











Anwen Jones Solicitor/Cyfreithiwr

Interim Head of Legal and Democratic Services
Pennaeth Dros Dro Gwasanaethau Cyfreithiol a Democrataidd

To: Councillors: Nancy Matthews, N. Phillips, Michael Priestly, Eryl Williams, Arwel Pierce, W. G. Roberts, Sharon Frobisher, Meirion Hughes and Alex Aldridge

CS/NG

8 March 2012

Nicola Gittins

01352 702345

nicola.gittins@flintshire.gov.uk

Dear Sir / Madam

A meeting of the <u>NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE</u> will be held in the <u>COUNCIL CHAMBER, BODLONDEB, CONWY, LL32 8DU</u> on <u>FRIDAY, 16 MARCH 2012</u> at <u>10.30a.m.</u> to consider the following items.

Yours faithfully

f ---

Democracy & Governance Manager

AGENDA

- 1. **APOLOGIES**
- 2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

County Hall, Mold. CH7 6NA Tel. 01352 702400 DX 708591 Mold 4

www.flintshire.gov.uk

Neuadd y Sir, Yr Wyddgrug. CH7 6NR Ffôn 01352 702400 DX 708591 Mold 4

www.siryfflint.gov.uk

The Council welcomes correspondence in Welsh or English Mae'r Cyngor yn croesawau gohebiaeth yn y Cymraeg neu'r Saesneg

- 4. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING
- 5. **PROGRESS REPORT (SO REPORT)**
- 6. RIR RISK STATUS UPDATE (SP REPORT)
- 7. COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE (SO REPORT)
- 8. WELSH GOVERNMENT GUIDANCE ON WASTE HIERARCHY (SP REPORT)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985 – TO CONSIDER THE EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The following item is considered to be exempt by virtue of Paragraph 14 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

- 9. ROAD-RAIL ASSESSMENT REPORT (SP REPORT)
- 10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS











NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Joint Committee held at County Hall, Mold on Friday 27 January, 2012.

PRESENT: Councillor Eryl Williams (Chairman) - Denbighshire County Council

Councillor Neville Phillips – Flintshire County Council

Councillor Arwel Pierce - Gwynedd Council

Councillor Sharon Frobisher – Denbighshire County Council

Councillor Mike Priestley - Conwy County Borough Council

Councillor Meirion Hughes - Conwy County Borough Council

Councillor Bob Parry - Isle of Anglesey County Council

Councillor W.J. Chorlton – Isle of Anglesey County Council

Alex Aldridge – Commissioner for the Isle of Anglesey County Council

ALSO PRESENT:

Flintshire County Council

Mr. Carl Longland, Ms. Kerry Feather, Ms. Louise Pedreschi and Ms. Ceri Owen

Denbighshire County Council

Mr. Steve Parker

Conwy County Borough Council

Mr. Andrew Kirkham

Gwynedd Council

Mr. Dilwyn Williams

Isle of Anglesey County Council

Mr. Dewi Williams

North Wales Residual Waste Treatment Partnership

Mr. Stephen Penny, Mr. Steffan Owen and Ms. Karen Powell











Partnerships UK

Mr. Huw Roberts

APOLOGIES

Councillor Nancy Matthews and Mr. Colin Everett (Flintshire County Council)

Carl Longland reported that Councillor Nancy Matthews had recently fallen and broken her arm. The Chairman asked that the good wishes of the Committee be sent to her.

1. <u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u>

No declarations of interest were received from any Member and Officers present.

2. <u>ELECTION OF A CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE</u>

The Chairman reported that this item would be deferred and included on the agenda for the next meeting scheduled for 16 March, 2012.

RESOLVED:

That this item be deferred to the next meeting scheduled for 16 March, 2012.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 October, 2011 were submitted.

RESOLVED

That the minutes be approved as a correct record.











4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

There were no matters arising.

5. PROGRESS REPORT

The Project Manager presented the progress report and stated that the project was progressing well. He explained that a dialogue had been continuing with the three participants on legal, financial and technical matters.

He reported that a public meeting had recently been held, which had been hosted by Connah's Quay Town Council to oppose the site at Deeside Industrial Park for incineration. 100 people had been in attendance with Merthyr Tydfil Friends of the Earth addressing the meeting. A petition had also been launched which included signatories from across the boarder in England. In addition to this a notice of motion which raised concern at any proposal for a residual waste treatment plant being sited on Deeside had been submitted to the next Flintshire County Council meeting scheduled for 31 January, 2012. Copies of the notice of motion were circulated at the meeting.

