

MEETING: CABINET MEMBER - ENVIRONMENTAL
DATE: Friday 26 February 2010
TIME: 12.00 Noon
VENUE: Town Hall, Southport (this meeting will also be video conferenced to the Town Hall, Bootle)

Councillor

DECISION MAKER: Tattersall
SUBSTITUTE: Brodie - Browne

SPOKESPERSONS: P Hardy D Jones

SUBSTITUTES: Friel Ibbs

COMMITTEE OFFICER: Paul Fraser
Telephone: 0151 934 2068
Fax: 0151 934 2034
E-mail: paul.fraser@legal.sefton.gov.uk

The Cabinet is responsible for making what are known as Key Decisions, which will be notified on the Forward Plan. Items marked with an * on the agenda involve Key Decisions

A key decision, as defined in the Council's Constitution, is: -

- any Executive decision that is not in the Annual Revenue Budget and Capital Programme approved by the Council and which requires a gross budget expenditure, saving or virement of more than £100,000 or more than 2% of a Departmental budget, whichever is the greater
- any Executive decision where the outcome will have a significant impact on a significant number of people living or working in two or more Wards

If you have any special needs that may require arrangements to facilitate your attendance at this meeting, please contact the Committee Officer named above, who will endeavour to assist.

This page is intentionally left blank.

AGENDA

Items marked with an * involve key decisions

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Subject/Author(s)</u>	<u>Wards Affected</u>	
1.	Apologies for Absence		
2.	Declarations of Interest Members and Officers are requested to give notice of any personal or prejudicial interest and the nature of that interest, relating to any item on the agenda in accordance with the relevant Code of Conduct.		
3.	Minutes of Previous Meeting Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 February 2010		(Pages 5 - 12)
4.	Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme Report of the Head of Regeneration and Technical Services	Ainsdale; Blundellsands; Cambridge; Church; Dukes; Harington; Linacre; Manor; Meols;	(Pages 13 - 16)
* 5.	Recycling Collection Service - Future Service Specification Report of the Environmental Protection Director	All Wards	(Pages 17 - 44)
6.	Environmental Protection Department - Fees And Charges 2010/11 Report of the Environmental Protection Director	All Wards	(Pages 45 - 50)

This page is intentionally left blank

THE "CALL IN" PERIOD FOR THIS SET OF MINUTES ENDS AT 12 NOON ON WEDNESDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 2010. MINUTE NO. 95 IS NOT SUBJECT TO "CALL-IN".

CABINET MEMBER - ENVIRONMENTAL

MEETING HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, SOUTHPORT ON WEDNESDAY 10 FEBRUARY 2010

PRESENT: Councillor Tattersall

92. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P. Hardy, Ibbs and D. Jones.

93. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

94. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13 JANUARY 2010

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Member held on 13 January 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

95. REGIONAL COASTAL MONITORING PROGRAMME

The Cabinet Member considered the report of the Head of Regeneration and Technical Services seeking approval to submit a grant application to the Environment Agency (EA) for the Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme and for Sefton to be the lead Authority for this project.

The report indicated that a comprehensive Regional Coastal Monitoring Strategy was developed for the area from Llandudno to the Solway Firth and was submitted to DEFRA for grant approval in 2005; that this subsequently received a one year grant approval for 2007/8 amounting to £230,000 and a three year approval for the period from 2008 to 2011 amounting to approximately £1.9m; that as the current lead Authority for the North West Region, Sefton was involved with the development of the coordinated application for Regional Monitoring for the period from 2011 to 2016; and that it was proposed that Sefton remained as the lead authority for the North West Region for the next five years of the programme should the application for grant aid be successful.

The report concluded that the grant application for the North West Region would be in the region of £3 million for the five year programme compared with a total cost of £27 million for all the English Regions; and that all expenditure relating to the Regional Monitoring Programme would be grant

Agenda Item 3

CABINET MEMBER - ENVIRONMENTAL- WEDNESDAY 10 FEBRUARY 2010

aided at a rate of 100% and as such would have no direct implications on the Council budget.

RESOLVED: That Cabinet be requested to

- (1) approve the submission of the grant application for regional monitoring; and
- (2) approve that Sefton be the lead Authority for the project in the North West.

96. REFUSE COLLECTION AND RECYCLING - CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR 2009/2010 CATCH-UP REPORT

The Cabinet Member considered the report of the Environmental Protection Director advising of the outcome of the Christmas and new year refuse and recycling catch-up arrangements for the period 2009/10; and indicating that a decision on this matter was required in order to inform future decision making.

The report indicated that over the last 2 years a combination of calendars, stickers and leaflets/letters had been used to inform residents and businesses of the revised collections during the festive period; that for the Christmas period 2009/2010 it was agreed that a 'sticker' system should be used to communicate the revised collection days message to residents/businesses that had a bin collection service; and that letters, as used in the past, were distributed to properties that received the sack collection service.

The report detailed the revised collection arrangements for wheeled bins, colour banded sacks and dry recycling service/bring sites; and in particular how the weather disrupted the services during the period 5 to 19 January 2010.

The report concluded that to keep customers informed during the period of adverse weather, an update of the 'state of play' across the refuse collection and recycling services was provided to the contact centre on a twice-daily basis and the Council website was updated at least daily. Regular updates were also supplied to members in the Wards affected by the weather; and that many staff showed exceptional dedication to providing the service, going beyond what was expected, ensuring that collections were made wherever possible in extremely challenging conditions. Consequently despite all of the difficulties experienced normal grey/green collections re-commenced as planned from Tuesday 19 January 2010.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the issues that affected the refuse and recycling catch-up arrangements during the Christmas and new year 2009/10 period be noted; and

- (2) liaison be undertaken between the Cleansing and Highways Services to ensure the effective deployment of resources as part of the Winter Service Programme and thereafter a report be submitted to the Cabinet Member - Environmental.

97. CLEANSING SECTION - SERVICE PRESSURES

The Cabinet Member considered the report of the Environmental Protection Director providing a summary of current issues that were likely to affect future performance of the Cleansing Service; and indicating that a decision on this matter was required to consider the issues identified and to acknowledge the impact such issues may have on future targets and objectives.

The report indicated that following a request by the Cabinet Member a presentation was made to Cabinet on 3 November 2005 outlining the status of the Cleansing Service. The presentation identified successes, areas requiring development and outlined proposals for any potential "growth" that might be considered within future budget setting processes; and that since then, the Cleansing Service had continued to operate on a fixed base budget (other than for annual pay awards and some inflation allocation) but had secured external funding to augment core service provision via the Working Neighbourhoods Fund, Housing Market Renewal Initiative, Step-Clever and the Waste Resources Action Programme.

