

ANGUS COUNCIL

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES COMMITTEE – 19 NOVEMBER 2009

SCOTLAND'S ZERO WASTE PLAN / ANGUS COUNCIL RESPONSE

REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

<p>ABSTRACT: This report informs members of Angus Council's response to the Scottish Governments' Scotland's Zero Waste Plan consultation document.</p>
--

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 It is recommended that members note the contents of this report.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 On 20 August 2009, the Scottish Government issued Scotland's Zero Waste Plan for consultation, with a return date of 13th November 2009 for those wishing to make comment.

2.2 Scotland's Zero Waste Plan will seek to provide direction and guidance, and the consultation seeks views on key waste management issues that can support Scotland on the journey to a zero waste society.

2.3 The key issues include: -

- Being clear about everyone's roles and responsibilities;
- Setting and meeting targets on prevention, reuse, recycling and composting, and setting caps on energy from waste and landfill;
- Waste management and climate change.

2.4 Due to the short consultation period, this did not leave sufficient time within the programmed committee timetable for the Councils' response to be considered by Neighbourhood Services committee, and consequently Neighbourhood Services committee of 8 October 2009 agreed to establish a cross party group to consider a series of issues and questions raised in the consultation document. Report no. 716/09 refers.

2.5 This group met on 2 November 2009 and agreed a response on behalf of Angus Council. The response is shown in Appendix 1, and this has been sent to the Scottish Government for their consideration within the timescale of 13 November 2009.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 There are no direct financial implications associated with this report.

4. HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no direct human rights implications associated with this report.

5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The issues contained in this Report fall within an approved category that has been confirmed as exempt from an equalities perspective.

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1 The Chief Executive, Director of Corporate Services, Head of Finance and Head of Law and Administration have been consulted on the contents of this report.

**RON ASHTON
DIRECTOR OF NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES**

NOTE: The background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (other than any containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to any material extent in preparing the above report are:

- Report No: 716/09.

NS/RA/JZ

Question No.	Question	Response
1	What further steps, if any, need to be taken to promote the waste hierarchy?	<p>The waste hierarchy is currently a tool that is largely known to waste professionals but will have little currency with the wider public. Although the 3 Rs (Reduce, Reuse Recycle) are seen here and there, by and large the public is not aware of the hierarchy. If it is to mean anything in a wider context the public need to buy in. Perhaps a bit of re-branding is also needed for public consumption. This could be done by:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TV and radio ➤ Schools ➤ Internet ➤ National press ➤ Local campaigns <p>The existing triangle graphic representation of the hierarchy depicts the most desirable option as having the least area in the graphic, and this can be misleading. It is felt that this graphic is no longer fit for purpose and should be replaced by a graphic which clearly depicts the hierarchy without the potential for confusion.</p>
2a	Waste tonnage will continue to be the main measure of progress. However, should Government also use other ways of measuring progress? Yes/No.	<p>Yes</p> <p>(The main measurement should always be done by the ultimate goal which is to avoid the production of methane and other greenhouse gasses. This is more problematic and less easily measurable therefore the next direct measure is tonnage. In addition at a daily practical level waste managers cannot relate easily to greenhouse gas production but can with tonnages. (There is a direct correlation between tonnages into landfill and methane production).</p> <p>Therefore for the prime measurement which can be widely used and understood and employed on a daily basis tonnage is still a good option)</p>
2b	If yes, what measures, how and why?	<p>Another measure which would reflect progress is kg per capita. Although the usefulness of tonnages is recognised, it is felt that a ratio provides a greater degree of comparability than a flat figure. This would not involve complex calculations and would reflect accurately how progress is being achieved in each area.</p>
3a	Do you agree with these proposals on improving data? Yes/No	<p>Generally yes. It is essential that solid reliable data is produced and made available. The only are of concern is with the possible costs of waste analysis. Although the principle of using regular waste analysis is a sound one, the procedure can be costly and with the anticipated reductions in budgets this additional cost should be</p>

		funded.
3b	<p>If no, what should be done and how and by whom?</p>	
4	<p>What should be the future role of Area Waste Groups and Area Waste Plans?</p> <p>Options include:</p> <p>i) Abolition (if so, how do you feel local needs could best be supported and developed?).</p> <p>ii) Updating Area Groups and Plans to reflect this Plan's objectives.</p> <p>iii) Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) to prepare new Area Plans which focus exclusively on data and infrastructure, similar to the Strategic Waste Management Reviews.</p> <p>iv) Using the Groups to monitor local delivery but with no Plan making requirements.</p> <p>v) Other option. If so, please outline.</p>	<p>The preferred option is therefore Option 1 i.e. abolition of the Area Waste Groups and Plans. It is felt that this mechanism has served its purpose and needs to be replaced by a more strategic approach at the highest possible level. It is essential that there exists a method by which a strategic overview of the needs of all- of-Scotland can be taken, and a resultant plan for the location and provision of infrastructure devised. This would ensure that economies of scale are achieved and that highly capital intensive infrastructure is not duplicated on a smaller scale, while still taking account of the proximity principle as it best applies at a national level.</p>

