



**Report To:** Environmental Services Portfolio Holder 25 February 2015  
**Lead Officer:** Mike Hills – Director of Health and Environmental Services

---

## TEEP Assessment

### Purpose

1. To obtain sign-off from the Portfolio Holder of the Councils “TEEP” (Technically, Environmentally and Economically Practicable) Assessment (Appendix 1) to demonstrate compliance with The Waste (England and Wales) (Amended) Regulations 2012 (the Regulations).
2. This is not a key decision but has been brought for decision by the Portfolio Holder as recommended in the “Waste Regulation Route Map” (the Route Map), (WRAP et al 2014)

### Recommendations

3. It is recommended that the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder signs-off South Cambridgeshire District Council’s “TEEP” Assessment.

### Reasons for Recommendations

4. Signing off the council’s “TEEP” Assessment (Appendix 1) will formally record and demonstrate the council’s compliance with The Waste (England and Wales) (Amended) Regulations 2012, namely that South Cambridgeshire’s two-stream co-mingled recycling scheme, collecting glass, metals and plastics co-mingled and paper separate, complies with the Regulations because:
  - (a) It captures high quality and quantity recyclables; and
  - (b) It is not environmentally or economically practicable to provide a separate collection of glass, metals and plastics.

### Background

5. The revised European Waste Framework Directive requires the UK to take measures to promote high quality recycling. These measures are implemented in England by the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011, as amended in 2012. Regulation 13 includes a specific requirement by 1 January 2015, to separately collect paper, glass, plastics and metals where:
  - (a) It is necessary to produce high quality recyclates [the Necessity Test], and
  - (b) It is technically, environmentally and economically practicable (TEEP) [Practicability Test] to do so.
6. As South Cambridgeshire District Council collects glass, plastics and metals co-mingled, an assessment of the Blue Bin collection scheme has been carried out to determine compliance with the Regulation.
7. The ‘Waste Regulation Route Map’ is a decision support tool which provides a clear, step by step process for local authorities to follow to help decide whether

they are compliant with the Necessity and Practicability Tests or need to consider making changes to their service Councils who have concluded it not necessary or not TEEP to operate separate collection arrangements should keep, and be able to provide for an inspection, an audit trail which will help the Environment Agency (EA) to understand the basis of their decision-making. The EA have announced that they will not commence checks until the end of March 2015.

### **Considerations**

8. In order to determine South Cambridgeshire District Council's compliance with the Regulations a "TEEP" Assessment, (Appendix 1) has been completed using the 'Route Map' and evidence has been retained in an electronic 'Evidence Folder'.

### **Necessity Test**

9. The Necessity Test has been completed to assess whether separate collection of glass, metals or plastics is necessary to facilitate or improve recovery.
10. The evidence demonstrates that the current two-stream co-mingled collection scheme:
  - (a) in terms of quality achieves high quality materials which are suitable for closed-loop recycling; and
  - (b) in terms of quantity achieves a greater quantity of recycling than a kerbside-sort scheme.
11. Although the results of the Necessity Test demonstrate that separate collections are not required, for robustness the Practicability Test has been applied to demonstrate clear compliance with the Regulations.

### **Practicability Test**

12. The Practicability Test was carried out to assess whether the separate collection of each material stream is technically, economically or environmentally practicable. Separate collections must meet **all** three elements of the Practicability Test to be required and if it fails any one, co-mingled collection of the material(s) is permissible.
13. The evidence demonstrates that separate collections:
  - (a) Are technically practicable, as previously demonstrated with the separate collection of paper, metal and plastic through the council's pre 2010 green box scheme. They have therefore been technically developed and proven to function in practice.
  - (b) Are not environmentally practicable as they would achieve smaller net environmental benefits when compared with the current two-stream comingled scheme.
  - (c) Are not economically practicable as they would result in excessive cost in comparison with alternative schemes using a degree of co-mingling.
14. Based on the results of the Necessity and Practicability Test the "TEEP" Assessment concludes that South Cambridgeshire District Council's two-stream co-mingled scheme, collecting glass, metals and plastics co-mingled and paper separate, complies with The Waste (England and Wales) (Amended) Regulations 2012 because:
  - It captures high quality and a high quantity of recyclables; and
  - It is not environmentally or economically practicable to provide a separate collection of glass, metals and plastics.

## **Options**

15. The Portfolio Holder has the option of signing-off or not signing-off the TEEP assessment.

## **Implications**

16. In the writing of this report, taking into account financial, legal, staffing, risk management, equality and diversity, climate change, community safety and any other key issues, the following implications have been considered: -

### ***Financial***

17. No financial implications have been identified arising out of the result of the TEEP Assessment.

### ***Legal***

18. The Legal & Democratic Services Manager has reviewed the TEEP Assessment and signed it off as recommended by the Route Map, being satisfied that it takes full account of the council's obligations under the Regulations.

### ***Staffing***

19. No staffing implications have been identified at this time.

### ***Risk Management***

20. A signed-off TEEP Assessment, carried out in accordance with the Route Map, significantly reduces the risk that the council will be successfully challenged that it's co-mingled recycling service does not comply with the Regulations and should therefore be switched from co-mingled to separate material collections.

### ***Equality and Diversity***

21. No Equality and Diversity implications have been identified at this time.

### ***Climate Change***

22. No Climate Change implications have been identified at this time

## **Consultation responses (including from the Youth Council)**

23. As this a technical assessment process, no consultations, other than those listed in the report, have been carried out.

## **Effect on Strategic Aims**

### **Aim 1 - We will listen to and engage with residents, parishes and businesses to ensure we deliver first class services and value for money**

24. The recommendation will contribute directly to the achievement of the council's strategic aims by offering a practical way forward to address the requirements of the Regulations in the delivery of value for money services.

## **Background Papers**

- Review of kerbside recycling collection schemes in the UK in 2011/12, WYG Group. June 2013 <http://www.wyg.com/uploads/files/pdfs/Kerbside-Recycling-Report-2011-12.pdf>

- Waste Regulations Route Map  
<http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Route%20Map%20Revised%20Dec%202014.pdf>
- Blue Bin Recycling Service – Evaluation Report. SCDC June 2011  
<http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s54643/Blue%20Bin%20Evaluation.pdf>
- Review of Refuse and Recycling Service Configuration. SCDC September 2009

**Report Author:** Kylie Laws – Waste Recycling and Minimisation Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713192