The report identified specific elements of Cleansing Services, where agreed targets were not being achieved or where there was a significant risk of under-achievement, together with corrective measures that had been established or were being considered to address the situation, in relation to the following:

- street cleansing services - graffiti removal
- street cleansing services - Chapel Street, Southport
- street cleansing services - Southport Town Hall frontage/garden
- street cleansing services - cycle track
- street cleansing services - pilot/splitter islands
- waste collection services - refuse collection
- waste collection services - bulky collections

The report concluded that the Cleansing Service had worked hard over recent years to improve refuse collection, recycling and street cleansing services in an attempt to achieve local and national targets and produce a cleaner, safer, green Sefton. The combination of budgetary savings, reductions in external funding and new/increased demands as outlined in the report would make it increasingly difficult to sustain performance at current levels. Whilst every opportunity would be explored to identify and implement changes to current services and existing resource deployment in order to sustain or improve current performance, it was possible that

Agenda Item 3

CABINET MEMBER - ENVIRONMENTAL- WEDNESDAY 10 FEBRUARY 2010

performance across the various service elements may suffer and agreed LAA targets not be achieved.

RESOLVED:

That the report on the potential impact of pressures on future performance and the measures that are being considered by Cleansing Services to address them within existing resources, be noted.

98. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT "WALKABOUTS"

The Cabinet Member considered the report of the Environmental Protection Director on the use of 'Walkabouts' by his Community Engagement Team to engage and encourage community participation; and indicating that a decision on this matter was required to raise awareness of 'Walkabouts' and their role in improving local environmental conditions and public involvement in service delivery.

The report indicated that an environmental Walkabout involved a planned inspection, "walking around" of an area looking for key environmental issues such as fly-tipping, litter, graffiti and dog fouling. It also encompassed wider areas of concern that those involved in the Walkabout wished to raise such as anti-social behaviour.

Anybody could participate in a Walkabout and a wide range of people did, including local residents; community representatives; Registered Social Landlords (RSL's); Councillors; Merseyside Fire Service; Merseyside Police; Cleansing; and Environmental Enforcement Officers. Other relevant Departments and individuals (e.g. Highways, Street Lighting, Network Rail, PCSO's etc.) were invited where a specific issue within their area of responsibility was known about.

The report concluded that once a Walkabout had been completed, the matters identified were referred to relevant partners; and that Walkabouts had proven to provide an effective means of community engagement, participation and partnership; and provided immediate and often sustainable solutions to local environmental issues and contributed to key performance indicators.

RESOLVED:

That the report on Community Engagement Walkabouts be noted and the continued use of Walkabouts as an effective means of facilitating community engagement, participation and public input into decision making and service delivery be approved.

99. A BETTER DEAL FOR CONSUMERS : DELIVERING REAL HELP NOW AND CHANGE FOR THE FUTURE

The Cabinet Member considered the report of the Environmental Protection Director advising of the White Paper “A Better Deal For Consumers: Delivering Real Help Now and Change for the Future” (the White Paper) published by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills in July 2009; and indicating that a decision on this matter was required to advise of the possible resource implications for the Trading Standards Section.

The report indicated that the White Paper set out the Government’s new, more active and strategic approach to financial and consumer markets by focusing on the following four key themes each of which were detailed in the report:

- Real help now for vulnerable consumers;
- A new approach to consumer credit;
- Empowering consumers through better enforcement and regulation; and
- Modernising consumer law.

The report concluded that the Trading Standards Section welcomed the White Paper and believed the measures contained in it would help boost consumer confidence; and looked forward to playing a key role in the consultation process. However it was important to be aware at an early stage of the potential resource implications for Sefton.

As an example of particular interest to those local authorities who oversaw the ports was the proposal to support product safety testing of imported goods at major ports. Whilst increasing the priority to be given to product safety enforcement was welcomed, how such enforcement was carried out needed to be particularly thought through. If the burden of testing all the goods coming through the container port was to fall on Sefton, the Trading Standards Service would be unable to cope with the imposed workload without significant additional resources, not only for testing but for the administration of such a testing regime.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the report on the new White Paper “A Better Deal for Consumers: Delivering Real Help Now and Change for the Future” be noted; and
- (2) further reports be submitted as the consultation process progressed.

Agenda Item 3

CABINET MEMBER - ENVIRONMENTAL- WEDNESDAY 10 FEBRUARY 2010

100. A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO TEST PURCHASING AGE RESTRICTED PRODUCTS

The Cabinet Member considered the report of the Environmental Protection Director advising of "A Practical Guide to Test Purchasing - A Practical Guide For Those Organisations Involved In The Conduct of Test Purchasing Operations Involving Young People And The Sale Of Age Restricted Products" (the Guide) published by LACORS in September 2009; and indicating that a decision on this matter was required as the control of age restricted sales had positive benefits for Community Safety and the health of young people; and that there was growing pressure from external organisations for the Council to increase the quantity of work in this important area.

The report indicated that local authorities had responsibility for the enforcement of legislation relating to the sale of age-restricted products such as tobacco, alcohol, knives and fireworks and that the participation of young people in test purchasing operations formed a valuable part of the local authority strategy designed to assess and maintain compliance with the legislation that dealt with age restricted products.

The report also detailed the main changes in the Guide; and the implications for the Trading Standards Section.

The report concluded that test purchasing exercises were resource intensive and responding to the increased level of underage alcohol sales in particular would place increased pressure of the limited resources available to the Trading Standards Service meaning the Trading Standards Manager had to prioritise test purchasing activities at the expense of other statutory duties.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the report on a practical guide to test purchasing age restricted products be noted; and
- (2) the continued use of test purchasing operations involving young people to enforce the legislation relating to age restricted products be approved.

101. REVENUE AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURE MONITORING TO 31 DECEMBER 2009

The Cabinet Member considered the joint report of the Environmental Protection Director and the Acting Finance and Information Services Director, informing of the quarterly forecast position based on information as at 31 December 2009, in relation to the Portfolio's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme.

The report indicated the details of the Portfolio's budgets that were monitored and reported on the risk-assessed basis as set out in Annex A of the report as follows:

- Payroll Costs
- Commercial Waste External Income
- Dry Recyclable Collection Costs
- Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority Recycling Credits
- Sales of Materials

The Portfolio's current Capital Programme was set out in Annex B of the report.