In response to comments on communication with the public, the Project Director explained that during the procurement process further information on sites and technology was commercially sensitive. Details of the proposals would be released later in the procurement process with the agreement of the remaining bidders in order to engage with the public.

Following a discussion, it was agreed that the Project Director would attend the Flintshire County Council meeting on 31 January, 2012 in order to respond to any technical matters raised by Members.

The Project Director reported that there were no major issues and an update with regard to minor issues in relation to the project activity was as follows:-











- ID 72 ISDS solutions to be submitted by participants. Following feedback from bidders and advisors the date had been adjusted to 27 January, 2012.
- ID 73 Assessment of ISDS submissions. Key information would be provided to Finance Technical and Legal Officers prior to the development of recommendations to the Project Board and Joint Committee. Further details were outlined within Appendix 1 of the report.
- ID 91 Seek legal advice following letters received about the presence
 of one of the bidders in the procurement process. Legal advice had
 been sought and letters were replied to, however a further response
 had been received. This has been forwarded to Flintshire County
 Council's procurement unit to address and to re-affirm legal advice.

A Member raised concern on the timetable for the decision on road/rail which he felt did not allow sufficient time to discuss this matter with fellow Members. In response, the Project Director said that the Joint Committee had the appropriate delegated authority to make such decisions as set out in the agreed Inter Authority Agreement. There would be the opportunity for each authority to canvass the opinion of their Members and report back to the Joint Committee.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

6. RIR – RISK STATUS UPDATE

The Project Director presented a Risk Register report which highlighted some of the amendments to the risk register that had been made to reflect the current understanding of risks and mitigation measurers that were in place.











The recent issue of the draft Collections, Infrastructure and Markets (CIM) Sector Plan by the Welsh Government (WG) had led to uncertainty as to the status of the existing Regional Waste Plans. The risk commentary had been modified to reflect the fact that the project team understood that the CIM had been delayed until early in 2012 to allow further WG planning team input. There was also a change to existing risk CO4 (Pressure from lobby groups/public against the preferred solution and location) to reflect the fact that national campaigners were engaging with local Community Councils and local Communities in attempt to build opposition to potential solutions at Deeside.

He commented on existing risk F13 (WG funding). WG had indicated that in the event that any solution that may involve energy recovery failed to achieve (or later lose) R1 energy efficiency status may be a risk of losing WG financial support. All participants had confirmed that their solutions would meet R1 in their ISOS submissions but the technical team were looking at this issue to see how likely it was that a solution could fall below R1 and what would be the circumstances. The risk level had not been changed at this time.

RESOLVED

That the updated Risk Register for the project be noted.

6. <u>COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE AND PRESENTATION BY THE PROJECT MANAGER</u>

The Project Manager updated Members on communication matters concerning the NWRWTP.

A meeting had been held by the Project Team with technical and communication advisors to plan communication and engagement going forward for the following 12 months. Details of the communication plan which had been drawn up were outlined within the report.











Following a discussion it was agreed that a press release would need to be published as soon as possible after 16 March, 2012 following the decision of the Joint Committee on road/rail.

The Project Manager provided a presentation to the Joint Committee which outlined the results of the consultation exercise and telephone survey.

Following discussion, the Project Manager confirmed that he would look again at the invalid responses to try and assess what their opinions would have been. This would be reported back to the Joint Committee at its next meeting.

A Member asked whether another consultation exercise would be carried out with the public living in the vicinity of the preferred site. Another Member suggested that resources be put aside to undertake door knocking to the public living in the vicinity of the proposed site to ensure their concerns were alleviated.

RESOLVED

That the Communication Update be noted.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.











AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 5

NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE TREATMENT PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

NORTH WALES RESIDUAL WASTE JOINT COMMITTEE

Date : 16 March 2012

Period: 18 January 2012 to 7 March 2012

PROJECT SUMMARY

To procure a sustainable waste management solution for the 5 local authorities in North Wales (Conwy, Denbighshire, Flintshire, Gwynedd and Isle of Anglesey) that will assist with the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from landfill and will minimise the tonnage of waste residue sent to landfill thus ensuring that the authorities avoid Landfill Allowance Scheme (LAS) infraction penalties and meet National Waste Strategy targets.

PROJECT STATUS

Overall Project Status	
Amber	ISDS bids were received from bidders on 27 January 2012 as per procurement timetable. These bids are not evaluated however the legal, technical and financial advisors have considered the relevant parts of the bids in order to give a generic comparison of the road based solutions and the rail based solutions. As previously outlined, only the advisors have been able to see the submissions, and the information provided to the project team and the authorities has been anonymised.
	There is continuing press coverage in the Flintshire area, with local press reports suggesting that 6,000 signatures have been received on the petition opposing the project (this includes signatures from neighbouring English areas).











