

Public Document Pack

**Democratic Services Section
Chief Executive's Department
Belfast City Council
City Hall
Belfast
BT1 5GS**

20th June, 2018

MEETING OF STRATEGIC POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Dear Alderman/Councillor,

As previously notified to you, I enclose a copies of the report for the following items to be considered at the meeting to be held at 9.30 am on Friday, 22nd June, 2018.

Yours faithfully,

SUZANNE WYLIE

Chief Executive

AGENDA:

4. **Physical Programme and Asset Management**

(a) Capital Programme (Pages 1 - 6)

5. **Finance, Resources and Procurement**

(d) Contracts for Award (Pages 7 - 12)

7. **Operational Issues**

(d) Single-use coffee cups and plastic items on Council sites (Pages 13 - 34)

(f) Minutes of Meeting of North Foreshore Members' Steering Group (Pages 35 - 40)

This page is intentionally left blank



Subject:	Physical Programme Update
Date:	22 June 2018
Reporting Officer:	Ronan Cregan, Deputy Chief Executive & Director of Finance and Resources Gerry Millar, Director of Property & Projects
Contact Officer:	Sinead Grimes, Programme Office Manager

Restricted Reports	
Is this report restricted?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, when will the report become unrestricted?	
After Committee Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
After Council Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some time in the future	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>

Call-in	
Is the decision eligible for Call-in?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

1.0	Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues
1.1	The Council's Physical Programme covers projects under a range of funding streams including the Capital Programme, the Leisure Transformation Programme, LIF, BIF, the Social Outcomes Fund and the projects which the Council is delivering on behalf of other agencies. This paper provides an update for Members on the Physical Programme.
2.0	Recommendations
2.1	The Committee is asked to; General

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • note the achievements under the physical programme over the last quarter as outlined in 3.1 and that, given the both the current scale of the programme and the number of new Members, that a tour of a number of physical projects (both completed or underway) is being scheduled for all Members. All Members are encouraged to take up this opportunity (see 3.2). <p>Proposed movements on/additions to the Capital Programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ agree that the Navarra Place project is moved to Stage 3- Committed on the Capital Programme. It is recommended that this is held at ‘<i>Tier 0 – Schemes at Risk</i>’ pending confirmation of funding from the DoJ, agreement on the land transfer from NIHE and a satisfactory tender return. Members are further asked to agree that the necessary procurement processes (including the invitation of tenders and/or the use of appropriate ‘framework’ arrangements) be initiated with contracts to be awarded on the basis of most economically advantageous tenders received and full commitment to deliver. <p>Physical Programme 2018/2019 and beyond</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • note the challenges and implications for the Physical Programme moving forward and agree that a series of Party Group briefings are undertaken on the Physical Programme, its links to the Council’s strategic agenda and the future financing strategy are undertaken.
3.0	Main report
	<p><u>Key Issues</u></p> <p>3.1 Members will be aware that the Council runs a substantial physical programme covering over 200 projects under a range of funding streams including the capital programme, BIF and LIF together with the projects that it is delivering on behalf of other agencies including the Executive Office and the Department for Communities. There are currently approx. 200 ‘live’ projects on the physical programme worth in excess of £300m which makes it not only a significant programme from a Council perspective but also one of the biggest regeneration programmes in the city.</p> <p>3.2 It is proposed that, given the both the current scale of the programme and the number of new Members, that a tour of a number of physical projects (both completed and underway) across the city is scheduled for all Members. It is likely that this will take place in August/September and ideally will be scheduled for a Saturday morning. Details will be communicated in due course and all Members are encouraged to take up this opportunity.</p> <p>3.3 Members are asked to note that there have been significant achievements under the physical programme in the last couple of months -</p>

- **RICS Northern Ireland Project of the Year** – the Council was awarded the prestigious **RICS Project of the Year in Northern Ireland for the £3.7m redevelopment and upgrade of the Tropical Ravine**. The highly acclaimed Project of the Year title is presented to the scheme which demonstrates overall outstanding best practice and an exemplary commitment to adding value to its local area. In awarding this, the RICS judges noted that *“The Tropical Ravine was unanimously supported as Project of the Year. Its sensitive conservation approach was professional, and the partnership created of caring community groups and the Heritage Lottery Fund added strength and injected a variety of views, often conflicting, and aspirations which collectively have transformed this neglected overgrown corner of Botanic Gardens into a visitor attraction with an amazing story to be absorbed at leisure”*. In addition the judging panel highlighted that *“Many visitors to Botanic Gardens in past years would not have known this Victorian building had existed for 120 years. Belfast City Council, Friends of Botanic and the Heritage Lottery Fund have transformed this unique national treasure and propelled it into the 21st century. The story it now tells, and welcomes you to share in, is a model of best practice.”*
- **Significantly Members are asked to note that this is the second year in a row that the Council has won RICS Project of the Year with Girdwood Community Hub winning the accolade in 2017**. This is a huge acclamation of the Council and the key role that officers, from across all Departments in the Council, played in making these projects happen.
- **Official opening of the new £21.75m Olympia** - The new £21.75m Olympia was officially opened on 21st June. This followed the opening of the new leisure facility last year and marked the end of over three years work on the site. The new outdoor facilities opened yesterday include a 3G pitch, MUGA, playground, boulevard way leading in off Boucher Road and a new pedestrian entrance off Olympia Drive together with a new art pieces. The success of Olympia is evident in its usage figures which have seen a 78% increase in footfall, a 50% rise in adult gym memberships and a 250% rise in the number of children taking part in the swim school.
- **Completion of the £15m Playing Pitches Strategy** – Members will recall that in 2012 a Playing Pitches Strategy for the city was agreed. Under this the Council invested £14m in 10 new playing pitches and pavilions across the city while the GAA provided match funding of £1m. The new 3G pitch and pavilion at Falls Park has recently been completed with the final pitch at Cherryvale due to complete next month. This is the culmination of the programme which has seen facilities at –

Location	Investment
Ballysillan Playing Fields	New changing pavilion
Cherryvale Playing Fields	New pitch 3G, repositioning of existing turf pitch
Cliftonville Playing Fields	New 3G pitch and changing pavilion
Dixon Playing Fields	New changing pavilion
Falls Park	New 3G pitch and pavilion
Musgrave Park	New pavilion and existing pitch extension
Ormeau Park	New 3G pitch
Victoria Park	New changing pavilion
Waterworks	New Changing pavilion
Woodlands Playing Fields	New 3G pitch, existing pitch extension and changing pavilion

Proposed movements on/additions to the Capital Programme

- 3.4 Members have previously agreed that **all** capital projects must go through a **3 Stage process** where decisions on which projects progress are taken by SP&R. Members are asked to agree to the following movements on the Capital Programme -

Project	Overview	Stage
Navarra Place	Development of a new playground and MUGA	Move to Stage 3- Committed Recommended to be held as at Tier 0 - Scheme at Risk pending confirmation of funding from DoJ, completion of the land transfer from NIHE and a satisfactory tender return

Move to Stage 3 – Committed

- 3.5 **Navarra Place** – Navarra Place is a small area located off the Whitewell Road in the north at a community interface. This proposal is for the development of a new playground, MUGA and the removal of an interface structure at the boundary with Serpentine Road. Although owned by the NIHE, the Council built a playground on the site in 2006 and has operated the playground and maintained the land since this time. The Council is currently in the process of agreeing the land transfer from NIHE and the project is contingent on this land being transferred. Members are asked to note that DoJ have committed 50% match funding to this project and a letter of offer is currently awaited.
- 3.6 **It is recommended that the Navarra Place project is moved to Stage 3 – Committed on the Capital Programme but that this is held at Tier 0 – Schemes at Risk pending confirmation of funding from the DoJ, agreement on the land transfer from NIHE and a satisfactory tender return.** At this stage the final budget will be brought back to Committee for sign-off and confirmation that it is within the affordability limits of the Council. In addition, Members are asked to agree that the necessary procurement processes (including the invitation of tenders and/or the use of appropriate ‘framework’ arrangements) be initiated with contracts to be awarded on the basis of most economically advantageous tenders received and full commitment to deliver for the above projects as required.

