounds, through new burdens funding. Full loss of current income should be compensated.

Proposal 9 – Other Garden waste collection options

Q21 How likely are the following options to support the above policy aims? (P48)

	Very Likely	Likely	Unlikely
Provide updated guidance on reasonable charges for garden waste.	Y		

Issue clear communications to non-participating households.	Y		
Support on increasing home composting (e.g. subsidised bin provision).	Y		

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that a charged-for garden waste service is a fair method of service provision and does not cause garden waste to be diverted into the residual waste stream. Charging should be a local decision. Each of the above measures could further help with making sure that garden waste is collected or treated in the best way.

In particular, support on increasing home composting would be welcomed as the most environmentally friendly and cost-effective way of helping the public to compost. It is better in the waste hierarchy and better from a transport emissions point of view. This also has the potential to reduce some of the food waste that local authorities collect. A comprehensive ongoing national home composting campaign alongside practical and financial help to councils to promote and subsidise would be welcomed. In Warwickshire, we offer detailed composting information on our web pages. We have an online training video and plan to resume face to face home composting workshops when able. We run a master composter volunteer scheme and we sell subsidised home composting equipment online and from HWRCs. With more funds and support through a national campaign, we believe there is still more home composting potential in Warwickshire.

Home composting information could be one of the items communicated to non-participating households. There are also a few community compost schemes starting up in Warwickshire and at the same time we can talk to residents about reducing food waste.

The take-up of green waste subscription services in Warwickshire demonstrates that householders are prepared to pay the charges levied for the service. We disagree with a government-stipulated cap on charges. Any cap on allowed subscription charges must take into account all costs involved in providing the service. That includes all physical collection costs plus the cost to manage and promote subscriptions. Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the £30 mentioned in the consultation document will be too low to cover the costs for most authorities, including the Warwickshire WCAs. The costs to run a service and therefore the charge levied will naturally vary around the country, not least because of differing labour costs. If the upper cost is limited to a figure less than the current charge in Warwickshire, new burdens funding should cover the difference and any future service delivery cost increases. We would support the idea of ensuring that charges are fair by the government working with local authorities to draw up a list of allowable costs.

Q22 Do you have any further comments on the above options, or any other alternatives that could help to increase the recycling of garden waste and/or reduce the quantity of garden waste in the residual waste stream? Please provide supporting evidence where possible. (P48)

Reasonable Charges

Charged-for services are known to provide better quality material for composting operations than free services. The effect of charging is that people are more invested in the collection system and are likely to take more care in what garden waste they place in their containers. For Warwickshire authorities, a £30 maximum charge will not cover their full collection, administration and promotion costs. This would then require Defra to fund the resultant difference in costs for local authorities as it would fall under the new burdens. To prevent overcharging, the regulation could stipulate what costs are legitimate to include when calculating the annual charge that allows local authorities to recover their associated costs.

Clear Communications

Warwickshire local authorities undertake a great deal of communication aimed at ensuring all recyclable waste is recycled and not put in residual containers. Despite best efforts with the funds available, public behaviour is still such that recycling collections are not used to their fullest and over half of the residual waste bin contains material that could have been recycling in current kerbside systems. By far the greatest chunk of this at 35% plus of the residual waste bin is food waste. Garden waste at just over 1% is not a large concern, however, the partnership would still welcome a national campaign and local funds to reduce further the amount of green waste in the residual bin. Part of the issue is that local authorities have very few policy tools available to them to compel residents to use the collection systems correctly. Enforcement powers have been eroded over time and having the threat of enforcement can be a useful aspect of communications activity.

Home Composting

Promotion of home composting is a favourable alternative to the collection of green waste. There are environmental benefits to not having to send vehicles out to collect green waste and the associated energy involved in industrial composting sites. In a target-based policy area the issue is that it is not possible to measure how much waste each home composting unit “processes” in a year. WRAP undertook extensive work previously that produced very good calculations on estimated figures that could be attributed to home compost activity. Warwickshire Waste Partnership would urge a review of this work and for it to be updated so that figures could be attributed to home composting activities.

Promoting home composting alongside a free garden waste service is less effective and this has been seen in Warwickshire by a large increase in the purchase of home composting equipment from the county as charged for services have been rolled out. Future take-up of home composting is likely to slow if a free service is available, as will the development of community composting schemes.

Proposal 10 – Exemptions on separate collection of two recyclable streams

Q23 Could the following recyclable waste streams be collected together from households, without significantly reducing the potential for those streams to be recycled? (P50)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure / Don't have an opinion
--	-------	----------	----------------------------------

Plastic and metal	Y		
Glass and metal	Y		

If you have agreed with either of the above, please provide evidence to justify why any proposed exemption would be compatible with the general requirement for separate collection of each recyclable waste stream.

Plastic and metal

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that mixing plastic containers and metal causes any issue regarding material quality. It is unclear from the consultation proposal if plastic film would form part of this exemption. Most existing MRFs in the UK cannot separate plastic film or cartons. However, the new sub-regional MRF will have the ability to separate all proposed streams if collected via a comingled system in a way that provides quality as good as kerbside sort if not better as the MRF will enable separation of material into different fractions and grades beyond the levels achieved at the kerbside.

Glass and metal

There can be issues with noise levels when glass is collected separately at the kerbside. Collecting glass and metal together might have the potential to increase this risk. In a fully comingled collection noise levels are dampened by the mixing of the recycling. Of more concern is the risk to operatives of manual lifting of these items as it would not be feasible for wheeled bins to be provided for every waste stream. This is also a risk to residents.

Q24 What, if any, other exemptions would you propose to the requirement to collect the recyclable waste in each waste stream separately, where it would not significantly reduce the potential for recycling or composting? (P50)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership understands the need for waste that has been collected for recycling to ultimately end up being recycled and for the quality of the recyclate to be good enough that there are viable end markets for the material. The ideal is for there to be enough quality materials to feed various closed loop systems and to increase the recycled content of packaging and paper products. Newer MRF technology has greatly improved on the technology that was built into older MRFs and within restrictions, the waste sorting industry has made improvements to existing infrastructure. So, there will be large variance across MRFs as to what materials they can sort and what quality they can achieve. For that reason, limiting what material can be mixed is less desirable than keeping options open and challenging mixing on the basis of a TEEP-style assessment. If any MRF is shown to be supplying sustainable end markets then materials can be collected together in any combination that the MRF can accept.

Local choice instead of stipulation would be welcomed in Warwickshire as from mid-2023 we will be using a new state of the art MRF that will have the ability to take fully comingled material, including all of the new materials, and achieve output material quality that is equal to or better than current kerbside sort systems.

The partnership believes that glass, plastic and metal could be collected together without the need for a written assessment. These materials create a natural “container” dry recycling stream that would lend itself then to a twin stream collection system when paired with a fibre stream in places where the MRF technology needs that separation to keep quality high.

Many top-performing recycling local authorities in England operate a co-mingled collection system. This includes Stratford District Council in Warwickshire which has a fully comingled service and a recycling rate of 60% in 2019/20. Its Warwickshire neighbour Warwick District Council, which has a similar demographic and geography, offers a kerbside sort service and has a lower recycling rate of 54%. We see this as a strong indication that the simpler service leads to higher recycling. A fully comingled method sits comfortably with the EPR proposal to label packaging with a binary recycle or don't recycle; the item either goes in the one recycling bin or it doesn't. In 2013, North Warwickshire Borough Council moved from a source segregated system using boxes to a dual stream service in order to simplify the collection system, provide more recycling capacity and reduce litter from recycling collections. Full year recycling rates either side of this change increased by 62%. In 2019 North Warwickshire Borough Council moved from the dual stream service to fully comingled in order to improve the health and safety of collectors and provide a simpler service. Full year recycling rates either side of this change were increased by 16%.