The report concluded by inviting comments about the overall performance of the Portfolio's revenue budget to the Cabinet for consideration.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the progress on the Environmental Portfolio's revenue budgets that are subject to risk-based monitoring be noted; and
- (2) the progress made on the schemes within the Portfolio's elements of the Council's Capital Programme be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

REPORT TO: Cabinet Member - Environmental
Cabinet

DATE: 26th February 2010
4th March 2010

SUBJECT: Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme

WARDS AFFECTED: Meols, Cambridge, Dukes, Ainsdale, Harrington, Manor,
Blundellsands, Church, Linacre

REPORT OF: Head Of Regeneration & Technical Services

CONTACT OFFICER: Graham Lymbery – Coastal Officer
Tel: 0151 934 2960

**EXEMPT/
CONFIDENTIAL:** No

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to seek Members' approval to procure survey services using the Buying Solutions Framework and to request that the Capital Programme be increased to reflect the revised cost of the project subject to Environment Agency approval.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

Approval is required to proceed with the procurement and changes to the capital programme

RECOMMENDATION(S):

It is recommended that subject to receiving 100% grant approval from the Environment Agency :

1) Halcrow Group Ltd are commissioned to undertake the survey via the Buying Solutions Framework at a cost of £295,000

2) the Capital Programme be increased to reflect the revised cost of the project.

KEY DECISION: NO

FORWARD PLAN: NO

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Following the call in period for the minutes of this meeting,

Agenda Item 4

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

Programme would either stop, be taken up nationally or another authority could take up the lead.

Loss of local control and experienced staff**IMPLICATIONS:****Budget/Policy Framework:**

Financial: There are no financial implications resulting from this report. The cost of the survey is estimated to be £295,000 and is subject to a successful application to the Environment Agency and 100% funding from grant.

<u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u>	2009/ 2010 £	2010/ 2011 £	2011/ 2012 £	2012/ 2013 £
Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton Capital Resources				
Specific Capital Resources				
<u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u>				
Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton funded Resources				
Funded from External Resources				
Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N	When?			
How will the service be funded post expiry?	New grant approval			

Legal:**Risk Assessment:****Asset Management:****CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS**

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

<u>Corporate Objective</u>		<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community		✓	
2	Creating Safe Communities	✓		
3	Jobs and Prosperity		✓	
4	Improving Health and Well-Being		✓	
5	Environmental Sustainability	✓		
6	Creating Inclusive Communities		✓	
7	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy		✓	
8	Children and Young People		✓	

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Agenda Item 4

1. Background

- 1.1 Based on recommendations from the first round of Shoreline Management Plans a Cell 11 (North West England) wide coastal regional monitoring strategy was developed. An approval was received in October 2007 for a 100% grant funded three year programme from 2008-2011.
- 1.2 Sefton Council act as co-ordinator for the development and delivery of the programme on behalf of all the Authorities in the Coastal Cell.

2. Variation to the monitoring programme and spend profile

- 2.1 Sefton Council are seeking a variation to the programme from the funding body, the Environment Agency, to undertake bathymetric surveys.
- 2.2 Following recommendations and upon reviewing the programme the original budget of £100k was found to be insufficient to undertake the required bathymetric surveys. A request for 100% grant funding has been made to the Environment Agency based on a revised spend profile of £295k in 2010/11.

3. Procurement methodology

- 3.1 The survey would be procured through the Buying Solutions framework. Buying Solutions is the national procurement partner for UK public services. It is an Executive Agency of the Office of Government Commerce in the Treasury and the Environment Agency are in agreement with this proposal.
- 3.2 The primary role of Buying Solutions is to maximise the value for money obtained by Government departments and other public bodies through the procurement and supply of goods and services. Buying Solutions is a Trading Fund which is run on commercial lines, with responsibility for generating income to cover its costs and make a return to the Treasury.
- 3.3 Sefton Council have procured a number of products and services using the Buying Solutions framework.
- 3.4 The contractor selected through the Buying Solutions framework is Halcrow Group Ltd.
- 3.5 The survey will only be procured once approval to fully fund the project has been received from the Environment Agency.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 It is recommended that subject to receiving 100% grant approval from the EA :
 - 1)Halcrow Group Ltd are commissioned to undertake the survey via the Buying Solutions Framework at a cost of £295,000.
 - 2) the Capital Programme be increased to reflect the revised cost of the project..

Agenda Item 5

REPORT TO: CABINET MEMBER – ENVIRONMENTAL
CABINET

DATE: 26 FEBRUARY 2010
4 MARCH 2010

SUBJECT: **RECYCLING COLLECTION SERVICE -
FUTURE SERVICE SPECIFICATION**

WARDS AFFECTED: All

REPORT OF: P Moore
Environmental Protection Director

CONTACT OFFICER: Jim Black
Assistant Director
0151 288 6133

EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL: No

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

To seek formal approval to commence the necessary processes to ensure that suitable arrangements are in place to continue to provide a recycling collection service when the current contractual arrangement expires.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

The current Dry Recycling Collection contract is due to end on 31 March 2011 and a recycling collection service must continue to be provided.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

That the Cabinet Member – Environmental recommends that Cabinet

- 1 Approve the recommendations made by the Overview & Scrutiny (Regeneration & Environmental Services) working group that “a ‘co-mingled collection’ be developed, subject to an acceptable/beneficial arrangement being recommended by Finance Directors and subsequently agreed by all MWDA member authorities and authorise the Operational Services Director to make the necessary arrangements for the implementation of the new recycling collection service that will operate from April 2011 onwards.
- 2 Pending a satisfactory conclusion to the above, to authorise simultaneously the Operational Services Director to make arrangements to tender for the provision of a kerbside sort recycling collection service, based on the materials currently collected with cost options for the addition of new materials.
- 3 That the potential cost increase associated with either collection service be noted and included in the Medium Term Financial Plan.

That Cabinet agree the above.

Agenda Item 5

--

KEY DECISION: Yes

FORWARD PLAN: Yes

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Following the call-in period of the Cabinet meeting.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework: Sefton is obliged to meet targets agreed with the Secretary of State for the Environment as contained in the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy. (currently under review)

Financial: The future recycling collection service is unlikely to be accommodated within the existing budget whichever type of collection service is chosen. A worse case figure of £1.96m is suggested for inclusion into the Council's MTFP for 2011/12.