Budget status	
Green	Actual spend for this financial year up to 31 December 2011 is £889,133. Profiled spend for this financial year up to is £994,821. (under profile by £105,688).

Status	Meaning
Green	There are no problems; all is progressing well and to plan
Amber	There are some minor/ less significant problems. Action is needed in some areas but other parts are progressing satisfactory
Red	There are significant problems and urgent and decisive action is needed.

PROJECT UPDATE – Activities due for completion 18th January 2012 to 7th March 2012 (and highlighted longer term actions).

ID	Activity	RAG status	Comments	Forecast	Actual
72	ISDS solutions to be submitted by participants	Amber	Bids received	27 January 2012	Complete
73	Assessment of ISDS submissions	Amber	Reports received from legal, financial and technical advisors, and main report with overall findings put together by Project Team (see item 9 on the Agenda).	February 2012	Complete
74	Participants informed of partnership's decisions on road / road-rail, and invited to submit refinements to their ISDS submissions in the light of decision	Amber		Mid March 2012	
75	Submission of Refined ISDS by participants	Amber		April 2012	
76	Refined ISDS	Amber		May / June	











	submissions evaluated			2012	
78	The second IAA (IAA2) to be commenced	Green	This to commence once ISDS solutions are known (and the likely contract structures are more certain)	November 2011	
82	Full analysis of consultation responses	Green	Presentation delivered to Joint Committee in January 2012	October 2011	Complete
83	Report back to public and respondents with results of consultation	Green	This to be done later in project timetable following discussion at the Joint Committee in January 2012	TBC	
84	Communication and engagement plan for next 12 months	Green	Plan agreed with Project Board	21 October 2011	Complete
87	Financial and technical teams to be consulted on the road / rail assessment result prior to Project Board and Joint Committee	Green	Meeting held with technical officers on 22 February to consider technical aspects, and meeting held on 29 Feb with Finance officers to discuss financial aspects.	February 2012	Complete
90	Road / Rail assessment results to be presented to Project Board and Joint Committee	Green	See agenda item number 9	February / March 2012	Complete
91	Seek legal advice following letters received about the presence of one of the bidders in the procurement process	Green	Letter written to bidder asking for response. Awaiting response.	February 2012	
92	Prepare press release and	Green	See item 7 on this agenda	Mid / late March 2012	











	process for informing the public of road / rail decision				
93	Prepare comprehensive information pack for Members and public to be used when it is appropriate to discuss technology and site proposals	Green	Early draft received. Project Team currently reviewing and amending. Work continuing	June 2012	

KEY	RISKS -	See	item	6	on	this	agenda.
------------	---------	-----	------	---	----	------	---------











AGENDA ITEM NO: 6

REPORT TO: <u>NWRWTP JOINT COMMITTEE</u>

DATE: <u>16 MARCH 2012</u>

REPORT BY: <u>PROJECT DIRECTOR</u>

SUBJECT: RISK REGISTER REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. The members of the NWRWTP Joint Committee have requested that they are provided with an update of the risk register at each meeting of the Joint Committee.
- 1.2. This report will highlight some of the amendments to the risk register that have been made to reflect the current understanding of risks and mitigation measures that are in place.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. The Risk Register will require continual update throughout the project.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1. There are no new risks identified this reporting period.
- 3.2. This reporting period risk PO2 (WG Environmental policy and objectives change) has changed as a result of the recently published Waste Hierarchy Guidance from Welsh Government (see separate report on this agenda). Likely hood that the project may now prove inappropriate reduced from 4 to 3.
- 3.3. The Top 8 risks (after controls have been put in place) are shown in appendix 1.
- 3.4. The changes this period are shown in appendix 2.
- 3.5. The risk register will continue to be reviewed by the Project Director and reported to the Project Board at future meetings.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. That the Joint Committee note the updated risk register for the project.