Fully comingled collections can provide both the quality of material that the markets need and the quantity of material to achieve a high national recycling rate and enable packaging producers to meet the targets they will be set. Crucially, comingled systems are simple for the public to understand and will link in well with the proposed EPR labelling of recycled or not recycled. There are no concerns with confusion, running out of capacity or how to store the many containers.

Local authorities have developed a large bank of knowledge and experience in proving collection services and systems that meet the expectations of their residents, are operationally efficient and provide materials to the specification that the wide variety of end markets that exist need.

There have been numerous examples of resident kick back against multi stream collections due to the higher number of containers they have to accommodate in their homes. This has seen some authorities move to twin stream or co-mingled collections services without dropping either the quantity or quality of the material collected. Comingled methodology also allows for easily adding new materials, so long as they can be sorted at the MRF. All waste is safely contained and littering from escaped waste is not a concern.

The collection element of kerbside sort is more costly and time consuming than comingled. Kerbside sort methodology can pose some serious Health and Safety risks. HSE guidance on manual handling advises that collectors should lift as little as possible, but this is not possible in the kerbside sort system, where containers of

glass and paper / card boxes are heavy. There is also the risk of puncture wounds from sharp waste elements such as glass or metal. There are road safety issues with sorting waste in the street. During the pandemic, there has been concerns about the kerbside sort technique bringing operatives into close quarters with potentially contaminated waste. With comingled collections there is no lifting or handling involved for the public (which can be problematic for physically less able householders) or operatives. Use of boxes quite often results in materials blowing all over the street and also getting wet.

Proposal 11 – Exceptions on two or more streams collected together

Q25 Do you have any views on the proposed definition for ‘technically practicable’? (P54)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that local circumstances should determine what is technically practicable for an authority. Each assessment should be considered individually as technical reasons will differ from place to place.

Technical practicability should take into account the impacts of citizen behaviour as this ultimately impacts all recycling collection services.

A crucial principle that Warwick Waste Partnership puts forward is, if a MRF is shown to be supplying sustainable end markets with quality materials, then materials can be collected together in any combination that the MRF can accept. Therefore, if a MRF can demonstrate it is supplying suitable end markets then it is technically feasible to collect materials together. Currently hundreds of thousands of tonnes of material are collected comingled and sorted to be sent to quality end markets.

There should be recognition of the infrastructure needed to support separate collection under the technical aspect of exemptions. If separate collection requires increased collection fleets that cannot be accommodated in existing depots this could be considered a technical exemption. It may also fall into an economic one as well depending on the costs of new vehicles and/or a new depot.

If a DRS were to go ahead in England, it could make some source separated collection much less efficient if a great deal of material is removed through a DRS.

Q26 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples cover areas where it may not be ‘technically practicable’ to deliver separate collection? (P54)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree with any of the above, please provide the reason for your response and indicate which example you are referring to.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership do agree that the proposed examples cover areas where it may not be technically practicable to deliver separate collections. However,

these may not be the only areas and we would be keen for government to seek further discussion with local authorities to develop a comprehensive list of examples ready for any more detailed guidance that may be published.

Q27 What other examples of areas that are not 'technically practicable' should be considered in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P54)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Social and economic demographics of an area
- Geography of an area and housing stock
- Health and safety guidelines and risk assessments for kerbside sort
- HSE guidance – manual handling, collectors should lift as little as possible. Glass and paper / card boxes are heavy
- HSE guidance – handling contaminated and / or sharp waste (glass / metal)
- Preventing vermin from accessing waste
- Greater capacity afforded by comingled versus kerbside sort
- Access issues, for example: narrow roads, long drives, back lanes, resident parking blocking roads
- Traffic flow
- Assisted collections and the ability of the frail or disabled to cope adequately with separate containers
- Balancing the capacity of each stillage on the collection vehicle
- Vehicle availability – long lead-in times of several months for purchasing
- Depot space – for vehicles, transfer of materials, containers
- Electric vehicles charging points required for electric vehicles
- Additional vehicles requiring more staff, shortage in frontline staff and trained or untrained drivers and cost of training
- Permitting restrictions, licensing
- End markets
- Maintenance infrastructure and maintenance crews for vehicles
- Flats, HMOs, dense housing, houses with no frontage - space for bins
- Small businesses - space for bins
- Consumers unclear about the system
- Equality issues, can all people safely and confidently access the system as it was designed to be used?
- Public acceptability and participation

Q28 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples cover areas that may not be 'economically practicable' to deliver separate collection? (P55)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree with any of the above, please provide the reason for your response and indicate which example you are referring to.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership do agree that the proposed examples cover areas where it may not be economically practicable to deliver separate collections. However, these may not be the only areas and we would be keen for government to seek further discussion with local authorities to develop a comprehensive list of examples ready for any more detailed guidance that may be published.

Q29 What other examples of 'economically practicable' should be considered in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P55)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Materials markets, possible saturation leading to lower value
- Communication costs to the public, especially if there is a significant service change, many new containers are introduced or a move to comingled is quickly followed by a move back to kerbside sort
- Sourcing of vehicles, bins and other infrastructure at the same time will cause problems, the market is not geared up to deliver such a change.
- Contract changes
- Cost of additional fleet (electric? / hydrogen?)
- Depots and storage of fleet
- Transfer arrangements and / or bulking
- Cost of crews and of supervision and ancillary staff
- Attracting and retaining drivers is a significant issue
- Higher contamination could lead to more rejected loads
- Cost of containers and availability

Q30 Do you have any views on what might constitute 'excessive costs' in terms of economic practicability? (P55)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the phrase "excessive costs" as this implies that there is a high degree of magnitude above the standard cost before it is deemed uneconomic for a local authority to collect materials separately. Under EPR, packaging producers will demand that collection services are efficient and effective, suggesting that costs should not approach an excessive level before an assessment says it is acceptable for an alternative solution to be sought. Each collection solution will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis considering local circumstances.

There is no detail within the consultation on what level and type of evidence would be required to demonstrate that costs would be excessive for a local authority to collect materials separately. Until this is known it then makes it more difficult to comment thoroughly on this proposal.

Q31 Do you have any views on what should be considered 'significant,' in terms of cases where separate collection provides no significant environmental benefit over the collection of recyclable waste streams together? (P56)

As with the phrase “excessive costs” the use of “significant” in this case suggests a very high threshold of proof that a comingled collection method has good environmental benefit. Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports good environmental outcomes, creating a circular economy and lowering carbon impact. Solutions need to be found where good environmental performance can be achieved and collection costs are covered by EPR, not scarce public funds. Each collection solution will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis considering local circumstances.

In Warwickshire, 4 of the 5 collection authorities operate a co-mingled / dual stream collection service. If they were forced to move to source separation service there is a good probability that they would see a decrease in the tonnage of recycling collected. This would then have a negative environmental impact, which most people would see as significant.

There are examples of authorities that have moved from a source separated collection system to a twin stream or comingled system and seen their recycling rates increase whilst still supplying material to the same end markets as they did previously. This means they have improved the environmental benefit of the systems they operate.

Q32 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples for ‘no significant environmental benefit’ are appropriate? (P56)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don’t have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree with any of the above, please provide the reason for your response and indicate which example you are referring to.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees with the examples given but does not believe that they are limited just to the examples given.

