

# Leisure and Environment Committee

Thursday 18 March 2010 7.30pm

Council Chamber  
Runnymede Civic Centre, Addlestone

## Members of the Committee

Councillors M J Brown (Chairman), Miss M N Heath and J J Wilson (Vice-Chairmen), A J Davis, Mrs M T Harnden, Mrs G M Kingerley, M T Kusneraitis, A M Moore, C J Norman and Mrs G Warner.

## AGENDA

### Notes:

- 1) Any report on the Agenda involving confidential information (as defined by section 100A(3) of the Local Government Act 1972) must be discussed in private. Any report involving exempt information (as defined by section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972), whether it appears in Part 1 or Part 2 below, may be discussed in private but only if the Committee so resolves.
- 2) The relevant 'background papers' are listed after each report in Part 1. Enquiries about any of the Agenda reports and background papers should be directed in the first instance to **Miss C Pinnock, Administration and Leisure Department, Committee Section, Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone (Tel. Direct Line: 01932 425627). (Email: [clare.pinnock@runnymede.gov.uk](mailto:clare.pinnock@runnymede.gov.uk)).**
- 3) Agendas and Minutes are available on a subscription basis. For details, please ring Mr B A Fleckney on 01932 425620. Agendas and Minutes for all the Council's Committees may also be viewed on [www.runnymede.gov.uk](http://www.runnymede.gov.uk).
- 4) In the unlikely event of an alarm sounding, members of the public should leave the building immediately, either using the staircase leading from the public gallery or following other instructions as appropriate.

See overleaf

If you need help reading this document please contact Denise Morley on 01932 425610 who will try to provide a reading service, a large print version, or another format.

## বাঙলা

আপনি যদি ইংরেজি পড়তে বা বলতে না পারেন, ও এই লেখাটি পড়তে যদি আপনার কোনও সাহায্য লাগে তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে 01483 750548 নাম্বারে উইটস্ লিঙ্কলাইন (WITS Linkline)-এর সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন ও আপনার নিজের ভাষায় একটা মেসেজ রাখুন।

## 简体中文

如果您无法阅读或说英语，需要协助以明白此文件，请与和景翻译服务处之语言专线联络 01483 750548，并用您的母语留下讯息。

## Italiano

Qualora non siate in grado di leggere o di parlare l'inglese, e necessitate assistenza che vi permetta di capire il presente documento, siete pregati di contattare la WITS Linkline allo 01483 750548 e lasciare un messaggio nella vostra lingua.

## اردو

اگر آپ انگریزی زبان پڑھ اور بول نہیں سکتے ہیں اور آپ کو اس دستاویز کو سمجھنے میں دقت پیش آتی ہے؛ تو برائے مہربانی سے وٹس لنک لائن کو اس نمبر 01483 750548 پر رابطہ کریں اور اپنی زبان میں اپنا پیغام چھوڑیں۔

## Polski

Jeżeli nie potrafisz czytać lub mówić po angielsku i potrzebujesz pomocy w zrozumieniu tego dokumentu, proszę skontaktować się z Linją Telefoniczną WITS pod numerem 01483 750548, zostawiając wiadomość w języku ojczystym.

## Español

Si no puede leer o hablar ingles, y necesita ayuda para entender este documento, por favor contacte a WITS Linkline al 01483 750548 y deje un recado en su idioma.

## **LIST OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **PART I**

#### **Matters in respect of which reports have been made available for public inspection**

	<u>Page</u>
1. FIRE PRECAUTIONS	4
2. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	4
3. MINUTES	4
4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	4
5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	4
6. FINANCIAL MONITORING STATEMENT	4
7. PLAYBUILDER FUNDING	5
8. SURREY CLIMATE CHANGE STRATEGY	8
9. RENEWAL OF KERBSIDE RECYCLABLES COLLECTION CONTRACT	14
10. CABRERA TRUST MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – CONSTITUTION	23
11. ADDLESTONE LEISURE CENTRE JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – MINUTES	24
12. CABRERA TRUST MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – MINUTES	24
13. RUNNYMEDE ARTS DEVELOPMENT STEERING GROUP – MINUTES	24
14. STANDING ORDER 42 – GREEN FLAG AWARDS	25
15. STANDING ORDER 42 – GROUNDS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT	25
16. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC	26

### **PART II**

#### **Matters involving Exempt or Confidential Information in respect of which reports have not been made available for public inspection**

a) <u>Exempt Information</u>	page
17. CHERTSEY MEADS – PROCUREMENT OF SERVICES FOR HIGHER LEVEL MANAGEMENT SCHEME	27
Exempt Appendices '1' and '2' to item 9 'RENEWAL OF KERBSIDE RECYCLABLES COLLECTION CONTRACT'	circulated separately
b) <u>Confidential Information</u>	
(No reports to be considered under this heading)	

1. FIRE PRECAUTIONS

The Chairman will read the Fire Precautions which set out the procedures to be followed in the event of fire or other emergency.

2. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

3. MINUTES

To confirm and sign as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 January 2010, which were included in the March 2010 Minute Book previously circulated.

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

If Members have an interest in an item please record the interest on the form circulated with this Agenda and hand it to the Legal Representative or Committee Administrator at the start of the meeting. A supply of the form will also be available from the Committee Administrator at meetings.

Members who have previously declared interests which are recorded in the Minutes to be considered at this meeting need not repeat the declaration when attending the meeting. Members need take no further action unless the item in which they have an interest becomes the subject of debate, in which event the Member must leave the room if the interest is personal and prejudicial.

6. FINANCIAL MONITORING STATEMENT (DF)

(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, November 2009, page 367, para 393)

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to inform the Committee of the latest financial projections for the 2009/10 financial year for Leisure and Environmental services.**

2. Background Information

2.1 The Financial Monitoring Statement was introduced to all Committees in September 2006 to inform Members of the current financial position of the services under the remit of each Committee. This Committee receives two statements, one for Leisure services and the other for Environmental services.

2.2 Each statement reflects an updated position based upon the 2009/10 probable estimates and the 2010/11 original estimates approved by this Committee in January. The projection in the Financial Forecast approved by Corporate Management Committee in October 2009 has been updated accordingly.

3. Report

3.1 The statement attached at Appendix 'A' is split into two parts:

- Leisure services
- Environmental services

Each statement is split into three distinct parts:

- Projected budget and forecast
- Savings targets
- Current year key budget indicators

3.2 The Projected budget and forecast sections show any anticipated variations in the current year's budget. These variations are categorised as approved changes and other potential changes. Implications for the following three years are included for completeness so that the full-year effect of any changes can be seen.

3.3 The achievement of the revenue reductions programme approved by the Council is one of the Council's key performance indicators. Savings targets are reported in the second

section of each statement. These savings are incorporated into the projected budget and forecast figures in Section One.

- 3.4 The final section sets out the key budget indicators for the significant areas of this Committee's budget. This indicates the actual income received set against the amount expected (the budget) for the period covered by each statement. In addition to this, at the request of this Committee, there are also graphs showing the membership numbers for each Leisure Centre, and also for the number of subscribers to the Council's Green Waste Collection service.
- 3.5 Members are asked to note that from May 2010 the budget for Safer Runnymede will be reported to the newly established Crime and Disorder Committee, which will then be able to make recommendations to Corporate Management Committee.

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

None stated.

