



Report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods

Executive Board

Date: 22nd June 2010

Subject: Strategic Review of Household Waste Sorting Sites and Bring Sites

Electoral Wards Affected:

All Wards (as this is a city wide strategy),
Horsforth, Garforth and Swillington Wards,
Temple Newsam, Rothwell, Calverley and
Farsley, Kippax and Methley are specifically
affected

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

Not Eligible for Call In

(Details contained in the report)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Leeds CC currently operates with ten (10) Household Waste Sort Sites (HWSS) and one smaller "zero waste" site for the receipt of a limited number of recyclable items. Located on sites with long standing waste disposal use, seven (7) sites have been significantly redeveloped: the East Leeds HWSS is to be developed during 2010, and the Gamblethorpe HWSS is programmed to close upon the expiry of a temporary planning extension.

The HWSS infrastructure provides a significant contribution, (13.8% points) to the overall recycling rate of the city, (30.4%, 2008/09). Leeds CC also operates over 400 bring sites for glass and other recyclables that contributes 2.7% points to the overall recycling rate.

Reviewing population densities and site operational capacities, the current sites provide a broad spatial infrastructure and the accessibility for Leeds residents to recycle but generally are neither working to capacity or consistently maximising recycling performance and diversion of waste from landfill.

Although there are differences in the operating cost/ tonne of each site, overall the total cost of provision of these sites compares favourably with other authorities. The report, however, concludes that there is no justification to maintain the Calverley Bridge zero waste site, as the costs are disproportionately high, given that there are alternative HWSS within a 10 min drive time.

The report recommends that the current free access for residents from neighbouring authorities, be maintained; on the proviso that protocols and procedures to account for the shared provision of facilities, on a site by site basis, are developed.

The report concludes that a revised site search be carried-out during the interim period before East Leeds reopens and Gamblethorpe closes to determine if there are any other replacement site options available and that the current on-going discussions both with North Yorkshire and Wakefield are completed and then formalised as necessary to ensure continuity in provision of any replacement site or arrangements. On this basis the preferred option is to work with neighbouring authorities and so provide flexibility for residents to use current and potential new border sites and for Leeds to contribute their share of the cost of operation of such sites as appropriate. It is noted that savings from this preferred approach can then be used to contribute to the refurbishment of the Kirkstall Road facility.

HWSS currently achieve between 50 to 70% recycling of waste delivered to sites. To maximise performance and deliver a consistently high performance across all sites, the operational practices are to be reviewed further, and be the subject of a future report.

Considering the complementary bring site infrastructure, the report highlights that a site can be accessed within a 1000m radius currently and details a Value For Money exercise showing the favourability of this approach.

1.0 Purpose Of This Report

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide information on the current provision and performance of Household Waste Sorting (HWSS) and Bring Sites, discussing issues influencing their use and effectiveness in order to recommend options for spatial policy and joint working with neighbouring authorities. The report details the need for further work to maximise consistently high recycling performance and diversion of waste from landfill.

2.0 Background Information

- 2.1 In October 2006, Executive Board adopted the Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds 2005-2035. In September 2007, Executive Board approved updates to the Integrated Waste Strategy to address the statutory recycling targets set out within DEFRA's Waste Strategy for England 2007 and to reflect the Council's commitment to achieving a combined recycling and composting rate in excess of 50% of household waste.
- 2.2 The emerging Leeds' Local Development Framework, which includes the Core Strategy, will set out the overarching strategic policies for planning and development in Leeds and the Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document, will contain spatial waste planning policies for the District. The Yorkshire and Humber Plan, provides the overarching strategy for planning in the region up to 2026.
- 2.3 Existing Provision: Household Waste Sites
 - 2.3.1 There are currently 10 household waste sorting sites (HWSS) and 1 zero waste site, for the receipt of a limited number of recyclable items, situated across Leeds. The map at Appendix 1 shows the location of these existing sites.
 - 2.3.2 In 2001 Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) funding was obtained and an extensive redevelopment programme was embarked upon which now sees 7 of the existing sites enhanced with new access layout, split level reception bays, recycling opportunities for numerous materials, WRAP's national signage, new staff amenity facilities and information points for customers. Table 1 below provides details of the HWSS status and recycling performance (2008/09). Overall the existing 11 sites contributed 13.8% points towards the overall recycling and composting performance of 30.4% in 2008/09.

2.3.3 The eighth site to be redeveloped will be East Leeds. The sites which currently remain undeveloped are Kirkstall Road and Gamblethorpe.