Q33 What other examples of ‘no significant environmental benefit’ should be included in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P56)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Carbon impact
- Air quality impact
- Additional vehicles
- Material output variety, quality and acceptability to end markets
- Maintaining dry waste while set out for collection
- Greater capacity through comingled versus kerbside sort
- Lack of litter / escaped waste generated by comingled versus kerbside sort
- Closed loop end markets versus aggregate, etc
- Balance between the quality in comingled and vehicle miles in collecting separately for possibly no increase in quality

Proposal 12 – Compliance and enforcement

Q34 Do you agree or disagree that local authorities should only be required to submit a single written assessment for their service area? (P58)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports the concept of a single written assessment including a single assessment for more than one authority where collection and / or treatment is shared or where other circumstances make it appropriate.

Q35 What other ways to reduce the burden on local authorities should we consider for the written assessment? (P58)

When the TEEP requirements were introduced, there was a lack of clear guidance and advice available to local authorities. A "Route Map" has since been designed to assist local authorities in their decision making on separate collections of recyclables. The Route Map with updates could act as a template for any future guidance and templates. We also understand that the WRAP assessment tool is being updated. Any tool should be co-designed with local authorities so that they are not too restrictive or onerous. Tools should aid consistency in assessments as well as ease of use.

A single assessment for more than one authority should be permitted where collection and / or treatment is shared or where other circumstances make it appropriate.

Completing a written assessment is a new requirement and therefore a new burden on local authorities, additional funding to cover the resources needed to complete assessments must be provided by Government.

Q36 What factors should be taken into consideration including in the written assessment? For example, different housing stock in a service area, costs of breaking existing contractual arrangements and/or access to treatment facilities. (P58)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests:

- Geography - rurality and urbanisation (variable population densities) of local authority
- Demographics
- Depot location and transfer stations
- Carbon impact and air quality
- Infrastructure needed and space needed for vehicles for example if need to go to kerbside sort, can existing infrastructure cope?
- Service planning and operational costs
- Procurement and recruitment
- Cost of changing/amending contracts

- MRF infrastructure. Onward reprocessing and markets
- Fixed assets – depots and transfer stations
- H&S assessment of operatives
- H&S, accessibility and equality regarding residents
- Flats with limited or no storage space
- Litter and street scene
- Participation and communication

Q37 Do you agree or disagree that reference to standard default values and data, which could be used to support a written assessment, would be useful? (P59)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Whilst the use of standard or default values can be useful in making an assessment quicker and easier, they also mean the assessment is less representative of the actual situation a local authority faces. The use of default values should therefore not be mandatory, and the preference would be that local authorities use their own values as much as possible.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests that a range of default values should be developed and used if default values are to be used at all, instead of one default value. This range could link to EPR family groupings.

Q38 Do you agree or disagree that a template for a written assessment would be useful to include in guidance? (P59)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports the use of templates if it is not too restrictive and directive. There needs to be flexibility to be able to add information and edit the template to suit.

Proposal 13 – Minimum service standards of dry recyclable materials

Q39 Do you agree or disagree with Proposal 13, particularly on the separation of fibres from other recyclable waste streams and the collection of plastic films? (P61)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Fibres

For Warwickshire authorities, we know that it will not be necessary to keep fibres separate in the collection model because our new, state of the art MRF due to open in mid-2023 will achieve high quality output materials from a fully comingled collection method. A TEEP-style assessment should determine which collection method is appropriate.

In recent years, two Warwickshire collection authorities have operated a dual stream collection model with fibre collected in a separate caddy that sits in the top of the DMR wheelie bin. There are many practical issues with this dual stream collection model, in particular the manual handling of the fibre container. Also, the balance of materials collected on the split body RCV, especially with recent increases in cardboard collected. There are also issues with the inserts themselves splitting and the cost of replacing these, as well as the danger posed by the sharp edges caused by splitting. One authority has recently moved from dual stream to fully comingled. There had been no alteration to the ultimate destinations of the DRM and no change in quality output. All of the above issues are resolved and the total amount of recycling collected has increased by 16%. It is believed that this is because the system is now more easily understood by householders and easier to use in practice. There are numerous examples of fibres being collected with one or more other materials that are of a suitable quality and are supplying end markets with no issues to the specification desired.

It will be difficult for all authorities who currently collect comingled to change to a dual stream or more source separated system if mandated to by new regulation within the timescale proposed. The magnitude of service change for some authorities would be a large-scale project that will take time to complete effectively.

Plastic Film

In Warwickshire, it will be feasible for local authorities to collect plastic film by 2026/27, however, we do not believe it is viable for all local authorities to collect plastic film by 2026/27 due to a lack of sorting and end market capacity.

Residual Waste Frequency

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not support statutory guidance that states local authorities cannot collect residual waste less frequently than fortnightly. There are sound evidence-based reasons why some local authorities have instigated three or even four weekly residual collections. We want to see local authorities retain the option to choose these frequencies if it is deemed right for the area and circumstances. We believe that all of the EPR, DRS and food waste proposals will mean that there will be hardly any residual waste, especially when plastic film is also collected for recycling. It will be inefficient and have a high carbon impact if all local authorities are made to collect fortnightly when local circumstances mean that a less frequent service to most households would be suitable. EPR producers will want to fund efficient and effective collection systems and restricting residual waste capacity is a proven way of driving up recycling rates while reducing collection and disposal costs. In the neighbouring borough of Daventry, residual waste dropped by 18% in year one of the introduction of a three weekly residual waste collection alongside

comprehensive dry recycling and weekly separate food waste collection and a charged-for green waste service. The reduction of carbon footprint for a three weekly collection service is another significant driver.

Proposal 14 – Non-statutory guidance

Q40 Which service areas or materials would be helpful to include in non- statutory guidance? (P63)

There is a lack of detail in the consultation document that makes commenting on non-statutory guidance difficult. It is unclear what the purpose of the non-statutory guidance and non-binding indicators is. Clarity on this would enable a more informed view to be taken.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests:

- HWRC usage
- Recognition of local authority knowledge so there is flexibility in how they deliver collection services
- Communications best practise and sharing of good ideas
- Clinical waste collections – definition of clinical waste should be statutory
- Schedule 1 of the Controlled Waste Regs development and clarification (although this should be statutory)
- Bulky waste collections
- Bring sites for business waste
- Enforcement for non-compliance

Proposal 15 – Review of Environmental Permitting Regulations

Q41 Do you have any comments on the recommendations from the review of the Part 2 of Schedule 9 of the Environmental Permitting Regulations? (P64)

The driver behind the implementation of the MRF regulations was not linked to aspects of producer responsibility policy reform. Changes in the regulations need to be a suitable vehicle to deliver aspects of EPR reform.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that careful consideration will need to be given to the design of the sampling protocol. It needs to be designed in a way that is fair to both collectors and reprocessors. This means there needs to be clear definitions in place for non-target material that is an operational concern but does not impact material quality, and genuine contamination that then impacts on material quality. The protocol should not be designed in a way that leaves loopholes that will reduce or remove justifiable payments to local authorities and other waste collectors.

Q42 If amendments are made to Part 2 of Schedule 9, do you agree or disagree that it is necessary to continue to retain requirements to sample non-packaging dry recyclable materials? (P64)

Agree

Disagree
Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Please provide the reason for your response where possible.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that the sampling of non-packaging would be advantageous as this gives a more complete picture of changes in waste composition.

Proposal 16 – Recycling Credits

Q43 Do you agree or disagree that provision for exchange of recycling credits should not relate to packaging material subject to Extended Producer Responsibility payments? (P68)

Agree

Disagree
Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Please provide the reason for your response.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees that there will not be a need for recycling credits for packaging material subject to EPR payments once payments to local authorities start.