<u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u>	2010/ 2011 £	2011/ 2012 £	2012/ 2013 £	2013/ 2014 £
Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton Capital Resources				
Specific Capital Resources				
<u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u>				
Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure		~1.9m		
Funded by:				
Sefton funded Resources				
Funded from External Resources				

Agenda Item 5

Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N	
How will the service be funded post expiry?	

Legal: The collection of at least four separate recyclable materials from households is scheduled to become a statutory requirement and the collection of plastics is likely to become a statutory duty.

Risk Assessment: The provision of a recycling collection service is a statutory function. £90m PFI allocation is dependent on Merseyside achieving at least 44% recycling.

Asset Management: The procurement of suitable vehicles and equipment will be necessary to provide the future service.

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS

Finance Department (FD 324) *Additional revenue funding will need to be allocated to the Recycling revenue budget to;*

- *accommodate the changes to additional collection costs (whatever service method is chosen); Compensate for the loss of recycling income from the sale of materials ; and cover any potential additional costs of the levy*

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

<u>Corporate Objective</u>		<u>Positive Impact</u>	<u>Neutral Impact</u>	<u>Negative Impact</u>
1	Creating a Learning Community		√	
2	Creating Safe Communities	√		
3	Jobs and Prosperity		√	
4	Improving Health and Well-Being		√	
5	Environmental Sustainability	√		
6	Creating Inclusive Communities		√	
7	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy	√		
8	Children and Young People		√	

Agenda Item 5

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Overview & Scrutiny (Regeneration & Environmental Services) working group – presentation and notes from meeting on 16th December 2009

Background

1. Sefton Council has provided a weekly recycling collection service to Sefton residents for the past eight years.
2. The weekly green box collection service, collecting paper, cans, glass bottles, textiles and food waste, has been successful in helping raise Sefton's recycling & composting rates to around 40% in conjunction with alternating refuse / green waste collection service arrangements.
3. The Council has a statutory duty to collect at least four materials for recycling from households as well as still having tonnage related recycling/composting targets to achieve.
4. The current contract with Abitibi Bowater Recycling Europe (subcontracted to P D Logistics) comes to an end on 31 March 2011 and cannot be extended. A household recycling collection service must continue to be provided from 1st April 2011 onwards to comply with our statutory obligations. The current contract includes the servicing and cleaning of bring banks.
5. Discussion has taken place with members of the Overview & Scrutiny (Regeneration & Environmental Services) working group to establish their preference for the type of recycling collection service that will operate from April 2011 onwards, either a continuation of the current kerbside sort recycling service with the addition of new materials or a change to the co-mingled collection system for dry recyclables via a (third) wheelie bin. This system requires the sorting of material at a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF).
6. The possibility of the co-mingled option follows protracted discussion with the four other Local Authorities on Merseyside and the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority to establish a suitable financial arrangement that would allow Sefton to make affordable use of the material recycling facilities that are now available.
7. The time for deliberating the future service is now over and arrangements need to be progressed, based on the working group's recommendations, for the subsequent procurement and supply of vehicles or other equipment for a new recycling service.
8. Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority (MWDA) has made provision within the newly procured Waste Management and Recycling Contract for the construction of a New Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) at Gilmoor. Levy contributions from Sefton include payments for the provision of the new Gilmoor facility, which will have sufficient capacity to manage Sefton's recyclables if collected co-mingled.

Agenda Item 5

Pressures for change

9. Although Sefton is closely approaching its current long-term recycling/composting target of 40% it is envisaged that a higher target of 50% will be imposed as the EU Waste Directive is transposed into national legislation later this year and regional and sub-regional strategies align.
10. There is also a significant desire from the Council and Sefton residents to recycle an increased range of materials from their homes, particularly the recycling of plastic bottles and cardboard. These materials can be accepted at the MWDA's new MRF which is under construction at Gillmoss and should be operational by the first quarter of 2011. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has concluded that delivering recyclable materials to this facility would be the most practical option when considering how to incorporate both of these materials into a new recycling service.
11. The addition of both plastic and cardboard could add around 5% to the weight based recycling rate, together with a significant amenity value for residents. The addition of these materials may also increase the overall participation and capture of other targeted materials.

Preferred New Recycling Collection Service

12. The members of the Overview & Scrutiny (Regeneration & Environmental Services) working group recommended, at the meeting on the 16th December 2009, that a 'co-mingled collection' be introduced, subject to an acceptable/beneficial arrangement being agreed by all MWDA member authorities. The financial implications are considered further in paragraphs 23 - 37.
13. Under a co-mingled collection system recyclable materials are stored, collected and transported mixed together. The vehicle delivers the mixed recyclables to a material recycling facility (MRF) where it is partly mechanically and partly hand sorted into the different materials. Once separated each material is then bulked and transported to the material reprocessors. The benefit of this service is that a single vehicle can collect a greater range of materials, although contamination of materials can be a problem.
14. The new MWDA recycling contract with the MRF operators, Veolia, has secured markets for all Merseyside recyclables for the next 20 years.
15. Problems can arise with 'co-mingled collection' if the material collected is not controlled. Contamination with refuse or untargeted materials such as plastic film or shredded paper can upset the workings of the MRF, increase rejection rates and result in financial processing penalties. It is therefore important to avoid contamination and to keep any materials the MRF is not designed to process out of the collection.

16. The co-mingled collection system can use a variety of containers including boxes, bags or wheelie bins, which are emptied into a collection vehicle. For the majority of properties, where grey and green wheelie bins are already being used, a further wheelie bin will be provided for storage and collection of recyclable materials as the additional materials, plastic and cardboard, are bulky.
17. It has been accepted by the Overview and Scrutiny working group that a fortnightly frequency for collection, where wheelie bins are suitable for use, is the most practical service option. This is based on the greater secure storage capacity they offer and proven methodology used by other local authorities across the country. Co-mingled recycling collection services that utilise a wheelie bin as the means for storage and collection generally operate on a fortnightly frequency.
18. For properties in Sefton that currently have non-recyclable waste collected via the colour-banded plastic sack service (where wheelie bins are not suitable) the current weekly dry-recyclable collection service (boxes and bags) will continue with additional container(s), probably plastic bags, provided for the additional materials. All of the recyclable material collected will be mixed together on the collection vehicle and will be delivered to the MRF for sorting/separation.
19. The co-mingled collection service would not allow textiles to be collected as these materials would be soiled and cannot be processed by the MRF, therefore textiles would no longer be collected via a co-mingled service. Residents would be encouraged to take good unwanted clothes to charity shops, make use of the numerous charity collections or to take unwanted textiles to Household Waste & Recycling Centres or Bring Sites.

