

Cheltenham Borough Council
Cabinet – 16th September 2014
Mixed Plastics Bring Bank Recycling

Accountable member	Cllr Chris Coleman
Accountable officer	Scott Williams – Strategic Client Officer, Joint Waste Team
Ward(s) affected	All
Key Decision	No
Executive summary	This report provides an update on the mixed rigid plastic recycling trial at the 12 larger bring sites in Cheltenham and recommends to implement as a permanent recycling service enhancement, and to close the 4 smaller infrequently used recycling sites, as detailed in the report which went to Joint Waste Committee (JWC) in April 2014.
Recommendations	That Cabinet approves the implementation of permanent mixed rigid plastic recycling at the 12 strategic bring sites used in the trial, as supported by the business case, listed in paragraph 1.5 of this report and to close the 4 smaller sites listed in paragraph 1.7 of this report.

<p>Financial implications</p>	<p>Costs: There were no increased operational costs in running the trial and providing that the 4 smaller recycling sites are removed, there would not be any additional operational costs going forwards.</p> <p>Promotional costs of £800 from the 2014/15 waste promotions budget were used to promote the trial and it is envisaged that up to this amount would be required again, if the permanent launch of the service is endorsed. This will be financed from within existing budget.</p> <p>Income: Going into the trial it was estimated that there would be a reduction of £5,563 in material income as a result of not continuing to collect plastic bottles separately, due to the fact that mixed plastics do not attract any income; with an estimated increase of £1,031 in recycling credits as a result of the increase in material.</p> <p>However since the trial, Printwaste have reported that the quality of the material was actually lower than thought under the old plastic bottle service, so due to the volume increase, overall income has actually risen by £70 for the month of June. If this is a representative, then the Council would see an increase in income of approximately £840 per annum. There will however be an estimated reduction of £174 in material income and £508 in recycling credits by permanently closing the 4 smaller bring sites.</p> <p>The scheme therefore has proved to be essentially cost neutral with a modest net gain of £158 and therefore has no budgetary impact.</p> <p>Contact officer: Nina Philippidis, Business Partner Accountant nina.philippidis@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264121</p>
<p>Legal implications</p>	<p>Section 55 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 gives the Council as a waste collection authority the power to acquire waste with a view to recycling it.</p> <p>Contact officer: Donna Ruck, Solicitor donna.ruck@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272696</p>
<p>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</p>	<p>There are no direct HR implications for Cheltenham Borough Council associated with the recommendations contained within this report.</p> <p>Contact officer: Julie McCarthy, julie.mccarthy@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264355</p>

<p>Key risks</p>	<p>Due to the volatility of the current market, failure to secure an outlet for mixed rigid plastics on permanent introduction of the service enhancement may result in CBC having to suspend the service and/or stockpile/landfill the material. However, this low risk is further mitigated by CBC having a contract in place with Printwaste for it to accept the material and source the necessary re-processors. As the current contract with Printwaste ends in April 2015, the options for the sorting and purchasing of all recycling materials are being considered to ensure that security regarding the necessary outlets for all of the recycling material collected in Cheltenham including mixed plastics can continue.</p> <p>Failure to promote the permanent service enhancement properly may result in low participation, which may affect the business case for permanent bring site mixed rigid plastic recycling into the future. This low risk is mitigated by the experience gained during the trial and the Joint Waste Team (JWT) will work with the Council's communications team, project managing a specific communications programme to support the permanent launch of this service enhancement if endorsed by Cabinet.</p> <p>Failure to properly understand the likely yield of plastics being collected at the bring sites may result in Ubico not being able to cope with demand, which may lead to increased waiting times for bank emptying and associated complaints being received by the Council. This low/medium risk has been mitigated by the experience in the trial and the JWT has supported CBC and Ubico, in re-assessing the business case now that two months of results of the trial have been gained. Removing the 4 smaller bring sites, will help mitigate this risk.</p>
<p>Corporate and community plan Implications</p>	<p>Approval of this service enhancement supports the Council corporate plan within 'Enhancing and Protecting our Environment' under 'Improvements to Waste & Recycling Services'.</p>
<p>Environmental and climate change implications</p>	<p>The Council operated a plastic bottle bring site service before the mixed plastics trial and it is these containers which have been used for the purpose of the trial. Any increase in the carbon emissions created by the permanent introduction of mixed plastics banks being emptied more frequently, should be offset by the saving in not visiting the 4 smaller sites which this report recommends to close</p>
<p>Property/Asset Implications</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Contact officer: David Roberts@cheltenham.gov.uk</p>

