

**To: The Deputy Leader and Members of the
Community and Environment Board.
(Phillips, Barber, Fowler, Lewis, B Moss, M
Moss, Pickard, Smith and Winter).**

For the information of other Members of the Council

For general enquiries please contact Jenny Price,
Democratic Services Officer, on 01827 719450 or
via e-mail jennyprice@northwarks.gov.uk.

For enquiries about specific reports please contact
the officer named in the reports.

The agenda and reports are available in large print
and electronic accessible formats if requested.

COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT BOARD AGENDA

21 July 2014

The Community and Environment Board will meet in The
Committee Room, The Council House, South Street,
Atherstone, Warwickshire, CV9 1DE on Monday 21 July
2014 at 6.30pm.

AGENDA

- 1 Evacuation Procedure.**
- 2 Apologies for Absence / Members away on
official Council business.**
- 3 Disclosable Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary
Interests**

4 **Public Participation**

Up to twenty minutes will be set aside for members of the public to ask questions or to put their views to elected Members. Participants are restricted to five minutes each. If you wish to speak at the meeting please contact Jenny Price on 01827 719450 or email democraticservices@northwarks.gov.uk

PART A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION

- 5 **Minutes of the Meetings of the Board held on 17 March 2014 and 20 May 2014** – copies herewith, to be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

- 6 **Budgetary Control Report 2014/2015. Period Ended 30 June 2014**– Report of the Assistant Director (Finance and Human Resources).

Summary

The report covers revenue expenditure and income for the period from 1 April 2014 to 30 June 2014. The 2014/2015 budget and the actual position for the period, compared with the estimate at that date, are given, together with an estimate of the out-turn position for services reporting to this Board.

The Contact Officer for this report is Nigel Lane (719371).

- 7 **Development of New Indoor Leisure Facilities in Coleshill** – Report of the Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development)

Summary

This report updates the Board on progress in respect of the development of new indoor leisure facilities in Coleshill.

The Contact Officer for this report is Simon Powell (719352).

- 8 **Recycling – Commingled Collections and Technical, Environmental & Economical Practicability** – Report of the Assistant Director (Streetscape).

Summary

This report updates Members on the Waste Framework Directive and the measures which the Borough Council must now take following the publication of further advice and guidance from the government and other agencies on the implementation of national Waste Regulations as they relate to the collection of waste for recycling.

The Contact Officer for this report is Richard Dobbs (719440).

JERRY HUTCHINSON
Chief Executive

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT BOARD

17 March 2014

Present: Councillor Phillips in the Chair.

Councillors Barber, Ferro, Freer, Lewis, B Moss, Smith and Winter.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fowler and M Moss (Substitute Winter).

Councillor Pickard was also in attendance.

48 **Disclosable Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests**

Councillor Freer declared a Non-Pecuniary interest in Minute 55 North Warwickshire Green Space Strategy Progress report by reason of being a member of Atherstone Town Council.

49 **Minutes of the Meetings of the Board held on 20 January 2014**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2014, copies having been previously circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

50 **Financial Inclusion Activity Update**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Community Services) provided Members with an update of the Financial Inclusion activity undertaken by the Council and some of its partners in the last twelve months.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

51 **Health Improvement Action Plan**

Further to the Director of Public Health's presentation to the Board at its meeting held in January 2014, the Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development) presented a draft three-year Health Improvement Action Plan for Members consideration.

Resolved:

That the draft Health Improvement Action Plan (2014 to 2017), be approved.

52 **Financial Assistance to Outside Organisations**

The Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development) detailed three requests for assistance through the provision of an annual grant; from Warwickshire Community and Voluntary Action (WCAVA) for funding towards a second year extension to its three-year countywide agreement, from North Warwickshire Citizens Advice Bureau (NWCAB) and from Live & Local for support towards the third year of its three-year countywide Key Client Agreement.

Resolved:

- a That the progress made by WCAVA in its delivery of Volunteer and Third Sector Support Services (VATS Support Services) in Warwickshire be noted and that the financial assistance for a second year extension to the current countywide agreement, as identified in the main body of the report of the Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development), be approved;**
- b That the draft Service Level Agreement be approved for further negotiation with NW CAB and that the proposed financial award for 2014/15 be approved and administered as indicated in the report, including the provision for the second instalment to be made subject to the prior agreement of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Board; and**
- c That the work undertaken by Live & Local in assisting local promoters to deliver professional arts performances in local venues be noted and the proposed grant award towards the third year of its three-year countywide Key Client Agreement, be approved.**

53 **Proposed Closure of Atherstone Skate Park**

Atherstone Indoor Skate Park was opened as a pilot project in March 2012. The Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development) reported that efforts to secure a sustainable future for the facility had not materialised and that the facility was no longer financially viable. Members were asked to consider a proposal to close the facility with effect from 31 March 2014.

Resolved:

That the Atherstone Indoor Skate Park be closed with effect from 31 March 2014.

54 Development of New Indoor Leisure Facilities in Coleshill

The Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development) updated the Board on progress in respect of the development of new indoor leisure facilities in Coleshill.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

55 North Warwickshire Green Space Strategy Progress Report

The Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development) informed Members of progress in respect of delivery against the priorities set out in the North Warwickshire Green Space Strategy and presented the supporting Action Plan for Year 7 of the Strategy for approval.

Resolved:

- a That progress in respect of the implementation of the provisions of Year 6 of the North Warwickshire Green Space Strategy Action Plan be noted and that the Action Plan for Year 7, be approved;**
- b That the proposal to lease the bowling green at Abbey Green Park to Polesworth Bowls Association, be approved;**
- c That the proposal to support Atherstone Town Council in the development of play facilities at the recreation ground in Westwood Road be approved and that the Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development) be authorised to continue negotiations with the Town Council in this respect;**
- d That, subject and subsequent to the installation of improved play facilities at Westwood Road, the proposal to remove play equipment from Minions Close Open Space, be approved;**
- e That the Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development) be authorised to continue discussions with Coleshill Town Council in respect of potential improvements at the Memorial Park; and**
- f That action taken under the Chief Executive's Urgent Business Powers to advance the project at Baddesley Ensor Church and Community Hall grounds, be endorsed.**

56 **Progress Report on Achievement of Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator Targets April – December 2013**

Members were informed of progress with the achievement of the Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator targets relevant to the Board for April to December 2013.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

H Phillips
Chairman

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT BOARD

20 May 2014

Present: Councillor Phillips in the Chair.