7. PLAY BUILDER FUNDING (DAL)

(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, September 2009, page 268, para 290)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to advise Members of the potential locations for the second Play Builder project proposed for the Addlestone area.**

2. Background Information

- 2.1 The Play Builder programme is a funding stream offered to all authorities by the Department for Children, Schools and Families. It enables the provision of play spaces for children in the 8-12 age group. Surrey is part of the wave 3 funding round and £1.1 million has been allocated (£50,000 in each financial year) to the County to be spent in the 2009/10 and 2010/11 financial years.
- 2.2 Play Builder funding has been allocated to the top tier authorities. Surrey County Council is expected to work closely with boroughs and districts, who, over recent years, have developed local play strategies linked to the recent Big Lottery funding made available to all local authorities.
- 2.3 The Surrey Play Builder bid is led by the County Council's Early Years Service. The Surrey Chief Leisure Officers Group met with them to produce applications for funding. A County and Borough group was also set up and it submitted an initial application for funding in February 2009 and the final application was made in April 2009.
- 2.4 At the meeting of this Committee in September 2009, it was agreed that Officers would look at potential locations for the second Runnymede project to be in Addlestone Bourneside, reporting back on proposals no later than March 2010, to ensure that funding deadlines were met.

3. Report

- 3.1 The first Play Builder project at Frank Muir Memorial Field in Thorpe has been tendered and the play element of the scheme is due to be completed as required by the end of March 2010. The skate facilities are due to be completed in late April 2010. The timescale to bring this project to completion has been very tight with consultation, specifications and tenders awarded over a short space of time.
- 3.2 The sum of funding available to each Play Builder project is £50,000, with boroughs and districts encouraged to seek other funding to enhance the provision, where possible. The first projects completed throughout the County have varied in cost and format but have all been well received.

- 3.3 Members were advised in September 2009 of how the projects should be developed and the criteria that needed to be met; for example encouraging natural play provision, and this was incorporated into the specification and tender analysis stage.
- 3.4 The focus on Addlestone Bourneside with the original application was due to the level of deprivation in the ward and the lack of any recent investment in the play facilities. Officers have looked at five possible options. These are Aviator Park, Victory Park, Sayes Court, Hamm Moor and Herondale. Of the potential locations, only Hamm Moor and Herondale are in Addlestone Bourneside, two of the locations are in Addlestone North and one in New Haw. Despite this, Officers still consider these are the best sites to consider due to the availability of space.
- 3.5 Aviator Park is an open space adjacent to the new office development. There is currently skate provision, a teen shelter, two junior football pitches and a multi-use facility in an area that covers 1.3 hectares. There is no formal play provision within the open space so this would potentially be a good site. However, any additional development would have to be carefully managed because it could impact on the existing junior football provision and residents whose houses back onto the open space to the south of the site. The open space is easily accessed being just to the east of Addlestone town centre and is already quite extensively used.
- 3.6 Victory Park is a manned park to the north of Addlestone town centre which has won the nationally accredited Green Flag award for the last three years. This is a very popular and well used park which includes three tennis courts, two football pitches, a paddling pool, play area and bowling green. The Pavilion is currently closed and is in need of urgent refurbishment. Corporate Management Committee recently approved making budgetary and capital programme provision, subject to the continued availability of the funding from the Surrey County Council Early Years Unit and the approval of OFSTED. If this is in place a tender list for the works would be approved with the agreement of the Chairman of this Committee. The location of any new play provision would have to be carefully managed to ensure it is accessible and does not adversely affect existing provision, as space is limited. One other option would be to replace the existing equipment in the play area. However, this caters primarily for younger children so the provision of equipment for older children could have a significant impact on current users.
- 3.7 Sayes Court Open Space is 4.3 hectares and has an existing play area and Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA). The river Bourne runs through the open space which means that the lower lying areas get wet in the winter. Improvements to the open space in recent years have included a new path to improve accessibility, some new pieces of play equipment and safer surfacing. Any new provision could be easily accommodated and would fit in well with the naturally undulating nature of the site. A number of residential properties back onto the open space but new provision could be located so as not to cause any significant problems. New provision could also increase usage of this open space.
- 3.8 Herondale is a very small play space to the south of Station Road in Addlestone, which consists of wooden play equipment, primarily for use by 5-7 year olds. Any re-provision on site would have an impact as the Play Builder programme is aimed at the 8 - 12 age group. The open space is in a built up area and sits between a number of properties. However, the equipment is old and there is little other provision locally.
- 3.9 Hamm Moor is an open space of 0.6 hectares to the south of Station Road in Addlestone. It includes an existing play area and informal football space but the play facilities are in need of refurbishment. This open space would be able to accommodate new provision and cater for an area of the town which has limited facilities.

#### 4. Council Policy

- 4.1 The service plan identifies that the Council will:

*Continue to invest in the parks, maintain the current high standards of provision, and improve where identified by need. Includes play area refurbishments and new builds.*

Play Builder funding allows the Council to continue the development of play areas despite a limited capital budget for the planned replacement programme.

5. Resource Implications

- 5.1 The capital funding for this project will be provided through Surrey County Council who manage the grant for the Play Builder programme. Any additional third party funding can be added to the scheme if required. As with the current play builder project at Thorpe, staff from the Parks section and Legal will need to be involved in the specification, tender and contract award process. The ongoing revenue costs, which will primarily consist of ongoing repairs and inspections, will be incorporated into the Parks budget. However, there may be a requirement to vire money from elsewhere in the Parks budget to meet any additional costs.

6. Equality

- 6.1 The specification for the play areas will incorporate the need to make them accessible to as wide a range of users as possible, including those with disabilities. The target age groups will be 8 to 12 year olds, so it is likely that there will be equipment and facilities unsuitable for under 8's.

7. Sustainability

- 7.1 The emphasis of the Play Builder programme is on natural play. The specification will ask for proposals that incorporate natural play and should also include sustainable products.

8. Conclusion

- 8.1 Officers consider that of the five sites identified, Herondale is too small, too near housing and currently caters for a younger age group. Victory Park already has sufficient provision, including an existing play area and space is limited in the park. Aviator Park has limited space for any further provision on site. However, this could be overcome by making some changes to the park's layout. Sayes Court and Hamm Moor both have space to develop a suitable play space, although they are both some distance from the centre of Addlestone.
- 8.2 It is recommended that consultation takes place with young people and residents on the three possible locations and a further report be brought to this Committee with the Officers' final recommendations and outline design options.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that -**

- i) the second Play Builder project be located at either Sayes Court Open Space, Aviator Park or Hamm Moor as these best meet the requirements of the scheme, by providing suitable space to develop for natural play provision;**
- ii) consultation be undertaken with young people and local residents on which site provides the best access and most suitable space to develop; and**
- iii) a further report be submitted to this Committee for approval of the final location and indicative design, enabling the end of March 2011 deadline to be met for project completion.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

None stated.

8. SURREY CLIMATE CHANGE STRATEGY (DTS)  
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, January 2010, page 471, para 496)

1. **Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 **The purpose of this report is to seek the Committee's endorsement of the Surrey Climate Change Strategy on behalf of Runnymede Borough Council and to explain what the Council is doing to address climate change.**

2. **Background Information**

- 2.1 The Surrey Improvement Partnership (SIP) is funded by Improvement and Efficiency South East (IESE) and works under the guidance and management of the Surrey Local Government Association (SLGA).

- 2.2 'Creating Capacity to Address Climate Change Targets' is a SIP project that began in 2008 as a collaboration between the eleven Surrey Districts and Boroughs and the County Council and the Surrey Climate Change Partnership (SCCP) is an Officer group that was set up to work on the project.

- 2.3 The partnership was established to:

- Facilitate joint working across the County on climate change issues.
- Develop best practice, which can be shared throughout the County and the region.
- Create a Surrey wide approach that can lead to improvement and efficiency.

- 2.4 The SCCP plays a key role in the delivering of the initial objectives of the Surrey Improvement Partnership (SIP) climate change project - the development of a County-wide **climate change strategy**. The SCCP commissioned the consultant Jacobs to prepare the strategy which is intended to:

- See the development of a core strategy of common objectives to tackle climate change across the County.
- Set out the policy context for the work of the partnership.
- Develop a set of objectives and actions to inform its work programme.