Q44 In relation to recycled waste streams not affected by Extended Producer Responsibility or which are not new burdens we are seeking views on two options: (P68)

- Option 1 Should we retain requirements for Waste Disposal Authorities to make payment of recycling credits or another levy arrangement with Waste Collection Authorities in respect of non-packaging waste?
- Option 2 Should we discontinue recycling credits and require all two-tier authorities to agree local arrangements?

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure / Don't have an opinion / not applicable
Option 1	Y		
Option 2		Y	

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would like to see the recycling credits system retained to cover recycled waste streams not affected by EPR or new burdens. The current arrangements do allow two tier local authority areas to make alternative local arrangements, which need to be fair to both tiers of local government. A suitable conciliation process would be welcomed for cases where agreements prove difficult to reach.

The recycling credits for non-packaging waste need to be viewed in the context of a continued and sustained decline in the amount of paper/newsprint collected for recycling. Any changes in the system should be designed with this in mind and the likely future occurrence of paper in the recycling stream in the next five to ten years.

Q45 Where local agreement cannot be arrived at what are your suggestions for resolving these? For example, should a binding formula be applied as currently and if so, please provide examples of what this could look like. (P68)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes there is scope to put in place an appropriate appeals/mediation process in the unlikely event that a local agreement cannot be reached. By having the process in place, it is more likely an agreement can be reached and stops one tier acting in a unilateral manner.

Proposal 17 – dry recycling collections from non-household premises

Q46 Do you agree or disagree that waste collectors should be required to collect the following dry materials from all non-household premises for recycling, in 2023/24? (P76)

	Agree –this material can be collected in this timeframe	Disagree –this material can't be collected in this timeframe	Not sure / Don't have an opinion /not applicable
Aluminium foil	Y		
Aluminium food trays	Y		
Steel and aluminium aerosols	Y		
Aluminium tubes, e.g. tomato puree tubes	Y		
Metal jar lids	Y		
Food and drink cartons, e.g. Tetrapak		Y	

If you disagree with the inclusion of any of the materials above in the timeframe set out, please provide the reason for your response and indicate which dry recyclable material you are referring to.

Tubes

Warwickshire Waste Partnership agrees with the inclusion of aluminium tubes but raises the issue that tubes cannot be easily cleaned of all food residue. This issue will need confirming with metal reproprocessors.

Cartons

Warwickshire Waste Partnership members will part-own a new, state of the art MRF, due to open mid-2023. So, in our particular case, the space and equipment to sort and store cartons for recycling will be available from the start of consistent

collections. Any trade recycling collected by Warwickshire local authorities can be sorted at the MRF and third-party waste can also be sorted. However, we are aware that the majority of other locations will not have access to the most up to date MRF facilities which can easily gear up to make provision for cartons. So, the partnership recognises that in other parts of the country there will be concerns about the sorting capability for food and drinks cartons in the UK and therefore concerns about adding them to the list of materials that should be collected from businesses from 2023/24.

The bigger concern for Warwickshire councils and businesses is that there is not sufficient reprocessing capacity in the UK or Europe to deal with the quantities of this material that will be sorted for recycling. There is currently only one facility able to reprocess this material in the UK, in Halifax. There is uncertainty about how DRS and EPR decisions will affect the prevalence of cartons in the waste stream or the future capacity for reprocessing of cartons in the UK.

Q47 Some waste collectors may not be able to collect all the items in the dry recyclable waste streams from all non-household municipal premises in 2023/24. Under what circumstances might it be appropriate for these collection services to begin after this date? (P76)

Collection contracts

Sorting contracts

Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) infrastructure capacity

Cost burden

Reprocessing

End markets

Other (please specify)

Please provide the reason for your response and indicate how long waste collectors require before they can collect all these materials.

Collection Contracts

Warwickshire collection contracts are being aligned to the availability of a new, state of the art MRF from mid-2023. However, we are aware that most local authorities will be at varying points in a collection contract, which are typically designed in length around the useful working life of the collection vehicles, typically 7 years or longer. This also applies to directly delivered services. Warwickshire authorities will be in a position to offer the collections of all materials to trade customers from the date, but elsewhere in the country, contracts may prevent this.

If business have to be offered a source separated service and a comingled service is precluded, there are all the associated issues with the increase in vehicles, staff, depot space etc that will need to be taken into account and make the change much more complex and so likely to take longer to achieve.

Sorting Contracts

The most cost-effective way to change contracts or contract terms is at the end of the current contract period. There is the possibility of doing it sooner, but this would

require the agreement of both parties and may involve additional contract payments. There is then the issue for government to consider as to whether these payments would be firstly covered under EPR payments and if so whether they represent value to producers on who the obligations and payments fall.

MRF Infrastructure

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the ability of most MRFs nationwide to be able to adapt within the timescales to enable consistent and thorough sorting of food and drinks cartons. Local authorities and local businesses are limited to which MRFs they can supply, due to proximity. In certain places, there may be challenges with other materials also. As councils will not receive payments for EPR obligated materials until 2023/24, and MRFs gain their income through gate fees for council contracts, it is not clear how they will receive a cash flow to provide the investment to change their equipment to be ready for the EPR / consistent collection materials.

A competitive procurement process will be affected by increased demand over a short timescale, for MRF capacity and for collection contractors, separated material off takers, vehicles, reprocessing – there could be significant capacity issues.

Cost burden

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is concerned that if up-front transition costs are not provided and if EPR funding and new burden funding for food waste are not aligned, there will be impacts on the whole collections system, including for trade collections. Authorities in Warwickshire do not currently collect food waste separately, so we will look to implement one service change for food and dry recycling collections. If the funding for food waste collections is not provided up front, this will delay planned changes for the dry recycling materials and what can be offered to businesses.

Reprocessing

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that the reprocessing capacity is likely to be available for cartons in time in the UK and in Europe. The partners do not want material from Warwickshire businesses to have to be shipped beyond Europe for reprocessing because the government has mandated collection of cartons before there is suitable and secure reprocessing available.

End Markets

The UK currently relies on many export end markets. The vast majority are reputable and legitimate end markets where materials are recycled properly. However, there remains a lack of full transparency for a local authority or business to have full sight of where collected materials end up. There is the perception, partially legitimate, that export beyond Europe is undesirable, and that some material exported is not recycled. The partnership would like to see government put in place more assurances that recycling cannot be exported illegally. New materials for collection should not be mandated until proper end markets are securely in place.

Other – Small businesses

Small businesses present challenges when it comes to implementing recycling collection services. There is often a lack of space for containers and use of shared facilities can make it difficult to undertake education and enforcement activities. There needs to be a recognition and acceptance that some businesses will need to have a comingled collection.

Proposal 18 – Collection of film from non-household premises

Q48 Do you agree or disagree that collections of plastic films could be introduced by the end of 2024/25 from non-household municipal premises? (P77)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and any evidence as to why this would not be feasible.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership members will part-own a new, state of the art MRF, due to open mid-2023. So, in our particular case, the space and equipment to sort and store plastic film for recycling will be available from the start of consistent collections. However, we are aware that the majority of other local authorities will not have access to the most up to date MRF facilities which can easily gear up to make provision for new materials to business customers. So, the partnership recognises that fellow authorities will have concerns about the sorting capability for plastic film in the UK, concerns about contracts, and therefore concerns about adding them to the list of materials that should be collected from businesses from 2024/25.

