

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL
LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ADVISORY BOARD

22 May 2012

Joint Report of the Director of Health and Housing and Director of Finance

Part 1- Public

Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet - Council Decision

1 RECYCLING SERVICES – FINANCIAL ISSUES

This report considers financial issues associated with the proposal to improve the Council's kerbside recycling collection services.

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 Elsewhere on this agenda is a report which sets out an option to improve the Council's kerbside recycling collection services. It is not our intention to repeat the detail of that report, but to focus on the financial issues associated with the proposal.
- 1.1.2 As referred to in the report elsewhere on the agenda to assist the evaluation process, a number of high level criteria were identified, one of these was that the changes, worst case, should be at no additional revenue cost to Service budgets. The outcome of the evaluation of the improved service showed that based on estimates of the tonnages to be collected there would be no additional revenue cost with a prospect of a modest annual revenue saving.
- 1.1.3 To facilitate the collection of the additional materials will require the purchase (capital expenditure) of additional waste receptacles. The cost of the additional waste receptacles is in the order of £560,000. Members will recall that, other than funding for the replacement of our assets which deliver services as well as providing money for statutory services, there is now an annual capital allowance for all other capital expenditure. That allowance has been set at £350,000 and for 2012/13 has been fully utilised.
- 1.1.4 If Members are minded to approve the proposal to improve the Council's kerbside recycling collection services it is suggested that the requisite capital plan provision sit outside the 'normal' capital plan review process. In addition, that the contribution to the revenue reserve for capital schemes for 2012/13 be increased from £350,000 to in the order of £910,000. This can be facilitated largely, if not entirely from the favourable outturn position for 2011/12.

1.2 Legal Implications

1.2.1 The purchase of additional waste receptacles, if approved, must be in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2006 (as amended).

1.3 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

1.3.1 As set out above.

1.4 Risk Assessment

1.4.1 The financial risks relate to the accuracy of our estimates of tonnages collected and the finalisation of the financial agreement with KCC.

1.4.2 See also risks identified in the earlier report on the agenda.

1.5 Equality Impact Assessment

1.5.1 See 'Screening for equality impacts' table at end of report

1.6 Policy Considerations

1.6.1 Procurement

1.7 Recommendations

1.7.1 It is **RECOMMENDED**, if **CABINET** is minded to approve the proposal to improve the Council's kerbside recycling collection services, that:

- 1) The requisite capital plan provision sit outside the 'normal' capital plan review process.
- 2) The contribution to the revenue reserve for capital schemes for 2012/13 is increased from £350,000 to in the order of £910,000.

Background papers:

contact: Neil Lawley

Nil

Sharon Shelton
Director of Finance

John Batty
Director of Health and Housing

Screening for equality impacts:		
Question	Answer	Explanation of impacts
a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to cause adverse impact or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	Report considers the financial issues associated with the proposal to improve the Council's kerbside recycling services.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality?	N/A	Report considers the financial issues associated with the proposal to improve the Council's kerbside recycling services.
c. What steps are you taking to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		See responses above.

In submitting this report, the Chief Officer doing so is confirming that they have given due regard to the equality impacts of the decision being considered, as noted in the table above.