- 2.5 There are differing views on the significance and the causes and effects of climate change but the Climate Change Act imposes legal requirements on Local Authorities. Also regardless of the climate change issue many of the actions that are being taken are beneficial in terms of cost, energy efficiency and reducing pollution generally.

**RBC Members' Workshop**

- 2.6 An RBC Members' Workshop, facilitated by The Energy Savings Trust, was held on 17 June 2009 at the Runnymede Civic Centre to:-

- Give an overview of what climate change means for all Surrey Councils.
- Support Members in recognising the economic and environmental advantages and benefits of tackling climate change.
- Outline reporting requirements for the Surrey Local Area Agreement and climate change National Indicators (National Indicators 185, 186, 187 and 188).
- Outline the work of Surrey Climate Change Partnership and the SIP climate change project.
- Gauge interest in establishing a Surrey Climate Change Member Working Group.

- 2.7 At the workshop it was explained that "Creating Capacity to Address Climate Change" is a Surrey Improvement Partnership (SIP) project that looks to help Local Authorities build capacity to deal with climate change targets within the Surrey Local Area Agreement (LAA), and to establish joint working and enhance capacity across the county and to become an exemplar for the South East.

2.8 A Surrey Climate Change Partnership Members' Group has recently been formed that meets approximately every six weeks. The Chairman of this Committee represents Runnymede on this Group, supported by the Council's Head of Engineering.

3. Report

Surrey Climate Change Strategy

3.1 The Strategy document was published in September 2009 and seeks to take forward the partnership approach that has been successfully established between the members of the SCCP, extending this to the County as a whole to effectively address climatic impacts through sustained action over the period to 2020.

3.2 The Strategy highlights the potential impacts of climate change and their relevance to Surrey. There are significant economic, social and environmental risks presented by not acting to reduce emissions and adapt to climatic changes but also substantial opportunities for Surrey to champion and benefit from a low carbon economy.

3.3 The structure of the Strategy is based on three core objectives:

- **Reducing Emissions** - The Strategy highlights the need to understand, monitor and manage Surrey's carbon footprint, targeting major sources of emissions by:
  - improving home energy efficiency;
  - improving energy efficiency in the business, public and voluntary sectors;
  - managing and developing land and infrastructure through a low carbon approach;
  - minimising energy use and emissions from transport;
  - managing resources in a sustainable way; and
  - supporting innovation and the development of renewable energy.
- **Adapting to Climate Change** - Planning for and responding to extreme weather events and longer term climatic trends will reduce the cost to the County's:
  - Public Services;
  - Industry & Commerce; and the
  - Built and Natural Environment.
- **Raising Awareness** - How effectively we respond to climate change will be determined by our level of understanding of the various impacts, and what to do in order to address them. Hence a key aspect of the strategy is to inform, engage and involve all parts of the County. The Strategy specifically aims to:
  - Raise awareness of climate change with public, community and partnership organisations and businesses; and
  - Promote awareness and embed principles throughout Surrey's educational system.

3.4 The full Surrey Climate Change Strategy document is available for Members to refer to in the Members' Room at the Civic Centre. The Strategy covers a wide range of climate related initiatives and these include:-

Surrey's Emissions

3.5 The strategy document identifies the allocation of total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by source, approximately 24% from road transport, 34% from industry and commercial operations and 42% from domestic sources. All twelve Local Authorities across Surrey are working towards developing a more detailed understanding of emission sources to identify opportunities to reduce carbon emissions across their area.

Improving Home Energy Efficiency

- 3.6 Housing is the highest contributor of carbon emissions in the County, as stated in para 3.5. NI 187 is one of the four national performance indicators (NI's) that relate to climate change of the Government's set of 198 NI's. NI 187 – Tackling fuel poverty, measures the people receiving income based benefits living in homes with low energy efficiency ratings.
- 3.7 The core strategy includes a common objective to work together across Surrey to tackle fuel poverty. By pooling together data and good practice across the County, Local Authorities will be better placed to identify those suffering fuel poverty in their local areas and will be able to target help and support. This would not necessarily require additional resources but would be a case of using existing data and targeting existing campaigns and support to the people that need it most.

#### Privately Owned Homes

- 3.8 The Council's Energy Projects Manager has been promoting several initiatives to help and encourage private owners to improve the efficiency of their homes;

#### Warmth for 1000 Insulation Scheme

- 3.9 Launched in summer 2009 this scheme is part of the Surrey and Hampshire Improvement Partnership funding bid from the Regional Housing Board utilising a combined fund of approximately £1.1m over three years. The scheme is aimed at private sector hard to treat properties, e.g. solid wall properties, park homes, hard to access lofts, and involves seven Surrey Local Authorities working in partnership.

#### Warm Front Grant Scheme

- 3.10 Providing heating and insulation measures in the homes of residents qualifying for benefit. During the first quarter of the current financial year Warm Front either installed central heating or replaced non-working boiler systems for 49 private sector residents within Runnymede. A letter sent to 421 Runnymede residents in receipt of Housing and Council Tax benefit should result in a substantial number of installations by the end of the financial year.

#### Runnymede Free Insulation Scheme

- 3.11 Primarily for the over 60's and families with young children, residents not eligible for a Warm Front grant but on a low income can benefit from free loft or cavity wall insulation under the Runnymede Free Insulation Scheme.

#### Boiler Scrappage Scheme

- 3.12 Central Government's 'Boiler Scrappage Scheme' was launched on 18 January 2010 which grants £400 to those private sector residents who wish to replace their old inefficient boiler. Runnymede Borough Council has allocated £5,000 from external energy efficiency commitment funding to assist 50 homes on a lower income with an additional £100 towards a replacement boiler.

#### Energy Current Cost Monitor

- 3.13 Runnymede Borough Council continues to support the Surrey Initiative that offers residents a free loan of a current cost monitor through the Surrey Library Service. The monitors show residents how much energy they are consuming and the costs enabling them to identify potential savings.

#### RBC Owned Social Housing

- 3.14 In recent years the Council has completed a programme of major works to improve the energy efficiency of its social housing stock. Where possible, all of the houses have had new heating systems and controls, upgraded boilers and hot water systems, roof and wall insulation and double glazing.

#### Improving Energy Efficiency in the Public, Business and Voluntary Sectors

- 3.15 NI 185 - CO<sub>2</sub> reduction from Local Authority operations is one of the four national performance indicators (NI's) that relate to climate change of the Government's set of 198 NI's. NI 185 deals with the energy used in buildings and transport in delivering the functions of a local authority, but not the embedded emissions in the goods procured by the authority, e.g. pens, tables, paper.

#### Public (Corporate) Buildings

- 3.16 The Council's Corporate Asset Management Programme includes:-
- Refurbishment projects for heating, lighting, insulation and windows.
  - Plant room audits of boiler rooms at five of the largest RBC properties recommending insulation works at an investment of £6600 showing a Return On Investment of approximately £15000 (£8400 Net) over a five year period.
  - Introduction of an energy monitoring and targeting system for the Civic Centre with future expansion to the Council's other larger properties.
- 3.17 The Climate Change Strategy includes a core strategy outlining common objectives and targets, particularly around carbon reduction. The SCCP is working to deliver consistent reporting on NI 185 across the County.

#### Business and Voluntary Sector Buildings

- 3.18 NI 186 - per capita reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the Local Authority area: The core strategy will seek to include a common position on reducing emissions in each Local Authority area in Surrey. This will involve a stated objective to engage residents and businesses in helping to reduce emissions.