5a	<p>Is there a need for a simplified delivery body programme? Yes/No. If yes, what form should this take?</p>	<p>The services provided by the delivery bodies are very useful but it can be confusing knowing where to get information. In addition it is likely that there is duplication. It is also unclear to what extent these delivery bodies reach the general public.</p> <p>However there is also benefit in having a range of organisations delivering services from different perspectives.</p> <p>The task is to ensure that there is no duplication and maximum collaboration. A structure which ensures this happens is essential. The number of delivery bodies is less important than ensuring that there is no overlap and that</p>
5b	<p>Are there areas where additional work is required from delivery bodies to support progress towards a Zero Waste Scotland? Yes/No. If yes, what are these areas of additional work?</p>	No
5c	<p>Are there current areas of work which delivery bodies could stop doing? Yes/No. If yes, what are these areas of work?</p>	No, existing services are useful, however as stated previously, there is a need to ensure that in covering such wide areas of work no duplication occurs.
6	<p>To date, development plans have not always identified sites and/or locational criteria for waste management plants. What can be done to ensure that development plans do so in future?</p>	<p>The development of locational criteria is a reasonably straightforward process and has already been undertaken within local authorities.</p> <p>The identification of sites however, is a much more complex process and involves a considerable burden being placed on local authority planning departments. The need to demonstrate that very complex scrutiny processes have been undertaken, the necessity to prove that the chosen site is optimal, allied to the need to deal with inevitable local concerns and active campaigns against most locations, combine to provide a huge disincentive against identifying sites.</p> <p>It is strongly felt that the process of identifying locations for waste disposal infrastructure should be undertaken at the highest strategic level using a national overview. Local authority planning departments could then react to the strategic decisions.</p>

7a	<p>Should Government set a target of reducing municipal waste by 1% per annum? Yes/No.</p>	<p>Yes provided there is a clear definition of which organisation is responsible for delivering the target, how it will be delivered and how the programmes will be funded. Without a clear target, reduction might not happen. Targets should also be varied in conjunction with other mechanisms which might affect whether such targets can be achieved, for example local authority expenditure constraints.</p>
7b	<p>Should Government set any specific targets on reducing household waste? Yes/No. If yes, what targets?</p>	<p>Same as 7a</p>
8a	<p>Should Government set a target in relation to "preparing for re-use"? Yes/No.</p>	<p>Without a target it is not possible to measure progress and therefore the ideal answer is yes.</p>
8b	<p>If yes, what sort of target should be introduced and how will it be achieved and measured?</p>	<p>There are many ways of measuring the positive environmental, economic and social impact reuse has on our communities.</p> <p>These include, but are not limited, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - tonnes diverted from the landfill - avoided disposal costs (donor/seller) - avoided purchase costs (recipient/buyer) - value of materials donated (donor) - revenues earned (donor/seller) - of job created or retained - of families/individuals/organizations assisted <p>Ideally the measure should be the tonnes diverted from landfill (the main object of the exercise). There are considerable practical problems in measuring. Preparers" need to be indentified. Materials collected need to be quantified. Data needs to be submitted. A framework to allow this to happen needs to be created.</p> <p>Much more effort should be put into highlighting the concept of reuse as a prime means of dealing with waste.</p>
9	<p>What targets, if any</p>	<p>Targets should e set in the same manner as for domestic waste. To make targets effective reliable data on the</p>

	should Government set in relation to the prevention of commercial and industrial waste and construction and demolition waste?	production of these types of waste is necessary and it is not clear if this can be acquired or not. Consideration could be given to making voluntary actions mandatory
10a	Have any potential waste prevention actions been missed?	There will always be other potential actions which might be implemented but those listed seem comprehensive
10b	Are there any actions listed which are not worth pursuing, and why?	No
11a	Do you agree with the key actions needed to improve municipal recycling rates? Yes/No. If no, what else should be done	Yes.
11b	Should most (e.g. 80%) of the recycling targets be met through collections of recyclate at kerbside and through recycling centres and points? Yes/No.	The use of kerbside collections and “bring to” systems is well established and the public are familiar with these. The systems generally work well and cater for various preferences in how to recycle goods and therefore it would make sense that the bulk of the target material is gathered through these systems
11c	Do you consider that local authorities need more in-depth support to help improve municipal recycling performance? Yes/No. If yes, what should be done?	Local authority waste managers are generally quite capable of managing changes in collection and disposal systems. The provision of centrally collected information to assist management decisions is very useful. (e.g. benchmarking type information).It is not quite clear what is meant by in-depth support but generally support at individual council level is not required.