Food Waste

20. Sefton currently provides a weekly opt-in food waste service and it is important, due to the amount of food waste in the waste stream (~20%) that a weekly service for the collection of this waste remains.
21. Last year Sefton collected 2400 tonnes of food waste. It is anticipated that annual tonnage will increase as a result of a further distribution of food waste caddies to ~30,000 households, due to take place in February 2010. These caddies will be delivered to properties that have not previously 'asked to participate' on an opt-out basis. The Cabinet Member has received previous reports about this initiative, which is fully funded by the Waste Resources Action Programme (WRAP).
22. Under the new recycling service food waste will continue to be collected on a weekly basis, on the same day as other containers are collected/emptied, but will be collected via a separate vehicle that will only collect food waste should a co-mingled service be introduced. It is anticipated that a separate collection system would improve the quality of this service.

Agenda Item 5

Financial Implications

23. Sefton's participation in co-mingled collection within the partnership using MWDA's recycling facility has obvious benefits to Merseyside as a whole. Anticipated income from the sales of materials shared between the MWDA and the MRF operators, Veolia, plus the reductions in Landfill Tax as Sefton's recycling tonnages expand, are estimated in the region of -£1.3m or possibly ~£2m if St Helens participate. However, the headline saving hides a potentially significant additional financial burden for Sefton, whilst other Merseyside authorities would benefit.
24. The Council would need to incur additional expenditure, in the order of £1m, to introduce the new co-mingled service. This relates to vehicle, bins and staffing costs for the new service – this is discussed further below. In addition, there would be a loss of income to Sefton from the sale of recyclable materials if a co-mingled service were to be introduced; the Council currently budgets for approximately £0.4m for income. This income currently helps to offset the gross cost of current recycling collection services.
25. It should be noted that the expansion of the existing kerbside service to collect additional recyclables would also incur additional spend; however, the additional amount would be subject to a tender arrangement and therefore the level of this is unknown at this stage.
26. In addition to the operational costs identified above, the current levy methodology could add a further additional charge of £1m from the MWDA, due to Sefton's current recycling tonnage being incorporated in the levy calculation. Therefore, the introduction of co-mingled collection could (as a worst case scenario) add ~£2m to Sefton's expenditure i.e. an unreasonable financial burden.
27. The other Merseyside Councils have indicated their willingness to consider options that would be of mutual financial benefit, including a phasing-in of the change. Merseyside Finance Directors have been tasked with trying to identify a satisfactory methodology. At the time of writing this report, an agreement/recommendation has not been established; the Finance Directors are due to meet again on the 9 March 2010. It should be noted that, even if a mutually acceptable proposal could be agreed at this meeting, it would still require each individual Authority to formally agree to its introduction. It is anticipated that a verbal report will be provided by Finance at the Cabinet Member – Environmental and Cabinet meetings.
28. The payment of recycling credits from the MWDA is a cost neutral exercise through the levy calculation mechanism. Sefton pays via the levy, and receives back, roughly equivalent recycling credits. Members should be mindful, that if Sefton joins the MWDA's MRF, these credits will no longer be payable on the dry recyclates. This would mean a reduction in both levy expenditure and

Agenda Item 5

income back, of around £900k, requiring a “netting down” budget adjustment to be made between the levy and the income budget currently held within the recycling accounts i.e. no overall impact.

29. The income from recycling credit claimed for compostable material, collected via green wheelie bins and diverted away from MWDA facilities, will continue to be claimed. Therefore the current income target associated with this service will be retained.
30. The 2010/11 MWDA levy has recently been announced, and Sefton’s increase is 1.3% on the 2009/10 figures. This lower level of increase can be attributed to the improved performance of our recycling collections, based on data provided from 2008/9.
31. Any further improvement in recycling performance will again reduce the amount by which the ‘waste levy’ will increase in future (‘less more’ to coin the previous Environmental Protection Director’s phrase).
32. Technically, under the levy calculation formula, there should also be a significant additional cost to Sefton Council for handling recyclable materials at MWDA sorting facilities. However, the actual cost to MWDA for extra waste passing through the MRF could be nominal under the current contract. As part of the mutually beneficial arrangement that is currently subject to negotiation, it is anticipated that Sefton may receive the benefit of a reduced gate fee for delivering co-mingled recyclable waste to such facilities (rather than the actual levy rate). The MWDA, and therefore all the Merseyside authorities would benefit due to the economy achieved from handling additional tonnage under their contract with Veolia at the true marginal cost and by the further reduction in the amount of waste going to landfill.
33. The current containers provided for the storage and collection of recyclable materials are not the most suitable storage option should a fortnightly co-mingled dry waste recyclables collection service be introduced. Over 100,000 wheelie bins would need to be purchased for use on fortnightly co-mingled recyclable collection and distributed at total cost of ~£2.5m, an annual prudential borrowing cost of around £250,000 to be incorporated into the recycling revenue budget. It may be possible that the overall annual revenue cost could be reduced by using some of the Waste Capital Infrastructure Grant (WCIG) available to Sefton, to purchase some of the wheelie bins. At this stage however, the use of this funding is only under consideration, and has been excluded from the overall £2m worse case scenario identified above.
34. A new fleet of vehicles will also be required to provide this service, and parking space will need to be created at both of the main depots to accommodate this fleet. The WCIG will be used to fund the development of each depot to address this need. It is also a possibility that this grant may be used towards some of the vehicle lease costs. However this use of the grant has also yet to be considered, and no contribution from this source has been assumed in the figures shown in this report. Detailed reports will be presented, regarding

Agenda Item 5

vehicles and procurement as the method of future recycling collection is agreed.

35. If the financial arrangements are not beneficial to Sefton, and do not facilitate a change to a co-mingled service, it should be noted that procuring, via tender, a continuation of the existing kerbside sort recycling collection service, with or without additional recyclable materials (i.e. plastic and/or card), is likely to cost significantly more than the current service.
36. When the current contract was procured the Contractor was willing to negotiate a variation (reduction) to their original tender and the majority of the fleet of vehicles made available at the start of the contract were paid for via DEFRA (external) grant funding. Since then food waste has been added to the range of recyclable materials collected and would be a requirement under a new contract. The addition of high volume but low weight materials, such as plastic and cardboard, are likely to substantially increase the cost if collected separately under a new contract.
37. Whichever service is ultimately established it will have a significant financial impact, therefore the anticipated cost will need to be included in the Medium Term Financial Plan for 2011/12 onwards.