Table 1 Household Waste Sort Site status and recycling performance

HWSS Performance Band	Site	Status	2008/09 Recycling rate %	2008/09 Tonnes processed
> 70%	Thorp Arch	Redeveloped	70.43	4774
65 to 70%	Kirkstall Rd	Undeveloped	68.4*	2668
60 to 65%	Ellar Ghyll	Redeveloped	64.86	4776
	Meanwood Road	Redeveloped	61.69	9616
	Holmewell Rd	Redeveloped	61.57	10302
	Milners Rd	Redeveloped	61.51	7487
55 to 60%	Gamblethorpe	Undeveloped	58.51	8079
	Pudsey	Redeveloped	56.6	8582
	East Leeds	Planned redevelopment for completion spring 2011	55.6	6975
<55%	Stanley Rd	Redeveloped	49.18	8397
Zero Waste	Calverley Bridge	Undeveloped	99.29	1491

* This figure may be inaccurate due to inconsistent allocation of materials on IWS between the HWSS and TLS

2.4 Existing Provision: Bring Sites

2.4.1 Leeds currently has the largest local authority network of what is termed 'Bring Sites' in the UK with over 440 sites. Small sites may for example have one bank for mixed glass with larger supermarket based sites having facilities for numerous recycling materials. Sites are signed and branded using WRAP iconography to ensure they are complementary and consistent with HWSS and kerbside recycling schemes.

2.4.2 Bring Sites contributed 2.7% points to the overall recycling rate in 2008/09. Significantly these sites provide a network for the collection of glass which is not currently accepted through the Councils existing kerbside recycling scheme. In addition to glass, work at maximising capture of other materials is being developed including addition of textile and small WEEE (Waste electrical and electronic equipment) collection points. This ensures that residents have various options to recycle which are adaptable to their lifestyle.

3.0 Main Issues

3.1 HWSS Capacity Requirements

3.1.1 In 2007/08 the 11 HWSS sites handled 75,200 tonnes of recyclable and residual waste and 73,133 tonnes during 2008/09.

3.1.2 Table 2 below details the current waste through puts at the existing sites and their licensed capacities taken from their Operating Permits. These permitted quantities are

not indicative of the actual capacity that a site could handle but are within a preset banding level for sites of their size.

3.1.3 Based on the best information available the estimated maximum working capacities of each existing site are shown in the table below, with a maximum threshold set at 15,000 tonnes. National guidance recommends that urban authorities should aim for a level of provision that should, on average, achieve throughputs of less than 17,250 tonnes per site.

3.1.4 The overall working capacity totalling an estimated 101,000 tonnes/annum compares favourably with the modelled processing capacity for 90,386 tonnes that will be required by 2026, as determined by waste flow modelling linked to the residual waste treatment PFI project. It should be noted that Gamblethorpe's capacity has not been taken account of as it is due to close in September 2010 and cannot form part of the longer term strategy for provision of HWSS in Leeds.

3.1.5 Table 2 below also indicates how sites are currently under-utilised for Leeds households within a 10 minute drive time radius of sites. Spatial policy and the impact of potential future housing growth are discussed later in the report.

Table 2 HWSS Capacities

Site Name	Licensed Capacity (tonnes)	Site Area (Ha)	2008/09 Tonnes processed	Estimated Maximum Working Capacity (tonnes)(1)	Households Within 10 min Drive Time	Spare Capacity Based On Current Use (%) (4)
Thorp Arch	24999	0.5	4774	12000	2,483	60%
Kirkstall Road	7499	0.2	2668	4000	98,021	33%
Ellar Ghyll	24999	0.4	4776	6000	26,238	20%
Meanwood Road	15000	0.5	9616	10000	85,143	4%
Holmewell Road	24999	0.6	10302	12000	34,931	14%
Milners' Road	24999	1.0	7487	15000	19,382	50%
Gamblethorpe(2)	0	0.3	8079		35,852	
Grangefield Road	24999	0.5	8582	10000	61,947	14%
East Leeds(3)	10000	1.0	6975	15000	59,289	54%
Stanley Road	24999	0.6	8397	15000	115,058	44%
Calverley Bridge	7499	0.3	1491	2000	62,643	23%
Total	189,992		73,147	101,000		

(1) Potential Capacity: Estimated based on two samples of waste tonnage taken from Meanwood Road over 2 separate weekends. The average tonnage was 50 tonnes. Meanwood has 9 bays so potentially could handle 5.5 tonnes per bay per day. 5 tonnes per bay used for all sites based on the No. of bays. Meanwood used for estimate as is one of the busiest sites and is potentially working close to capacity particularly at weekends. This estimate has been further reduced by 50% to allow for the assumptions made, unless current throughput exceeded. Overall estimated maximum capacity limited to 15,000 tonnes

(2) Gamblethorpe will close Sept 2010 planning condition

(3) East Leeds site to be developed 2010.