#### Sustainable New Development

- 3.19 Local Development Frameworks (LDF's) are intended to manage the way in which new developments take place in towns and the countryside. The Spatial Objectives that form part of the Council's LDF specify that the LDF will help tackle the causes and effects of climate change, encouraging sustainable construction, energy efficient design, renewable energy provision, sustainable travel and recycling.

#### Reducing Energy Use and Emissions from Transport

##### NI 185

- 3.20 NI 185 relates to the energy used in buildings and transport in delivering the functions of a local authority.

##### Green Fleet Review

- 3.21 The Energy Saving Trust (EST) has recently carried out a Green Fleet Review (GFR) on behalf of the Borough Council. The EST provides these reviews, funded by the Department for Transport, to organisations wishing to review the environmental performance of their fleet and business travel. The aim of the GFR was to identify actions that would reduce transport emissions, help lower running costs and enhance corporate social responsibility. The review looked at all of the Council's commercial vehicles under 3.5 tonnes and its cars, including those owned by employees and used in connection with Council business and vehicles leased by the Council and supplied to Officers for use on Council business and for their private use.

The GFR identified many suggestions for procuring, managing and operating its vehicle fleet that would reduce the Council's CO<sub>2</sub> footprint and would also benefit its NI195 vehicle rating.

##### Smarter Driver Scheme

- 3.22 The Energy Savings Trust has offered Smarter Driver lessons for RBC staff. The first group of 24 drivers will soon receive the training with the intention of changing their driving style so that they drive more efficiently.

### Yellow Buses

- 3.23 The first Runnymede Yellow School Bus service was launched in February 2002 and there are currently seven buses offering a dedicated school bus service to and from all four state secondary schools in the Borough.
- 3.24 The Service is provided by Runnymede Borough Council in conjunction with the Runnymede Business Partnership, whose members include local businesses, Chambers of Commerce, schools, colleges and Surrey Police.
- 3.25 Each bus has sixty seats and is fitted with an environmentally friendly Euro 3 engine running on low sulphur diesel. Many of the school pupils that use the service each day would be driven to school by their parents if the service was not available. This equates to a significant reduction in vehicle journeys and the emissions from those vehicles.

### Minimising Resource Use

- 3.26 Providing goods and services, using energy and water and disposing of waste are all significant causes of carbon emissions. Tackling opportunities at the procurement stage of projects, improving the sustainability of waste management processes and reducing both resource use and water generation are important targets to achieve the emission reductions necessary. The strategy highlights a need to further embed sustainable procurement principles throughout industry and the public sector.
- 3.27 The County's high reliance on landfill has been identified as a major issue that must be addressed through waste minimisation, re-use, recycling and diversion of waste to other forms of treatment. The Council is working with the Surrey Waste Partnership to halt waste growth and restrict landfill.

### Increasing Renewable Energy

- 3.28 Low carbon or renewable energy generation offers significant potential for contributing towards future emissions reductions. The main challenge currently is to make these systems financially and technologically viable for widespread adoption and environmentally acceptable. The Strategy encourages organisations across Surrey to consider steps that they can take towards increasing the generation of renewable energy.
- 3.29 NI188 – (Adapting to climate change) is 'process based' and is markedly different to majority of indicators which are target based. NI 188 is designed to:
- "Ensure Local Authorities are sufficiently prepared to manage risks to service delivery, the public, local communities, local infrastructure, businesses and the natural environment from a changing climate, and to make the most of new opportunities".*
- 3.30 Guidance Notes for NI188 issued in 19 December 2008 state that the overall aim of the NI188 is to:
- "embed the management of climate risks and opportunities across the local authority and partners services, plans and estates and to take appropriate adaptive actions where required"*
- 3.31 A key component of this new system is reliance on a sound and credible evidence base. In this case the indicator is looking to be supported by documented evidence that the Local Authority and its partners have put in place mechanisms for proactively managing climate risks and taking appropriate actions. It also looks for evidence that ensures that assessing the risks and opportunities from climate change is embedded within risk assessments, decision making, service delivery and planning. This requirement leads to the requirement for a more organised approach to the management and coordination of such projects and ultimately to their reporting. Officers are working on the development of the evidence base and the risk assessments that will support future actions.
- 3.32 Officers are currently working on a project which has the sole aim of providing the Council with a plan that will guide its move from the initially assessed Level 0 (basic awareness – and reported last year) to Level 4 (fully implemented plan) in a managed way, and will

contribute to its ability to meet the various embedding tests of Audit Commission whilst minimising wasted Council effort.

4. Council Policy

4.1 National policies require Local Authorities to address climate change through the Climate Change Act 2008 and National Performance Indicators.

5. Financial Implications

5.1 The Climate Change Strategy covers a wide range of Council services involving a variety of budgets. Any new projects and initiatives involving additional costs would require the approval of the relevant Committee. In the Council's current financial position this would require a virement of budget, possibly curtailing existing service activities.

6. Legal Implications

6.1 The Climate Change Act is a legally binding long-term framework to cut carbon emissions. It also creates a framework for building the UK's ability to adapt to climate change.

6.2 The Act gives the Secretary of State the power to direct reporting authorities (bodies with 'functions of a public nature' and 'statutory undertakers') to produce reports on what they are doing to adapt to climate change.

7. Sustainability and Equality Implications

7.1 Sustainability – The Surrey Climate Change Strategy has been developed in recognition of the fact that the global and local significance of climate change is now widely recognised and the strategy aims to establish a consistent approach across Surrey to address climate change.

7.2 Equality - The Council's Sustainable Community Strategy and Corporate Plan states that the Council will be sensitive to the needs of all in Runnymede in ensuring access to our services and that we seek to ensure that our services are accessible by and responsive to all people who need them. Our service-based Equality Impact Assessments will play a crucial role in achieving this.

7.3 The equality impact assessment process commits service managers to consider the impact on equality of access of any new service or policy.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

- i) the Committee notes the actions that are being taken by the Council to address climate change; and**
- ii) the Committee endorses the Surrey Climate Change Strategy.**

**(TO RECOMMEND)**

Background Papers  
Surrey Climate Change Strategy

9. RENEWAL OF KERBSIDE RECYCLABLES COLLECTION CONTRACT (DTS)  
(Ref: Minutes of Leisure and Environment Committee, November 2008, page 456, para 321 and September 2009, page 272, para 298)

1. **Purpose of Report**

1.1 **The purpose of this report is to:**

- i) **Determine the form of future kerbside collection of recyclables from a range of options;**
- ii) **Put forward recommendations for the award of the contract for the kerbside collection of recyclables;**
- iii) **Consider the implications for the refuse collection service; and**
- iv) **update Members on the position relating to the current contract.**

2. **Background Information**

2.1 In March 2007, full Council resolved that:

- i) A Member/Officer Working Group for refuse collection and recycling be established for a period of 18 months, to be extended if necessary, with the remit of advising on the introduction of alternate weekly collection and giving appropriate guidance to Officers, with three Members to be appointed to serve on the Group;
- ii) Subject to the deliberations of the Member/Officer Working Group and following consultation with staff, UNISON and the recycling contractor, the introduction of alternate weekly collections of residual household waste be approved in principle; and
- iii) A further detailed report on the proposals of the Member/Officer Working Group, staffing implications, and fully costed proposals be submitted to the Corporate Management Committee in due course for consideration and subsequent recommendation to Full Council.

2.2 Following consideration at a meeting of the Corporate Management Committee in September 2007, Full Council in October 2007 resolved that 'Fortnightly refuse collections not be introduced at this time and the Member/Officer Working Group considers further and recommends when this might be appropriate.'

2.3 The initial 18 month life of the Working Group was subsequently extended by two years, and meetings of the Member/Officer Working Group have now been taking place for the past three years. The Group has discussed possible options for future recycling and refuse collections and they support and recommend a particular option, as set out later in this report.