Other Implications

37. If a change to a co-mingled collection service is agreed it has been accepted by the Overview & Scrutiny (Regeneration & Environmental Services) working group that it would be appropriate to provide this service directly rather than contract it out.
38. The benefits outlined in the presentation made to the working group on the 16th December 2009 are attached as appendix A. The recommendations of the group, as recorded/noted, are attached as appendix B.
39. The current contract also includes the Bring Site recycling collection service, this element will be included if it is decided to procure a new recycling service contract (continue with a kerbside sort recycling collection service). However, if members agree to introduce a co-mingled service, it would also be financially beneficial to manage the Bring Site recycling service directly (internally) via the Cleansing section.
40. Due to the delay in establishing a Merseyside wide agreement it will no longer be possible to consult in detail or at length about the specification for the new service/contract should the recommendation to introduce a co-mingled recycling collection service not be possible. There is now increased time pressure to commence any EU procurement processes that are necessary, to avoid difficulties at the end of the current contract
41. Sefton currently has the highest combined recycling/composting rate on Merseyside. However, the current yield per household on the Wirral for dry recyclables, via a fortnightly collection of a 3rd wheelie bin with co-mingled

recyclables, is better. Wirral's dry recycling rate is 22.5% compared to Sefton 18%. The addition of new materials via a co-mingled collection could potentially increase dry recyclable capture rates by around 5% and take Sefton's recycling and composting rate to the mid forties %. If the Wirral rate was applied to Sefton, it could take our annual dry recycling tonnage up from ~17,000 to ~23,000 tonnes.

Summary

42. Sefton is statutorily required to continue to provide a recycling collection service. The current contract cannot be extended beyond 31st March 2011. The new service will cost more and will therefore require a significant amount of additional funding, regardless of which type of service is preferred. The Overview & Scrutiny (Regeneration & Environmental Services) working group have considered all of the advantages and disadvantages associated with each type of recycling collection service and have recommended the co-mingled service.
43. The co-mingled service does provide an opportunity for resident's to recycle both plastic bottles and cardboard, the Council is often criticised for being unable to offer the collection of these materials via the current collection service. The collection of plastic is likely to become a statutory requirement in future. Local experience suggests that the amount of recyclable material collected via a fortnightly co-mingled wheelie bin service will increase. Such an increase will be of benefit to Merseyside as a whole, but at extra cost to Sefton whatever the method of collection adopted in the future.

This page is intentionally left blank

KERBSIDE RECYCLING COLLECTION WORKING GROUP

MEETING HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, BOOTLE ON WEDNESDAY, 16 DECEMBER, 2009, AT 2.00 P.M.

PRESENT:- Councillors:- Booth, Cluskey, C. Mainey and S. Mainey.

ALSO PRESENT:- Councillor D. Tattersall, Cabinet Member – Environmental;
Dave Packard, Assistant Director Environmental Protection;
Jim Black, Assistant Director, Environmental Protection;
Clare Bowdler, Recycling Contract Monitoring Officer;
Ian Aylward-Barton, Scrutiny Support Officer.

1. APOLOGIES

Councillors Papworth and Pearson,

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

The following declaration of interest was received:-

Member	Minute No.	Reason	Action
Councillor Cluskey	3.	Personal Interest – he is a Member of Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority	Took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon.

2. FUTURE RECYCLING SERVICE OPTIONS

The Working Group received a presentation explaining what recycling service options were potentially available in future. The presentation addressed the following issues which were fully discussed by Members:-

(i) Waste Directives & Future Performance

Article 11 of the revised waste framework directive which would be implemented from 12th December 2010 required member states to promote re-use and collect at least paper (and cardboard) metal, plastics and glass by 2015. The directive further required member states to recycle a minimum of 50% waste by weight by 2020.

The presentation also gave details of the current best performing Local Authorities in the U.K.

Agenda Item 5

(ii) The Options – Co-mingled or Kerbside Sort

Members received an explanation of each option and the basic differences.

The Co-mingled collection service would require the provision of a third wheeled bin, which would take glass, cans, plastics and cardboard and would be collected within the alternating system and sorted at an MWDA facility. In areas where it has not been possible or practical to provide wheeled bins an additional bag or box would be provided.

The Kerbside sort collection service would require the provision of a number of smaller separate containers for recyclable commodities and these would be collected and separated at the point of collection.

(iii) A summary of the Pro’s & Con’s of each option:-

Co-mingled	Kerbside Sort
1.Easy for residents 2.Less labour intensive 3.Easier to service HMO’s 4.Less litter 5.No bulking station 6.One end user – Veolia 20 yr 7.Bring in-house: uniformity in services, respond to change 8.Contamination 9.Separate food waste collection 10.Plastic bottles and cardboard	1.Multiple collection containers 2.Labour intensive 3.Harder to service HMO’s 4.More litter issues 5.Large bulking/transfer station 6.Multiple end users – markets? 7.Remain contracted out: possible service conflict 8.High quality material 9.One pass with food possible 10.Plastic bottles or cardboard??

(iv) Issues to consider (for either option);

- (a) Storage/containment;
- (b) Frequency of collections;
- (c) In-house/out-sourced;
- (d) Consultation;
- (e) Staffing (TUPE);
- (f) Food waste service;
- (g) Service Performance;
- (h) Costs;
- (i) Publicity/Promotion;
- (j) Bring Site service; and
- (k) Environmental Impact.

Having regard to Consultation/publicity and promotion Members discussed a number of options, and it was the general view that, as the alternating weekly collection had only recently been rolled out, and that the proposals to extend the amount and type of recyclable materials

collected was largely in accordance with views expressed by the public, it would be appropriate to publicise the change and how the new system would operate but that a wide scale consultation similar to that carried out prior to the implementation of the alternating weekly collection was not necessary.

In respect of the costs of the service, the set up costs of either co-mingled or Kerbside sort were broadly similar however discussions were ongoing with the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority regarding the Council taking up their services. It was hoped that a satisfactory conclusion would be agreed in the near future.

Having considered all of the above Members were in agreement that, subject to the resolution of financial issues with the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority, the co-mingled collection would be the preferred option for the future recycling service.

(v) Key Timescales;

Proposals were required to be reported to the Cabinet Member – Environmental and to Overview & Scrutiny – Regeneration & Environmental Services early in 2010 to obtain approval to progress the preferred option and to formulate plans to establish the future recycling service when the current contract expired at the end of March 2011.