The new MRF that Warwickshire will use will be capable of sorting fully comingled recycling to high quality standards and that will include being able to sort many types of plastic film. The plastic film explicitly mentioned in the consultation document is limited to polyethylene type material: carrier bags, bread bags and bubble wrap. More clarity on whether government intends to also include other types of film is urgently needed, and there will be a wide range generated by businesses. Separately collected films and flexibles presents a serious litter concern due to how readily the material can be taken by the wind. Collecting this comingled in a lidded bin will allay this issue.

The introduction of film will bring with it many communication and contamination challenges for collectors. A lot of education will be needed to help staff understand the definition of films and flexibles. There is concern about how clean films and flexibles will be presented for collection by businesses and how the sorting and reprocessing infrastructure will be set up to cope with this.

Given the above issues, there is a question about why it is proposed that businesses can be provided with film collections earlier than households? We believe that the 2026/27 date for films from all households is not achievable and for most small and micro firms it will not be achievable either. They present their waste streams in very

similar ways to households, have very little storage to separate materials out into and to accommodate multiple containers. We believe these proposals and timeline do not take account of this vast sector of trade waste customers.

Some local authorities may also wish to co-collect household and non-household recycling streams together to drive efficiency. Therefore, there needs to be alignment with the household and non-household streams in terms of dates, types of materials and how they are collected. This means that it is less likely that film collections from businesses will be able to happen before they can from households.

There is also a danger that mandating film from businesses earlier than households puts local authority trade waste services at a disadvantage where they do co-collect with household waste. There is then the potential that local authorities could be at risk of losing trade waste customers. The requirement could then have the consequence of being anti-competitive for local authority trade waste services.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is keen that there is sufficient end market capacity that none of the plastic-containing waste collected in Warwickshire is shipped beyond the EU for reprocessing. It is felt that with ongoing developments in physical and chemical processing driven by EPR and mentioned in the consultation as a solution, adequate quality plastics end markets will be available by 2026/27. However, if they are not, the government should put back the start date.

Q49 Do you have any other comments on this proposal? For example, please specify any barriers that may prevent collectors delivering these services.
(P77)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes it will be very difficult to undertake extensive separate collections of films from small and micro businesses. They often have little room for storage of separate streams of waste of the containers needed. It is much more likely that they will end up having to receive collections of mixed recyclables. This then needs the sorting infrastructure in the UK to be able to deal with film. Although this should be available in Warwickshire, currently most UK MRFs cannot effectively sort film for supply to viable end markets. This calls into question then the viability of film collections from small and micro businesses in the short and medium term.

Proposal 19 – on-site food waste treatment technologies

Q50 Do you agree or disagree with Proposal 19? (P79)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

Q51 Do you have any other comments on the use of these technologies and the impact on costs to businesses and recycling performance? (P80)

This choice is best left to individual businesses who are best placed to decide if they wish to bear the cost of operation themselves or use a waste management company.

Proposal 20 – reducing barriers to non-household waste recycling

Q52 What are the main barriers that businesses (and micro-firms in particular) face to recycle more? (P81)

	Large barrier	Some barrier	Low/no barrier
Communication		Y	
Financial	Y		
Space	Y		
Engagement		Y	
Drivers to segregate waste	Y		
Location		Y	
Enforcement		Y	
Variation in bin colours and signage		Y	
Contractual		Y	
Staff/training		Y	
Other			

If you have selected other above, please specify.

Please provide any comments on how these barriers can be overcome.

Co-mingled recycling will be necessary for a lot of small and micro businesses due to space/storage issues. This then needs to align with household waste collections when collected within a mixed trade and household round, which is an efficient option. Most current collections from small and micro business are done on a co-mingled basis because of the barriers outlined above.

If source separated is mandated, additional staff will be needed by WCA trade services to educate and enforce correct use of bins. This resource should not be underestimated as education is an ongoing process and it can take several visits with a business to have collections running as they should. Businesses have staff turnover, so continued education may be needed.

Enforcement powers for non-household waste are needed to back up any education that does take place. Local authorities do want to use enforcement powers as this means behaviour has not changed but having the threat of enforcement as a measure of last resort is a huge aid to the education process. When enforcement action is used, this can then also assist the local authority in their engagement with other businesses.

Small and micro business are less likely to know or understand their legal obligations regarding waste, especially when these new requirements to recycle and separate waste are introduced. This forms part of the education activities that local authorities will need to undertake, and this includes for the many businesses that are

not their customers, as local authorities will often be contacted for advice from local small businesses.

The availability of service providers in rural areas may mean that businesses have limited choice in the type of service they can access.

Proposal 21 – exemptions and phasing on micro-firms

Q53 Should micro-firms (including businesses, other organisations and non-domestic premises that employ fewer than 10 FTEs) be exempt from the requirement to present the five recyclable waste streams (paper & card, glass, metal, plastic, food waste) for recycling? Please select the option below that most closely represents your view and provide any evidence to support your comments. (P83)

Yes – all micro-firms should be exempt from the requirement – Option 1

No – but all micro-firms should be given two additional years to comply with the new requirements in the Environment Bill (i.e. compliant in 2025/26) –

Option 2

No – all micro-firms should be required to present these waste streams for recycling, from the 'go live' date in 2023/24

Collections are best optimised when the same service is delivered to all customers on the collection round. This enables standardised vehicles, containers and customer engagement. With the new consistency for recycling for households and larger businesses coming into force in 2023/24, it does not seem supportive of the aims of the policy to allow a proportion of the potential customers to be able to retain a different collection system for up to two years or indefinitely. This will increase the complexity of the necessary collection systems which will be a cost that is passed to Government under the new burdens funding. It is more efficient and effective if the same requirements are on all households and non-households on the same implementation timetable.

There will be operational challenges for micro businesses and their collectors (predominantly local authorities) to overcome to enable separate collections to be undertaken. An initial view is that a different assessment process/template is devised that is more applicable to micro businesses. On the basis that it is understood that a large proportion of micro firms will need to have co-mingled collections, it would be preferable if the requirements apply to the same timescale as requirements on households.

In Warwickshire, we offer trade waste services at all of our HWRCs and these are designed with small businesses in mind. Businesses can purchase an annual permit to bring kerbside-type recyclables to the HWRC. They can pay as they go to recycle wood, hardcore, plasterboard and green waste.

Q54 Should any non-household municipal premises other than micro-sized firms be exempt from the requirement? Please provide evidence to support your comments. (P84)

No

Proposal 22 – Waste franchising/zoning

Q55 Which recyclable waste streams should be included under a potential zoning scheme? (P88)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure / Don't have an opinion / not applicable
Dry recyclable waste streams	Y		
Food waste	Y		
Other items e.g. bulky office waste	Y		

Waste management systems work most effectively and efficiently where there is a standardised service being delivered to the maximum number of customers in a locality. This creates better value and more robust processes and supply chains. If these are enabled through a zoning approach, then all businesses are guaranteed an equitable level of service provision for comparative cost. New innovative solutions such as shared waste and recycling containers then become possible. The collection provider can spread their overheads and development costs over the widest cost recovery base to minimise the pass-on charge to individual businesses. Cost and environmental savings in transport are also key considerations as are reducing congestion and protecting air quality.

Q56 Which of the below options, if any, is your preferred option for zoning/collaborative procurement? Please select the option that most closely aligns with your preference. (P89)

- *Encouraging two neighbouring businesses to share the same containers under contract*
- *Encouraging businesses to use shared facilities on a site/estate*
- *Business Improvement Districts/partnerships tendering to offer a preferential rate (opt-in)*
- *Co-collection – the contractor for household services also deliver the non-household municipal services*
- *Framework zoning – shortlist of suppliers licensed to offer services in the zone*
- *Material specific zoning – one contractor delivers food, one for packaging, one for refuse collection services*
- *Exclusive service zoning – one contractor delivers the core recycling and waste services for the zone*
- *None of the above*

All of the options have merits and shortcomings that will vary depending on location and other factors.