2.4 The current recycling contract was due to expire in February 2010. In November 2008, this Committee approved an extension of the contract for an additional period of not less than six months to explore potential partnering options with Spelthorne Borough Council. After further meetings however, it was decided by the Working Group and Officers that the project would not be financially viable for either authority. Spelthorne Borough Council currently favours co-mingled collection of recyclable materials and Runnymede uses the kerbside sort method. However, it was agreed that there was scope for savings to be made in the procurement of replacement refuse collection vehicles. The contract has subsequently been extended to 1 February 2011 to allow for completion of the re-tendering exercise.

2.5 It was agreed by this Committee in June 2008 that the existing method of collection i.e. kerbside sorting of recyclable materials, would be maintained and that costs for both weekly and fortnightly collections, and an expanded range of materials would be requested from shortlisted tenderers for the new contract.

2.6 A tender exercise has been carried out for the appointment of a recyclables collection contractor with a proposed start date of 1 February 2011. At the meeting of this Committee in September 2009, the following shortlist was agreed for the new contract:- Runnymede's DSO, Cheshire Recycling Ltd, trading as AbitibiBowater Recycling Europe (the Council's current contractor), May Gurney Limited, Biffa Waste Services, SITA UK and the Verdant Group. The initial closing date for bids was 9 November 2009, but at the request of some of the bidders this was later extended to 30 November, which was considered reasonable given the complexity of the requirements of their tender submissions.

3. Report

Legal and strategic framework and other considerations

3.1 The Waste Framework Directive ("WFD") (Directive 2008/98/EC) which was incorporated into UK law last year, contains the following requirements under Article 11:

- i) To take measures to promote high quality recycling and, to this end to set up separate collections of waste where technically, environmentally and economically practicable and appropriate to meet the necessary quality standards for the relevant recycling sectors; and
- ii) To set up separate kerbside collection for (at least) the following materials: paper, metal, plastic and glass by 1 January 2015.

3.2 The WFD therefore has significant implications for the Council in regard to the collection of dry recyclables, as the requirements will take effect during the life of a new contract. The tender specification includes options for contractors to include these materials.

3.3 The WFD also introduces a new provision which could have implications for refuse and recycling collections during the lifetime of the new recycling contract. Article 22 requires that Member States take measures, as appropriate (a) to encourage the separate collection of bio-waste with a view to its composting and digestion; (b) the treatment of bio-waste in a way that fulfils a high level of environmental protection; and (c) the use of environmentally safe materials produced from bio-waste. The effect of this is not known as the Government's initial response is that it recognises a need for separate collection of bio-waste [however] the cost to waste producers of separate collection is an important factor [and] evidence is that financial costs for English local authorities in respect of municipal food waste could be substantial. The Government further states that it encourages local authorities in England to consider separate collection of food waste for anaerobic digestion, and is considering whether to introduce further requirements as part of its Renewable Energy Strategy.

3.4 The Landfill Directive/Landfill Allowance Trading has as its objective the reduction in the amount of biodegradable municipal waste that can be deposited into landfill sites with significant target deductions in the lifetime of the recyclables collection contract.

3.5 The Surrey-wide Memorandum of Understanding relating to the implementation of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Surrey which the Council has signed up to is committed to achieving higher rates of recycling and composting in future years. Whilst there is no legal requirement to introduce a "step change" to significantly increase recycling rates there is an expectation that this will be done and the present low performance does impact on the Council's rating under Comprehensive Area Assessment.

Surrey County Council Financial Support

3.6 In addition, support is now being offered by Surrey County Council to provide three years of funding to assist with the set up and running costs of a kitchen waste collection service. Funding is being offered to all district and borough Councils in Surrey. The level of the grant to be based on the number of households in the Borough.

3.7 The financial support offered by the County Council for agreeing to provide a kitchen waste (food waste) collection service is a one off lump sum of approximately £250,000 capital and a further £98,000 per annum revenue for three years. The terms of the offer have yet to be finalised and the County Council has indicated that it would consider providing further

revenue support after the initial three year period. Even if the sum remains for three years only; when spread across the seven years of the contract, this would equate to £42,000 per annum.

- 3.8 There are clear drivers to increase recycling above the present rate and reduce residual waste. It is becoming increasingly expensive to dispose of waste as landfill tax increases annually and failure to meet drastically reducing landfill targets will result in very substantial financial penalties. Added to this is the range of legislation coming into force in the form of Directives.
- 3.9 There is far greater environmental awareness amongst the general public and a keenness to recycle more, which is evidenced in the amount of material brought to the 'bring' sites - especially material such as plastic bottles and cardboard which is not currently collected from households.
- 3.10 The Audit Commission has consistently criticised Runnymede for its low recycling rates, supported by DEFRA and Surrey County Council.
- 3.11 The Surrey Waste Strategy has targets of 40% recycling in 2010 (which across the county as a whole, is already being exceeded), and 50% in 2015. Surrey County Council would like to increase the recycling rate further to 60% and possibly even 70%, taking Surrey from the bottom 25% of performers to the top quartile. The County Council is aware of the role that the districts and boroughs (Waste Collection Authorities) would have in order for such high rates to be achieved.
- 3.12 Several Surrey Districts and Borough Councils have recently made "step changes" to their refuse and recycling services, pushing up recycling rates to 50% or more. This includes introducing kitchen waste collections, collecting a wider range of recyclable materials and moving to fortnightly refuse collections. By the end of 2010, only Runnymede, Reigate and Banstead, and Tandridge are still likely to have weekly refuse collections. Officers at councils including Elmbridge, Epsom and Ewell, Guildford, and Surrey Heath have all advised that their recent moves to fortnightly refuse collections alongside enhanced recycling and food waste collections have gone well. They have seen large increases in recycling rates with a corresponding reduction in the amount of residual waste. Appendix 'B' shows the levels of recyclables collected by all the districts and boroughs in Surrey.

#### Consideration for Award of Contract

- 3.13 It is suggested that in considering the look of the future recycling service, Members should decide on a preferred option, based on the various considerations and costs as set out in this report. Following that, consideration can be given to the award of the contract to the most economically advantageous tenderer which is assessed on the basis of the evaluation criteria supplied. A breakdown of tenderers' scores using the evaluation criteria is set out in Exempt Appendix '1'.

#### Award Options

- 3.14 There are four options which are based on the 2009/10 budget and Financial Forecast approved by Corporate Management Committee in October 2009 which includes an additional £180,000 per annum in funding. It should be stressed that in looking at potential costs for the various options below, assumptions have had to be made about income from material and recycling credit. Clearly this depends on the amount of material put out by the public for collection and the efforts to increase this by the eventual contractor.

#### Option A

- 3.15 This is the option of no change to the existing service: that is weekly collection of refuse and some recyclables (paper, glass, cans and textiles) and on the bids submitted would be likely to achieve savings of £127,000 per annum (see Exempt Appendix '2'). However, the Waste Framework Directive will impose on the Council a requirement to provide a kerbside collection service for plastics and cardboard (in addition to the materials already collected) from January 2015. Therefore, Officers and the Member/Officer Working Group consider that it would be more efficient to commence the collection of the additional materials required by the Directive at the outset of the contract in February 2011. This would save

confusion to the public and cause less disruption to the service and the contractor in delivering it and avoid the potential for additional cost.

- 3.16 However, a collection of all the materials covered by the Waste Directive on the basis of weekly recycling and weekly refuse collection is likely to do little to boost recycling rates and would only break even (given the assumptions made in the evaluation process in regard to tonnages and material prices) when compared to the Financial Forecast and is not put forward as a recommendation on account of the Council's need to achieve cost savings.

