

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The East Midlands comprises the County Councils of Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland along with the three Unitary Authorities of the cities of Derby, Leicester and Nottingham. It is the Region's Waste Disposal Authorities (WDAs) that have the responsibility to develop and implement Municipal Waste Management Strategies (MWMS). The WDAs within the East Midlands Region are:

- Derbyshire County Council
- Derby City Council
- Leicestershire County Council
- Leicester City Council
- Lincolnshire County Council
- Northamptonshire County Council
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Nottingham City Council
- Rutland County Council

STRATEGY STATUS

Of the nine Waste Disposal Authorities in the East Midlands, four have issued final MWMS documents (Lincolnshire, Leicestershire County, Northamptonshire County and Rutland), two have issued draft strategies (the Joint Derby City/Derbyshire County Strategy and Nottinghamshire County), and Leicester City is currently revising its Strategy (although the Biffa-Leicester Contract effectively represents a Strategy for the next 25 years). Areas of particular concern relate to Nottinghamshire County and Nottingham City. Nottinghamshire County produced a draft strategy in 2002 and this still has to be finalized, and Nottingham City is in the process of producing a draft.

WASTE ARISING AND FORECASTING

MSW Arisings across the Region amounted to approximately 2.3 million tonnes in 2003/04. Considerable variation exists in the Strategy documents with regard to the likely waste growth scenarios, with some Authorities assuming a continuous growth rate year on year and others presenting more detailed 'falling growth' scenarios which account for waste minimisation in future years.

PROCUREMENT PLANS AND WASTE MANAGEMENT CONTRACTS

With the exception of Leicester City, which has a 25 year contract already in place with Biffa for the management of municipal waste, all of the Waste Disposal Authorities in the Region are at various stages of procurement. Derbyshire and Lincolnshire have established preferred options but intend to maintain a degree of flexibility going forward with regard to treatment technology; both are at very early stages of a PPP/PFI procurement process (With Derbyshire slightly more advanced at the OBC stage). Northamptonshire is in the very early stages of the procurement process and is currently undertaking an options appraisal, whilst Leicestershire is currently procuring a number of contracts for sorting facilities and has just advertised for a composting contract (the Council has yet to progress the procurement of a long term contract for residual waste treatment and disposal). Nottinghamshire is at an advanced stage of a PFI procurement process, with Onyx having recently been identified as preferred bidder. Rutland Council has also announced an intention to establish a long term contract for its municipal waste.

With regard to preferred residual waste treatment technology procurement there is again variation across the Region:

- Derbyshire County Council , in partnership with Derby City Council , has identified two preferred options based on the use of Energy from Waste (EfW) or Anaerobic Digestion (AD), with no decision made to date as to which is the favoured technology.
- Lincolnshire County Council's Municipal Waste Strategy proposed a degree of flexibility going forward with respect to residual treatment, mentioning the inclusion of Anaerobic Digestion, MBT (with EfW) or EfW, or indeed a combination of all three.
- Leicester City Council leads the way in the Region having already procured a Recycling Centre at Bursom Industrial Estate (Utilising Ball Mill technology) and a purpose built anaerobic digestion plant at Wanlip to process organic wastes and the product from the residual treatment plant at Bursom.
- Leicestershire County Council is currently in the process of procuring a number of sorting facilities within the County, although the outcome of this process will not be know for around six months. The Council has also published a notice relating to a composting contract. The Strategy does not go into detail on residual treatment procurement but it is clear that the Council is looking to increase recycling and composting targets to help divert waste from landfill. The Council is currently reviewing its position on the use of alternative disposal and treatment facilities.
- It appears likely that Northamptonshire County Council will adopt a PFI route, although this has yet to be conformed. A BPEO has not been identified as yet, but

it should be noted that the Council does not favour the use of EfW for the treatment of residual MSW.

- Municipal waste from the City of Nottingham is currently managed through a combination of use of the Eastcroft waste to energy facility (which includes district heating capacity) located within the City centre along with landfill and composting capacity in Nottinghamshire. Developments surrounding the proposed extension to the Eastcroft facility will undoubtedly affect Nottingham City's procurement plans in the long term.
- Nottinghamshire County Council is currently at an advanced stage of a PFI procurement process for the long term management of municipal waste. Onyx has recently been selected as the preferred bidder for the long term contract, based on the use of EfW as the preferred process for residual waste treatment.
- Rutland County Council has just issued a notice inviting expressions of interest from parties capable of providing a long term (20 year) service for the disposal of some 15,000 tonnes/annum of municipal waste arising within the County.