It was Agreed: That:-

- (1) the information presented be received;
- (2) subject to the satisfactory resolution of financial issues with the MWDA the Working Group supports the option of pursuing a co-mingled collection for the future recycling service;
- (3) in view of the new service being a response to many requests for recycling to be enhanced (to include plastic and cardboard) consultation in the form of information as to how the new service will operate be pursued only, possibly by way of the Council's Area Committees; and
- (3) if necessary a further meeting of the Working group take place on 5 January 2010 at Southport Town Hall (prior to the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration and Environmental Services) at 6.30 pm) in order to inform those Members unable to attend this meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank



recycle for Sefton

The Future

Which Way Next?

The Options

Co-mingled collection - Kerbside sort collection



Revised Waste Framework Directive*

Article 11

By 2015 Member States must:

- Promote Re-Use
- Collect at least paper (& cardboard), metal, plastics and glass

By 2020 Member States must:

- Recycle a minimum of 50% by weight



The Best Performers:

- Staffordshire Moorlands DC: **61.58%** - Co-mingled **3 bin system**
- Cotswold DC: **60.83%** - Kerbside sort, box and bag, fortnightly
- East Lindsey DC: **59.45%** - Co-mingled **3 bin system**
- South Hams DC: **57.90%** - Two Stream Co-mingled, 2 bins/2 Sacks
- South Shropshire DC: **57.45%** - Kerbside sort, box, fortnightly
- Teignbridge DC: **57.37%** - Kerbside sort, 2, boxes fortnightly
- Huntingdonshire DC: **57.16%** - Co-mingled **3 bin system**
- Waveney DC: **55.91%** - Co-mingled **3 bin system**
- North Kesteven DC: **55.96%** - Co-mingled **3 bin system**
- Uttlesford DC: **53.73%** – Co-mingled **3 bin system**
- **SEFTON CURRENTLY ~ 40% (~18% dry recycle)**
- **Wirral has higher dry recycling ~23% with 3 bin AWC system**

The Pros and Cons

Co-mingled

1. Easy for residents
2. Less labour intensive
3. Easier to service HMO's
4. Less litter
5. No bulking station
6. One end user – Veolia 20 yr
7. Bring in-house: uniformity in services, respond to change
8. Contamination
9. Separate food waste collection
10. Plastic bottles and cardboard

Kerbside Sort

1. Multiple collection containers
2. Labour intensive
3. Harder to service HMO's
4. More litter issues
5. Large bulking/transfer station
6. Multiple end users – markets?
7. Remain contracted out: possible service conflict
8. High quality material
9. One pass with food possible
10. Plastic bottles or cardboard??

Co-mingled

1. 3rd Wheelie Bin - instead of box
2. Sack area methodology - box
3. Separate weekly food waste collection
4. Public Consultation? AWC feedback
5. In/out sourced
6. Procurement process
7. TUPE transfer of staff
8. Implementation – roll out
9. Communicate change
10. Education – MRF input specification
11. Cost



Kerbside Sort

1. Add plastics and/or cardboard
2. Material specification & commodity value, but subject to market price fluctuation
3. Additional box or bags
4. Keep weekly/alternate weeks
5. Weekly food waste - liners
6. Re-tender process
7. Implementation
8. Communicate change
9. Service performance
10. Education
11. Cost of enhancement?



Bring Banks

- Kerbside Sort:
Remain as part of
Contract
- Co-mingled: Managed
in-house with end-
user partners



Environmental Impact

- Co-mingled should bring ~5% recycling rate rise as cardboard, plastic bottles added and collection volume increased
- Kerbside recycling gain less sure – difficulty in adding both cardboard and plastic in easy collection service - relying more on active sorting by residents for different materials each week
- Higher fuel use for commingled collection fleet but offset by recycling / landfill avoidance gain
- A 5% increase in recycling would save ~£0.5m per year on the Waste Disposal Levy

Environmental Permitting

Co-mingled:

- MRF Responsibility of MWDA – MRF performance influenced by quality of input from us and other Merseyside users

Kerbside Sort:

- Our responsibility: Managing Contractors, end user issues

Key Timescales

Co-mingled

Cabinet Member (January 2010)
Consultation (January)
Overview & Scrutiny (February)
Cabinet Member (February)
Cabinet (March)
Round Planning (April/May)
Implementation Planning (May/June)
Vehicle Procurement (May/June)
Overview & Scrutiny (June)
Container Procurement (June)
Cabinet Member (August)
Cabinet (September)
Serve Notice to Contractor (?)
Staffing/TUPE issues (to March 2011)

Kerbside Sort

Cabinet Member (January 2010)
Specification (January)
Overview & Scrutiny (February)
Cabinet Member (February)
Cabinet (March)
Procurement/Tendering (March)
Tender Evaluation (May/July)
Overview & Scrutiny (July)
Cabinet Member (August)
Cabinet (September)
Serve Notice/Award Contract (Oct)
Staffing/TUPE issues (to March 2011)

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

REPORT TO: Cabinet Member – Environmental
Cabinet

DATE: 26th February 2010
4th March 2010

SUBJECT: **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DEPARTMENT
FEES & CHARGES 2010/11**

WARDS AFFECTED: All Wards

REPORT OF: Peter Moore
Environmental Protection Director

CONTACT OFFICER: Peter Moore
Environmental Protection Director
0151 934 4020

EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL: No

PURPOSE/SUMMARY:

To propose changes/increases in fees and charges in 2010/11 for the range of services delivered by the Environmental Protection Department.

REASON WHY DECISION REQUIRED:

In order to achieve the income requirement of the department for 2010/11.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

That the Cabinet Member – Environmental endorses the proposed fees and charges for 2010/11 listed in Annex A and recommends their adoption, together with the LAPPC fees and charges for 2010/11 once announced by DEFRA, to Cabinet.

That Cabinet approve the Environmental Protection Department's proposed fees and charges for 2010/11 and agrees the adoption of the LAPPC fees and charges for 2010/11 once announced by DEFRA..

KEY DECISION: No

FORWARD PLAN: N/A

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: N/A

Agenda Item 6

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS:

Not to agree the proposed fees and charges which would have budgetary implications for the department in meeting its income targets.

IMPLICATIONS:

Budget/Policy Framework: Fees and Charges are outside the budget setting framework

Financial:

Some of the Department's fees & charges are set nationally, where this is not the case the increases proposed are required for the department to meet its incomes targets and to reflect external financial escalators.

<u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u>	2009/ 2010 £	2010/ 2011 £	2011/ 2012 £	2012/ 2013 £
Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Funded by:				
Sefton Capital Resources				
Specific Capital Resources				
<u>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</u>				
Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Funded by:				
Sefton funded Resources				
Funded from External Resources				
Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N	When?			
How will the service be funded post expiry?				