Councillors Fowler, Lewis, B Moss, M Moss and Smith

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Barber, Freer and Pickard.

1 **Disclosable Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests**

Councillor Fowler declared a Non-Pecuniary interest in Minute 5 – Development of New Indoor Leisure Facilities in Coleshill by reason of being a Governor at The Coleshill School.

2 **Works to trees in Conservation Areas**

Members were informed of proposed works to trees in Birmingham Road, Coleshill, and a proposed approach to the management of trees within the Atherstone CCTV surveillance area, which were subject of reports to the Planning and Development Board.

Resolved:

That the content of the reports to Planning and Development Board in respect of proposed works to trees in Birmingham Road, Coleshill, and the approach to the management of trees within the Atherstone CCTV surveillance area, be noted.

3 **Local Nature Reserves – Proposed Management Agreement**

The Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development) set out a proposal for the ongoing management of the Borough Council's Local Nature Reserves in partnership with Warwickshire Wildlife Trust and presented a Management Agreement for approval.

Resolved:

That the Assistant Chief Executive and Solicitor to the Council be authorised to enter into a Management Agreement with Warwickshire Wildlife Trust for the ongoing management of the Borough Council's Local Nature Reserves on the terms set out

in the report of the Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development).

4 Proposal to Underlet Hurley Daw Mill Sports Ground

The Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development) set out details of the process necessary for the Authority to enter into an Underlease with Hurley Kings Football Club in respect of Daw Mill Sports Ground in Hurley Common and sought approval to effect such an agreement.

Resolved:

That the Assistant Chief Executive and Solicitor to the Council, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Board, be authorised to enter into a Licence to Underlet with the Coal Industry Social Welfare Organisation and to effect an Underlease with Hurley Kings Football Club in respect of Daw Mill Sports Ground, Hurley Common.

5 Development of New Indoor Leisure Facilities in Coleshill

The Assistant Director (Leisure and Community Development) updated the Board on progress in respect of the development of new indoor leisure facilities in Coleshill.

Resolved:

That the progress being made in respect of the development of new indoor leisure facilities at The Coleshill School, be noted.

6 Progress Report on Achievement of Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator Targets April 2013 – March 2014.

Members were informed of progress with the achievement of the Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator targets relevant to the Board for April 2013 to March 2014.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

H Phillips
Chairman

Agenda Item No 6

Community and Environment Board

21 July 2014

Report of the Assistant Director (Finance and Human Resources)

Budgetary Control Report 2014/2015 Period Ended 30 June 2014

1 Summary

- 1.1 The report covers revenue expenditure and income for the period from 1 April 2014 to 30 June 2014. The 2014/2015 budget and the actual position for the period, compared with the estimate at that date, are given, together with an estimate of the out-turn position for services reporting to this Board.

Recommendation to Executive Board

That the report be noted and that the Board requests any further information it feels would assist it in monitoring the budgets under the Board's control.

2 Consultation

- 2.1 Councillors Phillips, Lewis and Barber have been sent an advanced copy of this report for comment. Any comments received will be reported verbally to the Board.

3 Introduction

- 3.1 Under the Service Reporting Code of Practice (SeRCOP), services should be charged with the total cost of providing the service, which not only includes costs and income directly incurred, but also support costs relating to such areas as finance, office accommodation, telephone costs and IT services. The figures contained within this report are calculated on this basis.

4 Overall Position

- 4.1 The actual expenditure for budgets reporting to this Board as at 30 June 2014 is £1,245,144 compared with a profiled budgetary position of £1,216,629; an over spend of £28,515 over the period. Appendix A to this report provides details of the profiled and actual position for each service reporting to this Board, together with the variance for the period.

...

- 4.2 Where possible, the year-to-date budget figures have been calculated with some allowance for seasonal variations, in order to give a better comparison

with actual figures. Reasons for the variations are given, where appropriate, in detail below.

4.3 Leisure Centres

4.3.1 There is an overall under spend of £4,731 against the profiled budget. This is largely due to increased direct debit income at Atherstone Leisure Complex which is partially offset by a shortfall in swimming and party income.

4.4 Waste Management

4.4.1 The overall increase is £46,754 with the largest variance being employee expenditure; this is due to the need for two additional rounds in response to the increased demand levels seen since the new service was rolled out in October 2013. There is also an increase in transport costs due mainly to repairs and maintenance. Against this there is increased trade waste, bulky waste and sale of bins income.

4.5 Amenity Cleaning

4.5.1 The current underspend of £10,956 is mainly due to employee under spends but there are also smaller under spends related to transport costs and bought in services (weed spraying). There are small over spends against skip hire and asbestos removal.

4.6 Community Development

4.6.1 The overall position is an over spend of £4,888, mainly due to overtime costs, grant payments and bought in services. These over spends will be met from grants that will be received later in the year.

4.7 Others

4.7.1 There are a small number of other variances that are worth noting which are shown below.

A reduction in business rates at Atherstone Market, to reflect the fact that it is only used as a market two days a week, the remaining five days are charged to the car parks budget	(2,316)
Supplies and services costs at Parks, Playing Fields and Open Spaces (timing difference)	(2,011)
Horticulture DSO transport costs – fuel and maintenance	(2,457)
Corporate Policy - grants paid out (timing difference)	(2,845)
TOTAL	(9,629)

5 Performance Indicators

5.1 In addition to the financial information provided to this Board, when the budgets were set in February, performance indicators were included as a means of putting the financial position into context. These are shown at Appendix B.