INVOLVEMENT OF WASTE COLLECTION AUTHORITIES IN WASTE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

Two tier authorities in the East Midlands do appear to recognize the benefits of a coordinated approach to the delivery and implementation of a long term MWMS. The extent to which a coordinated approach is being delivered is again somewhat variable. If this trend continues it is possible that the ability to match collection and treatment/disposal services, and therefore the ability to meet targets in a cost effective way, could be compromised.

KEY STRATEGIC ELEMENTS

There are a number of recurring themes in the strategies identified in each MWMS, although the level of detail surrounding these themes does vary; they include:

- Expansion of kerbside collection schemes
- Expansion of bring site and HWRC provision
- Expansion of MRF and composting capacity
- Targets aimed at increased recycling and reduced reliance on landfill
- Most recognise the need for a phased approach, with short, medium and long term targets
- Most include reference to waste reduction and minimisation (although often in general rather than specific terms)
- Most provide non-specific (and therefore flexible) proposals for residual waste treatment (with the exception of Nottingham and Leicester City Councils)

POTENTIAL TO MANAGE MUNICIPAL WASTE WITH OTHER WASTE STREAMS

None of the Strategies make specific allowance for the management of non-municipal waste streams with municipal waste. Some highlight the fact that commercial and industrial waste streams are similar in nature to municipal waste and can therefore be treated using the same types of waste handling, treatment and disposal technologies. As new waste infrastructure is developed it is likely that facilities will be utilized for a range of controlled waste streams. Indeed, the land use planning requirements for waste management at Planning Authority level, as set out in Waste Local Plans, tend to be developed on the basis of providing for the full range of controlled waste streams. There does not currently appear to be any direct linkage between the Municipal Waste Management Strategies, Waste Local Plans and the Regional waste Strategy (the first of these dealing with municipal waste and the latter two addressing all controlled waste streams).

LINKAGES WITH WASTE LOCAL PLANS AND WASTE PLANNING AUTHORITIES

Only three Waste Disposal Authorities (City of Leicester, Northamptonshire, and the City of Nottingham) do not make specific reference to the relevant Waste Local Plan in their MWMS. Of these, the situation in Leicester is somewhat unusual within the East Midlands context given that a long term waste management contract is already in place and the necessary facilities are also largely already planned and constructed. A Strategy has yet to emerge for the City of Nottingham (a Waste Development Plan Document is proposed to replace the Waste Local Plan for Nottinghamshire and the City of Nottingham). Northamptonshire therefore appears to be the only Authority where some action may be required to develop a closer linkage between planning and delivery of the MWMS; this may well emerge in any case through the 'Northamptonshire Partnership'.

SUB-REGIONAL APPROACH

Most of the strategies make reference to the benefits or potential of adopting a sub-regional approach. This is most likely to develop further through waste partnership arrangements rather than through contractual frameworks. A good example currently in existence is the Leicestershire Waste Management Partnership. Leicestershire County Council is also a member of the Regional Recycling Consortium which targets the development of certain recyclables in the waste stream and the development of contracts for processing the materials across the Region.

The greatest potential for developing a sub-regional approach would appear to be within the three areas where a City Unitary Authority (i.e. Derby, Leicester and Nottingham) lies within a County Authority.

REFERENCE TO THE REGIONAL WASTE STRATEGY

Four of the more recently published strategies (including the Derbyshire Draft) make direct reference to the Regional Waste Strategy. Those that do not refer to the Regional Strategy tend to be the older documents dating back to 2002 or thereabouts. The two Strategies in the process of being updated (Leicester) or drafted (Nottingham) are expected to refer to the Regional Strategy.

The level and extent to which the Regional Strategy and Regional working is endorsed is very important in this instance. The Derbyshire Draft Strategy summarises the findings of the Regional work, referring in particular to the adoption of Option 2 as the preferred future Waste Management Framework for the Region. Lincolnshire's Strategy also provides detailed linkage with the Regional work, comparing and contrasting the preferred option with the Regional Waste Strategy Options 2 and 4. Apart from these two instances, there is a considerable lack of detailed reference to the East Midlands Regional Waste Strategy.