Physical Programme 2018/2019 and beyond

3.7 Members will be aware that the Council runs a substantial physical programme under a range of funding streams. **As at 18th June this comprised 197 live projects across 7 funding streams (Cap Prog, LTP, LIF, BIF, UV, BSC, SIF, etc) as well as the projects which the Council is delivering on behalf of other organisations.** Members will be aware that the Council is increasingly becoming the agent of choice for a number of central government departments including the Executive Office. Delivering these projects, while a recognition of both the successful track record of the Council as a delivery agent for capital projects and also the uniquely placed role of the Council as a civic leader in the city, also bring with them their own risks and issues. The breakdown of the current physical programme is shown below -

Scale	Area	Funding Stream
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 10 Transformational (over £5m gross) ● 21 Landmark (over £1m gross) ● 166 Local (below £1m gross) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● North - 55 ● South - 24 ● East - 36 ● West - 43 ● Citywide - 12 ● Corporate - 17 ● City centre - 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cap Prog - 49 ● LTP - 7 ● LIF - 41 ● BIF - 39 ● Peace IV - 3 ● Social Outcomes Fund - 9 ● Urban Villages - 8 ● Social Investment Fund - 15 ● Other - 26

3.8 Members will appreciate that the Council's physical programme is one of the most important programmes delivered by the Council and due to the **nature of capital projects it is also one of the most visible and easily recognisable signs of the Council's civic leadership role in the city.** Moving forward the Council will face two key challenges in respect of the capital programme. These are:

- The capital financing budget will soon come under pressure if all the projects currently in the programme are to be delivered.
- The need to ensure that Investment decisions are taken within the context of strategic alignment with the Belfast Agenda and in full consideration of what assets already exist in an area and how these are being used

3.9 **Given the implications of this, it is recommended a series of Party Group briefings are undertaken on the Physical Programme, its links to the Council's strategic agenda and the future financing strategy are undertaken.** In order to maximise the benefit of these Briefings it is recommended that all Members avail of the opportunity to undertake the tour of the projects which is being scheduled (see 3.2 above). This will help set the Programme in context for Members. This will take place before the Briefings.

3.10	<p><u>Financial & Resource Implications</u></p> <p><i>Financial</i> – Navarra Place is being held at ‘Tier 0 -Scheme at risk’ pending confirmation of funding from DOJ, agreement on the transfer of NIHE site and satisfactory tender return.</p> <p><i>Resources</i> – Resources from Property & Projects and appropriate departments in working up proposals in conjunction with groups.</p> <p><u>Equality or Good Relations Implications</u></p>
3.11	All capital projects are screened as part of the stage approval process
4.0	Appendices – Documents Attached
	None



Subject:	Contracts for Award
Date:	22 June 2018
Reporting Officer:	Ronan Cregan, Deputy Chief Executive and Director Finance and Resources Gerry Millar, Director of Property and Projects
Contact Officer:	Valerie Cupples, Procurement Manager

Restricted Reports	
Is this report restricted?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, when will the report become unrestricted?	
After Committee Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
After Council Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some time in the future	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>

Call-in	
Is the decision eligible for Call-in?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

1.0	Purpose of Report
1.1	<p>The purpose of this report is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek approval from Members to allow the advancement and award of tenders as outlined in Appendix 1, Table 1 in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation. • Seek approval from Members to allow extensions as detailed in Appendix 1, Table 2. • Seek approval from Members to allow the advancement and award of direct award tenders as outlined in Appendix 1, Table 3 in accordance with the Scheme of delegation
2.0	Recommendations
2.1	<p>The Committee is asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve the public advertisement and acceptance of tenders as listed in Appendix 1, Table 1 through the Council's electronic procurement system. Members are advised

	<p>that these tenders will only be advertised when they have gone through the Councils internal governance process which include demonstrating strategic alignment with the Belfast Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant delegated authority to the appropriate Director using pre-agreed criteria the most economically advantageous tender. • Allow month by month extensions where contracts are under review as outlined in Appendix 1, Table 2 • Agree to accede to Standing orders 55(a) exceptions in relation to contracts by direction of the council acting on recommendations of a Chief Officer that the exception is justified in special circumstances for the contracts laid out in 3.7 and Appendix 1, Table 3.
3.0	Main report
	<u>Key Issues</u>
3.1	<p>Section 2.5 of the Council's Scheme of Delegation outlines that under Standing Order 60(a) any contract that exceeds the statutory amount (currently £30,000) needs to be made under the Corporate Seal. Under Standing Order 51(b) the Corporate Seal can only be affixed when there is a resolution of the Council.</p>
3.2	<p>The tenders submitted for approval in Appendix 1, Table 1, have been forwarded by Departments for approval. Departments have been required to provide assurance that provision for the expenditure has either been made within their departmental budgets or approval has been sought from the Director of Finance and Resources that this expenditure has been provided for within a corporate budget.</p>
3.3	<p>Members should note that they are being asked to approve tenders in principal, after which the internal governance process demonstrating strategic alignment with the Belfast Agenda will be applied. As part of this process, Departments have also provided assurance that appropriate resources are available within their departments in order to effectively administer and management any contract(s).</p>
3.4	<p>In accordance with Standing Orders these tenders shall comply with the relevant requirements of national legislation and European directives and be overseen by Corporate Procurement Services.</p>
3.5	<p>This report relates to corporate and departmental supplies and services contracts only. The procurement of services and works contracts relating to the capital procurement is dealt with under the Capital Programme reports in accordance with the approved stage approval process.</p>

3.6

Direct Award Contracts

Members are asked to note that Corporate Procurement Services is currently under resourced and awaiting a report on the current procurement operating model. This position has resulted in an increase in the number of direct awards (single tender actions) and the requirement to accede to Standing Order 55(a).

3.7

Members are asked to accede to standing order 55(a) exception in relation to the contract by direction of the council acting on the recommendation of a Chief Officer that the exception is justified in special circumstances for the following:

- Local Authorities are required to provide annual property asset valuations in line with the Local Government (NI) Order 2005 and LGA (Accounts & Audit) Regulations NI 2015. For the last number of years Land and Property Services (LPS), procured via a framework, have provided this service. LPS provide asset valuation to all NI government bodies, all NI local authorities and other NI statutory bodies, they are regulated by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors and have built up extensive knowledge of the council's asset base. Furthermore they have no conflict of interest that other private valuation surveyors might have (particularly in respect of commercial and surplus lands portfolio).
- In order to provide accurate legal advice council solicitors must habitually research legislation; traditionally this was done through book research via law reports and legal texts. Lexis Nexus is an online database that allows access to a vast amount of legal material that cannot be replicated in book form. It is an invaluable tool for Legal Services permitting operational expediency and accuracy. No other database provides the same range of material and the Employment Law service it provide is unique.
- The Council requires specialist and technical support to undertake detailed accessibility and transport modelling to inform assessment of the emerging Belfast Region City Deal project proposals. This work is highly complex and bespoke, with David Simmonds consultancy having previous experience in this field and has a proven track record in undertaking similar important work for previous City Deals across the UK. Costs are contained within existing budgets.
- Commission KPMG to support the further development of the Belfast Region City Deal proposition including undertaking specialist economic and VFM modelling and prioritisation, project development and proposition design. This will ensure emerging proposals are compliant with HM Treasury and NICS requirements.
- Commission specialist support from Future Cities Catapult (FCC) to take forward the Belfast Region City Deal Digital and Innovation Strategy including the development of specific projects and identification of potential funding sources to support implementation. FCC are well-placed to deliver this work as they have direct connections with UK Government and have significant insight into the Government's Industrial Growth strategy and ambitions around innovation and digital transformation.