1. Background

- 1.1 A large proportion of residents in Cheltenham are keen to see the opportunity to recycle mixed rigid plastics within their area and have made this clear to the Council and its Members.
- 1.2 Prior to the commencement of the mixed plastics trial in June 2014, the Council offered residents the opportunity to recycle plastic bottles at 12 bring sites across the borough.
- 1.3 Earlier this year Ubico presented a business case to the Joint Waste Team and the then Cabinet Lead which showed an opportunity to introduce mixed plastic recycling at 12 well used bring sites, provided that 4 smaller infrequently used sites were closed to free up the capacity required to

provide the enhanced service. This is because the skip vehicle drivers would not have to spend the time visiting each of these smaller sites periodically to check whether or not they needed emptying. Their availability would instead be concentrated on emptying the banks located at the larger sites.

1.4 In order to test the viability of the business case a trial has been completed of mixed rigid plastic recycling at these larger bring sites in Cheltenham, and there is now the potential to introduce a permanent service enhancement following the positive results having been received which support the business case.

1.5 The trial began in June at the 12 sites listed below;

- Caernarvon Road, Morrisons
- Priors Road, Sainsbury's
- Manor Road, Sainsbury's
- Bath Terrace car park
- Hatherley Lane, Asda
- Church Piece car park
- Edinburgh Place car park
- St James Street car park
- Sixways car park
- Everest Road, Old Patesians
- Swindon Road recycling centre
- Whaddon Road, CTFC

1.6 Following the analysis of two months of data from the trial the results support the business case and show that mixed plastic recycling can be introduced as a permanent service enhancement at the chosen bring sites.

1.7 As part of the permanent introduction and included in the business case, the 4 sites listed below would be closed;

- Tommy Taylor's Lane
- QE II playing fields
- St Marks Community Centre
- Sandford Lido car park

2. Reasons for recommendations

2.1 Having tested the viability of the business case for mixed rigid plastic recycling in Cheltenham at the 12 larger bring sites, through the completion of two months of the trial, the results have shown that there has been a small increase (by weight) in the amount of material being collected with the Morrisons, Hatherley store being the most successful, along with the Swindon Road Recycling Centre - with Ubico reporting approximately twice as many uplifts per week now being made (compared to the plastic bottle skips previously used).

2.2 The data below shows the actual increase from the previous plastic bottles bring bank service in June 2013 to mixed plastics in June 2014 - even though the material composition hasn't changed, this increase can be attributed to the promotions which were completed as part of the launch of mixed plastics trial. It's also worth noting that the weight of plastic bottles collected as part of the kerbside collections has also increased slightly year on year for this period, which proves that the increase at the recycling banks during the trial isn't a transfer of material from that previously collected at the kerbside;

	Plastic Bottles	Mixed Plastics
	Jun-13	Jun-14
Bring Sites	5.98	6.17
Swindon Road	0.9	1.3
Kerbside	18.62	18.79

- 2.3** The material purchaser (Printwaste) has reported that there has not been any reduction in quality of the material being delivered compared with that before the trial began under the previous plastic bottle service. This leads us to believe that customers using the previous 'plastic bottle' banks across the town were using them to deposit all types of mixed consumer plastics anyway.
- 2.4** The customer service and communications teams at CBC have reported no press negativity or large numbers of public complaints during the trial of mixed plastic bring bank recycling at the bring sites.
- 2.5** The trial has demonstrated there is demand for the facilities and rationale to introduce mixed plastic recycling at the 12 selected larger bring sites as a permanent service enhancement. This should continue to deliver a small increase in recycling performance at cost neutrality.

3. Alternative options considered

- 3.1** The Council has previously explored the options available for collecting mixed plastics from the kerbside, with Ubico conducting a modelling exercise to assess the likely financial implications, but at this point any kerbside collection of this commodity is not financially viable within current budget constraints.

4. Consultation and feedback

- 4.1** The recommendations contained within this report have been endorsed by the Joint Waste Committee Senior Management Group which received this report as at its meeting held on 22nd August.