5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1. Not applicable
- 6. ANTI-POVERTY IMPACT
- 6.1. None
- 7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
- 7.1. Not applicable
- 8. EQUALITIES IMPACT
- 8.1. Not applicable
- 9. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS
- 9.1. Not applicable
- 10. CONSULTATION REQUIRED
- 10.1. Not applicable
- 11. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN
- 11.1. Not applicable

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT 1985

Background Documents:

None

Contact Officer: Stephen Penny NWRWTP













Appendix 1 Top (Red) risks and issues

			Curre	ent Asses	sment	How the risk will be ma	naged and controlled		Residual R	isk	Additional explanatory notes
ID	Risk / Issue (i.e.: Threat to the Project)	Consequence	Impact	L'hood	Overall	Already in Place	Not in Place (Proposed)	Impact	L'hood	Overall	
Policy & r	egulatory Risk – Char	nge in WG objectives	/ regul	ations				•	•	•	•
PO2	WG Environmental policy and objectives change	Project is now inappropriate	4	5	20	Keep in close contact with WG to ensure potential policy changes that may impact on the project are identified early. The Project team have developed and submitted a partnership consultation response (approved by the PB and Joint Committee) highlighting the potential impact of such a target on the project and to ensure WG addresses how any such target is related to potential household numbers of population growth rates that authorities may be subject to in future.		4	3	12	WG have indicated in the finalMunicipal Sector Plan (MSP) that they may adopt a waste minimisation target for MSW with a negative growth rate (reduction) of -1.2% pa. The WG MSP does not take any account of individual or partner authority HH or population growth rates. The Partnership has however received guidance from WG that the Partnership is free to make its own assessments about future waste arisings and as a result planning risk is now moderated. WG has now published guidance on the Waste Heirarchy. This is viewed by the project team as helpfull and will enable the Partnership to demonstrate how any solution that comes forward ranks in the waste heirarchy.
Communi	cation & stakeholders	- failure to proactive	ely eng	age wit	h key s	take holders leading to delay		t for th	e propos	ed soluti	on.
CO4	Pressure from lobby groups/public against the preferred solution and location.	Alternative solution/site has to be sought, increased project development costs, delays to project delivery programme, excessive LAS costs, impact on Partner Councils reputation	4	5	20	Communication and Engagement Strategy drafted and agreed in draft form by Communication Officer group. To be "live" document and therefore updated when necessary.	Alternative site work will continue during early stages of procurement process.	4	4	16	National campaigners' engaging with local community councils and local communities in attempt to build opposition to potential solutions.
Planning	and permitting -ability	y to secure successf	ul plan	ning an	d perm	tting outcome for solution					
PS5	Suitable sites are not in council ownership to support development of the solution	Project delayed whilst suitable sites are secured	5	3	15	Project team are identifying sites that could be suitable for location of both the waste transfer stations and residual waste treatment facility(s)	Complete negotiations with land owners of (further) additional sites identified as potentially suitable for location of facilities with the aim of securing options/ heads of terms for sites.	5	3	15	











Appendix 1 Top (Red) risks and issues (continued)

			Curr	ent Asses	sment	How the risk will be ma	anaged and controlled		Residual R	isk	Additional explanatory notes
ID	Risk / Issue (i.e.: Threat to the Project)	Consequence	Impact	L'hood	Overall	Already in Place	Not in Place (Proposed)	Impact	L'hood	Overall	
Finance &	Affordability										1
F15	plans to support additional recycling and composting services to meet	Failure to meet WG "front end" recycling and composting targets with increased residual waste arisings as a result.	4	4	16	Partner authorities to develop long term funding plans to support enhanced front end recycling and composting services.	Partner Authorities	4	3	12	WG are encouraging authorities in Wales to enter into a "change programme" where WG will offer assistance to Las to work together and improve "front end" recycling and collections services.
Procuremen	t Strategy and Process						l .				
P13	Technological solutions offered are not commissionable within LAS infraction timescales	LA's face infraction fines for additional landfill above allowance	4	4	16	OBC modelling has shown that each partner authority can meet LAS allowances if they increase "front end" recycling and composting" and the project is deliverd to timetable. Any underperformacne in this "front end" recycling and composting are outside the scope of this project and any subsequent LAS liabilities will lie with the invidivual partner authorities. See also risk W1	Procurment process to ensure that is dilevred ina timley manner with the risk of late delivery of the residual waste treatemtn service minmised.	4	3	12	
Planning a	and permitting -ability	y to secure successf	ul plan	ning an	d perm	itting outcome for solution	•				
	The recent issue of the draft Collections, Infrastructure and Markets Sector Plan (CIM) by WG has led to uncertaninty as to the status of the existing Regional Waste Plan (RWP). Thus the RWP may be given reduced weight in determination of a planning application for waste facilities. A policy vaccum may therefore exist if this is not addressed by WG.	Unsuccessfull planning application	4	4	16	Project team and north wales regional waste planning team engaging with WG on this issue to ensure that the final issued version of Collections, Infrastructure and Markets Sector Plan (CIM) does not leave a planning "policy vacuum". Regional Planing team and WG planing teams engaged with WG Waste Policy section to seek required ammendments to draft CIM		4	3	12	WG's published draft Collections, Infrastructure and Markets Sector Plan (CIM) indicates that RWP's will be replaced but with no indication as to timetable for replacement. The Project team understand that the CIM's publiciation is now delayed until early 2012.
Performance							•				
	Market/outlet is not available for outputs from the facility(s)	Increased project operational costs, increase in demand for landfill void	4	4	16	Ensure market deliverability demonstrated as part of procurement evaluation process.		4	3	12	













