

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE WEST ESSEX AREA  
WASTE MANAGEMENT JOINT COMMITTEE HELD AT  
COUNTY HALL, CHELMSFORD ON 28 SEPTEMBER 2005**

Membership

- \* Councillor Tony Sleep, Brentwood Borough Council (Chair)
- \* Councillor Norman Hume, Essex County Council (substitute for Councillor Roger Walters)
- \* Councillor Michael Gage, Braintree District Council
- \* Councillor Derek Jacobs, Epping Forest District Council
- \* Councillor Chris Millington, Harlow District Council
- \* Councillor Alan Thawley, Uttlesford District Council

\* present

**24. Apologies for Absence and Notices of Substitution**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Roger Walters, Essex County Council, with Councillor Norman Hume as his substitute. Apologies for absence were also noted from Graham Tombs, Director for Environment and Commerce, Essex County Council.

**25. Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 31 August 2005 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**26. Matters Arising from the Minutes**

There were no matters arising from the Minutes of the meeting held on 31 August 2005.

**27. Declarations of Interest**

There were no Declarations of Interest.

**28. Date of Next Meeting**

It was confirmed that the next meeting of the West Essex Waste Management Joint Committee would be held on Wednesday 26 October 2005, commencing at 2.30 pm in Committee Room 1, County Hall, Chelmsford.

**29. Urgent Business (Part I)**

There was no urgent (Part I) business for discussion.

### **30. Exclusion of the Public**

#### **Resolved:**

That the public, including the press, be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following agenda items on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as specified in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972: -

Procurement options appraisal;  
Timetable for procurement approach decision making;  
Project progress report.

(Paras 8 – contract for the acquisition of property or the supply of goods or services and 9 – terms relating to negotiations for a contract).

### **31. Procurement Options Appraisal**

(Public and Press excluded)

#### Introduction

Referring to paper WEWM/01/05, Alex Creecy, Technical Manager, Waste & Recycling, Essex County Council, gave a presentation on the results of the procurement options appraisal and relevant feedback. Members also considered papers WEWM/02/05, WEWM/03/05 and WEWM/04/05 as background information to the discussion and the decision making process.

#### Background

Members noted the information contained in report WEWM/01/05 with reference to three suggestions concerning area configurations, particularly in relation to those providing the best solutions in terms of cost and performance. An explanation of the modelling used to test different scenarios and the feedback obtained to date from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) were also provided.

It was confirmed that there would be a workshop in October aimed at deriving a further, more detailed, understanding of the implications of the recent modelling results.

It was noted that, for each scenario, overall performance had been assessed against a range of factors such as geographical, environmental and social. It was stated that the sites included in the examples had been selected for modelling purposes without prejudice to decisions to be taken in the future. Possible solutions resulting from the recent modelling exercise providing the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) for Essex were also noted. Members heard that economies of scale would theoretically be possible using selected solutions.

#### Discussion

Various technical points concerning different aspects of waste disposal processing and the potential impact on recycling rates and associated costs were briefly discussed in relation to the recent modelling results.

With reference to the different funding options available, members considered these in relation to various technical aspects such as future landfill costs and space.

Members discussed the commitments currently required by DEFRA of all partners and the potential, implications for collection services, particularly in terms of finance and actual delivery offered by industry. A summary of communications with DEFRA since April 2005 was provided for members. It was confirmed that, currently, DEFRA would require a letter from each partner committing each authority to an 'affordability clause' (also referred to as an 'affordability envelope'). It was noted that DEFRA also required the final solution to conform to the waste strategy and the consultation. At the request of members, it was **agreed** that Essex County Council waste and legal officers would continue to look at the current requirements specified by DEFRA. With reference to the 'affordability clause', members offered opinions, based on the estimated likely response of their respective authorities, regarding DEFRA's present requirements. The overall indication from members was that the affordability clause, in its current format, would be unacceptable.

Members expressed views, on behalf of their respective authorities, on the procurement options appraisal emanating from the results of the recent modelling and were comfortable with the new possibilities presented for different area configurations. There was a brief discussion about potential sites and the associated technical and logistical aspects of waste treatment, including consideration of the function and use of transfer sites. Members welcomed the fact that the West Essex officers would continue the more detailed discussions in terms of collection services and it was **agreed** that an update on this matter would be provided to the next meeting.

## **32. Timetable for Procurement Approach Decision Making**

(Public and Press excluded)

### Introduction

Referring to paper WEWM/05/05, Nicola Beach, Head of Waste & Recycling, Essex County Council, presented the timetable for the procurement approach decision making.

### Discussion

Members heard that the Waste Officers Steering Committee had agreed the next steps in terms of the timetable for the procurement approach decision making. With reference to the schedule for the remaining area Joint Committee meetings of 2005, the revised procurement approach and the business case would be present on future agendas. It was noted that further modelling work was being carried out in relation to the contractual element of the procurement approach

and that a business case would be required irrespective of the final funding option taken.

Several key points relating to the next stages of development were outlined including the re-affirmation of some basic principles of the partnership and opportunities for system integration.

In considering the revised procurement approach and other related points, it was noted that the project design element, management of the risk interface and opportunities for working needed to be explored in more detail.

### 33. **Project Progress Report**

(Public and Press excluded)

Introduction

Referring to paper WEWM/06/05, Peter Kelsbie, Project Co-ordinator, Waste & Recycling, Essex County Council, presented a schematic representation of project progress as at 16 September 2005.

It was noted that the paper provided a summary of a report distributed regularly to the Lead Officers of the partnership.

Discussion

The 'dashboard' style of the paper was briefly explained. It was noted that the summary contained various elements including key dates, a Gantt chart illustrating the project timeline and a risk summary. It was explained that regular meetings were held to look at the critical risks involved and associated risk management. .

Members heard that various suggestions had been made to incorporate changes to the summary, such as a more detailed timeline and current service contract end dates, to provide additional reference points.

It was confirmed that the dashboard style summary provided a useful 'snapshot' and it was **agreed** to continue regularly to provide these reports to the Committee.

### 34. **Urgent Business (Part II)**

There being no urgent (Part II) business for discussion, the meeting closed at 4.50 pm.