Encouraging two neighbouring businesses to share the same containers under contract.

If this option were implemented there would need to be revisions to how the current Duty of Care system operates. If there were problems with the use of containers it would take resources and time to establish which business was at fault.

Encouraging businesses to use shared facilities on a site/estate

The current Duty of Care system would need to change to reflect joint usage of containers and collections. The issues regarding problems with enforcement are tricky in this option as there will be multiple businesses sharing facilities. The problems that local authorities have with flats and HMOs and their communal facilities suggest this option is one that has the most problems associated with it. Shared facilities tend to lend themselves more to co-mingled collections. Different containers for different materials can be provided but the education and enforcement on the use of these amongst multiple users becomes much more problematic. Space, planning and controlling access are also barriers to this option. If the purpose of co-collection / zoning is to reduce traffic, air pollution and carbon emissions, several businesses all driving to a collection site is not an improvement on several waste collection companies all driving to neighbouring business premises.

Business Improvement Districts/partnerships tendering to offer a preferential rate (opt-in)

There may be issues with the effectiveness if it is an opt in system. If the waste collectors that were not successful in winning the tender were able to match the preferential rate on offer, the waste producers would still have a wide range of choice and so the number of operators may not be reduced.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership is concerned regarding the expertise and knowledge that might be available in BIDs to run and operate such a procurement exercise. This may mean that there needs to be a role for local authorities or others to support the procurement.

Co-collection – the contractor for household services also deliver the non-household municipal services

Where local authorities tender out their household collection services, this will increase the size and scale of the contracts that they let. It is also likely that in some instances there might be more than one business collection zone in a local authority area. This will further increase the scale of the procurement exercise. As such there will need to be a recognition that local authorities will require extra resources for this option. Some of this could be short term external assistance. There will however be ongoing contract management resources that need to be factored in.

Where local authorities direct deliver their services there are similar advantages to above and many DDOs already operate a co-collection model which would be enhanced by these legislation changes and potentially further enhanced by some zoning.

Framework zoning – shortlist of suppliers licensed to offer services in the zone

Warwickshire Waste Partnership believes that this option is worth pursuing and should have more research put into it as a medium to long term option.

Local authorities should automatically be on the short list of zone suppliers where a compliant trade waste service is offered, in order to fulfil the statutory duty of a local authority to make arrangements for collection of business waste.

Any firm that is on a framework should have a duty or obligation placed on them that is equivalent to the one local authorities currently have in order to ensure that all businesses in that zone can access suitable collections services.

Material specific zoning – one contractor delivers food, one for packaging, one for refuse collection services

In many instances, local authority household services are likely to be set up where food is collected on the same vehicle as packaging or refuse, by way of a pod. This option poses a risk to local authority trade waste services if they are not a named contractor for all materials. Small business rely on local authorities to provide their trade waste collections and so if material zoning were brought in there would need to be an obligation placed on the relevant waste collector that they provide a service to all businesses in their zone.

Exclusive service zoning – one contractor delivers the core recycling and waste services for the zone

There is merit in proposals on the zoning of business waste services. It has the potential to increase efficiency and effectiveness of business waste collections. There are issues around zoning in rural areas.

Q57 Do you have any views on the roles of stakeholders (for example Defra, the Environment Agency, WRAP, local authorities, business improvement districts, businesses and other organisations and chambers of commerce) in implementing a potential zoning or franchising scheme? For example, do you think there could be roles for one or more of these organisations in each of the following activities: (P89)

- *Procurement*
- *Scheme design*
- *Administration and day to day management*
- *Enforcement*
- *Business support*
- *Development of tools and guidance*
- *Delivery of communications campaigns*
- *Any other activities (please specify)*

*If you think that there is a role for any other stakeholders, please specify.
Please provide explanations where possible to support your above response.*

Any stakeholder responsible for implementing a zoning/franchising scheme must be representative and publicly accountable and local authorities or BIDs fulfil these criteria. They must be committed to delivering best value and environmental outcomes for the best quality services that can be procured. Both organisations can

deliver all the activities listed above, either individually or in partnership. As shapers of place and locality, local councils (or working through BIDs) are best placed to assume this strategic role.

Q58 Do you have any further views on how a potential waste collection franchising / zoning scheme could be implemented? (P89)

The procurement of any franchising/zoning scheme must acknowledge any available capacity via municipal infrastructure (EfW, MRF, AD etc) to maximise local processing/disposal before longer distance solutions. The proposal should consider how this can be hard-wired into the procurement process to promote public-private partnership working. This will stimulate local investment in municipal treatment infrastructure and could better deliver locally sustainable solutions. There would need to be duty placed on waste producers that they use the collector(s) stated for their zone. This goes beyond the current Duty of Care requirements.

Q59 Do you have any views on how Government can support non-household municipal waste producers to procure waste management services collaboratively? This could include working with other stakeholders. (P90)

Businesses/NHM waste producers should be obligated to be included within the local franchise/zoning arrangement by default. This would mean that information on their obligation and participation can be provided from their first contact with the necessary authorities (planning, environmental health, BID, chamber of commerce etc) and the service(s) to them started immediately upon them becoming operational as a business/organisation. This will make enforcement easier and lead to an improvement in the amenity and quality of the street scene.

Q60 Which type(s) of business support would be helpful? (Select any number of responses) (P90)

1:1 support

National /regional campaigns

National guidance and good practice case studies

Online business support tools (e.g. online calculators and good practice guidance)

Other (please specify)

All of the above.

Businesses need clear and concise reference information online and 1:1 personal or group (in forums) support to refresh their knowledge.

More resources will be needed for local authorities to be able to fully support businesses and provide information to them.

Q61 Are there any barriers to setting up commercial waste bring sites, and do you find these sites useful? (P90)

Finding locations that can meet regulatory requirements (planning, permitting) may prove problematic in the short to medium term. The Covid 19 pandemic necessitated the introduction of booking systems and other processes at HWRCs to manage use of the sites and social distancing. Whilst this has had the effect of limiting capacity, in some instances it has also improved the overall efficiency of operations at several sites. This means such systems may be maintained in the longer term.

If sites are then expected to take additional material from businesses, this will put new pressures on site usage that may be difficult to meet through the existing infrastructure. It will also mean that new HWRC sites may require larger sites and plots of land than perhaps they had previously. This could make their development take longer and fewer new sites may ultimately come forward. Sites will need to be licenced and resources will be needed to apply for licenses, along with ongoing costs of complying with licence conditions and operating sites to a suitable standard. Sites will need to be staffed for all or part of their availability, so resource levels will need to be taken into account.

Space on existing HWRCs are constrained in Warwickshire. This will make adding addition capacity and containers more difficult. Availability of sites maybe an issue going forward, especially for small and micro businesses. These businesses may have little opportunity to use bring sites during their own working hours and so would want to use them to or from work. Most current sites will not operate outside normal business working hours, especially during winter. Site licencing or planning could restrict any expansion of opening hours.

The use of bring sites by commercial waste producers will need to comply with any duty of care requirements. This may be difficult under the current duty of care system, especially in terms of any possible enforcement activity that could be needed. It is suggested the duty of care requirements will need to be reviewed considering all the changes that the consistent collections and EPR proposal are likely to bring about.