5.2 In summary, the majority of the Performance Indicators are comparable with the profiled position.

6 Risks to the Budget

6.1 The key risks to the budgetary position of the Council from services under the control of this Board are:

- Deteriorating condition of assets, particularly the leisure centres, and further economic pressure affecting the generation of income
- Further reduction or cessation of grants received and the possibility of redundancy costs for those staff affected by withdrawal of funding for given projects.
- A loss of trade waste customers
- Increasing bin replacement rates
- Expected savings from Refuse/Recycling changes not materialising

7 Easy Line Studio at Atherstone Leisure Complex

7.1 The table below shows the projected financial performance of the Easy Line Studio at Atherstone Leisure Complex relating to the 2014/15 financial year:

	Original Budget 2014/15 £	Profile to end June 2014 £	Actual to end June 2014 £
Staff Expenditure	3,880	970	970
Contribution to Replacement Fund	2,000	500	500
Income	(6,510)	(1,628)	(1,355)
Net Expenditure	(630)	(158)	115

7.2 This shows that the Studio is presently running at a small loss, which is as a result of the loss of DD members. It is believed that this down turn in memberships was a result of Studio users gaining more confidence with the gym equipment and thus having the ability to use the more physically exerting equipment in the main gym.

8 Estimated Out-turn

8.1 Members have requested that Budgetary Control reports provide details on the likely out-turn position for each of the services reporting to this Board. The anticipated out-turn for this Board for 2014/15 is £5,195,400, as detailed in the table below:-

	£
Approved budget 2014/15	4,995,400
Additional costs of Refuse and Recycling based on additional participation rates and volumes of recycling	200,000
Expected Out-turn 2014/15	5,195,000

8.2 The figures provided are based on information available at this time of the year and are the best available estimates for this Board, and may change as the financial year progresses. Members will be updated in future reports of any changes to the forecast out turn.

9 Report Implications

9.1 Finance and Value for Money Implications

9.1.1 The Council's budgeted contribution from General Fund balances for the 2014/15 financial year is £595,460. As can be seen above, an increase in the net expenditure of around £200,000 is expected to date from the services within this Board. Income and Expenditure will continue to be closely managed and any issues that arise will be reported to this Board for comment.

9.2 Environment and Sustainability Implications

9.2.1 The Council has to ensure that it adopts and implements robust and comprehensive budgetary monitoring and control, to ensure not only the availability of services within the current financial year, but in future years.

The Contact Officer for this report is Nigel Lane (719371).

Background Papers

Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D, as substituted by the Local Government Act, 2000 Section 97

Background Paper No	Author	Nature of Background Paper	Date

**North Warwickshire Borough Council
Community and Environment Board
Budgetary Control Report 2014/2015 as at 30 June 2014**

Cost Centre	Description	Approved Budget 2014/2015	Profiled Budget June 2014	Actual June 2014	Variance	Comments
3072	Polesworth Sports Centre	162,720	36,274	42,455	6,181	See 4.3
3073	Polesworth Hi-Tech	(33,910)	(9,498)	(12,252)	(2,754)	See 4.3
3074	Arley Sports Centre	191,540	57,277	54,867	(2,410)	See 4.3
3075	Coleshill Sports Centre	311,700	90,319	95,267	4,948	See 4.3
3076	Coleshill Hi-Tech	(61,580)	(12,735)	(11,649)	1,086	See 4.3
3077	Atherstone Leisure Complex	683,850	196,083	202,639	6,556	See 4.3
3078	Atherstone Hi-Tech	(157,150)	(37,724)	(54,041)	(16,317)	See 4.3
3082	Memorial Hall (Sports)	128,190	41,230	38,338	(2,892)	See 4.3
3083	Memorial Hall (Cultural)	(2,050)	619	1,489	870	See 4.3
4002/4/7	Public Health Services (Commercial)	297,410	61,761	62,849	1,088	
4003/6	Public Health Services (Domestic)	100,140	25,035	25,662	627	
5000	Refuse Domestic Collection	816,220	185,462	204,908	19,446	See 4.4
5002	Refuse Trade Collection	(20,250)	(152,546)	(157,064)	(4,518)	See 4.4
5003	Cesspool Emptying	(43,520)	(15,694)	(11,698)	3,996	See 4.4
5004	Recycling	564,990	210,202	238,032	27,830	See 4.4
5010	Amenity Cleaning	659,340	167,273	156,317	(10,956)	See 4.5
5013	Unadopted Roads	12,010	3,783	2,076	(1,707)	
5014	Drain Unblocking and Land Drainage	20,480	5,120	5,120	-	
5015	Street Furniture	8,170	2,042	1,730	(312)	
5016	Atherstone Market	5,420	3,685	1,369	(2,316)	See 4.7
5019	Parks, Playing Fields and Open Spaces	531,300	164,325	161,181	(3,144)	See 4.7
5020	Play Areas	202,710	41,062	41,791	729	
5021	Public Health Act 1984 Burials	2,930	733	931	198	
5022	Sustainable Communities	2,860	-	-	-	
5023	Consultation	19,000	2,920	3,420	500	
5025	Corporate Policy	58,570	15,220	12,379	(2,841)	See 4.7
5030	Rural Regeneration	44,210	10,745	10,753	8	
5034	Landscape	10,330	9,243	8,978	(265)	
5040	Marketing and Market Research	14,130	3,533	3,741	208	
5044	Support to Voluntary Organisations	97,370	12,778	7,291	(5,487)	See 4.6
5051	Young People and Intergeneration	76,680	22,095	26,379	4,284	See 4.6
5052	Community Development Environment	64,680	16,160	22,595	6,435	See 4.6
5054	Social Inclusion and Sport	66,950	16,690	17,133	443	
5055	Health Improvement	57,380	20,207	18,982	(1,225)	See 4.6
5056	Safer Communities	93,970	19,180	19,402	222	
5059	Allotments and Biodiversity	8,600	2,158	2,158	-	
5064	QE School Artificial Grass Pitch	10	1,612	1,612	-	
5064	Carlyon Road Skate Park	-	-	4	4	
	Total Expenditure	4,995,400	1,216,629	1,245,144	28,515	

Original Budget	4,989,610
Vired Training Budget	3,680
Vired Recruitment Budget	2,110
Approved Budget	<u>4,995,400</u>