3.8	<p><u>Financial & Resource Implications</u></p> <p>The financial resources for these contracts will be met within the current departmental budgets and the proposed departmental estimates process which are taken forward through the rate setting process.</p> <p>Costs relating to tenders 1. Economic, VFM and Inclusivity Modelling and 2. BRCD Digital and Innovation Strategy Technical Assistance will be apportioned across six councils participating in the Belfast Region City Deal on the basis of the Estimated Penny Product (EPP).</p> <p><u>Equality or Good Relations Implications</u></p>
3.9	<p>No specific equality or good relations implications.</p>
4.0	<p>Appendices - Documents Attached</p>
4.1	<p>Appendix 1 Schedule of Tenders for Consideration / Notation</p> <p>Table 1 – New tenders</p> <p>Table 2 – Contracts for extension of contract period</p> <p>Table 3 - Direct Award Contracts (Single Tender Action)</p>

Appendix 1 - Schedule of tenders for consideration

Table 1 – New tenders

Title of tender	Senior Responsible Officer	Proposed contract duration
Rates Maximisation Tool	Ronan Cregan	1 year
Health & Safety	Ronan Cregan	4 year
Comvault	Ronan Cregan	3 year
Accessibility and Transport Modelling	Ronan Cregan	Up to 6 months
Economic, VFM and Inclusivity Modelling	Ronan Cregan	1 year
BRC Digital and Innovation Strategy Technical Assistance	Ronan Cregan	1 year
IT system for Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs)	Ronan Cregan	5 year
Lone Workers Devices	John Walsh	1 year + 2
First Aid Training	John Walsh	2 year +1
Print Framework	John Tully	1 year + 2
Youth Outreach Programme	Nigel Grimshaw	1 year +1 +1
Youth Diversionary Service	Nigel Grimshaw	1 year +1 +1
Hydraulic Hoses	Nigel Grimshaw	3 year +1
Consultancy Change Programme	Nigel Grimshaw	3 year
Provision of Pest Control Services	Nigel Grimshaw	4 year
Radiochemical Analysis and Interpretation of Data	Nigel Grimshaw	1 year +2
Managed Service for Energy	Gerry Millar	4 year
Care/ Childcare Employment academy	Alistair Reid	4 year
Go Social	Alistair Reid	4 year
Procurement Programme	Alistair Reid	4 year
Destination Hub - Development of a Business Case	Alistair Reid	1 year
Implementation of Masterplan	Alistair Reid	1 year

Retail Mitigation Programme	Alistair Reid	2 year +1
Development of Employment Academy Procurement Framework & Call off List	Alistair Reid	1 year
Kick Start	Alistair Reid	4 year
Construction of Employment Academy	Alistair Reid	4 year
City Pledge Intervention	Alistair Reid	2 year + 1
Destination Hub – Design Competition	Alistair Reid	1 year +1 +1
Destination Hub – Financial Assessment/Due Diligence	Alistair Reid	1 year

Table 2 – Contracts for extension of contract period

Title of Tender	Director Responsible	Proposed Extension
T1517 Medical Referee Service	Nigel Grimshaw	month by month until a new contract is in place

Table 3 Direct Award Contracts (Single Tender Action)

System / product	Supplier	Estimate
Lexis Nexis Licence	Lexis Nexus	£66K over 3 years
Annual Property Asset Valuation	LPS	£50,000 over 5 years



Subject:	Single-use coffee cups & plastic items on Council sites
Date:	22 nd June 2018
Reporting Officer:	Nigel Grimshaw, Strategic Director, City & Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer:	Tim Walker, Head of Waste Management Peter McKay, Facilities Manager

Restricted Reports	
Is this report restricted?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, when will the report become unrestricted?	
After Committee Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
After Council Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some time in the future	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>

Call-in	
Is the decision eligible for Call-in?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

1.0	Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues
1.1	To report to Strategic Policy & Resources Committee regarding the use of single-use items for the Council, such as coffee cups and straws versus re-useable items of crockery and cutlery and to seek guidance on the next steps.
2.0	Recommendations
2.1	The Committee is asked to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note the contents of this report and to consider next steps.
3.0	Main report
	Background
3.1	At the SP&R Committee meeting in January 2018, Councillor McReynolds referred to the recently published Environmental Audit Committee (EAC) report into the impact of disposable coffee cups in the UK and asked the Council to consider the following motion " <i>This Council</i>

	<p><i>welcomes the recent report by the Environmental Audit Committee into the impact of disposable coffee cups in the United Kingdom; acknowledges the impact they are having on the environment given that 2.5 billion are thrown away each year with many ending up in landfill; agrees to replace current coffee cups on council sites with compostable cups.”</i></p>
3.2	<p>The Committee agreed that a report on the replacement of current coffee cups with compostable cups on Council sites be submitted to a future meeting. It also agreed that a report on the Council’s use of plastic materials be submitted to the future meeting.</p>
3.3	<p>Further to this Notice of Motion, in April a councillor sent a letter to the Chief Executive raising concerns around plastic polluting the seas and, in particular, the problem of plastic straws. In the letter, the councillor noted the Council’s success in tackling recycling and asked for the Council to give consideration to banning single-use plastic straws across Council properties.</p>
3.4	<p>Context</p> <p>In recent months, there has been considerable public and media interest in plastics and their fate. As part of the Circular Economy package (CEP), new recycling targets have been introduced for municipal waste (55% by 2025, 60% by 2030 and 65% by 2035) and are now awaiting transcription into local legislation. As part of this package, the EU announced proposals to restrict the use of single-use plastic products which would affect the sale of plastic plates, cutlery, stirrers and straws, sticks for balloons and cotton buds with plastic stalks. Some items (plastic bottles, food containers, wrappers/packaging, sanitary towels/wet wipes, balloons, lightweight plastic bags and cigarette filters) would not be banned, but subject to financial measures to encourage industry to reconsider their business model and/or pay for collection and clean-up costs of these items. The aim is to affect the design of these items and ask manufacturers to consider if there are sustainable alternatives. In terms of single-use plastic bottles, the CEP will mean Governments have to ensure that 90% of these are collected for recycling by 2025.</p>
3.5	<p>This plastic bottle target is in part a response to China's ban on importing plastics waste and the EU aim is to either cease production of these single-use items or to develop volumes which would support a plastic remanufacture industry. Similar plastic strategies have been drafted either within the context of the Circular Economy or as standalone items and, by way of example and in response to the EAC report, HM Treasury issued a call for evidence regarding the possible introduction of a tax on single-use plastic (SUP) waste in March. On behalf of the constituent councils, arc21 submitted a response.</p>

3.6	<p>This reply (which is included in full in Appendix 1) made several points, of which the most salient to Belfast are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ arc21 broadly agrees with the report’s definition of single-use plastics but considers that there should be exclusions for compostable liners and other containers used in the collection of food waste – WRAP research has shown their use results in greater food waste capture ▪ single-use plastics are often the only option for consumers as it is unusual for consumers to have a choice between buying products packaged in single-use plastic and the same product sold either loose or packaged in more sustainable materials, and ▪ the plastic bag levy in NI demonstrated that consumers can be responsive to price changes allied to strong environmental evidence, even if the price change is relatively minor. <p>The Council’s Canteen</p>
3.7	<p>Returning to the Council, Facilities Management reports that one of the principal reasons for using single-use plastics and other disposables in the canteen and on the trolley services in the three city centre buildings is the significant costs which would be incurred if they had to replace crockery and cutlery on an ongoing basis as much of this previously went missing. This topic gets raised periodically through the Council’s Question Time Forum and the following points have consistently been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>“our customers, especially those on the lower end of the salary scales, are very much price sensitive and some will not be prepared to pay the additional cost for using compostable disposables</i> ▪ <i>we priced these disposables out and the additional costs are significant</i> ▪ <i>our waste at the back-end is reduced as most of our dishes are freshly made and we don’t purchase a lot of processed foods, which normally have a lot of packaging</i> ▪ <i>we also minimize food waste by not over producing and re-using food which is safe and of a high standard in other menu dishes”</i>
3.8	<p>Further to this, in 2017 the expenditure on single-use items which could be swapped with crockery was £4K, while £1K was spent of missing crockery. Standard practice from canteen staff is to ask customers if they are sitting-in or taking-out with a view to encouraging the use of crockery for those sitting-in and to minimize the cutlery being removed from the Atrium.</p>

