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## 1 Background

1.1 In October 2005 the Environment Committee adopted a work programme in order to deliver the waste strategy established at the time.
1.2 Things have now moved forward substantially and there is a need to review our position by drawing up a new programme which will take us forward to 2025 and beyond.
1.3 The purpose of the strategy is to reduce the waste that goes into landfill sites and there are several drivers that take us down this path.
1.4 Obviously the first consideration is the ecological footprint. In addition to using up the world's scarce raw materials, placing waste in landfill substantially increases greenhouse gases (with methane 21 times more damaging than $\mathrm{CO}^{2}$ ).
1.5 With this in mind the European Parliament have set allowances on the decomposable waste that is sent to landfill sites and if the Council sends more than the allowance then there will be financial penalties to pay. There are therefore also economic drivers to the strategy. [Even though some of the suggestions noted in the strategy appear more costly than landfill - when the penalties for landfill allowances are considered together with the expected increases in the rate of the landfill tax the pendulum swings the other way.]
1.6 The Assembly Government has also set targets for other elements in connection with recycling and what can be sent to landfill and the strategy also endeavours to address these targets. The Minister for the Environment, Sustainability and Housing has noted that she intends to make some of these targets statutory in due course which could mean more financial penalties.

She has also noted her intention to prohibit some materials (e.g. food, paper, cans etc) being sent to landfill sites.
1.7 In reality therefore the financial threat could be more than that noted in the strategy.

## 2 The Strategy

2.1 Section 6 of the attached report details the contents of the strategy for the period to come and the related programme of activity.
2.2 The Head of Highways and Municipal Services will give a brief presentation to the Council summarising the strategy's direction and explaining its content.
2.3 Whilst there are 12 specific elements noted, the elements that will cost the most are :-

- Establish provision to deal with food waste (Gwyriad Project) (Paragraph 6.1.9)
- Establish shared arrangements across North Wales to deal with remaining waste (Paragraph 6.1.11);

The Assembly Government will offer financial assistance to establish these facilities which will assist the business case. However it will also mean a substantial investment from the Council. The cost would be much higher however if we did not undertake this provision.

The difference is stated in graph form in Appendix D of the original report. Following a further review of the figures it was identified that the original graph did not include inflation figures for the cost of collection. This does not alter the overall conclusionbut for the sake of accuracy, detailed figures and a revised graph are included in appendices 1 and 2 .
2.2 In relation to the effect on residents the main effects will be -

- The intention to increase the recycling collections frequency (blue box) and food to weekly; (paragraph 6.1.1.)
- The consideration that must be given to decrease the capacity of the green bin or consider decreasing collection frequency further (paragraph 6.1.7)
2.3 Of course, once the appropriate infrastructure is in place, the key to the continuing success of the strategy will be an increased emphasis on education and persuasion. (Paragraph 6.1.8)


## 3 Consideration by the Council

3.1 It must be underlined that there are very serious consequences if the Council fails to deliver the strategy.
3.2 If the Council adopts the strategy, we will then move forward to develop the various elements and the Board will be responsible for considering the detailed business cases for those elements.
3.3 The strategy has already been presented to the Environment Scrutiny Committee and that Committee's view was to recommend that the Council should adopt the strategy whilst noting that it will mean facing difficult decisions in the future if we are to reach the relevant targets.
3.4 Obviously this will also mean a substantial investment by the Council (even though additional assistance is given by the Assembly Government) and the Council is asked to adopt the strategy and the consequent investment requirements.

## FINANCIAL COMPARISON OF THE STRATEGY COMPARED WITH DOING NOTHING

Do Nothing

|  | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management and Awareness | 572 | 587 | 601 | 616 | 632 | 648 | 664 | 680 | 697 | 715 | 733 | 751 | 770 | 789 | 809 | 829 |
| Direct Disposal Costs | 3,498 | 3,585 | 3,675 | 3,767 | 3,861 | 3,958 | 4,057 | 4,904 | 5,263 | 5,395 | 5,530 | 5,657 | 5,788 | 5,921 | 6,058 | 6,198 |
| Landfill tax (1) | 1,746 | 2,220 | 2,590 | 2,989 | 3,397 | 3,517 | 3,640 | 3,731 | 3,825 | 3,920 | 4,018 | 4,078 | 4,138 | 4,199 | 4,261 | 4,324 |
| LAS Penalties | 0 | 0 | 0 | 745 | 979 | 1,214 | 1,449 | 1,633 | 1,816 | 2,000 | 2,183 | 2,631 | 3,079 | 3,528 | 3,977 | 3,956 |
| Collection Costs | 5,555 | 5,694 | 5,837 | 5,982 | 6,132 | 6,285 | 6,442 | 6,603 | 6,769 | 6,938 | 7,111 | 7,289 | 7,471 | 7,658 | 7,849 | 8,046 |
| Waste Management Grant | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ | $(3,372)$ |
| Total Costs | 7,999 | 8,714 | 9,331 | 10,727 | 11,629 | 12,250 | 12,880 | 14,179 | 14,998 | 15,596 | 16,203 | 17,034 | 17,874 | 18,723 | 19,582 | 19,981 |
| Effect of the Strategy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Additional GwyriAD costs (net) | 0 | 38 | 38 | 801 | 810 | 826 | 842 | 859 | 876 | 893 | 911 | 929 | 948 | 967 | 987 | 1,007 |
| Additional costs Energy from Waste | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,539 | 3,485 | 3,426 | 3,441 | 3,371 | 3,356 | 3,285 | 3,145 |
| Savings in disposal costs | (39) | 35 | 93 | (204) | (199) | (192) | (173) | (915) | $(1,476)$ | $(1,529)$ | $(1,584)$ | $(1,626)$ | $(1,683)$ | $(1,733)$ | $(1,793)$ | $(1,865)$ |
| Savings in landfill tax | 0 | (137) | (308) | (511) | (646) | (735) | $(1,011)$ | $(1,125)$ | $(3,603)$ | $(3,693)$ | $(3,786)$ | $(3,842)$ | $(3,898)$ | $(3,956)$ | $(4,014)$ | $(4,073)$ |
| Savings in LAS penalties | 0 | 0 | 0 | (745) | (979) | $(1,214)$ | $(1,449)$ | $(1,633)$ | $(1,816)$ | $(2,000)$ | $(2,183)$ | $(2,631)$ | $(3,079)$ | $(3,528)$ | $(3,977)$ | $(3,956)$ |
| Additional collection costs | 0 | 192 | 611 | 626 | 642 | 658 | 674 | 691 | 708 | 726 | 744 | 763 | 782 | 801 | 821 | 842 |
| Strategy Total | 7,960 | 8,842 | 9,765 | 10,694 | 11,257 | 11,593 | 11,763 | 12,056 | 13,226 | 13,478 | 13,731 | 14,068 | 14,315 | 14,630 | 14,891 | 15,081 |
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