#### Option B

- 3.17 This is the option of weekly recycling (excluding kitchen waste) and fortnightly waste collection.
- 3.18 In Runnymede it is estimated that a move to fortnightly refuse collection could boost recycling rates from the current 27% to between 45 – 50%. This could be achieved by the introduction of a comprehensive recycling service which would be funded by reduced costs and increased income. It is estimated that a move to fortnightly refuse collection could reduce the number of rounds from five to three, although a detailed assessment of the operational implications of this would need to be undertaken. Such a reduction is anticipated to deliver £204,000 savings per year on waste collections and will increase the income from the sale of materials and recycling credits.
- 3.19 As the refuse collection service is run in-house, this has implications for existing staff. A reduction in two rounds affects two drivers and four loaders. However, an expected increase in garden waste collections will mean some redeployment to this area. As the new arrangements would not commence until February 2011 it is expected that any adjustments in staff numbers would be achieved by natural wastage. However, there has been consultation with refuse staff and their initial comments are set out in Section 8 of this report.
- 3.20 The best tender for fortnightly collection of refuse and weekly collection of recyclables would provide for recycling of the following materials:
- paper
  - glass
  - cans
  - textiles
  - plastic bottles
  - other plastics
  - cardboard
  - tetrapaks
  - batteries
  - ink cartridges
  - mobile telephones
  - spectacles
- 3.21 This could potentially achieve savings of around £380,000 per annum with an initial outlay of £162,000 for an additional recycling container (see Exempt Appendix '2').

#### Option C

- 3.22 This is the option of fortnightly recycling and fortnightly refuse collection. This is the most cost-effective of all the options put forward by tenderers which would be to move to both fortnightly refuse and fortnightly recycling collections. This would be based on the same recyclable materials as Option B above. This could achieve savings of £710,000 per annum, again with an initial outlay of £162,000 for an additional recycling container.
- 3.23 Whilst this has attractions in terms of the Council's financial position, it would be more difficult to gain public acceptance, as although the range of recycling material collected would greatly increase, the frequency of collection of both refuse and recycling would reduce.
- 3.24 In addition, a move to fortnightly refuse collections is best accompanied by a separate kitchen waste collection which removes many of the public's concerns about smells and vermin deriving from such waste remaining in wheeled bins for longer periods.
- 3.25 To add separate fortnightly kitchen waste to the collection on Option C reduces the annual saving to £560,000 but an additional £110,000 would also be required for the one off acquisition of kitchen caddies.

- 3.26 Ideally, kitchen waste needs to be collected weekly. If recycling and refuse collection were to be fortnightly then a separate weekly kitchen waste collection would cost an additional £500,000 per year, reducing the saving to £210,000 per annum.

#### Option D

- 3.27 This is the option of fortnightly recycling, including kitchen waste and fortnightly refuse collection. If Members agree that a weekly collection of recyclable kitchen waste is desirable then it would be logical to have a weekly collection of all recyclables. This could be financially supported by a move to fortnightly refuse collections.
- 3.28 Option D is therefore a weekly collection of all the materials set out in paragraph 3.20, in addition to kitchen waste, with refuse collected on a fortnightly basis. Given the wide range of materials collected weekly for recycling, provided residents participated in the recycling scheme, they would have no need to have residual refuse collected on a more frequent basis.
- 3.29 This option could achieve a possible saving of £180,000 but must take into consideration the one-off additional cost for all storage containers of £272,000 – although the majority of this could be met from the Surrey County Council capital funding (see Exempt Appendix '2').
- 3.30 The Member/Officer Working Group and Officers recommend to the Committee that this is the option which is taken forward. It is anticipated that this option could boost recycling rates locally to between 45 and 50%.
- 3.31 In addition, the tenderer who has offered the best price for this option indicates that it will recycle kitchen waste. This should mean that the Council would be entitled to recycling credits which could add another £100,000 per annum to the savings. This does however need to be clarified. Therefore, this potential source of income has not been included in the financial analysis.

#### 4. Tender Process

- 4.1 Shortlisted tenderers were invited to submit bids on a variety of basis, to determine which services would be feasible to pursue within existing budgetary arrangements. The options available ranged from prices for maintaining the existing services to fortnightly collections for both recycling and residual waste. Prices were also obtained for an enhanced collection service to include additional materials to those currently collected (paper, cans, glass and textiles). This could include the kerbside collection of plastics and cardboard; the kerbside collection of which will be a mandatory requirement from 1 January 2015. Tenderers were further provided with the option of pricing for the collection of additional materials including kitchen waste.
- 4.2 The tender process was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (EU procurement regime). In addition, Officers have factored in time for the contractor appointed to procure vehicles and equipment. An estimated lead in period of at least seven months is required.
- 4.3 Based on Westminster City Council's initial ideas, this Council's pricing structures have been devised to enable the Council to share in the contractor's income from materials collected, whilst retaining an incentive for the contractor to continue to pursue the collection of high volumes of recyclable materials. Essentially, the Contractor charges an annual sum for the provision of the services (including all additional costs; for example, transport and disposal) and the Council receives 50% of the gross income from all receipts from the sale of materials. There is an element of risk as the income received is likely to fluctuate with the market value of materials. However, on balance this approach is perceived by Officers as likely to be financially beneficial throughout the life of the contract.
- 4.4 A strategy to pursue the kerbside separation of materials was considered to be most advantageous not only on account of the large capital costs involved in purchasing suitable containers for co-mingled waste but also because the value of the waste is much reduced when co-mingled and would not be compatible with the strategy pursued of maximising income from the waste for both the Council and future Contractor.

- 4.5 Whilst technology at material recovery facilities is improving so that contamination is reducing, currently Councils providing co-mingled recyclables to them do not receive income and also have to pay a gate fee for disposal. It is estimated that loss of income and additional costs would result in additional costs of £400,000 falling to the Council if a move from kerbside to co-mingled recycling was contemplated (based on Option D set out in Exempt Appendix '2').
- 4.6 In addition to the complexities of the pricing structure, tenderers were required to submit bids taking into account TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006) requirements and detailed method statements, setting out proposed resourcing and types of vehicles they would propose to use.
- 4.7 Bids were received by 5 of the 6 shortlisted tenderers on 30 November 2009. The Verdant Group decided not to submit a bid and Cheshire was subsequently placed into administration. It was initially proposed that Officers report to this Committee in January 2010. This was postponed to enable the Service Review Group to consider the waste and recycling strategy generally and agree an appropriate time to put forward recommendations for award. Both the Service Review Group and Member Officer Working Group have now considered the issues arising and have agreed that the award decision should now be considered by this Committee, followed by Corporate Management Committee and finally Full Council, in line with the following project management timetable:

Activity	Period	Date	Comments
Tender return date	61 days	30.11.2009	Completed
Evaluate Compliance with tender requirements	1 day	01.12.2009	Completed
Evaluate tenders Stage 1 Detailed evaluation of submissions  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical</li> <li>• Experience</li> </ul>			Completed
Evaluate tenders Stage 2  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview of Tenderers</li> </ul>			Currently underway
Recommendation of Award of Tender by Leisure and Environment Committee		18.03.2010	
Recommendation of Award of Tender by Corporate Management Committee		08.04.2010	
Award of contract by Full Council		22.04.2010	
Standstill (formerly Alcatel) Period			10 days after electronic notification
Tender award date		03.05.2010	
Contract Start /Implementation		01.02.2011	