3.9	Crockery has further additional costs over single-use items including use of detergent, dishwasher repairs and maintenance and power. Moving to compostable cups and other items would incur additional cost for the Council as presently they are more expensive than single-use items.
3.10	<p>The greatest number of single-use items purchased are the 12oz disposables cups for the bean-to-cup machine used in the Atrium which are not included in the above figures as it is considered that there would be H&S issues should customers choose to use their own cups which could prove to be incorrectly sized, plus keeping the single-use cups with this machine assists in the control of payments from customers. The possibility of encouraging people to bring their own mugs or to purchase a branded reusable mug have been discussed within Facilities Management but to date it has been considered that it would be extremely difficult to control portion sizes, or for catering staff to challenge customers who brought coffee from the staff kitchens located elsewhere in the Cecil Ward Building (CWB) or 9 Adelaide Street.</p> <p>“Sort it out” Materials & Educational Campaign:</p>
3.11	The internal waste management arrangements for CWB were optimised in 2014-15, raising the recycling rate from 39% to 50% – and supported on the Council’s homepage and by an educational campaign for all staff to “Sort it out”. There may be some scope to increase this as the Council’s facilities are served by the Commercial Waste collection service which has a new contract bringing commercial waste recycling in line with what is offered to households in Belfast (mixed dry recyclables include plastic pots and trays, as well as paper, cardboard, cans and plastic bottles which can now all be included in the blue recycling deskside bins).
3.12	This 2014-15 optimisation exercise did not include single-use plastics due to complications in terms of cost, and customer behaviours (disappearing cutlery and crockery). It is also obvious that the Atrium’s customers’ habits have deteriorated in recent years probably not helped by office moves and staff turnover, &c. In this regard, the recent report on Water Refill Points is also of relevance here (see Appendix 2).
3.13	This approach builds upon previous voluntary bans on single-use items on Council premises, such as balloons, which was approved by the Health & Environmental Services Committee meeting in November 2008 (see Appendix 3).

Approaches from Other Councils:

- 3.14 Other councils have been considering how to tackle single-use items and there are now several examples of good or best practice. For example, **Cork City Council** is introducing an office ban on the use of single-use coffee cups by ceasing to provide disposable cups within Council buildings. In their place, the Council is distributing free reusable cups to staff at Cork City Hall. If staff forget their “*keep cups*”, they will have to pay 20 cent extra to use one of the crockery cups available in the Council’s canteen (see <https://greennews.ie/cork-city-council-ban-coffee-cups-offices/>).
- 3.15 Similarly, **Oxford City Council** is planning to take its first step towards stopping using single-use plastics, such as straws and cups with a complete ban on these items in Council buildings. This Council hopes that other businesses will follow their lead and cut back on the amount of plastic used and thrown away in the city (see http://www.oxfordmail.co.uk/news/15674949.Could_Oxford_City_be_about_to_ditch_plastic_for_good_/). It is thought that by adopting such an approach, Oxford will become the first UK city to ban non-recyclable food containers. Demonstrating how this is applied, all street vendors will be required to use recyclable or biodegradable food containers in order to reduce the amount of waste the city sends to landfill (see <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/oxford-becomes-first-uk-city-to-ban-non-recyclable-plastic-food-containers-10174601.html>).
- 3.16 In 2016, **Bristol City Council** proposed to itself “*single-use plastic-free*” and to develop a strategy to encourage and enable the city’s institutions, businesses and citizens to adopt similar measures. The Council recognized that this would require changes in policy and Council leadership/championing to reduce their use of single-use plastics (SUP). Specifically, the Council would:
- end sales of SUP bottles in Council buildings and phase out their use at all events hosted in Council-owned buildings, both public and private
 - end the use of other SUP products in council buildings starting with, but not limited to, “*disposable*” cups, cutlery and drinking straws
 - ensure re-usable and affordable food containers are available for sale in public markets – to be piloted by the Council’s city centre market
 - work with the Festivals Team and create policy in which single-use cups are replaced at all festivals with reusable or deposit scheme cups (this would ultimately be a licence condition for large events)

- work with tenants in the Council’s commercial properties to phase-out SUP glasses, bottles, cutlery and straws and help them to engage with “Go Green’s” methodology
- work with bars and cafes to phase-out single-use cups and to encourage the use of reusable and deposit scheme ones.
- encourage, enable and aid all employees and councilors to engage with the Plastic Free July challenge.”

Many of these pledges were captured on the City-to-the-Sea website (see <https://www.citytosea.org.uk/getting-the-council-to-do-its-bit-in-cutting-single-use-plastics/#1>).

3.17 Councils are not the only public sector organisations addressing this issue. Last month, the Scottish Government banned single-use cups, and hot drinks will be served in reusable ceramic mugs in cafes and canteens at their offices instead. Staff have also been encouraged to bring in their own mugs for takeaways. The government said the move would prevent 450,000 plastic cups from being thrown away each year (see <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/plastic-coffee-cup-ban-single-use-scotland-government-buildings-roseanna-cunningham-a8375521.html>).

3.18 Elsewhere, **Brisbane City Council** has announced it’s about to become one of Australia’s most environmentally friendly councils after committing to ban plastic straws, helium balloons and single-use bottles (see <http://www.news.com.au/technology/environment/conservation/brisbane-city-council-announces-ban-on-plastic-straws-balloons-and-singleuse-bottles/news-story/99c8af5b049a9c30e5e761a0bf7003f5>).

3.19 In NI last November, **Ards & North Down Borough Council** adopted a Notice of Motion to recognise the importance to reduce waste, society’s increasing reliance on plastic and the resultant rise in the amount of plastic which ends up in the oceans and on beaches. At the meeting, ANDBC councillors were also asked to support an “*end to use single use plastics*” and for the Council to promote eco-friendly alternatives. Currently, research is being done to consider the best way for this decision to be implemented and a report will be re-presented to the Council in shortly (see <https://www.sustainableni.org/blog/ards-and-north-down-council-bans-single-use-plastics>).

3.20	<p>Returning to Belfast, Members should note that responsibility for managing internal waste does not rest with any one service. The provision of cups and crockery lies with Facilities Management's Catering Services, whereas the policy landscape and provision of public services rests with Waste Management. While my Service is keen to lead by example, most of its focus is externally driven on changing public attitudes and behaviours (there has been notable changes in these areas over the years). If Members wish to reduce single-use items within the Council, then resources will need to be identified to work across the Council and develop viable proposals.</p>
3.21	<p>Next Steps</p> <p>Committee is asked to consider each of the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ implementation of a loyalty card or discount scheme for the reuse of standardised (for H&S) and branded reusable coffee mugs ▪ incentives for the use of reusable crockery and their return to the canteen ▪ a ban on Council premises of specific single-use plastic items. <p>It is recommended that the following steps are taken:</p>
3.22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ research policies elsewhere regarding single-use plastics ▪ research single-use plastics throughout the Council ▪ establish a project team to explore implementation of bans on certain items/incentivising reuse ▪ the Council promote voluntary initiatives through existing communications channels ▪ that KPIs are developed to monitor performance and permit adjustment ▪ further report be submitted providing detailed costed options and analysis.
3.23	<p><u>Finance & Resources Implications</u></p> <p>Members should be aware that any subsequent changes of policy in the context of the above information will likely have a significant budget implication. No specific financial resources have been set aside within the current budgets for 2018/19.</p> <p><u>Equality Implications</u></p> <p>There are no equality implications contained in this report.</p>

3.24	
3.25	
4.0	Appendices – Documents Attached
	<p>Appendix 1a&b – arc21 report on Treasury call for evidence on addressing single-use plastic waste and submission</p> <p>Appendix 2 – People & Communities Committee report of 5 June, 2018: Water Refill Points - Response to Notice of Motion</p> <p>Appendix 3 – Health & Environmental Services Committee report of 5 November, 2008: Balloon Releases at Council Events</p>

ITEM 12

Call for Evidence on Using the Tax System or Charges to Address Single-use Plastic Waste

Purpose of the Report

To advise the Joint Committee on the call for evidence originating from HM Treasury.