5. Performance management – monitoring and review

- 5.1** If the recommendations within this report are approved, then following the completion of a tailored communications and promotions campaign launch, the mixed plastics yield will be reviewed on a quarterly basis along with the other commodities as part of the Councils and JWT's performance management process.

Report author	Contact officer: scott.williams@cotswold.gov.uk, 07775 420943
Appendices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk Assessment 2. Report which was presented and approved by JWC on 1st April 2014 3. Ubico business case for mixed plastic bring site recycling
Background information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk					
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register	
1.1	Plastics market volatility	SW	22.08.14	3	3	9	Reduce	Contract in place with Printwaste for material sale until April 2015.	N/A	Scott Williams	No	
1.2	Lack of promotion of service on launch could result in low participation	SW	22.08.14	3	1	3	Accept	Communications and Promotions campaign to be complete at permanent launch	4-6 weeks following approval of recommendation	Scott Williams	No	
1.3	High material yield affecting Ubico's ability to deliver service	SW	22.08.14	3	3	9	Reduce	Closure of the four smaller sites to mitigate this risk and increased available operational capacity	Risk will continue to be monitored as part of contract management	Scott Williams No		
Explanatory notes												
<p>Impact – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)</p> <p>Likelihood – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)</p> <p>Control - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close</p>												

Guidance

Types of risks could include the following:

- Potential reputation risks from the decision in terms of bad publicity, impact on the community or on partners;
- Financial risks associated with the decision;
- Political risks that the decision might not have cross-party support;
- Environmental risks associated with the decision;
- Potential adverse equality impacts from the decision;

- Capacity risks in terms of the ability of the organisation to ensure the effective delivery of the decision
- Legal risks arising from the decision

Remember to highlight risks which may impact on the strategy and actions which are being followed to deliver the objectives, so that members can identify the need to review objectives, options and decisions on a timely basis should these risks arise.

Risk ref

If the risk is already recorded, note either the corporate risk register or TEN reference

Risk Description

Please use “If xx happens then xx will be the consequence” (cause and effect). For example “If the council’s business continuity planning does not deliver effective responses to the predicted flu pandemic then council services will be significantly impacted.”

Risk owner

Please identify the lead officer who has identified the risk and will be responsible for it.

Risk score

Impact on a scale from 1 to 5 multiplied by likelihood on a scale from 1 to 6. Please see risk [scorecard](#) for more information on how to score a risk

Control

Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close

Action

There are usually things the council can do to reduce either the likelihood or impact of the risk. Controls may already be in place, such as budget monitoring or new controls or actions may also be needed.

Responsible officer

Please identify the lead officer who will be responsible for the action to control the risk.

For further guidance, please refer to the [risk management policy](#)

Transferred to risk register

Please ensure that the risk is transferred to a live risk register. This could be a team, divisional or corporate risk register depending on the nature of the risk and what level of objective it is impacting on

Joint Waste Committee

1st April 2014

Trial & Potential Permanent Service Enhancement of Mixed Rigid Plastics at Bring Sites in Cheltenham

Accountable Member

Cllr Roger Whyborn
Cabinet Lead CBC

Accountable Officer

Scott Williams
Strategic Client Officer - Joint Waste Team

Purpose of Report

To provide details of an opportunity to run a trial over a 12 week period of mixed rigid plastic recycling at a number of larger bring sites in Cheltenham, with the potential to introduce a permanent service enhancement if the results of the trial are favourable and support the business case.

Recommendation(s)

That the Joint Waste Committee;

Make the recommendation to Cheltenham Borough Council to complete a trial of mixed rigid plastic recycling at a number of the larger bring sites in Cheltenham.

Make the recommendation to Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) to implement permanent mixed rigid plastic recycling at strategic bring sites if the results of the trial are supported by the business case.

Reason for Recommendation(s)

To test the viability of the business case for mixed rigid plastic recycling in Cheltenham at the larger bring sites and the potential to introduce as a permanent service enhancement, which should increase recycling performance for both CBC, JWC and the GWP.

Financial Implications

There is an estimated reduction of £5,563 in material income and £1,031 in recycling credits as a result of not continuing to collect plastic bottles separately.

