
Minutes of the meeting of the **Waste Management & Recycling Sub-Committee** held on **14 February 2005** when there were present:-

Cllr P K Savill (Chairman)

Cllr C A Hungate
Cllr C J Lumley

Cllr G A Mockford
Cllr M G B Starke

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn.

OFFICERS PRESENT

R Crofts - Corporate Director (Finance and External Services)
J Bourne - Leisure and Contracts Manager
S Worthington - Committee Administrator

5 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2005 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

6 KERBSIDE RECYCLING SCHEME

The Sub-Committee received a verbal update from the Leisure and Contracts Manager on progress with respect to the kerbside recycling scheme.

It was noted that the kerbside recycling operation was settling down well, with the office only receiving a small number of calls relating to problems with the service. The operation was now running smoothly.

The tonnages of recyclables collected in the first fourteen weeks of the service were considerably higher than Serviceteam's estimated tonnages. 55% of actual recyclables collected during this period were paper, 36% glass and 9% tins.

Members agreed that, in the event of any recycling credits or material sale value being retained by the Council as part of the profit share arrangement, there would be merit in ring fencing these monies for expenditure on the recycling service.

During debate there was a general consensus that, although current tonnages were high, it was likely that tonnages during the summer holiday period would be lower. In addition, it was also perceived that participation levels could be improved.

Officers advised that the recycling officers were in the process of going

around the District to conduct participation monitoring. Although it was too early for any conclusive results to emerge from this monitoring, it appeared that there were some areas, Wakering, for example, where participation levels were not as high as other parts of the District. Any areas where participation levels were low would be targeted to receive additional educational and promotional material relating to the service, which would inform residents what items they could leave for recycling and also explain the benefits of recycling.

During debate Members concurred that the red bags did not have adequate capacity for 2 weeks' worth of papers. It was, however, clear that residents preferred to place their papers in the red bags provided, rather than in carrier bags. Officers confirmed that various options were being explored with respect to replacement bags. The ideal solution would be to provide residents with a supply of disposable bags, as there had been many instances of the current, re-usable bags being either lost or blown away. A roll of 26 disposable bags with tie handles, which would have a larger capacity than the current re-usable bags, could be supplied to residents for a cost of around £18,000 - £26,000 per annum. Officers were exploring the possibility of applying to the County Council for funding for this through the DEFRA scheme.

In response to a Member enquiry relating to the costs of the current, re-usable bags, officers confirmed that 35,000 bags had been purchased at a cost of £4,000 - £4,500. It was, however, probable that some of the increased costs of purchasing disposable bags would be offset by increased paper tonnages as a result of the larger capacity bags. The costs of the disposable bags would include provision for some text to be printed on the bags, which could include, for example, "paper only".

Officers advised that an article had appeared in the last edition of *Rochford District Matters* advising residents that papers could be placed in ordinary carrier bags, as well as the red bags. A further article would also appear in the next edition. There was a general consensus that it was important that, in tandem with this message, all Serviceteam recycling teams did accept papers left out in carrier bags.

Responding to a Member enquiry about whether papers had been contaminated as a result of rain, officers confirmed that contamination levels had remained low.

Officers advised that there was still the occasional complaint received from residents who had been on the previous recycling round. The substance of these complaints focused on the issue of the current kerbside recycling service not providing the opportunity for residents to recycle as many different materials as the previous service. It was, however, pointed out to these residents that they did now receive a weekly grey bin collection, which was not previously the case.

In response to an enquiry relating to green waste, officers confirmed that the Authority was currently out to tender on the provision of a green waste collection service. Bids were expected back on 10 – 12 March in the hope that a green waste service could be offered to residents in April. Officers further advised that, as part of the tendering process, companies were asked to provide a range of information, including options for receptacles for the green waste, which could include either bins or bags.

Responding to a Member enquiry relating to those properties not currently on a kerbside recycling round, officers advised that Serviceteam were looking at various vehicles that might be used for those properties not yet on a round. One of the vehicles was much smaller than the other vehicles being used, and would resolve the access issues relating to some of these properties. However, it was possible that consideration might have to be given to the collection of 2, rather than 3, recyclable materials, as the vehicles were liable to have insufficient capacity to collect all 3 materials.

There was a general consensus that, in the case of flatted developments, planning conditions relating to the developer providing an area for the storage of recycling bins should be enforced.

Members concurred that there would be merit in exploring the possibility of extending some existing recycling rounds to include properties that were not currently on a round, but were situated not far from roads that were on rounds. There was also a consensus that officers should explore the possibility of stickers being placed on bins to remind residents what sorts of waste should be placed in the grey bins, and what should be placed in the blue boxes and, finally, what should be placed in the bags.

On a Motion moved by Cllr G A Mockford and seconded by Cllr M G B Starke, it was:-

Recommended to the Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee

That any future monies gained by the Council through the profit share arrangement be ring fenced for expenditure on the recycling service. (CDF&ES)

EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining business on the grounds that exempt information as defined in paragraph 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 would be disclosed.

7 ESSEX JOINT PROCUREMENT PROCESS

The Sub-Committee received a verbal update from the Leisure and Contracts Manager on the Essex Joint Procurement process.

It was noted that one of the principal objectives of the Waste Management Advisory Board was to oversee the creation of a joint waste strategy and joint waste procurement process for the county. A public consultation exercise was conducted in 2002, to evaluate views from industry, Councils and the general public on the future methods of managing Essex's waste, which brought out an emphasis on high levels of recycling and waste minimisation. Within the resulting draft strategy a recycling target of 60% across the county by 2010 was set. It was recognised that this target was aspirational and would not be easy to achieve.

The procurement process was complex and moving at a fast pace. A Joint Committee would be set up for each of the three area working groups: Thames Gateway, East and West. Each Joint Committee would be formally constituted by May 2005. A draft business plan and constitution was currently being drafted for each Joint Committee and being evaluated / discussed by County and District Officers.

The County Council hosted a 'soft market testing event' in June 2004, with the aim of obtaining views from industry on long-term integrated contract working with respect to municipal waste. The event included representatives from waste management companies, technology providers and banks. The feedback from industry was mainly positive.

No definite decision had yet been taken on the method of contract procurement, but at present the most beneficial method appeared to be via a PFI contract. An outline business case would be submitted to DEFRA by the end of March to determine whether or not DEFRA would be supportive of the case for PFI funding and determination of the level of PFI credits that would be paid. The County Council had organised two PFI training sessions on 2 March and on 7 March. It was noted that Cllrs G A Mockford, P K Savill and M G B Starke would attend the session on 7 March.

8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Sub-Committee was scheduled for Monday, 21 March at 10.00 am in Committee Room 4.

The meeting closed at 12.40 pm.

Chairman

Date