Executive Summary

HM Treasury have made a call for evidence relating to the possible introduction of a tax on single-use plastic waste and arc21 have submitted a response within the prescribed timescale.

The Joint Committee is asked to note the report.

Report

In January, the Prime Minister launched the 25-Year Environment Plan, outlining the government's new ambitions for protecting the environment. The plan sets out steps to tackle a wide range of environmental issues, including plastic waste and the impact it has on the marine environment. The Prime Minister announced that the government has pledged to eradicate all avoidable plastic waste by the end of 2042 and will publish a Resources and Waste Strategy later this year.

A key element of the government's plan to eliminate avoidable plastic waste is to examine how economic incentives can be used to encourage more sustainable behaviour.

This call for evidence will explore how changes to the tax system or charges could be used to reduce the amount of single-use plastics we waste in order to deliver better environmental outcomes, which would be the primary objective of any such intervention. Specifically, the government would like to understand how further economic incentives can be effective in continuing to reduce waste from single-use plastics by reducing unnecessary production, increasing reuse, and improving recycling.

Alongside this, the government would like to explore how the same economic incentives can drive innovation, for example by stimulating businesses to develop and integrate new technology, or by encouraging growth in the recycling industry by addressing barriers to investment.

The government intend to consider all options for using the tax system and charges to address single-use plastic waste and to drive innovation, and will use the evidence gathered from this call to inform that process. The government wants to look broadly across the whole supply chain, from production and retail to consumption and disposal, in order to gain the best possible understanding of the whole landscape before deciding on the best course of action.

Appendix 1a

HM Treasury recognise there are a number of areas of environmental policy that are devolved. As part of this process, the government commit to engage with the devolved administrations on the role that taxes and charges could play in reducing waste from single-use plastics in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

The document is 17 pages long and is subdivided into 3 distinct Chapters:

- Chapter 1 Introduction;
- Chapter 2 Defining single-use plastics and assessing the benefits and harms; and
- Chapter 3 The life cycle of single-use plastics.

The document is available at the following link:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/ouublications>

The closing date for submissions was 18th May 2018.

The call for evidence posed eighteen generic questions. There are questions about the nature of the stages outlined in the chapters and about the impact of potential interventions. HM Treasury have indicated that respondents may wish to focus on the stage of the life cycle which most affects them, but they do state they will welcome responses to any questions which respondents choose to answer.

Following consultation with a number of parties, an appropriate submission was submitted to HM Treasury within the prescribed timescale. A copy of the submission is attached at Appendix E.

Action to be Taken

The Joint Committee is asked to note the report.

Officer to Contact

Ricky Burnett
Policy & Operations Director
Tel: 028 90 726333 Ext: 6677
Email: ricky.burnett@arc21.org.uk



Consultation on Using the Tax System or Charges to Address Single-use Plastic Waste

Introduction

arc21 is a Local Government sector entity embracing six Councils located along the Eastern Region of Northern Ireland which covers approximately 33% of the land base, populated by approximately 59% of the national population and accounts for approximately 60% of the national Local Government controlled municipal waste arisings.

The establishment of arc21 together with its functionality has been enshrined in various pieces of legislation with the most recent provision being The Local Government (Constituting a Joint Committee a Body Corporate) Order (Northern Ireland) 2015.

In essence, it is primarily responsible for activities associated with the production, ongoing development and implementation of a Waste Management Plan for the arc21 area.

The six Constituent Councils of arc21 are Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council, Ards and North Down Borough Council, Belfast City Council, Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council, Mid and East Antrim Borough Council and Newry Mourne and Down District Council.

Report

arc21 welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation. Prior to responding to the specific questions contained in the consultation document arc21 would offer some general comments as follows:

- I. There are a number of measures and possible initiatives currently being considered throughout the UK including the Devolved Administrations and it will be vital that there is a holistic and coordinated approach is adopted by central government to such to avoid potential unintended consequences that may not be in the best interests of all or any part of the UK.
- II. It will be important to factor into deliberations the situation relative to Northern Ireland which is the only part of the UK that has a land border with another member State and the potential cross border impact relative to this matter.
- III. In considering the introduction of such a measure, it will be important to ensure that the potential for the displacement of single use plastics by other material and its possible impact is fully considered.

- IV. In the event that such a tax or charge are introduced, arc21 would welcome consideration being given to developing a scheme whereby the revenue from such is ring fenced for use in environmentally beneficial projects developed by councils or duly determined by a process involving councils.

In terms of the specific questions contained in the consultation, we would respond as follows:

Q1. How should the government define single-use plastics, and what items should be included and excluded, and why?

A1. We are broadly content with the definition suggested in the document. To be clear we believe this would apply to such items as plastic bottles, pots, tubs and trays.

In terms of exclusions, we would ask that compostable liners used in kitchen caddies and other containers for the collection of food waste is specifically excluded. It has been established through research conducted by WRAP that the use of such liners by householders does result in a greater capture of separate food waste.

Q2. What are the most important problems associated with single-use plastics, and why?

- *Which polymer types are particularly problematic?*
- *Which items are particularly problematic?*

A2. We understand that there are different plastic polymers used in the production of single used plastics and such a multitude of mixtures adds a significant layer of complexity to the supply chain leading to downstream treatment. Accordingly there appears to be some rational that would suggest a more consistent approach should be adopted to the production of single use plastic products used in the market place in terms of the polymers utilised.

For councils, the single use plastic products that pose the most problems fall into the following categories:

1. are frequently littered;
2. are not recyclable via current processes and are therefore either sent to landfill/energy from waste, or contaminate the recycling waste streams;
3. are impracticable or impossible to separate from other recyclables at materials recovery facilities (MRFs) or plastics recovery facilities (PRFs), and therefore are not sent for recycling; and
4. have a low or negative market value.

Examples of single use plastics that fall into most of these categories include: plastic films, expanded polystyrene packaging or food containers, plastic drinking straws and composite items such as coffee cups, pouches, crisp tube packaging and black plastic trays (which MRFs often struggle to separate).

Plastic bottles fit into only the first category, i.e. they are easy to recycle and separate and have a relatively high market value, but are frequently littered. We therefore feel that, from a council perspective, plastic bottles are one of the least problematic form of single use plastic. Having said that, plastic bottles still have negative environmental impacts due to the oil and energy used in creating them and the limited number of times that they can be recycled, so their remains an argument that measures should be introduced to reduce their use.

Examples of single use plastics that fall mainly into the final category include: liquid cartons and plastic pots, tubs and trays.

Q3. Are there more environmentally friendly alternatives, currently available or possible in the future, to these types of single-use plastic items or their manufacturing processes, and can they still offer similar benefits?

- *Should the government encourage biodegradability in plastics, and if so, how?*

A3. In general arc21 understand that biodegradable plastics can be categorised into two different types:

- a) Those made from plant based materials (bioplastics); and
- b) Those made from petrochemicals with chemical additives which facilitate.

Regardless of the type it is currently not feasible to recycle these into new plastic products. However, those in category a) can be composted under properly controlled conditions. All the councils in arc21 collect food waste separate from residual waste and supply and/or promote the use of compostable kitchen caddy liners. They are of the view this is a very important component in their efforts to optimise capture of food waste for treatment of organic waste. Accordingly, and as indicated above, we would advocate that such products are specifically excluded from any tax or charge currently under consideration.