#### The Tender Submissions

- 4.8 Tenders were evaluated on the basis of the following criteria (weighting shown in brackets):-
- Price **(80%)**
  - Proposals, plans and initiatives to increase recycling rates and plans to introduce optional and/or additional items for recycling **(10%)**
  - Proposals to optimise the market value of materials recycled and secure exit contracts for recyclables **(5%)**
  - Quality control procedures and systems for managing the recycling service **(1%)**
  - Proposals to reduce emissions/ environmental impact of your vehicles **(1%)**
  - Complaints handling procedures **(1%)**

- Equalities policies (1%)
- 4.9 The openness of the tender led to 84 different material combinations/collection frequencies being received. Due to the number of price evaluations required, it is not practical to list them all out in this report. However, Exempt Appendix '1' sets out the tenderers evaluation scores for each of the four options set out in this report.
- 4.10 Save for the current liquidity problems suffered by the current contractor, any one of the organisations submitting a bid would meet the criteria in terms of quality of their bid and ability to carry out the services. On three of the four options, Biffa Waste Services achieved the highest evaluation score by some margin. The one option where Biffa failed was Option A - the re-provision of the current service.
- 4.11 Biffa Waste Services, a private company, was formed from Biffa PLC in April 2008, by a consortium led by Montagu Private Equity and Global Infrastructure Partners in a £1.7billion transaction. Biffa is a leading nationwide integrated waste management business in the UK, operating in all areas of waste. Biffa provides waste collection, transfer and logistics, recycling, treatment, recovery and disposal services, together with the management of hazardous waste and the provision of a range of environmental services to approximately 65,000 local, regional and national customers in the UK. This includes a significant presence in the public sector, providing street cleansing, waste collection, recycling, recovery and disposal services to over 30 local authorities and a wide range of other public bodies. The company has provided contact details of various waste and recycling collection and disposal contracts at 20 local authorities including three in Surrey (Mole Valley District Council, Tandridge District Council and Woking Borough Council).

#### Administration of Bridgewater Paper

- 4.12 Cheshire Recycling's parent company Bridgewater was placed into administration on 2 February 2010 and subsequently ceased production - it had faced soaring energy bills, high raw material costs and difficulties in increasing prices for the newsprint it produced.
- 4.13 Within ten days Cheshire followed suit, and the administrators sold the assets of the company to German-owned Palm Paper Limited. Palm has contacted Officers and confirmed that a new subsidiary called Palm Recycling Limited will continue to service Cheshire Recycling's local authority clients.
- 4.14 Palm Paper opened a new newsprint mill in King's Lynn last year and the acquisition of Cheshire Recycling is seen as the means by which this will be provided with recycled paper. There is to be no change in the current contractual arrangements, and the contract will continue to run until the end of January 2011.

#### 5. Council Policy

- 5.1 The Council's Sustainable Community Strategy and Corporate Plan set out the vision to enhance the quality of life for residents, visitors and businesses.
- 5.2 In terms of recycling, the Plan sets out actions to promote the sustainable use of resources and meet Government targets and National Performance Indicators.

#### 6. Resource Implications

- 6.1 The current contract costs approximately £167,000 per annum, after taking into account the income from sale of materials and recycling credits from Surrey County Council (for avoidance of disposal costs). A further £110,000 per annum is spent on servicing banks on Bring Sites throughout the Borough. Consideration would be given to removing the banks for plastic bottles and cardboard should the new contract be extended to include these materials, therefore saving on some of these substantial collection costs.
- 6.2 In evaluating the affordability to the Council of each tender submission, Members should be aware of some of the assumptions that have been made. Income projections have been based on average tonnages collected for a range of options (using the figures submitted by all the tenderers), should tonnages vary by 10% this could potentially affect the income by £70,000. Likewise, income from the sale of the materials collected has been based on

material prices from October 2009. Using the figures for November 2009 affects the income generated by approximately £7,000.

- 6.3 The Financial Forecast approved in October 2009 includes additional provision for the recycling service of £180,000 in 2010/11 onwards. This is additional money to that which is currently spent on the service and was included to recognise the likelihood that the new contract will be at a higher price than the current competitive bid. The options considered in this report have been compared against this Financial Forecast figure.
- 6.4 The Council is currently looking for savings of around £1.5m in order to bring into balance its income and outgoings over the medium term. The tenders received by Biffa for all four options highlighted in Exempt Appendix '1' would contribute towards this by not calling on all of the additional money identified in the Financial Forecast, and would provide a cushion should there be an adverse effect on the level of income generated from these proposals.
- 6.5 Surrey County Council funding of approximately £250,000 capital (single payment) and £98,000 per annum revenue for three years is still subject to discussions between Runnymede and the County Council. If agreed, any funding from them towards the implementation of a food waste collection scheme is to be welcomed. However, as with all time limited contributions, the Council will need to ensure that once the three year revenue funding is over, there are alternative measures in place to ensure that the additional costs of running such a scheme are met by other means.
- 6.6 The staff employed by the current recycling contractor would have their terms and conditions preserved under TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations) legislation. Whilst this would be a matter between the two companies, the Council would wish to ensure that the new employer fully meets their legal obligations in this regard.
- 6.7 In addition, it is recommended that in preparation for the new contract, and immediately after it commences, there will be a need to employ temporary staff to enforce the current bin policy and educate the public in terms of recycling their waste. This was something that was requested by the Member Group on Waste and Recycling some 18 months ago, but fell by the wayside when the reduction in refuse rounds took longer to stabilise than originally envisaged. This would be part of a communications strategy which will be reported to this Committee in due course.

## 7. Legal Implications

- 7.1 The proposed recyclables collection contract has been let under the regime set out in Public Contracts Regulations 2006 and in accordance with EU procurement law. The Authority is not obliged to make an award of contract following the tender exercise. However, following any such award recent caselaw (the Presstext case) has established that the Council would need to exercise caution should any variations (not anticipated in the tender documentation) be required. Essentially this means that upon award the Council will be bound to their decision for the seven year duration of the contract.
- 7.2 The Waste Framework Directive will impose the requirement to collect plastics and cardboard in addition to materials already collected by this Council from the beginning of 2015, i.e. in the fifth, sixth and seventh years of the contract.
- 7.3 Officers strongly recommend that any contract includes at least the material required to be collected in 2015, so that there is no need for further change when that legislation is introduced, which would cause disruption and confusion to the public.

## 8. Comments from Staff and UNISON

- 8.1 The refuse crews have been consulted about possible changes and their initial views are set out below. Clearly there will be further opportunities for them to put forward comments and concerns as this matter is later considered by the Corporate Management Committee before a final decision by Full Council at the end of April 2010.
- 8.2 Inevitably, initial concerns were over a reduction in jobs and whether this could be achieved through natural wastage. There was also concern about any public anger regarding

changes being directed at them whilst working and it was agreed that ample publicity information needed to be provided to the public.

8.3 Staff commented that it would be necessary to re-arrange all remaining rounds to ensure equality of workload and felt it necessary to have close working relationships with the recycling contractor.

8.4 The comments of UNISON will also be reported at the meeting.

## 9. Equalities Implications

9.1 An Equality Impact Assessment is attached at Appendix 'C'.

9.2 The current provision of wheeled bins and recycling containers would be retained, albeit with an additional container, so many of the equalities issues would remain unchanged. The current arrangements to provide assisted collections for elderly and disabled residents would remain.