(4) Spare capacity based on current tonnage captured per household within 10 minute drive

3.2 Maximising Potential of redeveloped sites

3.2.1 Referring to information in previous tables there is a need to assess how to develop use of the sites to maximise their potential. Stanley Road and Milners' Road have the largest site areas and number of container bays but conversely do not have the greatest throughput or recycling performance. Milners' Road is not reaching its potential and although there are current issues regarding noise and the use of the site compaction machine (that are in the process of being addressed) this should not impact on the number of customers attempting to use the site. Therefore understanding the demographic profile of households living within the catchment areas of sites may also suggest the best method of engagement to maximise the potential of all redeveloped sites.

Table 3 HWSS performance, operating costs/ tonne and potential savings from diverting additional waste from landfill

HWSS Performance Band	Site	2008/09 Recycling rate %	2008/09 Tonnes Processed	Site Operating Cost per Tonne (£)	Potential FUTURE saving by achieving 70% recycling rate (£000)
> 70%	Thorp Arch	70.43	4761	54.84	n/a
65 to 70%	Kirkstall Rd	68.4	2668	111.48**	(2)
60 to 65%	Ellar Ghyll	64.86	4776	61.35	(10)
	Meanwood Road	61.69	9612	29.51	(34)
	Holmewell Rd	61.57	10319	29.24	(35)
	Milners Rd	61.51	7486	38.70	(25)
55 to 60%	Gamblethorpe	58.51	8077	48.20	(37)
	Pudsey	56.6	8573	31.87	(48)
	East Leeds	55.6	6974	69.59	(45)
<55%	Stanley Rd	49.18	8398	34.20	(79)
Zero Waste	Calverley Bridge	99.29	1489	142.06	n/a

**Operating costs based on direct cost (No central charges)*

Note: Potential savings need to be assessed against future changes if staff costs resulting from review of management and operational practices.

***This is currently show as disproportionately high as it also includes Transfer station costs*

3.2.2 Ensuring maximum usage of each site needs to be explored further taking detailed account of the operating cost per tonne for each site and the potential cost savings from diverting additional waste from landfill. Table 3 above provides a comparison of each sites operating costs per tonne of waste processed. It also indicates the potential financial savings that could be achieved if recycling and composting levels could reach 70%. The saving calculated reflects anticipated landfill tax and gate fee savings, offset by the relevant changes in recycling processing costs. It must, however, be noted that the achievement of the 70% recycling rate is aspirational and would require changes in operational and management practices as well as cultural change. The required

operational and staffing review to embed this change will be subject to a separate future report.

3.2.3 Leeds' cost per tonne for HWSS operations (£46 per tonne) compare favourably with other local authorities operating similar sites operated both by in-house and outsourced arrangements. Cost range from £29 per tonne for Bristol to £57 for Lincolnshire.

3.2.4 Well utilised sites for example Meanwood Road, Holmewell Road and Pudsey have the lowest costs per tonne, on average £29 per tonne. Sites such as Thorp Arch which has an excellent recycling rate, but not the level of throughput which urban sites have, in comparison costs £54 per tonne. This again demonstrates the need to ensure site capacity is maximised.

3.3 Site Specific Issues in relation to currently undeveloped HWSS

3.3.1 **Calverley Bridge**

- a) Calverley Bridge is located just off the A6120 Leeds outer ring road between the Leeds and Liverpool canal and river Aire. The site occupies a very small parcel of land which was the former location of a pulverisation and incineration plant operated by Pudsey urban district council. Access to the site is directly from the ring road onto Calverley lane. This is an extremely busy road and customers and contractors servicing the site have difficulty turning in and out of the site. During peak times traffic can sometimes queue back onto the ring road itself causing traffic problems.
- b) Due to the site size and location it was not been deemed suitable for refurbishment in line with the Councils other HWSS. The site has however been trialled as a zero waste site, offering a range of recycling opportunities for customers. The site does not accept general waste. If customers wish to dispose of any waste they are redirected to either Pudsey or Milners' Road HWSS's, which are both within 3 miles of the site.
- c) In terms of tonnage Calverley handles the smallest amount of materials of any of the sites. During 2008/09 its throughput was 1489 tonnes. The site has a small rol-pak in operation and operates utilising 2 full time attendants. Cost of operating the site during 2008/09 was approx £150K.
- d) Strategically the site is located in very close proximity to Milners' Road and Pudsey HWSS's. Drive time plans indicate that these two sites are located such that they could adequately provide an alternative recycling and disposal point for residents currently using Calverley Bridge, with the majority of households within this area being able to reach one of the two sites within a 15 minute drive time or less which is acceptable.
- e) If we compare the cost per tonne for waste processed through these sites at 3.2.1 above it can be seen that Calverley Bridge's processing costs are significantly higher than either Milners' Road or Pudsey's.
- f) Considering the above, it is proposed to close this facility. Local Ward Members for the site have been consulted on this proposal and have requested that residents in the area do have kerbside recycling prior to the closure of the site. This is being actioned through the Recycling Improvement Plan previously presented to Executive Board and is linked to the Street Scene Change programme. Regular updates are to be provided to the Ward Members.