We are not convinced there is sufficient evidence that would enable us to support the view that bioplastics are a viable alternatives to single use plastics. Enhanced efforts need to be applied to reduce the level of packaging with greater utilisation of reusable containers.

Q4. Are there single-use plastic items that are deemed essential by their nature or application, which cannot be substituted or avoided?

A4. As indicated above we would contend that compostable kitchen caddy liners should not be the subject of any tax or charge introduced by central government.

Q5. What factors influence the choice of polymer, or combination of polymers, in the production of single-use items?

- *Can you provide data on the production and use of single-use plastic items you produce?*
- *What proportion of the polymers you use or sell do you import and export, respectively?*
- *What proportion of the single-use plastics you produce do you export?*

Q6. What proportion of the plastic that you produce is made of recycled plastic, and what are the barriers to increasing this?

Q7. What proportion of the plastic that you produce is commercially recyclable and what are the barriers to increasing this and improving the grade it can be recycled to?

Q8. In your opinion, how can the tax system or charges play a role in delivering better environmental outcomes at this stage?

- *What interventions should be implemented, and why?*

- *What behavioural effect would these interventions have, both on this stage in the supply chain, and more broadly?*
- *What would be the impact on your business?*

Q9. What factors influence the design and specifications you make for the single-use plastic items you sell, and what are the barriers to using alternatives?

- *In what way, and to what extent, do the decisions of producers and consumers influence the choice of single-use plastics you use in the items you sell?*

Q10. Can you provide data on the volumes and costs of different types of single-use plastic used?

Q11. Have you taken any steps to address the environmental impact of the single-use plastic items you sell, including their end-of-life?

- *Can you provide evidence of the effect these actions have had?*

Q12. In your opinion, how can the tax system or charges play a role in delivering better environmental outcomes at this stage?

- *What interventions should be implemented, and why?*
- *What behavioural effect would these interventions have, both on this stage in the supply chain, and more broadly?*
- *What would be the impact on your business?*

A5-12. arc21 are content to defer to other parties more appropriately placed to provide responses in relation to these questions.

Q13. What factors influence consumers' choices related to single-use plastic items?

- *How can the government encourage the re-use of these items?*

A13. Firstly, consumers' choices relating to single use plastic items appear to be primarily restricted through the lack of viable alternatives.

Notwithstanding the above, we are of the view that consumers will take the following factors into account with regard to single use plastic packaging:

- **Transparency:** plastic packaging is often see-through, so the consumer can clearly see the product that they are buying.
- **Transportability:** plastic keeps loose items well contained. Rigid plastics are also strong and can protect products well during transit.
- **Hygiene:** plastic is a strong impermeable barrier and can prevent bacteria spreading between food items at the point of purchase, particularly meat items.

It may be that an effective Extended Producer Responsibility system will significantly influence the potential for reducing single use plastic packaging. arc21 understands that detailed discussions in connection with such may commence soon and we would be happy to contribute to such.

Q14. What are the barriers to consumers choosing alternatives to single-use plastic items, and how responsive would consumers be to price changes?

A14 As indicated above, single use plastics are often the only option for consumers. It is unusual for consumers to have a choice between buying a product packaged in single use plastic and the same product sold either loose or packaged in more sustainable materials. The results of the plastic bag levy in Northern Ireland has demonstrated that consumers can be very responsive to price changes allied to strong environmental evidence even if the price change is relatively minor in quantum.

Q15. In what way, and to what extent, do the decisions of producers and retailers influence consumer choice?

A15. Arc21 would contend that decisions of producers/retailers are highly influential when it comes to consumer choice in this regard. as already suggested consumers are very rarely faced with a choice around the nature of packaging used particularly with single use plastics. The nature of packaging is primarily determined by the producers/ retailers and as such there is little consumer choice.

Q16. In your opinion, how can the tax system or charges play a role in delivering better environmental outcomes at this stage?

- *What interventions should be implemented, and why?*
- *What behavioural effect would these interventions have, both on this stage in the supply chain, and more broadly?*
- *What would be the impact on consumers?*
- *Are there specific items the government should be focussing on?*

A16. As previously mentioned, it is important to ensure that a suitably balanced package of measures are developed. These potentially include Extended Producer Responsibility, Deposit Return Schemes, as well as the imposition of a single use plastic tax /charge.

Central government may also wish to consider encouraging measures that result in single use plastic which contain a degree of recycled material are not as ‘heavily penalised’ as those that do not contain recycled material. This could help create a pull within the market for material that is separated for recycling so that there is more stability in the long-term value of the recycled plastic material.

Q17. What are the barriers to the collection of single-use plastics and more environmentally friendly methods of waste treatment, including barriers to any existing technologies?

A17. A major barrier involves single use plastics being put on the market by producers that are unable to be recycled via current technologies and/or impossible to separate from other materials at Material Recovery Facilities due to their size, shape, structure or polymer type.

Such materials are either put in residual waste bins by householders or put in recycling bins, where they are later removed as ‘contamination’ and treated as residual waste. It not particularly realistic to expect sorting and recycling technology, given cost etc to continue to cope with the myriad of single use plastics products that is either on or will be put on the market.

Q18. In your opinion, how can the tax system or charges play a role in delivering better environmental outcomes at this stage?

- *What interventions should be implemented, and why?*
- *What behavioural effect would these interventions have, both on this stage in the supply chain, and more broadly?*
- *What would be the impact on Local Authorities and business?*

A18. As previously suggested it will require a suitably balanced package of measures are developed. These potentially include Extended Producer Responsibility, Deposit Return Schemes, as well as the imposition of a single use plastic tax /charge. This could be augmented with the development of appropriate legislative provisions in Northern Ireland for use by councils to encourage householders to fully and properly utilise council kerbside recycling services.

arc21
May 2018



Subject:	Water Refill Points - Response to Notice of Motion
Date:	5 June 2018
Reporting Officer:	Nigel Grimshaw, Strategic Director of City & Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer:	Stephen Leonard, Environmental Health Manager, City & Neighbourhood Services

Restricted Reports	
Is this report restricted?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, when will the report become unrestricted?	
After Committee Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
After Council Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some time in the future	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>

Call-in	
Is the decision eligible for Call-in?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

1.0	Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues
1.1	To report to People & Communities Committee on the feasibility of implementing a bottle refill initiative in Belfast.

2.0	Recommendations
2.1	<p>The People & Communities Committee is asked to consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether they wish to join a water refill scheme for Belfast.
2.2	<p>If Committee agrees to join a water refill scheme for Belfast, they are asked to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve the next steps outlined in paragraph 3.13 below.
3.0	Main Report
3.1	<p>Background</p> <p>At the meeting of the Council on 1st February, the following motion, which had been proposed by Councillor Milne and seconded by Councillor Kyle, was referred to the Committee for consideration:</p> <p>3.2 <i>“This Council notes that many cities in the UK and Ireland are taking action against plastic waste by implementing free water refill points. Notably, Bristol has been implementing a very successful refill scheme since 2015, and London has recently pledged to increase the availability of water refill points to help limit the amount of recyclable waste sent to landfill.</i></p> <p>3.3 <i>Not only will increasing the provision of free water refill points help reduce plastic waste, but increased access to water can contribute towards people living a healthier lifestyle.</i></p> <p>3.4 <i>The Council, therefore, agrees to assess the feasibility of implementing a bottle refill initiative. Additionally, it will write to the Belfast Chamber of Commerce seeking to determine whether local shops and businesses can work together to provide access to public drinking water. This could potentially increase footfall within local businesses and even further improve the public relations impact of our business community.”</i></p> <p>3.5 The People & Communities Committee of 6th February 2018 agreed that a report be submitted to a future meeting.</p> <p>Current Context</p> <p>3.6 Plastic pollution has become an increasingly prevalent issue through the additional media scrutiny on the harmful effects of plastic on the marine environment. China has recently imposed quality restrictions on the import of recyclable materials, in an attempt to address</p>