Legal: N/A

Risk Assessment: N/A

Asset Management: N/A

CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN/VIEWS:

Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director

Agenda Item 6

CORPORATE OBJECTIVE MONITORING:

Corporate Objective		Positive Impact	Neutral Impact	Negative Impact
1	Creating a Learning Community		✓	
2	Creating Safe Communities		✓	
3	Jobs and Prosperity		✓	
4	Improving Health and Well-Being		✓	
5	Environmental Sustainability		✓	
6	Creating Inclusive Communities		✓	
7	Improving the Quality of Council Services and Strengthening local Democracy		✓	
8	Children & Young People		✓	

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS RELIED UPON IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

None.

Agenda Item 6

Background

1. Other than any areas specifically identified in the Council's budget proposals, the setting of fees and charges falls outside the budget setting framework and it is left to individual departments to determine any need for increases. Fees and charges levied by the Environmental Protection Department are reviewed and adjusted to reflect current service delivery costs (including material costs such as pesticides, cleaning chemicals etc.), national guidelines and/or inflation. None of the fees and charges included within this report for services delivered by the Environmental Protection Department has been specifically identified in the Council's budget proposals for 2010/11.
2. Some areas where the Environmental Protection Department levy a fee or charge are controlled by national arrangements/guidelines e.g. LACORS or DEFRA. In most other areas the increases proposed are inline with inflation, taking into account the September Retail Price Index (RPI), the same measure used by the Government for uprating pensions and benefits, and any additional actual inflationary costs experienced (i.e. pesticide costs, fuel costs and pay award). DEFRA have not as yet published LAPPC fees and charges for 2010/11, Sefton Council has no discretion in relation to these fees and charges and the Cabinet Member/Cabinet are asked to approve their adoption in advance of their publication by DEFRA.

Trading Standards

3. Following a review of the methodology for setting verification fees, LACORS Guidance has now moved away from a fee for each type of equipment to an hourly cost based on the provision of a single weights and measures inspector, reflecting salary levels plus all the necessary on-costs for the delivery of such a service (including on-costs training, management, administration, infrastructure, transport and equipment). There is an additional charge where additional staff are required. This simpler method allows councils to better demonstrate that fees levied cover costs of providing the service.

Building Cleaning

4. It is not proposed to increase charges for Building Cleaning contracts (including the Core Contract) at this time, other than where an annual uplift is specified within the contract.

Agenda Item 6

Annex A

Details	VAT rate	Date of last increase	Previous 2009/10 charges £ p	Proposed 2010/11 charges £ p	Percentage increase on charge %
---------	----------	-----------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------------

DOG WARDEN SERVICE

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (STRAY DOGS) REGULATIONS (1992)

Seizure and detention of Stray Dogs

Collection of dog by owner from RSPCA kennels within 48 Hours of dog arriving at kennels	O	Introduced 1.4.09	35.00	35.00	0.0%
--	---	----------------------	-------	--------------	------

Collection of dog by owner from RSPCA kennels after 48 Hours of dog arriving at kennels until end of retention period.		1.4.09	85.00	85.00	0.0%
--	--	--------	-------	--------------	------

Microchipping of Dogs		1.4.09	12.30	12.70	3.0%
-----------------------	--	--------	-------	--------------	------

Microchipping fees are only levied in relation to the actual costs incurred in purchasing the microchips. When microchips are provided free no charge is levied.

HMO LICENSING

HMO Licensing fees are levied over a 5-year period.

The fees below relate to the annual proportion of that 5-year fee i.e. 20% per year.

Annual licence fee per unit (up to a maximum of 6 units per premise)	O	n/a	32.00	32.00	0.0%
--	---	-----	-------	--------------	------

Annual licence fee per unit (each additional unit over 6 units per premise)		n/a	10.00	10.00	0.0%
---	--	-----	-------	--------------	------

PEST CONTROL SERVICE

Domestic Premises:

Treatment of one wasp nest	O	1.4.09	48.50	50.00	3.0%
----------------------------	---	--------	-------	--------------	------

Treatment of one ant nest		1.4.09	56.00	58.00	3.5%
---------------------------	--	--------	-------	--------------	------

Rats, Mice, Fleas, Bedbugs, Cockroaches			Free	Free	
---	--	--	------	-------------	--

Commercial / Industrial Premises (including communal areas of tenanted domestic properties):

Normal hours (Monday to Friday 9am - 5pm) Treatment of any vermin, wasps or ants - minimum charge per visit.	S	1.4.09	69.00	71.00	3.0%
--	---	--------	-------	--------------	------

For every 15 minutes per operative after first 30 minutes plus materials and other specific costs		1.4.09	23.00	23.70	3.0%
---	--	--------	-------	--------------	------

Outside normal hours calculated at 1.5 times normal hours rate.

Sundays and Bank Holidays calculated at 2 times normal hours rate.

Agenda Item 6

GYPSY CARAVAN SITE, BROAD LANE, FORMBY

Pitch Charges per week

Single	O	1.4.09	55.60	57.30	3.0%
Double		1.4.09	61.50	63.40	3.0%
Single let as double		1.4.09	58.90	60.70	3.0%

In addition to the above residents will be re-charged for electricity and water usage at the rate set by the utility provider and in accordance with actual usage obtained from regular meter readings.

TRADING STANDARDS

N.B. Charges are in accordance with the national recommendations set by L.A.C.O.R.S.

Weights and Measures Inspector calculated at a per person and per hour rate for the time spent at the place of submission for the purposes of the examination.	O	new		51.13	n/a
Weights and Measures Technical Officer calculated at a per person and per hour rate for the time spent at the place of submission for the purposes of the examination.		new		30.66	n/a

POISONS ACT :

(1) Initial registration		1.4.09	30.80	31.72	3.0%
(2) Re - registration		1.4.09	16.24	16.72	3.0%
(3) Change in details of registration		1.4.09	8.30	8.55	3.0%

INFORMATION CHARGES

Supply of Environmental Information

Up to 30 mins	O	1.4.08	41.50	41.50	0.0%
Per additional hour or part thereof		1.4.09	41.50	41.50	0.0%

Statement of facts	S	1.4.09	103.00	103.00	0.0%
--------------------	---	--------	--------	---------------	------

Photocopying costs

per page (A4)	O	1.4.09	0.32	0.32	0.0%
per page (A3)		1.4.09	0.90	0.90	0.0%