Key performance Indicators for Budgets Reporting to the Community and Environment Board

performance as at 30 June 2014

	Budget	Profiled budget	Actual
Polesworth Sports Centre			
Cost per Visit	£4.73	£4.34	£4.54
Income per Visit	£2.89	£2.81	£2.79
Subsidy per Visit	£1.84	£1.53	£1.74
Arley Sports Centre			
Cost per Visit	£5.28	£5.80	£6.95
Income per Visit	£1.80	£1.64	£2.18
Subsidy per Visit	£3.48	£4.17	£4.77
Coleshill Leisure Centre			
Cost per Visit	£5.04	£5.40	£5.57
Income per Visit	£2.66	£2.45	£2.35
Subsidy per Visit	£2.38	£2.96	£3.23
Atherstone Leisure Complex			
Cost per Visit	£5.99	£6.68	£6.02
Income per Visit	£2.91	£2.95	£2.83
Subsidy per Visit	£3.08	£3.73	£3.19
Memorial Hall			
Cost per Visit	£10.13	£11.50	£10.29
Income per Visit	£2.52	£1.40	£1.57
Subsidy per Visit	£7.61	£10.11	£8.72
Refuse Domestic Collection			
Number of Households	27,101	27,101	26,004
Costs per Household	£30.09	£6.10	£6.66
Maximum missed collections per 100,000 users	25	25	135
Refuse Trade Collection			
Number of Trade Bins	497	497	537
Gross cost per bin collected	£369.64	£85.81	£80.47
Net cost per bin collected	-£10.74	-£11.69	-£19.23
Cespool Emptying			
Number of emptyings	1,560	390	342
Gross cost per emptying	£92.53	£96.24	£107.74
Net surplus per emptying	-£27.90	-£28.70	-£21.05
Recycling			
Cost per household	£20.84	£5.21	£6.92
Tonnes of recycled material collected - green waste	6,125	1,531	2,858
Tonnes of recycled material collected - red box	5,185	1,296	1,282
% of waste recycled	50.0%	50.0%	56.8%
Parks, Playing Fields and Open Spaces			
Number of Pitches	24	24	20
Number of Teams	17	17	14
Number of Hirers	24	24	20
Income per Team	£581.76	£285.00	£310.00
Play Areas			
Cost of maintenance per play area	£3,583.87	£895.29	£920.42
Number of play areas (meeting the safety, DDA and Play Value standard)	31 (28)	31 (28)	31 (28)

Agenda Item No 7

Community and Environment Board

21 July 2014

**Report of the
Assistant Director
(Leisure and Community Development)**

**Development of New
Indoor Leisure Facilities
in Coleshill**

1 Summary

- 1.1 This report updates the Board on progress in respect of the development of new indoor leisure facilities in Coleshill.

Recommendation to the Board

That the Board notes and comments upon the progress being made in respect of the development of new indoor leisure facilities at The Coleshill School.

2 Consultation

- 2.1 The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson for the Special Sub-Group, the Community and Environment and Resources Boards, the Safer Communities Sub-Committee, Members with responsibility for Health, Well-being and Leisure and Young People and Coleshill Ward Members have all had an opportunity to comment on the content of this report. Any comments received will be reported verbally to the Board.

3 Background

- 3.1 Further to previous meetings of the Board, Members are aware that the construction of replacement indoor leisure facilities commenced on site at The Coleshill School on 7 November 2013. The Board is further aware that the capital funding available for the project is £4,301,366, including £2,815,000 from the Borough Council, with the balance being made up of valuable contributions from the Education Funding Agency and England Squash and Racketball.
- 3.2 Account needs to be taken of the need to fund £152,000 of fees attributable to the project, thereby leaving a sum of £4,149,366 available to support project delivery (including all contingencies and provision for fitness equipment and furniture and fittings, etc.).

4 Update on Progress – Construction Work

- 4.1 As reported to the Board in May 2014, despite a slightly delayed commencement of on-site construction work, the building programme is now approximately two weeks ahead of schedule. The overall project completion date, however, currently remains as the end of October 2014, although this timetable may be affected, positively or negatively, as a consequence of the time taken to secure an electricity supply to the building. Recent progress has been encouraging. In addition to the work previously detailed to Members, superstructure block and brickwork, the installation of PV panels and insulation and membrane work are all completed. Detailed mechanical and electrical containment undertakings have commenced, as have internal duct work, render and screed, the installation of Kalwall, the installation of doors, flashings and louvres and internal decoration activity. Forthcoming progress will focus on the completion of mechanical and electrical work, including the installation of plant, rendering, screeding and painting.
- 4.2 As Members are aware, the Borough Council retains responsibility for the additional costs of all client risks identified within the Risk Register and also for any client changes to the agreed project design. It has been reported to the Board that a number of the client risks on the Risk Register are potentially expensive if they occur.
- 4.3 The most significant risk that is currently facing the project concerns the provision of statutory services to the site, and in particular the need to secure and electricity supply to the building. The Board is already aware that the contractor has been advised that the existing electricity sub-station does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the needs of the new Leisure Centre. The required upgrade to the sub-station has been estimated to cost in the region of an additional £22,500. This cost is “non-contestable”. The risk is owned by the client and, therefore, will impact on the final Actual Cost of the project. Nevertheless, an alternative solution to this problem, which involves the construction of a new sub-station on the Leisure Centre site, is now being advanced. This undertaking will require planning consent, but initial cost projections suggest that it will be approximately £6,000 cheaper than up-grading the existing sub-station. The highest risk with this option, however, concerns the need to complete the required legal agreement with the electricity company by the middle of July 2014 if Wates Construction is to secure practical completion of the project by the end of October. A delay beyond this deadline would carry with it the additional risk of failing to meet an EFA funding milestone for practical completion of the project by this date, which could lead to a grant reclaim. Given the nature of its interest in the site, The School has had to assume responsibility for the completion of the agreement with the electricity company, which also necessitates the need to secure landlord (Warwickshire County Council) consent, as well as that of the Secretary of State. Landlord consent has already been received and it has been confirmed that a General Consent from the Secretary of State exists “where such land is required for the purposes of constructing, maintaining or

servicing a highway, or for health and safety requirements or enabling the provision of gas, water or electricity". With regard to the previously reported concern relating to the provision of a water supply to the site, the contractor has been working with its mechanical and electrical sub-contractor to develop a scheme that will meet the demands of both the Borough Council and local schools. Based on likely demand patterns, a scheme has been developed that will meet predicted peak usage of the showers on all but the most unusual of occasions, thereby minimising the associated risk.