LATS DELIVERABILITY

Overall the Region's Municipal Waste Management Strategies lack detail in relation to LATS deliverability.

Five of the Strategies focus on LATS and the ability to meet, or even to exceed the targets. The Nottinghamshire Draft MWMS and the Northamptonshire MWMS do not go into any detail as to how LATS will be achieved and provide no insight into BMW diversion. This is principally due to the documents dating back to 2002, and therefore prior to the more recent focus on LATS.

Further insight into how LATS targets will be achieved was gained by direct contact and discussion with key representatives from each Authority:

- Derby City and Derbyshire County – The preferred approach is achieve, and in fact exceed LATS targets. This will be based on seeking to achieve high levels of recycling with residual waste treated either using EfW or Anaerobic Digestion.
- Lincolnshire County – The Strategy details two potential options; one would achieve the LATS targets and the other would exceed targets, thereby placing the County in a position to trade surplus permits.
- Leicester City – The Biffa-Leicester contract is intended to ensure LATS targets are achieved.
- Leicestershire County – On further discussion with the County, it has been identified that there is likely to be a shortfall in meeting LATS targets in 2008/09 and 2009/10 (by approximately 30,000 tonnes). In light of this the Council is currently reviewing the Strategy with a view to setting higher recycling/composting targets. Alternative treatment and disposal facilities are also

- being considered, along with the purchase mechanism associated with the tradable permit scheme.
- Northamptonshire County – From 2008/09 onwards it is likely that the Council will initiate a trading strategy (although the details have not been established yet). The Council is intending to procure suitable sustainable residual treatment through the PFI route, but this is unlikely to be in existence before 2010/11.
 - Nottingham City – The City has a long term contract with WRG up to 2032 and the Council should be in a position to achieve LATS through the use of the Eastcroft EfW plant. The Council has however, expressed a desire to be less reliant on the Eastcroft plant, with the aim of increasing recycling rates.
 - Nottinghamshire County – The Council was unwilling to disclose any further information at this stage as they regard any information of this nature to be confidential.
 - Rutland County – Rutland intend to initiate a trading strategy as they will only need to purchase allowances for a small tonnage of waste (around 110 tonnes this year). The Council are also exploring the possibility of procuring a small scale residual waste treatment process for up to 20,000 tonnes of waste per annum.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL AUTHORITY RECYCLING/COMPOSTING PERFORMANCE

The overall recycling and composting performance of each of the Waste Disposal Authorities against the 2003/04 targets was generally good. Rutland, Nottingham City, Leicester City and Derby City failed to meet the targets, although only Derby City failed by any significant amount (7%). It should be noted that the East Midlands Region exceeded the National Average by 0.3% in 2003/04.

SWOT ANALYSIS

Strengths

- Region performing above average in relation to composting and recycling
- Most Authorities have an active strategy in place (or at least a draft)
- A number of the Authorities have adopted a flexible approach with regard to the procurement of residual waste treatment technology
- Generally the importance of an effective relationship between the WCA's and the WDA is highlighted

Weaknesses

- More emphasis and real evidence of a sub-regional approach to waste management is desirable
- Stronger linkages with the Regional Waste Strategy are also desirable. The majority of Strategies lack any detail when referring to the Regional approach.
- With the exception of Leicester City and Nottingham City, most Authorities do not have any clear residual treatment procurement process in place.

- Strategies present a lack of specific detail with regard to LATS deliverability.

Opportunities

- Potential for sub-regional working is highlighted by the existence of the Leicestershire Waste Management Partnership which includes both Leicester City and Leicestershire County as members. It is thought that the greatest potential for developing a sub-regional approach would be within areas where a City Unitary Authority (i.e. Derby, Leicester and Nottingham) lies within a County Authority.
- The potential for inter-Regional working, particularly with the East of England and West Midlands Authorities also exists (e.g. proximity between Northamptonshire and Milton Keynes, Lincolnshire and Peterborough, etc)

Threats

- Strict application of the proximity principle may detract from sub-Regional working potential.
- A number of the Strategies appear to be out of date in relation to various key issues, for example LATS deliverability, coupled with a lack of reference and compatibility with the Regional Waste Strategy.
- Authorities require a closer linkage between their MWMS and the relevant Waste Local Plan to enable more appropriate waste management infrastructure to be planned and delivered.