11d	<p>Do you consider that there could be a greater role for incentives to improve recycling performance. Yes/No. If yes, what type of incentives?</p>	<p>Incentives for the public could play a part in improving recycling performance. Cash (or redeemable vouchers etc) would seem the most obvious examples eg the refundable deposit on glass bottles</p>
11e	<p>Should any changes be made to the categories of household waste where local authorities can charge for collection? Yes/No. If yes, what changes should be made?</p>	<p>No. Individual charges for routine collections of waste would be very difficult to administer and avoidance would be easy. Charges for "one-of" collections are already provided for.</p>
12	<p>What more should be done to encourage recycling in public places?</p>	<p>The provision of easily usable and conveniently located facilities which must be clean, well signed and well serviced allied to good publicity at local level.</p>
13	<p>Should a campaign be run reminding companies of their responsibility under Duty of Care? Yes/No.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
14a	<p>Do you agree that these are the priority materials and sectors for which tailored programmes of work should be</p>	<p>Yes. Food waste may be less relevant to those authorities which use WtE as the main method of disposal (i.e. no FW to landfill).</p>

	developed? Yes/No	
14b	If no, what should be included?	
15a	Should Government set a target on reducing the amount of commercial and industrial waste sent to landfill by 150,000 tonnes a year? Yes/No.	It is not practical for the council to specify what amount should be set as a target and this should be defined by what is practicable. However the principle of setting a target is a sound one however it is expressed.
15b	Should Government set targets by specific sectors, companies or materials? Yes/No. If yes, which sectors, companies or materials, and why?	Unless specific targets are imposed by specific parameters which are then measurable it is difficult to see how reductions will occur. Monitoring and measuring will be difficult however. Packaging should be a prime target
16a	Should Government explore further the merits of different forms of producer responsibility, which might more directly support household recycling collections? Yes/No	Yes
16b	Should Government explore further whether extended producer responsibility as outlined in Article 8 of the revised	Yes extended producer responsibility should be explored. Unsure of what materials should come first but possibilities are Computers Televisions Nickel cadmium batteries

	Waste Framework Directive should be introduced? Yes/No. If yes, what materials?	Plastic bags Packaging materials Chemicals Mobile phones and batteries
16c	Should Government or other bodies do more to extend the concept of voluntary producer responsibility? Yes/No. If yes, what?	No. Responsibility should be statutory
17	Do you agree that the cap should not extend to mixed waste treatment, such as Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT), Mechanical Heat Treatment (MHT) and Anaerobic Digestion taking mixed waste? Yes/No. If no, why not?	Yes agree
18	Should the cap extend to single-stream municipal wastes going to energy from waste plants? Yes/No	Yes
19a	Should Government support local authorities when they seek to procure or build infrastructure to treat residual waste? Yes/No.	Yes

19b	If yes, what should Government do?	Assist with expert information on access to funding and expert technical information.
20	Do you have any initial views on materials or streams or products which could be banned from landfill?	Materials should be banned from landfill based only on the scientific evidence available and therefore those materials which have been shown to have the most adverse effect should be banned first. Materials should be banned from landfill only where suitable alternative means of disposal have been identified
21a	What opportunities would arise in this area if Scotland had fiscal autonomy, with the power to set the rate of landfill tax in Scotland?	No comment
21b	What might the effects of a different constitutional arrangement for Scotland be in this area?	No comment
22	Are there any other points you wish to make?	<p>This response is made subject to the following qualification:-</p> <p>All measures which emanate from the combined responses to this consultation document, which place additional obligations on local authorities, must be adequately resourced. The proposed strategy incorporates a number of targets, objectives and tasks which local authorities will be expected to deliver. Any strategy which does not take full account of the resource implications at the outset will likely fail.</p> <p>The agreement in this response to various proposals, or the proffering of alternative suggestions, is offered only on the basis that full account will be taken of those resource implications and that provision for funding required will be made available. In the absence of such assurances the council's responses are not warranted.</p>