	<p>domestic concerns about pollution and public health. This in effect closes down the export of recyclable plastics and other materials from the world's richest countries. The need to reduce the amount of plastic used has become more urgent.</p>
3.7	<p>Plastic bottles are one of the main sources of plastic pollution within Northern Ireland. It is estimated that 12,000 tonnes of plastic bottles are collected every year in NI, equating to 181 million plastic bottles per year. Although there are no specific estimates for Belfast, an extrapolation of the NI average suggests that 33.3 million plastic bottles are collected every year within Belfast.</p>
	<p>Refill Schemes</p>
3.8	<p>In relation to refill schemes, there are two main schemes – Refill Ireland and City to Sea. Both schemes follow the same concept – premises/organisations voluntarily join the scheme, offering the public to get their bottles refilled for free, get a sticker advertising this placed on the front door or window and get mapped onto the website or app.</p>
3.9	<p>City to Sea is the original campaign group (established in 2015) and is more established. Starting in Bristol, it now has over 1,600 refill sites across the UK, including 22 in Belfast (3 of which are Belfast City Council sites – Ormeau Park, CS Lewis Square and Sir Thomas & Lady Dixon Park). Premier Inn and Starbucks are currently signed up to this scheme and mapped in Belfast. They have a smart phone app, making it easy to find refill points when you are in the city. There is also a rewards system for refilling at the signed up sites with a certain amount of points entitling you to a free refillable bottle.</p>
3.10	<p>Refill Ireland is primarily based in the Republic of Ireland, though do have a presence in Northern Ireland – Mount Stewart has six refill points mapped. They do not currently have a presence in Belfast and their map is web based rather than a smart phone app that can easily be accessed when in the city to find the nearest water refill point.</p>
3.11	<p>Given that City to Sea has already established a presence in Belfast (including three BCC sites), draws a lot of national attention and is attracting large scale multi-national companies who have a presence in Belfast to join the scheme nationally, City to Sea is recommended as the preferred scheme for Belfast.</p>
	<p>Current Water Refill Sites in Belfast City Council Premises</p>
3.12	<p>Currently, within Belfast City Council sites there are eight drinking water fountains:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ormeau Park (two water fountains); • Connswater Community Greenway (at CS Lewis Square); • Sir Thomas and Lady Dixon Park; • Woodvale Park; and • City Hall (two water fountains) • The Adventurous Playground, Cavehill Country Park. <p>Next Steps</p> <p>3.13 Should Committee wish to join a water refill scheme, it is recommended that the following steps are undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The eight BCC sites be immediately added to the City to Sea refill scheme; • Officers will approach our operating partners (GLL and Amadeus) and representative bodies (for example Chamber of Commerce and Retail NI) to ascertain if they are also willing to operate and/or promote the scheme; • Begin to promote the initiative through existing communications channels; • Monitor the uptake of the campaign in Belfast; and • Report to Committee on the success of the campaign in relation to take up by other premises. <p>3.14 <u>Resources Implications</u> There are no additional resource implications contained within this report.</p> <p>3.15 <u>Equality Implications</u> There are no equality implications contained in this report.</p>
4.0	Appendices – Documents Attached
	None



Belfast City Council

Report to:	Health & Environmental Services Committee
Subject:	Balloon Releases at Council Events
Date:	5th November, 2008
Reporting Officer:	William Francey, Director of Health and Environmental Services (ext. 3260)
Contact Officer:	Wesley Thompson, Departmental Policy Manager (ext. 3377)

Relevant Background Information

The Marine Conservation Society has recently written to the Council, raising concerns about the environmental implications of balloon releases and asking the Council to consider either introducing a bye-law prohibiting balloon releases or a voluntary code to stop balloons being released. A number of publications point to both the positive and negative aspects of balloon releases. While the use of balloon releases in awareness and fund raising campaigns for important causes is recognised, there is acceptance that there are negative environmental implications. Views on the extent of the environmental impact of balloon releases vary widely, however, with some organisations advocating that they should not be held and others advising on how current practices can be improved to reduce the environmental effects.

A frequently quoted study concludes that most helium filled latex rubber balloons burst into tiny pieces about five miles above the ground and that the others biodegrade over a relatively short period, depending on environmental conditions (Burchette, 1989). The Balloon Association, in its code of conduct, advises against using ribbons, string and plastic valves, and encourages other practices aimed at reducing the environmental impacts. The Marine Conservation Society outlines evidence that not only are balloons littering, but they are potentially lethal to wildlife and have killed whales, dolphins, turtles, sharks and seabirds. They encourage a range of alternative uses of balloons for those with promotional, marketing or entertainment roles. While EnCams do not consider balloons to be a big source of litter, they agree that they are a pollutant and can have a damaging effect. They describe the best way to tackle problems caused by balloons that float back down to earth as not releasing them in the first place.

Enquiries within the Council indicate that, while the Council has held balloon releases in the past, environmental concerns have been recognised and they are no longer used. On rare occasions, balloons may be released on Council ground, at locations such as Malone House or Belfast Castle, by third parties, at charity events or wedding receptions. Concern has been expressed about the practicability of enforcing a ban on such third parties, particularly given that management may only realise that it is being done when the balloons are being released. Soundings from Departments support the formalising of a voluntary ban, and this has been endorsed by the Chief Officers' Management Team.

Recommendation

The Committee is asked to agree that the Council introduces a voluntary ban on balloon releases at Council events.

NORTH FORESHORE MEMBERS' STEERING GROUP

(To which Members of the Strategic Policy and Resources and City Growth and Regeneration Committees were invited to attend)

Minutes of Meeting of 13th June, 2018

Members Present: Alderman Convery (Chairperson);
Aldermen Browne, Copeland, L. Patterson and Spence; and
Councillors Hutchinson and Murphy.

Also Attended: Alderman Kingston and
Councillors Hussey, Kingston and Johnston

In Attendance: Mr. G. Millar, Director of Property and Projects,
Mrs. C. Reynolds, Estates Manager; and
Mr. G. Graham, Democratic Services Assistant.

Election of Chairperson

The Steering Group sought nominations to fill the vacant position of Chairperson and it was:

Moved by Alderman Spence
Seconded by Alderman L. Patterson

Resolved - that Alderman Convery be appointed to the position of Chairperson for the period ended on the date of the Local Government Elections in May, 2019.

(Alderman Convery in the Chair)

Apologies

An apology was reported on behalf of Councillor M.E. Campbell.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 15th May, 2018 were taken as read and signed as correct.

Declarations of Interest

Alderman Copeland declared that she was a member of the Board of the Belfast Harbour Commissioners, who had been selected to provide the Steering Group with a presentation on their development proposals in respect of the Giant's Park.

Noted.

Update on North Foreshore

The Director of Property and Projects provided the Steering Group with the undernoted report providing an update on the conclusion of the marketing process in respect of lands at the Giant's Park for a proposed commercial leisure led and mixed use development. He provided the Members with an overview in respect of the shortlisting process which had been undertaken, prior to the developers being invited to submit their

development proposals to the Steering Group. He reminded the Members that the Expression of Interest Development Brief marketing particulars had sought development proposals from developers with the experience and ability to acquire a site and build and manage a commercial leisure led and mixed use development but with no prescriptive uses identified. He reminded the Members also that the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee was responsible for the approval of the preferred developer following completion of the evaluation process in accordance with the assessment criteria as set out in the Development Brief.