3.3.2 **East Leeds**

- a) East Leeds HWSS is currently programmed for redevelopment. Demolition of the former transfer station which jointly occupied the site has already been completed. A planning

application has been submitted and subject to consent, it is expected that the site will close late October 2010 and reopen at the latest August 2011.

- b) This site refurbishment will be the biggest undertaken to date and will provide opportunities for SME businesses to recycle their waste in addition to public access for household waste.
- c) A further enhancement to this scheme is the construction of a purpose built re-use shop within the HWSS boundary which will be operated by the Community and Voluntary Sector.
- d) The redevelopment programme for the site is strategically linked to the closure of the Gamblethorpe site, as detailed in 3.3.3 below. East Leeds has been identified as being the main alternative site, for customers who currently favour using Gamblethorpe, pending consideration of longer term options including joint working with neighbouring authorities.

3.3.3 Gamblethorpe

- a) The Gamblethorpe HWSS was developed within the footprint of the former landfill in greenbelt. It has been the subject of three temporary extensions on the basis of special circumstances. It is currently programmed to close on the expiry of the current temporary planning extension.
- b) An extensive site selection study, based on local authority owned land, was undertaken in 2006/7. This included land at:
 - a. Ash Lane Garforth
 - b. Bell Hill, Stourton
 - c. Land adjacent to Railway, Peckfield/Micklefield
 - d. Barrowby Lane
 - e. Land north of Pontefract Rd, south of railway and west of M1 (Aire Valley)
 - f. Former wholesale markets between Newmarket Approach and Newmarket Lane

None of these sites were found at the time to be in a position which was deliverable

- c) Leeds planning cannot support a permanent site at the existing location as it contravenes current planning guidance in terms of permanent development in greenbelt. Ward Members for the Gamblethorpe area, together with Ward Members of adjacent wards where constituents use the sites, have been consulted. Members have expressed concern at the closure of the site and have requested that officers seek to further defer compliance with Planning directives and seek an alternative site. £1.05m is currently set aside to develop new provision.
- d) The following three actions are therefore proposed:
 - (i) That closure of Gamblethorpe is delayed until the East Leeds site has been fully refurbished, in order to ensure that the residents in the East and South East of the city are not disadvantaged. The redeveloped East Leeds site has significant space capacity and lies within a twenty minute drive time of the majority of people who currently use Gamblethorpe.
 - (ii) In order to provide further alternatives for residents in the South East of the city, the Council will work in the intervening period to secure free access to sites in neighbouring Tadcaster and Castleford, based on reciprocal arrangements with North Yorkshire and Wakefield.

(iii) In the event that cross boundary agreement cannot be reached, Officers will resume the search for an alternative site within the Leeds boundary during the period before Gamblethorpe closes.

- e) The development of a site, in the event that a suitable site could be identified, would incur significant costs, with further expenditure required if land was required to be purchased. On this basis the preferred option is to work with neighbouring authorities and so provide flexibility for residents to use current and potential new border sites and for Leeds to contribute their share of the cost of operation of such sites as appropriate. By taking this proposed course, the Council can meet the needs of those currently using the service, whilst releasing £1m for the much needed refurbishment of the Kirkstall site. The revenue saving of £300k will also be asked to expand the city councils recycling strategy.
- f) It is recommended that the Executive Board supports the above proposals.
- g) It was acknowledged that a detailed communications plan was required to explain the benefits of residents using alternative redeveloped sites, detailed in 2.3.2, and to advise residents on the location of such sites prior to closure/ redevelopment of the Gamblethorpe and East Leeds HWSS.
- h) Members also expressed the desire to re-profile and extend the opening hours of redeveloped sites such that they became both more in-tune with the public demand to visit sites especially during the summer months. This is to be the subject of a future report to Executive Board.

3.3.4 Kirkstall Road

- a) Kirkstall Road HWSS occupies a small area of land, less than 0.2ha, within the footprint of the fire damaged transfer station. No redevelopment work or enhancements have ever been undertaken at the site. The strategic review demonstrates the need for a HWSS at this location and so it is proposed that a new HWSS will be developed within the curtilage of the existing transfer station of a similar size and design to the new facility at East Leeds. As part of the redevelopment, to include the removal of the present fire damaged structures, the remainder of the site will be used to provide a modern transfer facility to deal with the current range of materials that are dealt with at the site.