- 4.4 As previously reported, any client design changes will incur additional project cost. The Board has previously been informed of the need for fibre links to support on-site IT provision, the need for larger than originally proposed viewing gallery windows into the sports hall, the need for mirrors within the fitness suite, the need to revise the specification of security gates, internal doors, power points within the fitness suite and sports hall, lighting within the dance studio and the provision of a water supply to the proposed vending machines. Further changes will be needed to floor finishes, the door entry and security system, the provision of power and data points within the dance studio (in order to accommodate the potential to use this space in the event of an emergency planning or business continuity need) and additional cabling to support the equipment to be provided within the fitness suite. The cost of these changes, however, are largely being offset by the omission of unrequired balustrading on a low level roof, the reconfiguration of a first floor store room and an alternative approach to the provision of CCTV within the Leisure Centre.

5 Update on Progress – Financial Position

- 5.1 Wates Construction is required to provide its Target Cost and Actual Cost forecasts on a monthly basis. The Project Manager, who is very carefully scrutinising all costs on behalf of the Borough Council, is required to produce a monthly Funding Position Statement a week thereafter. For the remainder of the contract, these forecasts and statements will be subject to bi-monthly meetings between the Authority, the Project Manager and Wates Construction. The next of these meetings will be held on 17 July 2014.

- ... 5.2 Attached at Appendix A is the latest Funding Position Statement produced by the Project Manager, on 09 July 2014, after Wates Construction's submission of its ninth project invoice. The Statement takes account of the contractor's "Forecast Final Target Cost" and its "Forecast Final Actual Cost", as stated in its Payment Application 9 (to the end of June 2014). It should be noted that the identified funding position "overspend" of £25,680 will be affected by future "Compensation Events", caused by the need to address risks and client variations. It will not be possible to establish a clear picture of Actual Cost versus Target Cost until later on in the contract, when the financial implications associated with all of the major works packages are known.

- 5.3 At the time of writing this report, approximately £2.4 million had been paid to the contractor. A further invoice from Wates Construction in the sum of

£373,280, however, is currently being processed for payment. Invoices totalling just over £1 million have been issued to The Coleshill School in order to draw down the appropriate proportion of Education Funding Agency grant for the project.

6 Update on Progress – Other Matters

- 6.1 The Board will recall that, at its meeting held in April 2014, the Special Sub-group approved the content of the draft Joint Use Agreement between the Borough Council and The Coleshill School, through which the facility will be managed and used. Members will be aware, however, that in recent weeks there has been disquiet amongst users of the existing Leisure Centre about the extent of community access to the new sports hall. The question of daytime, term-time access to the new Leisure Centre has always been an acknowledged matter of significance within the local community and it remains so for the Borough Council. Indeed, it was the subject of a “Frequently Asked Question” on the Borough Council’s website as long ago as October 2012. The draft Joint Use Agreement affords an opportunity for daytime, term-time community access to the sports hall when it is not being used by local schools. The School furnished the Borough Council with sight of its timetable requirements slightly ahead of its 30 June deadline. These timetable requirements afford an opportunity for community access into the sports hall during the day, during school term-times, as a consequence of which both parties, the Borough Council and The School, have been able to honour their stated commitment to work together to meet the needs of school students and the local community.
- 6.2 Members will be aware that there has been a recent change of Head Teacher at The Coleshill School. Officers have met with the new Head of School and have been re-assured that the relationships and commitments that have been established over time will be maintained and that The School will continue to work with the Authority to ensure that the needs of both parties, and their respective and shared communities, are met.
- 6.3 Wates Construction’s programme for engaging local schools and the community within the building process is on-going. In this regard, the contractor is proposing to organise a “walk around” for the local community at some point over the summer months. A site visit was held for the Special Sub-group, the Community and Environment Board and Ward Members on 02 July and further visits for Councillors and staff will be held prior to the opening of the new facility. In the meantime, it is pleasing to be able to report that Wates Construction has been awarded Considerate Constructor status for its specific work on the Coleshill Leisure Centre site.

7 Report Implications

7.1 Finance and Value for Money Implications

7.1.1 In addition to those previously reported to the Board, the headline financial implications associated with the construction of the new Coleshill Leisure Centre are detailed in section 5 above.

7.2 Safer Communities Implications

7.2.1 The provision of good quality leisure facilities and services has profound and positive implications for the development of safer communities and a reduction in the likelihood of criminal and / or anti-social behaviour.

7.3 Legal and Human Rights Implications

7.3.1 The future replacement of Coleshill Leisure Centre will have direct and positive implications for the Authority's ability to meet the requirements of Equalities and other legislation and on its determination to enhance access to good quality services for the local community.

7.4 Environment and Sustainability Implications

7.4.1 The proposed investment of resources is required if the Council is to maintain and enhance the quality, consistency and sustainability of its indoor leisure provision in Coleshill. The services provided through the new leisure facility will make a positive and lasting impact on individual and collective quality of life within North Warwickshire.

7.5 Health, Well-being and Leisure Implications

7.5.1 Leisure facilities have a positive impact on the health and well-being of individuals and communities through the provision of opportunities for formal and informal recreation and by contributing to an enhanced quality of life in the Borough. The project is also compliant with, and helps to deliver against, the priorities identified in the Warwickshire Health and Well-being Strategy and the supporting Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.

7.6 Human Resources Implications

7.6.1 There is no immediate Human Resource implication arising directly from this report.

7.7 Risk Management Implications

7.7.1 The condition and future replacement of Coleshill Leisure Centre have been the subject of a detailed risk assessment, a copy of which was presented to the Community and Environment Board in July 2012.

7.8 Equalities Implications

7.8.1 The scheme to replace Coleshill Leisure Centre has been designed to positively impact on the corporate priority to protect and provide access to Council services. An Equality and Impact Needs Assessment (EINA) has been carried out and was presented to the Community and Environment Board at its meeting held in July 2012.

7.9 Links to Council's Priorities

7.9.1 The undertaking to replace Coleshill Leisure Centre has positive and direct links to the following corporate priorities:

- Public service
- Crime and disorder
- Access to services
- Consultation and communication
- Health and well-being

7.9.2 The future replacement of Coleshill Leisure Centre with a new development at The Coleshill School has positive implications for the Sustainable Community Strategy priorities to:

- Raise aspirations, educational attainment and skills
- Develop healthier communities
- Improve access to services

The Contact Officer for this report is Simon Powell (719352).