“1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To update Members following the conclusion of the marketing process for lands at Giant’s Park for a proposed commercial leisure led and mixed use development and to advise regarding the forthcoming presentations by developers in relation to their respective development proposals.**

2 Commercial Leisure Led / Mixed Use Development Marketing Update

- 2.1 As Members will be aware, a marketing process has been ongoing in respect of lands at Giant’s Park, North Foreshore for a potential commercial leisure led and mixed use development. These proposals relate to the 200-acre portion of the site located to the north and west. The Strategic Policy and Resources, at its meeting on 21st August 2015, had approved the commencement of a Development Brief marketing process for a commercial leisure and mixed use development. Subsequent reports have been brought back to both the North Foreshore Steering Group and to the Strategic Policy & Resources Committee regarding this two stage marketing process.**

- 2.2 Following the approval of the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee to progress on this basis, the North Foreshore Steering Group on 14th November 2016 approved the final draft of the Expressions of Interest document to be issued to the market. This included suggestions from Members previously made at the October 2016 meeting. Members also received an update on three previous public consultation exercises undertaken regarding potential future uses of the site which had concluded a broad range of leisure type uses as being appropriate. On this basis and also because this is a land disposal and not a public procurement exercise to provide specific facilities, the Expressions of Interest was deliberately not prescriptive in respect of proposals that would be considered.**

- 2.3 In broad terms the Expression of Interest marketing particulars sought development proposals from developers with the experience and ability to acquire a site and build and manage a commercial leisure led and mixed use development but with no prescriptive uses identified. Members of the North Foreshore Steering Group were reminded at its 16th April 2018 meeting by the Director of Property and Projects that all submissions had to be considered in this broad context.**

- 2.4** The marketing of the site has been by way of a two stage process; the Stage 1 Expression of Interest had sought broad proposals for a commercial leisure led and mixed use development and the subsequent Stage 2 process required a much more detailed submission. At their meeting on 23rd June 2017, the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee gave approval to eight development submissions progressing to the more detailed Stage 2 process with further details to be brought back to Committee following this process.
- 2.5** The Stage 2 process required developers to provide details on the development team, detailed development proposals, finance, funding, delivery programme, strategic context and economic and social benefits etc.
- 2.6** The Strategic Policy and Resources Committee, on 20th April 2018, approved the minutes of the North Foreshore Steering Group of 16th April 2018 which noted that four submissions had been received by the closing date of 28th February 2018 for the Stage 2 of the Expressions of Interest process with the evaluation and clarification process ongoing. The detailed development proposals received were for an extensive range of commercial leisure led and mixed use proposals. Members were advised that developers would be invited to present their detailed proposals to a future meeting of the North Foreshore Steering Group with Members from the Strategic Policy and Resources and City Growth and Regeneration Committees also invited to attend.
- 2.7** The Expression of Interest documents set out the detailed selection criteria against which submissions would be assessed. Further clarification on various issues was also sought and followed up, where applicable, with interviews with prospective developers. The Evaluation Panel has undertaken a detailed assessment of all submissions received in line with the selection criteria as set out and this will be finalised following the presentation of proposals at the Steering Group on 13 June.
- 2.8** At this meeting on 13th June each developer will provide an overview of their development proposals by way of a presentation (10 minutes) with a further 10 minutes allocated for Members to ask questions/seek clarification from respective developers/teams thereafter. Officers will also update Members on the evaluation process to date.
- 2.9** It is hoped that a report can be subsequently brought to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee in August seeking approval to appoint a preferred bidder to take forward development of these lands, subject to detailed terms to be agreed.”

Representatives from four separate developer consortia presented their detailed development proposals to Members. Three of the submissions focussed on the commercial leisure led development and one submission focused on warehouse development for part of the lands only. All developers provided an overview of their development proposals and the potential economic and social benefits including jobs created, visitor numbers and community benefits including their past experience in the

delivery of major developments; financial backing; development programme and the ability to deliver on their proposals.

Development Submission One

Representatives from the first development submission attended in connection with this item and were welcomed by the Chairperson.

They provided the Steering Group with detailed plans in respect of their development proposals for Giant's Park, focusing on commercial leisure led development. The Members were provided with an overview of the potential community benefits associated with their proposals, including the opportunities for local employment associated with their proposed investment. The Members were provided with examples from around the world where their development works on similar landfill sites had revitalised those areas and brought substantial economic and social benefits to those communities.

In response to a question from a Member in respect of the development team's ability to deliver on their development proposals, the team representatives referred to their past experience in the development on contaminated land and of their ability to raise adequate capital to complete the necessary work outlined in their development proposals. The Steering Group were provided with an estimate of the potential visitor numbers and completion date of the project should they be successful in being awarded the contract.

The Steering Group thanked the developer representatives for their detailed development proposals and they departed from the meeting.

Development Submission Two

Representatives from the second development submission provided the Steering Group with an overview of their plans to develop lands on a portion of the Giants Park, focusing on warehousing. They referred to their previous development projects and the Steering Group was provided with financial assurances on their ability to secure the necessary financial resources to deliver their development proposals. They confirmed, however, that their interest was solely in relation to one portion of the lands only i.e. the commercial development of the lands on the western portion of the site and that they would not be interested in developing the northern lands for leisure related purposes as set out in the Brief. They did indicate that they would also be interested in acquiring some additional land in this northern section for development at a later stage if the Council could zone this for commercial development purposes.

In response to questions from Members, they provided information in regard to the number of jobs which they estimated would be created as a result of their development proposals, including the income accruing to the Council associated with the expansion of the rate base. In response to a further question from a Member the developer conceded that their development proposals would result in the site being split as a result of their requirement to develop part of the land only.

The Steering Group thanked the developer representatives for their development proposals and they departed from the meeting.

Development Submission Three

Representatives from the third development submission attended in connection with this item and were welcomed by the Chairperson.

They provided the Steering Group with a detailed presentation in regard to their proposals for the development of Giant's Park focusing on commercial leisure led

development. They outlined the potential employment opportunities as a result of their proposals and assured the Members of their financial backing to enable them to complete the development programme, The developer outlined their proposals to enhance transport networks between the Giant's Park and the city centre and, in response to concerns from the Steering Group, stated that their development proposals would not displace other facilities in the area. They provided the Steering Group also with an estimate in regard to the number of potential jobs created as a result of their proposals, including the number of visitors to the Giant's Park associated with their development plans.

The Steering Group thanked the developer representatives for their detailed presentation and they departed from the meeting.

Development Submission Four

Representatives from the fourth development submission attended in connection with this item and were welcomed by the Chairperson.

The development company provided the Steering Group with a summary of the key elements of their development proposals, focusing on a range of commercial leisure led developments. They outlined the potential economic development which they estimated would accrue from their investment in the Giant's Park. The group provided details of their financial backing and assured the Members of their ability to deliver the project. In response to a question from a Member, the Group provided information in regard to the number of potential jobs which it anticipated would be created as a result of their development proposals and the benefits which would be provided to the local community. The development company representatives stated that their proposal would provide a unique leisure experience which would cater for all age groups, stating that their proposals would complement the Council's Belfast Agenda priorities and assured the Members of their commitment to the project, which would be both financially and economically sustainable.

The Steering Group thanked the developer representatives for their detailed presentation and they departed from the meeting.

Summary/Discussion

The Director of Property and Projects provided the Steering Group with an outline of the process to be undertaken prior to the selection of the preferred developer. He stated that it was his intention to bring a report to the August meeting of the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee with a recommendation in relation to a preferred developer, following a rigorous and robust evaluation process being undertaken in accordance with the assessment criteria set out in the Expression of Interest Development Brief.

Noted.

Proposed Filming by Westway Film Productions

Members of the Steering Group were advised of proposed filming scheduled to take place at Giant's Park by Westway Film Productions, as discussed at the previous meeting of the Steering Group. It was reported that the production, 'Ulster Giants' was focussed on a range of civil engineering projects in Northern Ireland and specifically in relation to the Giant's Park, it was proposed to cover the transformation of a former landfill site for future development, including the challenges encountered from a civil engineering and construction perspective. The Estates Manager stated that It had been agreed further that, relevant officers would take part in the filming and that the Chairperson of the Steering Group

would be asked if he wished to participate, subject to the approval of the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee .

Noted.

Date of Next Meeting

The Steering Group agreed that its next meeting be held on Monday, 13th August at 12.30 p.m.

Chairperson