3.4 Cross Border Use

- 3.4.1 Across West Yorkshire all Leeds' neighbouring authorities operate HWSS of their own. The distribution of the sites across the County is largely historic and as such pays no real heed to individual local authority boundaries. As a result in certain locations residents from neighbouring authorities find it easier to cross borders to try and access sites rather than to visit sites within their own local authority area. From a customer perspective this is understandable and should be seen as the ideal in terms of providing the best and most convenient customer service.
- 3.4.2 In recent years a number of other authorities have decided to introduce various controls for example residents permits or van bans such that waste deposited at HWSS is to a greater or lesser extent derived solely from that own authority's area. As a result of this approach a situation has developed where some authorities are net importers of waste and others are net exporters. Results from 3 customer surveys undertaken indicate that Leeds is a net importer.
- 3.4.3 The significance of this position has obviously increased in recent years as all local authorities are charged with not only reducing and recycling as much waste as possible but are also engaged in procurement exercise for residual waste treatment facilities where predicting accurate future waste arisings is a fundamental part of that work.

- 3.4.4 Leeds' view is that ideally HWSS should be made available to residents without restriction so that they are most easily able to access sites closest to them; this should be regardless of whether their nearest site is in another authority's area.
- 3.4.5 As part of joint working with the West Yorkshire Authorities through the Association of West Yorkshire Authorities a number of options were proposed and all authorities asked for their views. Leeds' firm view being that free cross border use was the ideal position. This however was not the view put forward by the other authorities.
- 3.4.6 In order to try and move this issue forward Leeds agreed to undertake an independent survey of their HWSS located in border areas. Leeds commissioned Enventure Consultancy Limited to undertake this survey with the objective of ascertaining:
- The extent to which people who live within local authority areas use Leeds City Council's HWSS
 - Why customers use these sites?
 - If influxes of customers from neighbouring authorities occur on particular days
- 3.4.7 The survey was carried out at 5 sites over 7 consecutive days from 25 May until 31 May 2009. 1193 customers were interviewed. In brief the main conclusions from the report were:
- Customers use sites which are the closest to where they live.
 - The majority of customers (83%) use a car to travel to the sites
 - Almost half of the material taken to the site is general waste (42%)
 - The main sites which are used by customers from other Local Authorities are:
 - Ellar Ghyll (Bradford customers)
 - Holmewell Road (Wakefield Customers)
 - Thorp Arch (North Yorkshire Customers)
- 3.4.8 Bradford and North Yorkshire (NY) operate their sites on the same basis as Leeds at present and customers entering their sites from neighbouring authorities are not challenged. Wakefield District Council however does have a residents permit system in operation which means that no flow of waste from Leeds customers is allowed through their sites. The survey tells us that circa 25% of customers using Holmewell Road are from Wakefield. Based on the current tonnage data for the period Sept 08 to Aug 09 the site handled 10,165 tonnes of waste. Based on the survey results the proportion of waste from Wakefield would be 2,541 tonnes. When considering the strategic provision for Leeds in terms of Holmewell Road and the proportion of customers from Leeds we anticipate it should be capable of serving we would need to consider this flow of waste from Wakefield.
- 3.4.9 North Yorkshire (NY) have also undertaken customer survey work in collaboration with Leeds in an attempt to judge the level of cross border activity in the Wetherby/Tadcaster area. The survey undertaken in 2007 indicated that approximately 22% of customers using NY's Tadcaster site were Leeds residents and 9% of Thorp Arch's customers were from NY. The evidence appeared to show that usage of the Tadcaster site by Leeds residents occurred mostly during their later opening period and by drivers of larger vehicles which potentially may be considered as being commercial in Leeds' view and restricted to Wednesday and Saturday. It is accepted however by both authorities in this case that import and export occurs in both directions. The Enventure report on Cross

Border Use indicated that 18% of users of the Thorp Arch site during the survey were from North Yorkshire.

3.4.10 North Yorkshire are currently seeking to secure a new HWSS for their residents in the Sherburn in Elmet area which lies adjacent to Leeds' eastern boundary. They have indicated that they would welcome further discussions relating to the potential shared use of their new facility and Leeds' Thorp Arch facility for residents from both authorities. It is thought that when Gamblethorpe closes, then residents in the areas of Garforth, Kippax and Micklefield would probably use this new site as opposed to other alternatives in the Leeds area. Joint working would appear to be of benefit to both authorities as efficiencies could be gained from shared use rather than extensive capital investment by both in such close proximity.