Background Papers

Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D, as substituted by the Local Government Act, 2000 Section 97

Background Paper No	Author	Nature of Background Paper	Date
1	Wates Construction	Client Meeting Report 2	January 2014
2	Coventry City Council	Clerk of Works Report 2	January 2014
3	Coventry City Council	Client Meeting Notes (16 January 2014)	January 2014
4	Coventry City Council	Client Meeting Notes (26 February 2014)	Feb 2014
5	Wates Construction	Client Meeting Report 4	March 2014
6	Wates Construction	Client Meeting Report 5	April 2014
7	Wates Construction	Client Meeting Report 6	May 2014
8	Wates Construction	Client Meeting Report 7	June 2014

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL
NEW LEISURE CENTRE AT THE COLESHILL SCHOOL

09 July 2014

OVERALL FUNDING POSITION

Available Funding	£	£	£
NWBC Capital Receipts	1,850,000.00		
NWBC Approved Prudential Borrowing	965,000.00		
Sport England	nil		
England Squash & Racketball	25,000.00		
EFA	<u>1,461,366.00</u>		4,301,366.00

LESS

NWBC- other costs	£		
Planning Fees (unchanged)	11,550.00		
Planning discharge fees / amendments	2,000.00	est	
Building Regulation Fees (unchanged)	1,810.00		
CDM-C Fee (as Osbornes quote)	5,250.00		
Clerk of Works Fee @ 1% of £3.5m	35,000.00		
PM Fees @ 2% of £3.5m	<u>70,000.00</u>	125,610.00	
The Coleshill School - other costs	£		
Legal fees	23,000.00		
Auditor fee	<u>funded separately</u>	23,000.00	
Reserve for client FF&E			
Fitness Equipment	160,000.00		
Loose FF&E	<u>40,000.00</u>	<u>200,000.00</u>	348,610.00

FUNDING BALANCE

3,952,756.00Cost of Sports Centre

Wates Target Cost Option C	3,904,157.27		
Design Fees & Surveys	included		
Compensation Events (risks/variations)	65,630.93		
Wates Final Total Target Cost Forecast (TC)	<u>3,969,788.20</u>		
Wates Final Total Actual Cost Forecast (AC)	<u>3,967,464.08</u>		
Difference to Share (TC) - (AC)	2,324.12		
Contractors Share @ 50% (95% to 100% of TC)	1,162.06		
FINAL COST FORECAST (AC) + (Cntrs Share)	3,968,626.14		3,968,626.14

WATES CURRENT FUNDING POSITION - overspend

-15,870.14Other costs (not incl with Wates AC or TC)

Compensation Events (adjustment)	9,809.75		
Change requests - as schedule	0.00		
Early Warnings - as schedule	0.00		
			<u>9,809.75</u>

CURRENT FORECAST FUNDING POSITION - overspend

-25,679.89

Exclusions

- 1) VAT
- 2) ICT and voice/data connection
- 3) CCTV installation
- 4) Variations & EWN's in abeyance and/or awaiting estimates
- 5) Other as listed within Wates TC Submission and Risk Register

Agenda Item No 8

Community and Environment Board

21 July 2014

**Report of the
Assistant Director (Streetscape)**

**Recycling – Commingled
Collections and Technical,
Environmental and Economical
Practicability (TEEP)**

1 Summary

- 1.1 This report updates Members on the Waste Framework Directive and the measures which the Borough Council must now take following the publication of further advice and guidance from the government and other agencies on the implementation of national Waste Regulations as they relate to the collection of waste for recycling.

Recommendations to the Board

- a That Members note the contents of this report; and**
- b That Members endorse the actions taken so far in relation to the implementation of the current kerbside recycling service and the TEEP assessment being undertaken.**

2 Background

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the time of putting the current kerbside recycling out to tender, there was a great deal of uncertainty around the status of commingled collections (commingled collections are where some or all recycling waste is collected together and then sorted into its individual material streams later, usually at a MRF or similar facility). This related to the Waste Framework Directive the associated Waste Regulations and was largely due to the ongoing judicial review of those regulations and the statutory guidance which had been published subsequently.
- 2.2 The Council invited prospective bidders for the kerbside recycling service to propose their preferred method of collection on technical, environmental and economic grounds. The majority of bids were based on commingled collections of one form or another. The bidders which offered kerbside sorting schemes were more expensive than the lowest commingled bids and predicted a lower recycling rate. In the end, all the bids proved to be economically unsustainable and the Council brought the service back in-house. The Council utilises a dual-stream system which separates paper & card at the kerbside and commingles glass, metal and plastic.

- 2.3 At the time the contract was being let, a judicial review was drawing to a close. That review in essence concluded that commingled collections of glass, paper, metal and plastics could continue and that it was for local authorities alone to determine the best method of collection on grounds of technical, economical and environmental practicability. However, since the outcome of the judicial review, no further statutory guidance in this area has been issued.
- 2.4 Some time after that ruling, the focus switched to the issue of Technical, Environmental and Economical Practicability and its interpretation. Lord de Mauley, wrote to all Councils on behalf of DEFRA in October 2013 reminding them of the requirements of the Waste Regulations and the emphasis on the need to collect high quality recyclate and that they must do so by way of separate collections of plastic, metal, glass and paper unless it is not technically, environmentally or economically practicable.
- 2.5 At that time, the Council was on the verge of moving to its new dual-stream recycling service and had invested heavily in bins and vehicles as well as leaflets and calendars sent to every household as well as a significant amount of staff training. Contracts for the transfer and sale of materials had also been let. As part of the tendering process, the technological, environmental and economic practicability of each proposed service had been assessed. It was considered that the economic case for commingling was clear due to the lower cost of the new scheme compared to the alternative tenders which had been submitted and evaluated, while the environmental case for commingling was strong on two points: Firstly, that the predicted recycling rate was higher than for a kerbside sort system and secondly, that the move away from kerbside sorting would have a positive impact on the local environment in terms of both the street-scene and issues with windblown litter. In general terms, the outcome of the judicial review and advice from the DEFRA funded Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) given at the time appeared to support that view.