Proposal 23 – exemptions to separate collection from non-household premises

Q62 Could the following recyclable waste streams be collected together from non-household municipal premises, without significantly reducing the potential for those streams to be recycled? (P91)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure / Don't have an opinion
Plastic and metal	Y		
Glass and metal	Y		

If you have agreed with either of the above, please provide evidence to justify why any proposed exemption would be compatible with the general requirement for separate collection of each recyclable waste stream.

Plastic and metal

Warwickshire Waste Partnership does not believe that mixing plastic containers and metal causes any issue regarding material quality. It is unclear from the consultation proposal if plastic film would form part of this exemption. Most existing MRFs in the UK cannot separate plastic film or cartons. However, the new Warwickshire MRF will have the ability to separate all proposed streams if collected comingled in a way that provides quality as good as kerbside sort if not better.

Glass and metal

There can be issues with noise levels when glass is collected separately at the kerbside. Collecting glass and metal together might have the potential to increase this risk. In a fully comingled collection noise levels are dampened by the mixing of the recycling.

Q63 What, if any, other exemptions would you propose to the requirement to collect the recyclable waste stream in each waste stream separately where it would not significantly reduce the potential for recycling or composting?
(P91)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership would like to see the co-collection of household and non-household waste facilitated as much as possible. This will reduce the costs of operation for local authorities and so for businesses and producers under the EPR scheme.

Limiting what material can be mixed is less desirable than keeping options open and challenging mixing on the basis of a TEEP-style assessment. If any MRF is shown to be supplying sustainable end markets, then materials can be collected together in any combination that the MRF can accept. The partnership believes that glass, plastic and metal could be collected together without the need for a written assessment.

Local choice instead of stipulation would be welcomed in Warwickshire as from mid-2023 we will be using a new state of the art MRF that will have the ability to take fully comingled material, including all of the new materials, and achieve output material quality that is equal to or better than current kerbside sort systems. Crucially, comingled systems are simple for businesses to understand and will link in well with the proposed EPR labelling of recycled or not recycled. There are no concerns with confusion, running out of capacity or how to store the many containers. Comingled methodology also allows for easily adding new materials, so long as they can be sorted at the MRF. All waste is safely contained and littering from escaped waste is not a concern.

The collection element of kerbside sort is more costly and time consuming than comingled. Kerbside sort methodology would pose some serious Health and Safety risks in a business setting. HSE guidance on manual handling advises that collectors should lift as little as possible, but this is not possible in the kerbside sort system, where containers of glass and paper / card boxes are heavy. There is also the risk of puncture wounds from sharp waste elements such as glass or metal. There are road

safety issues with sorting waste in the street. During the pandemic, there has been concerns about the kerbside sort technique bringing operatives into close quarters with potentially contaminated waste. With comingled collections there is no lifting or handling involved for the business or operatives.

Proposal 24 – exemption on two or more recyclables from non-household premises

Q64 Do you have any views on the proposed definition for ‘technically practicable’? (P93)

In principle this will follow the same concepts as for household waste. These issues and considerations are best done at the franchise/zoning level as a holistic exercise for all types of business. This would enable minimum standards and best practice to be included within the procurement and a more equitable and fair level of service provision for local communities through benchmarking and comparison. A comparison would be a locality-based waste/recycling management plan, the smaller scale equivalent of a JMWMS.

Q65 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples cover areas where it may not be ‘technically practicable’ to deliver separate collection? (P94)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don’t have an opinion / not applicable

If you have disagreed with any of the above, please say why and indicate which example you are referring to.

The proposed examples do cover areas where it may not be technically practicable to deliver separate collections. However, these may not be the only areas.

Q66 What other examples of areas that are not ‘technically practicable’ should be considered in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P94)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Social and economic demographics of an area
- Geography of an area and business types
- Health and safety guidelines and risk assessments for kerbside sort
- HSE guidance – manual handling, collectors should lift as little as possible. Glass and paper / card boxes are heavy
- HSE guidance – handling contaminated and / or sharp waste (glass / metal)
- Preventing vermin from accessing waste
- Greater capacity afforded by comingled versus kerbside sort
- Access issues, for example: narrow roads, long drives, parking blocking roads
- Traffic flow
- Balancing the capacity of each stillage on the collection vehicle
- Vehicle availability – long lead-in times of several months for purchasing
- Depot space – for vehicles, transfer of materials, containers

- Electric vehicles charging points required for electric vehicles
- Additional vehicles requiring more staff, shortage in frontline staff and trained or untrained drivers and cost of training
- Permitting restrictions, licensing
- End markets
- Maintenance infrastructure and maintenance crews for vehicles
- Small businesses - space for bins
- Staff unclear about the system
- Business willingness to participate

Q67 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples cover areas that may not be 'economically practicable' to deliver separate collection are appropriate? (P94)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you have disagreed with any of the above, please say why and indicate which example you are referring to.

In principle this will follow the same concepts as for household waste. These issues and considerations are best done at the franchise/zoning level as a holistic exercise for all types of business. This would enable minimum standards and best practice to be included within the procurement and a more equitable and fair level of service provision for local communities through benchmarking and comparison. A comparison would be a locality-based waste/recycling management plan, the smaller scale equivalent of a JMWMS.

Q68 What other examples of 'economically practicable' should be considered in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P95)

Economically practicable refers to separate collection which does not cause excessive costs in comparison with the treatment of a non-separated waste stream, considering the added value of recovery and recycling and the principle of proportionality. If the additional cost of collecting a recyclable waste stream separately outweighs its value once collected, it may not be economically practicable to collect a waste stream separately.

It is also unclear at this moment in time how "economically practicable" will be determined in relation to EPR payments and the options for business waste that were put forward in that consultation. This is complicated further by the fact that there is working group looking at further options that have not been presented in that consultation.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Materials markets, possible saturation leading to lower value

- Communication costs to businesses, especially if there is a significant service change, many new containers are introduced or a move to comingled is quickly followed by a move back to kerbside sort
- Sourcing of vehicles, bins and other infrastructure at the same time will cause problems, the market is not geared up to deliver such a change.
- Contract changes
- Cost of additional fleet (electric? / hydrogen?)
- Depots and storage of fleet
- Transfer arrangements and / or bulking
- Cost of crews and of supervision and ancillary staff
- Attracting and retaining drivers is a significant issue
- Higher contamination could lead to more rejected loads
- Cost of containers and availability

Q69 Do you have any views on what might constitute 'excessive costs' in terms of economic practicability? (P95)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the phrase "excessive costs" as this implies that there is a high degree of magnitude above the standard cost before it is deemed uneconomic for a local authority to collect materials separately. Under EPR, packaging producers will demand that collection services are efficient and effective, suggesting that costs should not approach an excessive level before an assessment says it is acceptable for an alternative solution to be sought. Each collection solution will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis considering local circumstances.

There is no detail within the consultation on what level and type of evidence would be required to demonstrate that costs would be excessive for a local authority to collect materials separately. Until this is known it then makes it more difficult to comment thoroughly on this proposal.

Q70 Do you have any views on what should be considered 'significant,' in terms of cases where separate collection provides no significant environmental benefit over the collection of recyclable waste streams together? (P95)

As with the phrase "excessive costs" the use of "significant" in this case suggests a very high threshold of proof that a comingled collection method has good environmental benefit. Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports good environmental outcomes, creating a circular economy and lowering carbon impact. Solutions need to be found where good environmental performance can be achieved and collection costs are covered by EPR, not scarce public funds. Each collection solution will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis considering local circumstances.

Q71 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed examples for 'no significant environmental benefit' are appropriate? (P95)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you have disagreed with any of the above, please say why and indicate which example you are referring to.