3.4.11 There are various options to address cross border issues including:

- Introduction of residents permit system for Leeds only customers at border sites.
- Agreement with Wakefield that they bear a financial burden for their customers use of the Holmewell Road site, or permit reciprocal cross border use for their sites, specifically in the Castleford area (Wakefield have been invited to enter discussions with officer from Leeds to discuss the way forward)
- Agreement with North Yorkshire for joint use of Thorp Arch and their new Sherburn facility
- Agreement would be need to be reached with regard to cost sharing of the Thorp Arch and Tadcaster sites with colleagues from North Yorkshire.

3.4.12 North Yorkshire currently have an agreement in place with Wakefield which allows their residents to use Wakefield Ferrybridge Site near Castleford. A Memorandum of Understanding exists with in respect of NY's residents use of the Ferrybridge Site. The site is monitored on a minimum of 4 periods per annum to ascertain use by the two council's residents. The survey is led by Wakefield but NY are free to monitor. Tonnages are split according to this surveyed split for the following quarter. NY is billed for disposal (including vehicle wear and tear). The Audit Commission and DEFRA have agreed that this arrangement is suitable for the assessment of tonnages for Waste Data Flow.

3.4.13 Following results of the Enventure customer survey Leeds have now approached officers from Wakefield to discuss its' implications with a view to continuing to allow free access to the site for Wakefield's residents on the basis that Wakefield make an appropriate financial contribution or of revisiting the possibility of reciprocal cross border use. It was proposed that calculation of the contribution would be on the same basis as outlined at 3.4.12 above. Wakefield are considering the proposal and further meetings are planned with their officers to discuss all the issues.

3.5 Options For Spatial Policy

3.5.1 There are various factors influencing the decision as to where to locate HWSS to ensure adequate provision, these include:

3.5.2 Drive Times

- a) Available guidance suggests that urban authorities should aim to provide sites which are within a maximum of 20 minutes normal drive time for all their residents. Maximum normal drive times of 10 minutes for most residents are desirable.
- b) Mapping the average drive times from Leeds' 9 HWSS based on an off peak journey time, where Calverley Bridge and Gamblethorpe have been excluded, demonstrates that all residents of Leeds have access to one of the 9 HWSS within a 20 minute drive of their

home. In fact the majority of the City has reasonable access within a 15 minute drive but there are some gaps to the east of the city in the Garforth and Kippax area.

- c) A 10 minute drive time data set shows that most residents living within densely populated areas can reach a HWSS within a 10 minute drive. This accords well with national data and what residents are likely to view as a desirable time to reach a facility.

3.5.3 Sites per head of population and average site tonnages

- a) In considering the provision of sites in further detail we have also taken into account the number of HWSS provided per inhabitant of the City. This provides an approximate measure of the number of customers using each HWSS and consequently an approximate measure of the amount of waste taken to each site.

Table 4 Sites per head of population

Leeds	Population 2008/9	Current No. of HWSS	Average No. inhabitants per HWSS
2008	761,000	11	84,555
2026	933,000	10*	93,300

** If Gamblethorpe not replaced total drops to 10 sites.*

- b) Analysis of national data reveals that the average population per HWSS for English urban authorities is circa 99,300 compared to circa 41,800 for rural authorities.
- c) In comparison to other local authorities Leeds currently has a large number of HWSS. Even when considering the closure of Calverley Bridge and Gamblethorpe the nine remaining sites would give provision, currently, for 84K customers per site. Taking account of population growth up to 2026 these existing sites would give provision for 104,000 customers per site.

3.6 Localised Housing Growth

- 3.6.1 Considering the potential for localised housing growth suggested in the Core Strategy (the principal document in the Local Development Framework), it is viewed that to meet the longer term needs of residents to the east of the A1/M1 motorway in the Garforth and Kippax area the preferred policy is to progress joint working with North Yorkshire and the resulting flexibility of using cross border sites.

3.7 Bring Sites

- 3.7.1 It is considered that 1000metres is the potential catchment radius of a bank and the maximum distance a customer should realistically be expected to walk to reach a recycling point.
- 3.7.2 Larger bring sites, of which there are 26 in Leeds, for example ones located at the White Rose and Asda Owlcoates have a larger potential catchment. These sites are obviously more accessible to car users and as such a 5km (3 miles) is considered the potential catchment zone of these locations.
- 3.7.3 Information obtained from the Leeds 2008 Compositional Analysis Survey, indicates that the average proportion of glass in the residual waste from residents is as high as 7%. The existing bring banks captured over 8000 tonnes of glass in 2008/09 but there is obviously a significant proportion still being placed in black residual bins by residents.
- 3.7.4 Current collection and treatment costs for recycle collected through bring banks is £7.89 per tonne compared with kerbside SORT at £103.42 per tonne. Commingling