Appendix 2 Headline Changes this Period

	IDENTIF	YING THE RISK or I	ISSUE					MANAGING	THE RISK	or IS	SUE					
	Risk / Issue (i.e.:		Curre	nt Asses	sment	How the risk	will be mar	naged and control	led	Res	sidual	risk				Additional explanatory notes
ID	Threat to the Project)	Consequence	Impact	L'hood	Overall	Already in Place	Who is Managin g	Not in Place (Proposed)	Who will Manage		L'ho od	Over all	Impln Date	Review Date	Closure Date	
PO2	Inducy and	Project is now inappropriate	4	5	20	Keep in close contact with WG to ensure potential policy changes that may impact on the project are identified early. The Project team have developed and submitted a partnership consultation response (approved by the PB and Joint Committee) highlighting the potential impact of such a target on the project and to ensure WG addresses how any such target is related to potential household numbers of population growth rates that authorities may be subject to in future.	PD			4	3	12	Ongoing	Feb-12		WG have indicated in the finalMunicipal Sector Plan (MSP) that they may adopt a waste minimisation target for MSW with a negative growth rate (reduction) of -1.2% pa. The WG MSP does not take any account of individual or partner authority HH or population growth rates. The Partnership has however received guidance from WG that the Partnership is free to make its own assessments about future waste arisings and as a result planning risk is now moderated. WG has now published guidance on the Waste Heirarchy. This is viewed by the project team as helpfull and will enable the Partnership to demonstrate how any solution that comes forward ranks in the waste heirarchy.









AGENDA ITEM NO: 7

REPORT TO: <u>NWRWTP JOINT COMMITTEE</u>

DATE: <u>16 MARCH 2012</u>

REPORT BY: PROJECT MANAGER

SUBJECT: <u>COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE</u>

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1. To update the NWRWTP Joint Committee on communication matters concerning the North Wales Residual Waste Treatment Project (NWRWTP).

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. The Joint Committee has requested regular updates on communication matters relating to the NWRWTP. This report provides an update on progress to date.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1. Media Coverage

There is continued media coverage in the Flintshire press, with reports now suggesting that 6,000 signatures have been received on the petition opposing the project, which includes signatures from neighbouring English areas. Please see example in Appendix 1 below. There has also just been some coverage on the BBC Wales news North East Wales website, see Appendix 2 below.

3.2. Media Relations and Stakeholder relations

- 3.2.1. As per the communication plan outlined at the last Project Board meeting on 9 January 2012 and discussed at the Joint Committee on 27 January 2012, the Project Team and advisors are preparing for media and stakeholder relations with regards the results of the consultation exercise and the telephone survey, and the outcome of the road / rail decision, specifically:
 - a) Consultation results summary report
 - b) Media release on the outcome of the road rail decision
 - c) Stakeholder newsletter with the above
 - d) Planning the process for making the announcement of the two bidders progressing in the procurement process and the site and technology proposed (e.g. media briefing, newsletter etc).











- e) Comprehensive information pack to be issued at that time this to include any supporting information that the bidders agree to release.
- f) Points d) and e) above will be discussed at the next Project Board
- 3.2.2. There was some discussion as to the appropriate timing of engaging with the media and stakeholders on the above items given the proximity to the local government elections. The Project Team feel that the more pro-active the project can be in terms of engagement with the media, the more beneficial it will be, however it is clear the proximity to the elections may prohibit media releases and such during the latter part of March 2012 (Purdah begins in Flintshire on 20 March 2012).
- 3.2.3. The Project Board's views were therefore sought in relation to the timing of the announcement on the road / rail decision. A number of options were outlined (see below) on the assumption that a decision is reached at this Committee:
 - a) Issue press release and Member & stakeholder newsletters announcing road / rail decision on Monday 19th March. Release and newsletters to include brief outline of the results of the rail question only from the consultation process and telephone survey. Further aspects of the consultation can be publicised during the summer as part of the wider discussions.
 - b) Issue press release and Member & stakeholder newsletters announcing road / rail decision on Monday 19th March. Release and newsletters to include full consultation results report.
 - c) Announce road / rail decision as part of the wider press release in July 2012 announcing the two bidders progressing in the procurement process and the site and technology proposed. It should be noted that this option leaves a gap prior to the election where the project is unable to provide the media with any updates to counter the negative press in the Flintshire area. This could be countered to some extent by publishing the consultation results report only prior to purdah and leaving the road / rail decision announcement to July 2012
- 3.2.4. Project Board's chosen option was option c, however it was noted that the Project Team should be prepared to answer any press enquiries clearly should the press contact the project.