In principle this will follow the same concepts as for household waste. These issues and considerations are best done at the franchise/zoning level as a holistic exercise for all types of business. This would enable minimum standards and best practice to be included within the procurement and a more equitable and fair level of service provision for local communities through benchmarking and comparison. A comparison would be a locality-based waste/recycling management plan, the smaller scale equivalent of a JMWMS.

Q72 What other examples of 'no significant environmental benefit' should be included in this proposal? Please be as specific as possible. (P96)

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests other examples include:

- Carbon impact
- Air quality impact
- Additional vehicles
- Material output quality and acceptability to end markets
- Maintaining dry waste while set out for collection
- Greater capacity through comingled versus kerbside sort
- Lack of litter / escaped waste generated by comingled versus kerbside sort
- Closed loop end markets versus aggregate, etc
- Balance between the quality in comingled and vehicle miles in collecting separately for possibly no increase in quality.

Proposal 25 – compliance and enforcement

Q73 What ways to reduce the burden on waste collectors and producers should we consider for the written assessment? (P97)

- Standard template preferably online
- No easy opt outs – organisations completing the template should be limited to a choice of responses and not allowed too many (if any at all) free form entries that require intensive and subjective assessment. This will mean that external audit and verification will be easier and quicker and the number of assessments requiring review can be reduced (compared to if each individual business had to do its own). Similar to a municipal waste and recycling strategy
- Ideally done at a franchise/zoning level rather than individual businesses so all businesses within the service area can use this as evidence for any regulatory challenge.

Q74 We are proposing to include factors in the written assessment which take account of the different collection requirements, for example, different

premises within a service area. What other factors should we consider including in the written assessment? (P98)

- Collective container provision shared between businesses in franchise area/zone. This would need to be subject to considerations relating to duty of care obligations.
- Secure digital access to containers like RF transponders (bin chipping) on bin lifts. Linked with automatic bin weighing/volume measurement, it will enable businesses to just pay for the waste/recycling they produce. These costs amortised across a zone/franchise area will be lower than if put on an individual business.
- If business collections are undertaken on a zoning basis, thought may need to be given to the size of zone in relation to the assessment. It is likely that there may need to be several different collection methods within each zone to take account of the different business sizes and characteristics.

Q75 Would reference to standard default values and data, that could be used to support a written assessment, be useful? (P98)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Whilst the use of standard or default values can be useful in making an assessment quicker and easier, they also mean the assessment is less representative of the actual situation a local authority faces. The use of default values should therefore not be mandatory, and the preference would be that local authorities use their own values as much as possible.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership suggests that a range of default values should be developed and used if default values are to be used at all, instead of one default value.

Q76 Do you agree or disagree that a template for a written assessment would be useful to include in guidance? (P98)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Warwickshire Waste Partnership supports the use of templates if it is not too restrictive and directive. There needs to be the flexibility to add information and edit the template to suit.

Q77 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed approach to written assessments and non-household municipal collections will deliver the overall objectives of encouraging greater separation and assessing where the three exceptions

(technical and economical practicability and environmental benefit) apply?
(P98)

Agree

Disagree

Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable

The challenges faced by small and micro businesses in managing and having their waste collected separately should not be underestimated. It needs to be acknowledged that local authorities and other waste collectors currently provide good co-mingled business waste collections that deliver material that is of the quality needed for the markets they supply. There needs to be an assessment of the value in increasing costs of collection against the increase in "quality" of material achieved.

Proposal 26 – costs and benefits

Q78 Do you have any comments and/or evidence on familiarisation costs (e.g. time of FTE(s) spent on understanding and implementing new requirements) and ongoing costs (e.g. sorting costs) to households and businesses? (P103)

Until the full extent of the changes is known it is not possible to provide figures on this. Given that this consultation and the EPR consultation still contain a great many unknowns, it is unreasonable to expect local authorities to plan in any level of detail for the changes.

All local authorities will have examples of costs of previous service changes, but few of these are likely to reflect the changes that would be needed to meet the policy changes proposed in this and the EPR consultations. Too much prescription in the way waste is collected will stifle innovation and further efficiencies and environmental / carbon benefits.

In 2013, North Warwickshire Borough Council moved from a source segregated system using boxes to a dual stream service in order to simplify the service, provide more recycling capacity and reduce litter from recycling collections. Full year recycling rates either side of this change increased by 62%.

In 2019 North Warwickshire Borough Council moved from the dual stream service to fully comingled in order to improve the health and safety of collectors and provide a simpler service. Full year recycling rates either side of this change were increased by 16%.

Both changes were popular, so moving to more containers would be difficult and should not be necessary as the new sub-regional MRF will deliver quality materials from comingled collections. Many Warwickshire properties have little outdoor or indoor space for additional containers.

A service change requires additional staff to liaise with businesses and households as well as deliver the practical elements and procurement. The extent of initial and ongoing communications work should not be underestimated.

Q79 Do you have any comments on our impact assessment assumptions and identified impacts (including both monetised and unmonetised)? (P103)

Some concerns from Warwickshire Waste Partnership are outlined:

Garden Waste Collections

Carbon inputs related to charged garden waste collections are generally much lower than free services. Fewer vehicles are used in collections; their routes are far more optimised and so the carbon attributed to them smaller.

The quality of green waste collected on paid for services is also higher than free services. This means less rejected material, with the carbon loss that incurs, and a better quality of compost that is produced, with the carbon gains that accrues.

Dry Recycling Collections

If carbon savings are a key driver, then the assessments must be done across dry recycling streams as well as garden waste. Looking to achieve weight-based targets may undermine better policy choices in terms of carbon, e.g. vastly increasing home composting instead of free green waste collections.

The same reprocessors are often taking material from all types of collection system, source separated, twin stream and co- mingled. If a reprocessor is accepting material for recycling, then that material is quality because it is fit for purpose.

Relevance of Modelling – Covid-19 Impacts

The Covid-19 pandemic has created some major and potentially long-lasting changes in the waste that people and business produce, where it is produced and this has impacted on collection and treatment operations. These changes must be considered if the proposed policies are to design and implement a new system of household and business waste management that is future proofed.

New Burdens

Warwickshire Waste Partnership has concerns about the estimates of the new burdens local authorities will face if the proposals in the consultation are implemented. There are legitimate costs in operating waste management services that we believe may not have been captured, both existing and potential.

One example is the amount of resource needed to undertake written assessments. Whilst the consultation contains proposals on how this burden may be minimised, there is a possibility of judicial challenges if written assessments conclude that services should deviate from source separated collections. Local authorities will want to ensure their assessments are robust and have suitable levels of research and evidence behind them. This may mean they require much more resource than has been anticipated in the modelling and the impact assessment.

The partnership is concerned that local authorities will not receive full funding for the new burdens these proposals will incur. Defra themselves have indicated that the proposals are subject to confirmation in the next spending review, which will be one of the most difficult since the financial crash and has many national and

international level pressures on it. This may see the spending on waste moved down the overall priorities in the spending review compared to where it might have been pre-pandemic and when the first round of consultations was released in 2019.

There is a need for funding to enact changes to be provided up front, in order to meet the timescales and this does not seem to have been factored into the new burdens plan. If there is a delay in the payment of EPR funds, will new burdens cover the shortfall to enable local authorities to establish consistent collections in line with the proposed timetable?

Agenda Item No 13

**Community and Environment
Board**

26 July 2021

**Report of the
Chief Executive**

Exclusion of the Public and Press

Recommendation to the Board

That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined by Schedule 12A to the Act.

Agenda Item No 14

Polesworth Sports Centre – Report of the Director of Leisure and Community Development

Paragraph 2 - Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.

The Contact Officer for this report is Emma Humphreys (719226).