glass within existing SORT collections is not viewed as current best practice and would also significantly add to the processing costs. There are no current proposals to make separate collections of glass from the kerbside, and so it is essential that an adequate network of bring banks are provided for residents to recycle their glass as conveniently as possible. However it is acknowledged that in certain areas the proportion of glass is greater than the average stated in 3.7.3 and that this has the potential to overwhelm a bring infrastructure. These issues will be tackled via the implementation of the Recycling Improvement Plan that was approved by Executive Board in December 2009. The Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board are also currently conducting an inquiry into Recycling and are due to make recommendations soon.

4.0 Implications For Council Policy And Governance

- 4.1 The proposals in this report would reduce the number of HWSS within the Leeds administrative boundary to nine (9) redeveloped sites and formalise a policy of joint working with neighbouring authorities on HWSS provision, subject to a new site search providing a viable land development option within the SE are of the Leeds boundary. This report also looks to endorse that 1000metres is the potential catchment radius of a bring bank and the maximum distance a customer should realistically be expected to walk to reach a recycling point.

5.0 Legal And Resource Implications

5.1 Closure of Calverley Bridge zero waste site

- 5.1.1 In addition to the financial detail contained in 3.2.1 and 3.3.1, there is also a potential capital receipt from the sale of the Calverley Site on the open market, previous enquiries have been made with regard to potential purchase of the site if it became available.

5.2 Impact of future closure of Gamblethorpe HWSS

- 5.2.1 Savings from the closure of the site are estimated at around £300k in a full year. The cost of dealing with the tonnage this site currently attracts would need to be quantified once future usage patterns at alternative sites are established.
- 5.2.2 Land acquisition to develop an alternative facility will not be necessary (subject to the agreed new site search update not identifying any suitable available land;see 3.3.3) resulting in a potential capital saving. The current capital programme includes a sum of £1.050m for the replacement of a site for Gamblethorpe HWSS funded by Leeds own capital resources. It is proposed to utilise this funding to contribute to the costs of the upgrade of Evanston Avenue (Kirkstall Road – see 5.5). However, section 5.5 also shows the additional prudential borrowing contribution required should this proposal not be acceptable.

5.3 Cross Border Use

- 5.3.1 The potential contribution from Wakefield should they agree to make a financial contribution for their residents use of Holmewell Road is approximately £70,000. This funding could be used to offset any net contributions required to be made by Leeds for joint site (Thorp Arch and Tadcaster) use with NY.
- 5.3.2 As referred to in para 3.4.9, the potential contribution from NY for using Thorp Arch would be broadly £10,000 (plus share of site costs); whereas Leeds could have to pay an estimated £22,000 for the use of NY's Tadcaster's site (plus share of site costs).

5.3.3 Based on para 3.4.10, assuming 1/3 of the current tonnage from Gamblethorpe taken to a site in Sherburn, then Leeds could have to pay approximately £75,000 to North Yorkshire in disposal costs alone for use of the site.

5.4 Increased Landfill Diversion

5.4.1 Potential savings from increased landfill diversion are discussed in 3.2.1 Table 3. If HWSS recycling rates could be increased to 70% considerable savings could be realised. At landfill tax rates of £48 per tonne, these savings are estimated in the region of £300k.

5.4.2 Options available to facilitate this are currently being evaluated and would be funded from the disposal cost savings accruing from improved recycling performance. This is to be the subject of a future report.

5.5 Kirkstall Road Redevelopment

5.5.1 Following the Executive Board's approval of the decision to exclude the redevelopment of Kirkstall Road from the Residual Waste Treatment PFI, the costs of redevelopment, discussed at 3.3.4 would now be required to be funded from the Council's capital programme.

5.5.2 Indicative costs for the site have been sought from the Council's technical advisors, Jacobs. These suggest that the redevelopment of the site, based on current throughput, would cost around £3.8m.

5.5.3 In 2010/11 an additional DEFRA Waste Infrastructure Grant of £0.5m will be received by the City Council. This funding will be earmarked for the Kirkstall Road site which would reduce the impact on the Council's capital programme to around £3.26m. If this had to be prudentially borrowed over 25 years, the annual cost to the Waste Management revenue budget would be around £231k.

5.5.4 A business case would need to be prepared to obtain the approval for any new capital scheme that is funded by prudential borrowing. It is anticipated that the savings in this service review as a whole would form the basis of the business case rather than the Kirkstall site alone.