4. **RECOMMENDATIONS**











- 4.1. To note the content of this update report.
- 4.2. To note the intended approach to publicising the road / rail decision.
- 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
- 5.1. Not applicable.
- 6. ANTI-POVERTY IMPACT
- 6.1. Not applicable.
- 7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
- 7.1. Not applicable.
- 8. EQUALITIES IMPACT
- 8.1. Not applicable.
- 9. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS
- 9.1. Not applicable.
- 10. CONSULTATION REQUIRED
- 10.1. See above.
- 11. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN
- 11.1. Not applicable.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT 1985

Background Documents:

None

Contact Officer: Steffan Owen NWRWTP











Appendix 1 Flintshire Press coverage

Have you got a story?

Zumba expert to take masterclass

AWORLD famous zumba expert is

AWORLD famous zumba expert is coming to Broughton. Samba queen Priscila Sartori, who is PA to zumba creator Beto Perez, will be making a special guest appearance at zumba masterclass at Airhus Sports and Social Club on Wednesday, February 29.
Organiser Adriana Whitley, originally from Brazil but now living in Ruthin, persuaded Priscila to attend the event while she is in the UK attending the 2012 zumba instructor's conference in London.

Adriana said: "Having someone of Priscila's stature come to North Wales is a rare treat." This is the first time someone from Beto Perez's Florida-based fitness crew has come to the area, so for anyone interested in zumba this masterclass is a must, it's an opportunity to learn from one of the very best." Performing alongside Priscila and Adriana will be zumba education specialist Sandra Bayliss, originally from Mexico.

They will also be joined by Chilean Paula Picon, a zumbajammer, who is travelling with Priscila on her first visit to the

The event is in aid of the ABC

The event is in aid of the ABC Trust, which helps the most vulnerable children and young people in Brazil. The masterclass runs from 7.30pm.9pm and tickets, costing 512, are available from Adriana at zumbawithadri@mail.com or on 07990866981.

The Leader Monday, February 20, 2012 9

Email our news team at news@leaderlive.co.uk

III Brazilian Zumba expert Priscila Sartori.

Elizabethan Patio Doors

LAST REMAINING STOCK CLEARANCE

TUDOR 10' x 8' was £7,150 - £3,995 - 1 LEFT GABLE 10' x 8' was £7,695 - £4,999 - 1 LEFT EDW 10' x 10' was £8,050 - £5,900 - SOLD TUDOR 12' x 10' was £8,450 - £6,260 - SOLD ELIZ 15' x 9' was £9,500 - £6,950 - 1 LEFT

Double Opening Doors Base and Brickwork inc Inside Cills - 3 colours Feature Beam Roof Bronze Anti-Glare Poly FULLY INSTALLED



THIS IS NO GIMMICK, COME AND SEE SOME OF THE SAME MODELS ON DISPLAY FOR YOURSELF AT OUR FACTORY & SHOWCENTRE HERE IN GWERSYLLT OR CALL US TODAY FOR FURTHER DETAILS ON THIS OFFER

ON (01978) 752020 AND ASK FOR MARK

Protests moun incinerator plans

By Hayley Collins

MORE than 6,000 people have joined the fight against the possible construction of an incinerator on Deeside.

construction of an incinerator on Deeside. Fears are mounting that Deeside will become the site for a huge incinerator to deal with residual waste from Flintshire. Denbighshire. Anglesey, Gwynedd and Conwy.

Anti-incinerator campaigners, led by Connah's Quay Town Council, have sent out a rallying cry to all community councils in the county calling for their as of the county calling for their as of the county calling for the petition opposing construction of an incinerator in Deeside or anywhere in Flintshire. Connah's Quay councillor Bernie Attridge says the whole of Flintshire, as well as communities in neighbouring councils, have got behind the campaign. He said: This isn't just going to affect Deeside. Depending on which way the wind is blowing, it's going to affect the other side of the county as well such as Flint and Holywell.

'And it's not just the people of Deeside that are behind this campaign, I've had people from all over Flintshire as well as Neston and the Wirral wanting to sign the petition.

Flintshire shouldn't be the dumping ground for Wales

"Shotton, Queensferry, Sealand and Garden City community councils are all supporting Connah's Quay Town Council in its endeavours to oppose incineration in Deeside."