9.3 Consideration does however have to be given to the following issues:

- Older and disabled residents may have some difficulty with the use of the collection containers and may find the containers too large.
- Boxes of recyclable materials can be too heavy for disabled or older people to carry. If bags are used, these may split if people drag them along the ground because they can't carry them.
- If boxes are used without lids, paper gets wet and the box is then even heavier.
- Some residents may have difficulty in remembering what can and cannot be recycled and how the materials should be sorted.
- Visually impaired residents may have difficulty in distinguishing the different bins used for recycling.
- Visually impaired residents may have difficulty in cleaning out kitchen caddies, cans and bottles, resulting in smells or vermin.
- Visually impaired residents in particular have problems when collection crews do not leave empty boxes and other containers in the precise location as the resident left them for collection.
- Wheelchair users who travel independently by car have problems if containers are left on their driveways such that they cannot drive their cars onto their property in order to transfer from car to wheelchair.
- Wheelchair users and older people may have difficulty in using a wheelie bin. If minority groups have more difficulty than others this is not justified and reasonable adjustments will need to be made to enable everyone to use the bins provided.
- Provision may have to be made for larger families in terms of a larger or additional bin. Consideration will also have to be given to nappy disposal as well as incontinence pads.
- Those persons for whom English is not their first language may have difficulty in understanding written advice on the changes to the service.
- People without transport would have difficulty taking excess material to the civic amenity sites.

## 10. Conclusions

10.1 Given the legislative changes that come into force in 2015 it is recommended that the recycling contract starts with at least this range of materials. The best bid includes a wide range of recycling materials. To encourage recycling and reduce costs to afford such an

extensive recycling scheme it is recommended that refuse collection move to a fortnightly basis.

- 10.2 To accompany fortnightly refuse collection, a kitchen waste collection is desirable, preferably on a weekly basis. If this is collected weekly, then to save a separate collection service, it is recommended that all recyclables are collected weekly. It is therefore recommended that Option D be adopted.
- 10.3 As indicated in Exempt Appendices '1' and '2', when all the evaluation criteria are considered, the highest scoring tenderer is Biffa Waste Services and it is recommended that they be awarded the tender.
- 10.4 Although the decision to award this contract rests with this Committee, it has previously been agreed that any changes to the frequency of refuse collections will be made by Full Council, following a recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee. Given that the decisions on both the recycling contract and future of refuse collections are interdependent, it is recommended that this Committee makes a formal recommendation to the Corporate Management Committee.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

**the Corporate Management Committee be recommended to:**

- i) award the contract for the provision of a weekly recycling service for those materials in Option D at Exempt Appendix '2', including a weekly collection of kitchen waste;**
- ii) award the recycling contract to Biffa Waste Services commencing on 1 February 2011; and**
- iii) introduce the collection of refuse on a fortnightly basis commencing on 1 February 2011.**

**(TO RECOMMEND)**

Background Papers

The Waste Framework Directive (WFD) (Directive 2008/98/EC).

Stage One: Defra Consultation on the transposition of the revised Waste Framework Directive.

Memorandum of Understanding for the implementation of the Surrey Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

10. CABRERA TRUST MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – CONSTITUTION (DAL)

The Committee will note from the Minutes attached at Appendix 'F' that at its last meeting the Cabrera Trust Management Committee considered the future of the Riverside Walk Advisory Committee. For some while the Advisory Committee has not secured a large attendance at its meetings, and it is difficult to find representatives with the knowledge and time to fulfill its appointed task of specialist advice to the Cabrera Trust Management Committee on ecological and related matters.

The solution favoured by the Management Committee was to discontinue separate meetings of the Riverside Walk Advisory Committee and to invite the Honorary Wardens of the Riverside Walk (four in number), together with one volunteer advisor (proposed to be Mrs Hannah Lane, former Chairman of the Advisory Committee) to attend meetings of the Management Committee. This could be achieved in one of three main ways:

- i) The additional attendees to be sent copies of the Management Committee's agenda and invited to attend, but without any formal status.
- ii) The Constitution of the Management Committee be changed so that it has power to co-opt, and all the additional persons be co-opted formally to the Management Committee. In

theory this could create quite a large and cumbersome Committee, and is not necessary for the purpose of taking advice. However, it is unlikely that all the additional Members would be able to attend at once.

- iii) Formally co-opt two (Mrs Lane and one of the wardens) and invite the others to attend informally.

The current Constitution of the Management Committee is set out at Appendix 'D' and Clause 2 would require amendment either to provide for the routine invitation of additional persons to meetings, or to provide a power of co-option. The Cabrera Trust Management Committee initially considered co-option, but this is not a crucial issue. Co-option carries the disadvantage for the co-optees of fixing them with legal responsibility for the affairs of the Trust, instead of merely attending in an advisory capacity. Accordingly, although the approval of the Constitution is a matter for this Committee, Members may consider that a requirement to invite the wardens and advisor to attend offers the most practical and flexible way forward.

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

**the Director of Administration and Leisure be authorised to amend the Constitution of the Cabrera Trust Management Committee to provide for the regular invitation of the Honorary Wardens, and if available one volunteer advisor on flora, fauna, or ecology, to attend its meetings.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

Background Papers

None.

- 11. ADDLESTONE LEISURE CENTRE JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – MINUTES – 12 JANUARY 2010 (DAL)

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 January 2010 are attached at Appendix 'E'.

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

None.

- 12. CABRERA TRUST MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – MINUTES – 15 JANUARY 2010 (DAL)

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 15 January 2010 are attached at Appendix 'F'.

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

None.

- 13. RUNNYMEDE ARTS DEVELOPMENT STEERING GROUP – MINUTES – 2 FEBRUARY 2010 (DAL)

The Minutes of the meeting of the Steering Group held on 2 February 2010 are attached at Appendix 'G'.

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

None.

14. URGENT ACTION – STANDING ORDER 42 – GREEN FLAG AWARDS

The following action has been taken after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee under Standing Order 42.

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Central Index No.</u>
Head of Leisure Services	<p>Withdrawal from the Green Flag scheme in 2010</p> <p>The rules concerning the application process changed and Officers were unable to meet the deadline to submit a Management Plan for Heathervale Recreation Ground (the third park to be added to the scheme) which would have taken considerable Officer time both on site and behind the scenes.</p> <p>The cost of maintaining the Green Flag status for the two parks that have it now and entering a third park is prohibitive in the current financial climate (£8 - 14,000 per annum) and means resources are not available for more needy sites.</p> <p>Therefore, it is an opportune moment to withdraw from the Green Flag scheme in 2010 and consider alternative and perhaps more appropriate quality assessment tools which look at the Parks service as a whole.</p>	711

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

Proforma No 711 dated 14 January 2010.

15. URGENT ACTION – STANDING ORDER 42 – GROUNDS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

The following action has been taken after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee under Standing Order 42.

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Central Index No.</u>
Parks and Amenities Manager	<p>Extension of the Grounds Maintenance Contract by one year to end on 31 December 2011.</p> <p>The Service Review Working Group looking at Parks and Open Spaces has agreed that changes to the Parks service coming out of the service review might affect the Grounds Maintenance contract.</p> <p>Therefore, it is appropriate to extend the existing contract for a further 12 months so that potential changes can be considered, and if adopted, reflected in the new contract.</p>	715

**(FOR INFORMATION)**

Background Papers

Proforma No. 715 dated 3 February 2010.

16. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

**OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATION that –**

**the press and public be excluded from the meeting during discussion of the following reports under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the reports in question would be likely to involve disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.**

**(TO RESOLVE)**

**PART II**

**Matters involving Exempt or Confidential Information in respect of which reports have not been made available for public inspection**

- |     |   |               |
|-----|---|---------------|
| a)  | <u>Exempt Information</u>   | <u>paras.</u> |
| 17. | CHERTSEY MEADS – PROCUREMENT OF SERVICES FOR HIGHER LEVEL MANAGEMENT SCHEME                   | 1, 2 and 3    |
|     | Exempt Appendices '1' and '2' to item 9 'RENEWAL OF KERBSIDE RECYCLABLES COLLECTION CONTRACT' | 1, 2, 3 and 4 |
| b)  | <u>Confidential Information</u>   |               |
|     | (No reports to be considered under this heading)  |               |