	Without Gamblethorpe	With Gamblethorpe
CAPITAL COSTS	Cost (£000)	Cost (£000)
Redevelop Evanston Avenue	3,756	3,756
Use of 2010/11 DEFRA Grant	(0.501)	(0.501)
Gamblethorpe Capital Funding – Not Required	(1.050)	
TOTAL REQUIREMENT FOR KIRKSTALL	2.205	3.255
Annual Revenue Repayment	156	231

5.5.5 The current operating costs for the Kirkstall Road site are budgeted at around £450k. The staffing and vehicle levels reflect the total throughput at the site of around 26,000 tonnes of variable waste types. These budgeted costs are consistent with the independent figures received from Jacobs of £440k operating costs for a site of this size and waste type. Therefore, other than the additional borrowing costs, there ought to be no significant revenue implications of the redevelopment of the site.

5.6 East Leeds Waste Sort Site

5.6.1 With the closure of the East Leeds HWSS for refurbishment in the spring / summer of 2010, savings will accrue in 10/11 and partially into 11/12. However, the current operating budget (staff and vehicles) will need to be retained in its entirety when the site re-opens after redevelopment.

5.6.2 The table below assumes East Leeds closes in October 2010 for redevelopment saving around £125k in 2010/11. The exact date will be dependent upon planning permissions.

5.7 Summary of Financial Issues

5.7.1 The financial implications associated with this report are both immediate and long term. Current estimates are set out in the table below.

5.7.2 It should be noted that the revenue budget for 2010/11 already assumes a total of £250k worth of efficiencies within the Waste Management service. (£150k in the base 09/10 and a further £100k target in 10/11), leaving a longer term indicative saving of £250k.

5.7.3 Even with this target, the longer term financial implications of this Strategic review indicate that savings in excess of this level can be delivered.

5.7.4 It needs to be noted that some of this saving could be required to fund the financial implications of the required staffing and cultural changes required to deliver 70% recycling as referred to in 3.2.1.

Cost Area	Immediate (2010/11) £000	Longer Term Indicative Costs /(Savings) 2011/12 + £000
Closure of Calverley Bridge WSS	(150)	(150)
Closure of Gamblethorpe WSS	0	(280)
Temporary Closure of East Leeds (October 2010)	(125)	0
Kirkstall Road Financing Costs (assuming capital contribution as per 5.5.4)	0	156
Improvement in Recycling rates at WSS to 70%	0	(315)
Contribution from Wakefield relating to Holmewell Road WSS	(70)	(70)
Net payment to NY CC re Tadcaster / Thorp Arch sites	12	12
Potential Payment to NY for new site at Sherburn (disposal only)	38	75
TOTAL	(289)	(572)

6.0 **Conclusions**

6.1 In conclusion this report provides information on the current provision and performance of Household Waste Sorting (HWSS) and Bring Sites, discusses issues influencing their use and effectiveness in order to recommend options for spatial policy and joint working with neighbouring authorities. The report details the need for further work to maximise consistently high recycling performance and diversion of waste from landfill.

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 Executive Board is requested to approve:

- The permanent closure of the Calverley Bridge zero waste site.
- Maintaining the current free access for residents from neighbouring authorities, to use border HWSS on the proviso that protocols and procedures to account for the shared cost of the provision of facilities, on a site by site basis, are developed and subject to continuous review.
- Commend development of joint working with neighbouring authorities North Yorkshire and Wakefield in parallel with the undertaking of a revised replacement site search, to be carried out during the interim period before Gamblethorpe closes upon completion of East Leeds redevelopment.
- The redevelopment of the HWSS at Kirkstall Road and modernisation of the existing transfer station by means of an injection of £3.8m into the Capital Programme. A full design and cost report (DCR) and business case will be prepared and brought back to Executive Board for approval when the detailed plans have been fully worked up and costed. At this stage it is proposed to fund the redevelopment of the site using a DEFRA grant (£0.5m) and unsupported borrowing. The borrowing repayments will be funded from savings made as part of the overall HWSS review. The scale of the revenue repayment will be dependant upon the use of the £1.05m currently identified for a replacement site for Gamblethorpe as set out in para. 5.5.4 above.
- The further review of operational practices in order to deliver a consistently high performance across all sites and that a further report be submitted.
- Maintaining and developing the current complementary bring site infrastructure, whilst continuing to evaluate the effectiveness of bring site provision.

9.0 Background Papers

The following papers are available to view: Network Recycling Report, Bristol Report, Acxiom Drive Times 10 Minutes, Acxiom Drive Times 15 Minutes, Acxiom Drive Times 20 Minutes, LDF Core Strategy.

10.0 APPENDICES

Location of HWSS in Leeds and bordering sites in Wakefield and North Yorkshire.