"I would now urge the other councils to come onboard and help us in our fight."

North Wales Residual Waste Treatment Project (NWRWTP) is proposing to build a facility in North Wales to deal with the excess residual waste.

A firm decision has not yet been made on what technology will be used or where the facility will be located, but an outline business case presented by the project board lists Deeside as the only possible location.

Last year another site put forward on Anglesey was ruled out.

Cilr Attridge added: "I accept no

torward on Angiesey was rued out.

Cilr Attridge added: "I accept no firm decision has been made, but you only have to read between the lines.

"Deside is the only site mentioned, the Anglesey site was just a paper exercise."

Filmshire shouldn't be the dumping ground for Wales. We will fight this all the way.

A letter from Connah's Quay Town Council clerk Ian Jones sent to all other councils says: "Although no firm proposals have been agreed, there is a school of thought at present that as part of the waste treatment an incinerator will be built to burn household waste from the whole of North Wales. "Such a proposal could have a devastating effect on the environment with the potential for pollution and as yet unknown effects on health due to the emission of the council of

proposals from the bidders this summer.
"No decisions have been made yet, and as the project's timetable remains as outlined previously, with the three bidders being reduced to two in lune-July 2012. The remaining bidders will then submit their final tenders in late 2012 and the preferred bidder will be appointed in early-mid 2013.
"A planning application will then follow."



























AGENDA ITEM NO: 8

REPORT TO: <u>NWRWTP JOINT COMMITTEE</u>

DATE: <u>16 MARCH 2012</u>

REPORT BY: PROJECT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: <u>NEW WASTE HIERARCHY GUIDANCE</u>

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1. To update the Joint Committee on the new Waste Hierarchy guidance from the Welsh Government.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The Joint Committee will be aware of the term 'Waste Hierarchy' and how it has been used for several years to define a rank order of priority for the management of waste. The three 'Rs' (reduce, re-use and recycle) have been applied as a slogan for many years by local authorities as a means of implementing the Waste Hierarchy in practice. Final disposal to landfill has always been at the bottom of the Waste Hierarchy.
- 2.2. In January 2012 the Welsh Government (WG) published a new document called "Guidance on Applying the Waste Hierarchy", which provides further details on how the Waste Hierarchy should be applied in Wales. In particular, there is guidance on where different residual waste treatment technologies lie within the Waste Hierarchy, which will be of interest to the North Wales Residual Waste Treatment Project (NWRWTP). This report will summarize the key points of this new Waste Hierarchy guidance.

3. SUMMARY OF NEW GUIDANCE ON THE WASTE HIERARCHY

- 3.1. WG's updated Waste Hierarchy guidance is summarised in the table shown in **Appendix 1** of this report.
- 3.2. The guidance also considers common waste items (e.g. paper and card, food, plastics and residual 'black bag' waste etc) and specifies, in rank order, how these particular waste categories should be managed. Of particular note to the NWRWTP is the guidance given by WG on how residual 'black bag' waste should be managed in future (as noted in Appendix 2 of this report).











4. KEY IMPLICATIONS OF THE WASTE HIERARCHY TO THE NWRWTP

- 4.1. The Joint Committee will be aware that all partner local authorities are committed to reaching very high re-use, recycling, composting and landfill diversion rates to meet WG's statutory targets. It should be noted therefore that each partner local authority has a duty to ensure these targets are met by implementing their own local action plans to ensure compliance. This reflects the requirements of the new Waste Hierarchy guidance for individual waste categories (e.g. paper and card, food, wood and glass etc), where waste prevention, re-use, recycling and composting etc are the preferred methods of managing different materials. However, even after reaching very high re-use, recycling and composting rates, there will always be a percentage of residual 'black bag' waste that will have to be treated further in some way.
- 4.2. WG's new Waste Hierarchy guidance has provided a detailed rank order of priority, explaining how residual waste should be managed in Wales in future years (as shown in Appendix 2). It should be noted from the Waste Hierarchy that following the prevention of residual waste, WG's preferred technology to treat this material is some form of Energy from Waste (EfW) with Incinerator Bottom Ash recovery/recycling. Other forms of waste treatment such as mechanical biological treatment and mechanical heat treatment are less desirable and appear lower down the Waste Hierarchy.
- 4.3. As noted on previous occasions, the NWRWTP is technology neutral, meaning it has no preference on how residual waste is treated, as long as the key service outputs specified by WG are met. It has been therefore up to the three remaining bidders to decide which technology would best meet the NWRWTP's requirements. The technology solutions being developed by bidders are likely to perform well in terms of demonstrating consistency with the waste hierarchy as set out in the newly published WG document.

5. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.1. To note the content of this report.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1. Not applicable.

7. ANTI-POVERTY IMPACT

7.1. Not applicable.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

8.1. Not applicable.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT











- 9.1. Not applicable.
- 10. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS
- 10.1. Not applicable.
- 11. CONSULTATION REQUIRED
- 11.1. Not applicable.
- 12. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN
- 12.1. Not applicable.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT 1985

Background Documents:

None

Contact Officer: Stephen Penny NWRWTP











APPENDIX 1

WASTE HIERARCHY (as	s per new WG guidance)
Prevention (<u>highest priority</u>)	Using less material in design and manufacture. Keeping products for longer; re-use (e.g. donations to charity). Using less hazardous materials.
Preparing for re-use	Checking, cleaning, repairing, refurbishing, whole items or spare parts that have been discarded as waste for them to be re-used.
Recycling	Turning waste into a new material, substance or product. Includes anaerobic digestion if the digestate is a product meeting quality protocols for use as a soil conditioner or fertiliser. Includes composting if it meets quality protocols for use as a soil conditioner or fertiliser.
Other recovery	Includes anaerobic digestion where the digestate does not meet quality protocols; landspreading and some backfilling. Can include: incineration with energy recovery, gasification and pyrolysis which produce energy (fuels, heat and power) and materials from waste.
Disposal (<u>lowest priority</u>)	Landfill and incineration without energy recovery











APPENDIX 2

Residual 'black bag' (WG's Waste Hierarchy guidance rank order)
Prevention (highest priority)
EfW at maximum process efficiency (heat only) with IBA recovery/recycling
Mass Burn EfW at >60% efficiency and gasification or pyrolysis at >50% efficiency with IBA recovery/recycling
Mass Burn EfW gasification or pyrolysis at >30% and <50% efficiency with recycling of ash
MBT/MHT with RDF to high efficiency EfW
Energy Recovery♦ (Electricity Only) with recycling of IBA
MBT with AD/IVC and CLO to landfill*/ MBT with RDF to EfW plants operating in electricity-only mode. Disposal (lowest priority)

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

EXEMPT INFORMATION SHEET

COMMITTEE:	North Wales Residual Waste Joint Committee			
DATE:	16 March 2012			
AGENDA ITEM NO:	9			
REPORT OF:	Stephen Penny – Project Director			
SUBJECT:	Outcome of Road – Rail Assessment			
•	em is NOT FOR PUBLICATION because of <u>exempt</u> following section(s) or paragraph(s) of Schedule 12	•		
Covernment / tot 10//	- .	<u>Para</u>		
Information relating to a particular individual *		12	[]
Information likely to reveal the identity of an individual *		13	[]
Information relating to financial/business affairs of a particular person * See Note 1		14	[1	√]
Information relating to consultations/negotiations on labour relations matter *		15	[]
Legal professional privilege		16	[]
Information revealing	the authority proposes to:			
(a) give a statutor		4-	_	_
	ory order/direction *	17	_]
information on prevei	ntion/investigation/prosecution of crime *	18	L]
For Standards Committee meetings only:				
Information subject to obligations of confidentiality		18A	[]
Information relating to national security		18B	[]
The deliberations of a Standards Committee in reaching a finding			[]
Confidential information which the Council is not permitted to disclose			[]

PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX

Note 1: Information is not exempt under paragraph 14 if such information is required to be registered under Companies Act 1985, the Friendly Societies Acts of 1974 and 1992, the Industrial and Provident Societies Act 1965 to 1978, the Building Societies Act 1986 or the Charities Act 1993.

^{*} Means exempt only if the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

SCHEDULE 12A LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE OF DOCUMENTS

REPORT: Outcome of Road – Rail Assessment

AUTHOR: Stephen Penny – Project Director

MEETING AND DATE OF MEETING: North Wales Residual Waste Joint Committee

- 16 March 2012

I have considered grounds for exemption of information contained in the report referred to above and make the following recommendation to the Proper Officer:-

Exemptions applying to the report:

Paragraph 14.

Factors in favour of disclosure:

Transparency.

Prejudice which would result if the information were disclosed:

Disclosure of the sensitive and commercially privileged information contained in the report could result in breaches of confidentiality and potentially undermine the process.

My view on the public interest test is as follows:

The public interest test favours non disclosure at this stage.

Recommended decision on exemption from disclosure:

That the report be exempt and the press and public be excluded during the consideration of the item.

Date: 8 March 2012

Signed:

Post: Team Manager – Committee Services

I accept the recommendation made above.

Proper Officer

Date: 8 March 2012