3 **TEEP**

- 3.1 In April 2014, WRAP published a Waste Regulations Route Map and supporting documentation devised to guide local authorities through the process of undertaking TEEP assessments of their recycling collection services. More information on TEEP is set out in the attached report from Rugby Borough Council which was presented to the Warwickshire Waste Partnership on 18 June, 2014 (see Appendix A). In late June 2014 the Environment Agency (which is the body responsible for enforcing the waste regulations) published a briefing note on the topic of the separate collection of recyclables. The note effectively endorsed the Route Map as a method to help local authorities comply with the legislation.
- 3.2 The note states that commingling will only be permissible after 2015 where it provides high quality recyclates or where separate collection is not

practicable. The note goes on to state that, while the EA will take account of local circumstances and that different solutions may be practicable in different neighbourhoods, they will expect to see that the collection authority has thoroughly reviewed the issue based on evidence and can provide a clear audit trail to support their conclusions. The note explains that 'practicability' is intended to be a high hurdle and that 'impracticable' *does not just mean difficult, inconvenient, more expensive or unpopular*.

- 3.3 Unfortunately, there is no absolute definition of 'high quality' nor of how much more expensive a service needs to be before it becomes economically impracticable. In terms of quality, the Route Map offers some advice and guidance and, for the first time, the EA's briefing note signposts local authorities to quality standards published recently by the Resource Association and Zero Waste Scotland. It further states that European Commission guidance *implies* that High Quality means the standard that can be achieved by Separate Collection, although whether that refers to a specific standard that *is* achieved by such collection systems is unclear, especially as, unsurprisingly, the standard achieved varies from scheme to scheme.

4 Next Steps

- 4.1 Officers are already working with other local authorities within Warwickshire to determine the best way forward. It is intended that North Warwickshire Borough Council's officers will work through the Waste Regulations Route Map and report on the outcome by the end of 2014. Information on costs and quality is already being gathered and collated in preparation and Warwickshire County Council is investigating what support may be available to help local authorities through what will prove to be a complicated and time-consuming process.
- 4.2 Although the regulations come into force on 1 January 2015, officers believe that the economic practicability test has already been satisfied for the current service. The costs associated with replacing the Council's vehicle fleet, supplying a range of new containers, recalling and disposing of (or storing) the old bins (which cost in excess of £500,000), retraining of staff and writing to every household in the Borough would evidently be prohibitive, especially given the current economic climate. What the Council must do is assess the Technical, Environmental, Economical and Practicable implications of the current system and any significant changes to it, as well as the specific requirements of any future kerbside recycling service and balance those against the Council's aims and objectives and the priorities of North Warwickshire and its residents.

5 Report Implications

5.1 Finance and Value for Money Implications

5.1.1 While there are no immediate implications, the outcome of the TEEP assessment and any resultant changes in service delivery may have a significant impact on the Council's budgets.

5.2 Environment and Sustainability Implications

5.2.1 These are at the heart of the TEEP assessment process.

5.3 Links to Council's Priorities

5.3.1 This links directly to the Council's aims of "protecting public services for local people whilst maintaining a balanced budget and keeping Council Tax increases lower than inflation", "protecting and improving our local environment" and "increasing recycling."

5.4 Risk Management Implications

5.4.1 There are clearly significant potential risks associated with this area and these will be fully assessed as part of the TEEP evaluation process.

The Contact Officer for this report is Richard Dobbs (719440).

Warwickshire Waste Partnership

18th June 2014

Co-mingled collections and Technical, Environmental and Economic Practicability (TEEP)

Recommendations

- a) That the Waste Partnership notes the guidance in this report
- b) Individual Authority Members consider the best way forward for their own Authority in completing this process prior to January 1st 2015.

1.0 Key Issues

1.1 Background

Councils collecting waste paper, metal, plastic or glass from 1st January 2015 will have a duty that they must do so by separate collection where it is necessary to ensure that waste undergoes recovery operations in accordance with WFD articles and to facilitate or improve recovery and is technically, environmentally and economically practicable.

- 1.2 The key issue local authorities are likely to be concerned with is whether they must collect the four materials separately from one another, or whether they can collect some or all of them co-mingled. Whilst the Regulations express a clear presumption in favour of material being collected in separate streams, there are circumstances under which it may be permissible to collect materials co-mingled. Decisions about whether co-mingled collections are justifiable need to be taken locally, based on the particular circumstances in each area. Authorities can apply the Necessity and Practicality (“TEEP”) tests to determine if this is needed in their circumstances.

- 1.3 Authorities will want to ensure that they are compliant with the law. In addition to their normal desire to achieve high standards of compliance, Authorities will also need to be aware of the possibility of judicial review or regulatory enforcement. The Environment Agency is responsible for enforcing compliance with the Regulations in England. They may use compliance, stop and/or restoration notices where they identify non-compliant practice. Local authorities will in any case wish to take steps to examine the compliance of their waste collections with the requirements of the law to underpin and justify any decision they take regarding their future shape (which may in some cases

include retaining their current collection model). In particular, authorities considering a change in their collection method in the lead up to and most particularly after January 2015 will need to be particularly mindful. Where this could lead to paper, metals, plastics or glass being collected co-mingled with one or more other materials when it had previously been collected as a separate stream consideration will need to be given to whether the proposed new system is compliant. However, all local authorities may wish to ensure they have carried out a robust assessment of their collection systems before 1st January 2015, even if they currently separately collect the four materials, in case application of the Necessity and Practicality (TEEP) tests reveals that changes are required. They will also want to ensure that they establish a process for future reviews of compliance, which may need to take place at periodic intervals or when relevant circumstances change – for example, when a collection, treatment or recycling contract ends, if vehicles are to be replaced, or if access to a new recycling facility or technology becomes available.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 Compliance

This report provides a practical guide that Warwickshire Authorities can follow to ensure compliance.

In order to comply with the Regulations the following tests must be carried out on the four materials (paper, cans, glass & plastics); however, Authorities can, should they so wish, carry the tests out on all materials collected within their particular scheme.

The guidance provided within this report assumes that the tests are carried out solely on the four materials.

2.2 The Necessity Test

The first part of the process that needs to be carried out is the necessity test. For each material, is separate collection (the default option) 'necessary to ensure that waste undergoes recovery operations in accordance with Articles 4 and 13 of the Waste Framework Directive and to facilitate or improve recovery'? (Regulation 13).