There is an estimated reduction of £174 in material income and £508 in recycling credits by permanently closing the smaller bring sites.

The total estimated reduction in income is £7,276.

If the results of the trial are positive and the permanent service enhancement is introduced, it is anticipated that these reductions in income will be largely mitigated by the increase in all materials being collected at the larger bring sites, as a result of the permanent implementation of mixed rigid plastic recycling.

In which case, it would therefore be proposed to offset any reduction in income from within the current CBC waste management revenue budget.

Key Risks

The following risks are associated with the recommendation(s) within this report;

Due to the volatility of the current market failure to secure an outlet for mixed rigid plastics on permanent introduction of the service enhancement may result in CBC having to suspend the service and/or stockpile/landfill the material. However, this risk is mitigated by CBC having a contract in place with Printwaste for it to accept the material and source the necessary re-processors.

Failure to promote the trial and potential permanent service enhancement properly may result in low participation, which may affect the business case for permanent bring site mixed rigid plastic recycling. This risk should be mitigated by the Joint Waste Team (JWT) working with the Council communications team project managing a specific communications programme to support both the trial and the potential permanent launch of this service enhancement.

Failure to properly understand the likely yield of plastics being collected at the bring sites may result in Ubico not being able to cope with demand, which may lead to increased waiting times for bank emptying and associated complaints being received by the Council. The risk should be mitigated by the JWT supporting CBC and Ubico in re-assessing the business case once the results of the trial have been analysed.

Appendices

Attached at Appendix A is the business case for mixed rigid plastic bring site recycling in Cheltenham which has been prepared by Ubico.

Conclusion

A large proportion of residents in Cheltenham are keen to see the opportunity to recycle mixed rigid plastics within their area and have made this clear to the Council and its Members.

Whilst the implementation of permanent mixed rigid plastic recycling bring sites does carry its own risks both financially and reputationally, it is anticipated that these can be mitigated by careful assessment of the business case following the trial and through a tailored communications and promotion campaign for both the trial and potential permanent introduction of this service enhancement.



Cheltenham Borough Council
Expanded plastic recycling following a bring site review
January 2014

Ubico serves 18 'Bring Sites' on behalf of Cheltenham Borough Council. The materials collected in the council's banks are cardboard, paper, plastic bottles, glass and cans. Other materials are collected at the sites via third party and charity banks but these are outside the scope of this review.

Performance over two 12-month periods has been analysed (September 2011 to August 2012, and September 2012 to August 2013), with the analysis focusing specifically on the following areas:

- ◇ The number of empties undertaken at each site
- ◇ The total tonnage collected from each site
- ◇ The contribution of each site to the total arisings from all the bring sites

The total number of empties undertaken reduced from 2000 in 2011-12 to 1650 in 2012-13 (-350 per annum).

The total tonnage collected from all the sites also reduced by just over 80 tonnes.

Supermarkets are the most popular sites with Morrisons being the most serviced site. Bath Terrace car park is also very popular and is one of the most challenging sites due to space constraints and the depositing of commercial waste.

Tommy Taylor's Lane, QE2 Playing Fields, Quat Goose Lane (now closed), St Marks Community Centre, High St Car Park and Sandford Lido Car Park require only a handful of empties each year (1 to 6).

North Place car park site is being closed due to redevelopment and this will release additional capacity within the service (100 empties per annum, or 2 per week).

Plastic bottles account for a relatively small percentage by weight but due to the nature of the material there is a requirement for regular servicing of the skips. If the range of plastic were expanded to include mixed rigid plastic then it is recommended that a cautious approach is taken with only the busiest sites promoted as receiving mixed plastics.

The 350 per annum lift capacity plus the 100 from North Place, provide capacity for 9 additional lifts per week (based on 50 week operation). The table on page 2 suggests how this capacity may be utilised to introduce mixed rigid plastic to a limited number of bring sites.

