

# TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

29 January 2013

### Joint Report of the Director of Health and Housing and Cabinet Member for Environmental Services

#### Part 1- Public

#### Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet

#### **1 PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE KENT JOINT MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

##### **Summary**

**The report sets out proposed changes to the Objectives and Policies contained in the Kent Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.**

**1.1** The proposed changes to the Objectives and Policies contained in the Kent Joint Municipal Management Strategy (KJMWMS) were considered by the Local Environmental Management Advisory Board on 27 November, 2012. The Board noted and supported the proposed changes. The KJMWMS is part of the Council's Policy Framework and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are asked to consider the proposed changes and report back on its findings.

#### **1.2 Background**

**1.2.1** All 13 Kent councils (excluding Medway) comprise the Kent Waste Partnership (KWP). It has been in place since 2007. Portfolio holders with responsibility for recycling and waste services form the KWP Board. Heads of Service form the KWP Officers Advisory Group. Each group meets three times a year to take forward policies and associated actions.

**1.2.2** The first KJMWMS was adopted by all councils in 2007. The Strategy is a significant document but the crux of it was to put in place a range of policies and targets that all 13 councils adopted. These policies and targets can be found at **[Annex 1]**. The KJMWMS is publicly available at [www.kent.gov/kwp](http://www.kent.gov/kwp).

**1.2.3** Since 2007, councils have worked hard to achieve the key targets set out in the KJMWMS. The following targets have been attained:

- a 40 per cent recycling and composting rate across Kent by 12/13;
- household waste recycling sites achieving a 60 per cent recycling and composting rate by 12/13; and

- reduction of waste sent to landfill from 75 per cent in 05/06 to 22 per cent in 11/12.

### **1.3 Refresh of the Strategy**

1.3.1 Following the success of attaining the key targets set out in the KJMWMS, the KWP members board agreed in 2011 to carry out a “refresh” of the strategy aims and objectives. This refresh would build on the existing strategy rather than review or replace it. Put simply, consideration was given to what ambitions the KWP had moving towards 2020.

1.3.2 The refresh has included significant consultation exercises with the widest range of stakeholders. These included the public, waste companies, government departments etc. KWP members consequently agreed a new set of objectives and policies which are set out in [Annex 2].

### **1.4 Conclusion**

1.4.1 We support the KWP’s members board recommendations that the adoption of the “refreshed” policies as set out in [Annex 2] demonstrates a positive collective desire of Kent councils to derive the best possible value for Kent taxpayers in the delivery of their waste collection and disposal functions.

### **1.5 Legal Implications**

1.5.1 The requirement for councils to produce joint waste management strategies is contained in the Waste and Emissions Trading Act 2003.

### **1.6 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

1.6.1 Adopting the policies at [Annex 2] does not oblige any of the 13 Kent councils to commit to any specific spending. The implementation of the refreshed policies is designed to create opportunities for councils to avoid future costs as a result of partnership working. Local implementation of specific policies will require dialogue and agreement between partners and would only go forward if a clear and sound business case was deliverable.

1.6.2 Member states of the EU are required to achieve recycling and composting rates of 45 per cent by 2015 and 50 per cent by 2020 as contained in the revised Waste Framework Directive 2008. Failure to achieve these levels of performance as a nation may give rise to EU fines. The Government has legalised the passporting of such fines to local authorities via the Localism Act 2011. Suffice to say that the purpose of the new recycling and composting target is as much about protecting taxpayers’ financial interests as it is about environmental performance.

## 1.7 Risk Assessment

- 1.7.1 The failure to create synergy from improved joint working across Kent could result in costs for the collection and disposal of waste increasing at a time of financial austerity. The way forward, as set out in **[Annex 2]** would see income from recycling increase and make good use of the Allington Energy from Waste facility to deliver better financial and environmental value from tacking residual waste.

## 1.8 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.8.1 See 'Screening for equality impacts' table at end of report.
- 1.8.2 During the development of the refreshed policies, Equality Impact Assessments were undertaken. The review did not identify any equality issue. If local implementation of the refreshed policies is to be considered, these will be subject to a further look at consequential equality issues.

## 1.9 Policy Considerations

- 1.9.1 The KJMWMS forms part of the Council's Policy Framework. Consequently, any changes to the strategy, if agreed, need to be adopted by Council.

## 1.10 Recommendations

- 1.10.1 It is **RECOMMENDED** that Overview and Scrutiny Committee:
- 1) **CONSIDER** the proposed changes to the KJMWMS as set out in the report; and
  - 2) **REQUEST** the Cabinet to endorse the proposed changes and recommend the Council to adopt the revised Strategy.

Background papers:

contact: Phil Beddoes

Nil

John Batty  
Director of Health and Housing

Councillor Owen Baldock  
Cabinet Member for Environmental Services

<b>Screening for equality impacts:</b>		
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Explanation of impacts</b>
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	Equality Impact Assessment, undertaken by KWP officers, do not reveal any adverse impact.
b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality?	No	
c. What steps are you taking to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		N/A

*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.*