If the Authority is carrying out separate collections then it is already operating a compliant system and will need to go no further unless it wishes to.

If the Authority is not carrying out separate collection then it must carry out the following;

Examine the quantity & quality of Recycling. This process will show if separate collection is necessary to 'facilitate' or 'improve' recovery. Compared with

other approaches, what would be the effect of separate collection of each material?

If in answering this question for all four materials it can be proven that separate collection would not lead to an increase in both quality and quantity of each material then there is no need to carry out separate collections. If it can be proven that quantity and quality would not be increased on 2 or 3 of the four materials then it is acceptable to collect those co-mingled.

Proving quantity can be carried out via each Authority recycling collection records, however proving quality would require the assistance of the MRF operator. The MRF Operator would have to provide the necessary proof that in the case of the four materials the process of the MRF is so effective that;

Paper: is sold to the re-processor as top quality product such as newsprint. None of the collected material sold on as low quality paper.

Cans: properly separated and sold on to both steel and aluminium re-processors and market prices achieved.

Glass: sold on to the glass industry as re-melt only. Not aggregate.

Plastics: sold on as quality mixed plastics achieving market prices for the product.

If it can be proven that the Authority meets one of the criteria through its co-mingled collection, say quantity but cannot meet the quality criteria then the necessity test is not conclusive but separate collections may be necessary. At this point the Authority must move to the Practicability Test commonly known as the TEEP Test.

2.3 The Practicality Test (TEEP)

Is separate collection technically, environmentally and economically practicable? (Regulation 13)

The TEEP test must be applied separately to each of the four materials or any of the materials that required possible separate collection after the Necessity Test.

It is not the purpose of the TEEP test to prove that an Authority's co-mingled collection system is compliant but that separate collections in an Authority area are or are not compliant. If any of the four materials fails any one of the TEEP tests then separate collection of that material is no longer necessary.

The outline details of each test are as follows;

2.4 Technical

Is separate collection technically practicable?

The first question to answer is “Has your Authority ever carried out a separate collection of these materials in the past?” If the answer is yes to all four materials then put simply there is no technical reason why the Authority could not re-introduce such a collection system.

If the Authority has collected never collected materials separately, then the following question needs answering, “Is separate collection of materials carried out by another Authority with similar characteristics?” If the answer is yes then transpose their system into your own Authority area, are there any technical reasons why such a system will not work? if you cannot prove this to be the case there is no technical reason why the Authority cannot introduce such a collection system.

Another area to consider and question is “Does your Authority area have unusual characteristics that would make separate collections impracticable?” If so then then separate collections fail the TEEP test on technical grounds allowing co-mingled collections to continue.

It is unlikely that Warwickshire WCA’s will be able to use Technical as a justifiable reason as all have carried out kerbside separate collections in the past.

2.5 Environmental

Is separate collection environmentally practicable?

There is no easy way to show that separate collections of the four materials is or isn’t environmentally practicable. The European Commission guidance on the Waste Framework Directive stated that:

‘Environmentally practicable’ should be understood such that the added value of ecological benefits justifies possible negative environmental effects of the separate collection (e.g. additional emissions from transport). A system will therefore be environmentally practicable if the benefits from increased or improved recycling outweigh any negative impacts’.

As such the environmental practicability issue becomes subjective and the results open to challenge. It will be necessary to question such areas as;

Would separate collection for recycling achieve a net environmental benefit?

Does a co-mingled collection approach yield a better environmental outcome?

In order to answer such questions each Authority would have to compare such issues as CO2 emissions, air pollution, water pollution and noise between separate kerbside collection systems against that of a co-mingled collection systems. The environmental practicability element of the TEEP test must also be a fair comparison, looking at equivalent parts of different systems under consideration. For example, in addition to the impacts of the collection process, it must take account of the transport emissions related to haulage of materials after they have been collected and the energy used by

any MRF that is needed to sort co-mingled materials, as well as taking account of MRF loss rates. Finally, the greenhouse gas savings associated with the specific uses envisaged for the materials should be accounted for – these are likely to be greater for “high quality” recycling (e.g. remelt glass applications will avoid more greenhouse gas emissions)

2.6 Economic

Is separate collection economically practicable?

The European Commission guidance on the Waste Framework Directive says that:

“Economically practicable” refers to a separate collection which does not cause excessive costs in comparison with the treatment [including recycling] of a non-separated [co-mingled] waste stream, considering the added value of recovery and recycling and the principle of proportionality.”

The following questions need to be answered;

Would a separate collection system result in excessive costs when compared to a co-mingled collection system?

Are any additional costs proportionate to the environmental benefits (if any) of a separate collection system?

Factors to consider when answering such questions include;

Capital costs already incurred (Vehicles, bins etc.)

Capital required to start- up new scheme (vehicles, collection boxes etc.)

Revenue costs associated with publicity for new service.

Possible compensation payable to collection and or MRF operators, in case of early contract termination.

2.7 Council Sign Off

It will be necessary to get formal “sign-off” of the full process from the Head of Service as an absolute minimum. It would also be prudent to have the Head of Legal also sign the process off as it will be that department that would have to defend any legal challenge. Many Authorities will also require this process to be signed off at Member level.

3 Conclusion

- 3.1 The requirements of the WFD and the regulations present one of the greatest challenges faced by Authorities recently especially those using co-mingled collections. It is therefore necessary for the Authorities concerned to go through the process set out in the report.

- 3.2 The process has to be completed by January 1st 2015, Authorities will either have to secure the resources to carry out this work internally or employ external consultants.

Background Papers

1. The Waste Framework Directive and Co-mingled Collections Report to Warwickshire Waste Partnership Meeting of September 18th, 2012.
2. DEFRA views on co-mingled collections and Technical, Environmental and Economic Practicability (TEEP) Report to the Warwickshire Waste Partnership Meeting of December 3rd 2013.

	Name	Contact Information
Report Author	Andy Smith	andy.smith@rugby.gov.uk
Head of Service	Mark Ryder	markryder@warwickshire.gov.uk
Strategic Director	Monica Fogarty	monicafogarty@warwickshire.gov.uk
Portfolio Holder	Jeff Clarke	jeffclarke@warwickshire.gov.uk