Recycle Bank	Number of plastic skips	Number of empties Sept 12-Aug 13	Average per week (divided by 50)	Recommend sites and estimated number of additional collections
Caernarvon Road, Morrisons	2	50	1	2
Priors Road, Sainsbury's	1	42	0.84	3
Manor Road, Sainsbury's	1	39	0.78	2
Bath Terrace Car Park	1	30	0.6	2
Hatherley Lane, Asda	1	24	0.48	1
Church Piece Car Park	1	21	0.42	N/A
Edinburgh Place Car Park	1	19	0.38	N/A
St James Street Car Park	1	16	0.32	N/A
Sixways Car Park	1	14	0.28	N/A
Everest Road, Old Patesians	1	4	0.08	N/A
Q.E. II Playing Field	1	2	0.04	N/A
Whaddon Road, CTFC	1	1	0.02	N/A
Total	15	262	5.24	10.0

It is recognised however that providing mixed plastic collections at a limited number of sites might be confusing to the public. If a decision was taken to decommission the less frequently used sites (Tommy Taylor's Lane, QE II Playing Fields, St Marks Community Centre, High St Car Park and Sandford Lido Car Park) then the capacity generated would enable all current plastic bottle skips to be used for mixed rigid plastics (with the exception of QE II which would be closed). This is shown in the table below.

Recycle Bank	Number of plastic skips	Number of empties Sept 12-Aug 13	Average per week (divided by 50)	Recommend sites and estimated number of additional collections
Caernarvon Road, Morrisons	2	50	1	2
Priors Road, Sainsbury's	1	42	0.84	3
Manor Road, Sainsbury's	1	39	0.78	2
Bath Terrace Car Park	1	30	0.60	2
Hatherley Lane, Asda	1	24	0.48	1

Church Piece Car Park	1	21	0.42	0.5
Edinburgh Place Car Park	1	19	0.38	0.5
St James Street Car Park	1	16	0.32	0.5
Sixways Car Park	1	14	0.28	0.5
Everest Road, Old Patesians	1	4	0.08	0.5
Whaddon Road, CTFC	1	1	0.02	0.5
Total	13	260	5.20	13.0

The Joint Waste team have confirmed that Printwaste have committed to supporting CBC to run a trial of mixed plastics. The contract with Printwaste has not yet been finalised and this proposal is captured in the Heads of Terms which as yet have not been signed off. However Printwaste seem to be receptive of receiving this material.

The plastics market is quite volatile at the moment and therefore represents a risk to the ongoing provision of this service. Reports have been received of other authorities stockpiling mixed rigid plastics as they cannot find a market for them and do not want to pay the landfill costs (having already claimed recycling credits).

Without knowing the quality of the material being collected Printwaste estimate that they would charge between £20 and £30 a tonne to take mixed rigid plastic. This is in contrast to £70 per tonne that CBC currently receives for plastic bottles. In 2012/13 a total of 75 tonnes of plastic bottles were collected from bring sites. The table below shows the financial impact on material income if the change were made.

Material	Tonnage	Price	Impact
Plastic bottles	75	£70 (income)	- £5,250
Mixed plastics (incl. bottles)	75	£25 (est. expenditure)	- £1,875
Mixed plastics (growth)	20 (est.)	£25 (est. expenditure)	- £500
Recycling Credits Increase	20	£51.55	+ £1,031
		Total	- £6,594

In addition, closure of the smaller recycling sites would result in an anticipated reduction in income as follows;

Material	Tonnage	Price	Impact
Glass	9	£10.50	- £94.50
Cans	0.5	£110.00	- £55.00
Plastic Bottles	0.36	£70 (loss)	- £25

Recycling Credits Loss	9.86	£51.55	- £508
		Total	- £682.50

Conclusions

The closure of the less frequently used bring sites (Tommy Taylor's Lane, QE II Playing Fields, St Marks Community Centre, High St Car Park and Sandford Lido Car Park), along with the closure of the North Place car park site, will provide sufficient capacity to introduce mixed rigid plastic collections at the other sites within existing budget.

This would however leave a gap in bring site provision in the west end of the town centre area. To overcome this consideration should be given to retaining the High Street car park site as it is currently not a busy site and will need little attention.

Without agreed prices and handling charges for mixed rigid plastics it is not possible for Ubico to accurately determine the cost / benefit of expanding plastic recycling at bring sites but this report shows that the skip operation can be delivered within existing budget.

Risks

Financial - The market for recycled plastics is known to be volatile and this will impact on income budgets.

Financial – contamination and the percentage mix of plastic bottles to other rigid plastic containers may change and increase handling charges.

Reputation - If an end market cannot be found then the material may have to be landfilled.