

Waste Management & Recycling Sub-Committee – 21 March 2005

Minutes of the meeting of the **Waste Management & Recycling Sub-Committee** held on **21 March 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

OFFICERS PRESENT

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

9 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2005 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

10 KERBSIDE RECYCLING SCHEME

The Sub-Committee received a verbal update from the Leisure & Contracts Manager on progress with respect to tenders received for the green waste contract.

The following tonnages were confirmed by officers:-

Week 15
93 tonnes

Week 16
59 tonnes

Week 17
76 tonnes

Week 18
61 tonnes

Week 19
87 tonnes

Week 20
63 tonnes

It was noted that the lower tonnage for week 17 had occurred during half term. The kerbside recycling scheme had been in operation for 20 weeks and a total of 1,380 tonnes of recyclables had been collected during that period, which averaged at 138 tonnes per fortnight. However, if the first two weeks of operation were disregarded, the fortnightly average rose to 147 tonnes. Serviceteam originally estimated that 2,260 tonnes would be collected during the first year of operation. However, if the fortnightly average remained at the same level, this annual estimate would be attained after 32 weeks.

The following tonnages for dry recyclables, under the previous recycling scheme were noted:-

Waste Management & Recycling Sub-Committee – 21 March 2005

2002/2003

1,004 tonnes

2003/2004

1,150 tonnes

2004/2005 (7 months)

800 tonnes

Members noted that, under the previous recycling scheme, recycling collections had been made on a weekly basis, rather than the current fortnightly basis, but that grey bins had been emptied on a fortnightly basis, rather than the current weekly basis. Paper tonnages now were approximately three times higher than those of the previous scheme.

Concern was raised that, as a result of grey bins being emptied weekly, compared to recycling bins and bags only being emptied fortnightly, there was a real possibility that some recycling materials were still being placed in the grey bins.

Members did, however, consider it essential that residents should continue to have a weekly grey bin collection.

Members were concerned that 180 litre grey bins would be more expensive to purchase than the current 240 litre bins and, further, did not consider that introducing 180 litre grey bins would lead to a big increase in recycling tonnages.

Members concurred that it was vital that the Authority continued to educate residents about the importance of recycling and to market the service. Education and marketing were key factors in increasing residents' participation in recycling. There would be merit in recycling officers visiting local schools during school assemblies.

Monitoring had taken place over a number of weeks of around 2,000 properties in various different parts of the District, the results of which showed that the overall participation rate was around 65%. This percentage was deemed favourable, given the length of time the service has been in operation. Monitoring would continue in other parts of the District.

It was noted that, under the previous scheme, in 2002/2003 800 tonnes of paper was collected. It was projected that the current scheme would result in 3 times more paper being collected.

The following tonnages were noted for bring banks:-

2002/2003

Glass = 417 tonnes
(96 tonnes = October-December)
Paper = 632 tonnes
(172 tonnes = October-December)

2003/2004

Glass = 456 tonnes
(101 tonnes = October-December)
Paper = 605 tonnes
(149 tonnes = October-December)

Waste Management & Recycling Sub-Committee – 21 March 2005

2004/2005 (April – September)

Glass = 205 tonnes

Paper = 306 tonnes

2004/2005 (October – December)

Glass = 84 tonnes

Paper = 115 tonnes

It was noted that tonnages for cans were so low that meaningful comparisons could not be drawn.

Members were of the opinion that residents in flats or smaller houses often lacked sufficient space in order to store recyclable materials for a fortnightly collection. This problem would increase because of the national directives relating to affordable housing.

It was noted that officers would supply Members of the Sub-Committee with details of what other partner Authorities of the Thames Gateway Joint Committee were doing with respect to recycling. It was, however, noted that Basildon District Council, with around 72,000 households within its District, (roughly double the number for this District) had 70 bring banks, compared to 55 within this District, a district wide kerbside recycling scheme for newspapers and magazines, a scheme for cardboard, food and drink cans/jars and textiles to 12,000 households, a green waste scheme to 45,000 households and a scheme for mixed glass and jars to 15,000 households.

Castle Point Borough Council, with 36,000 households, had 21 bring bank sites within its District, a district wide kerbside recycling scheme for green waste, paper and textiles and a scheme for cardboard for 4,000 households.

Officers advised that tenders had been received for a green waste collection service. A range of issues would be clarified with the applicants. It was, however, clear that the service would not be cost neutral to the Council, even despite residents having to pay annually for the service. No provision had been made within the budget for the service, although potentially there could be some funding available at the end of the first year of operation of the kerbside recycling service as a result of the profit sharing arrangement with Serviceteam.

It was noted that proposals had been based on approximately 3,000 residents electing to pay for a green waste service and that there could be the possibility that costs might decrease if uptake by residents was higher. There was also the possibility that residents might be prepared to pay a higher sum than that suggested by applicants for a green waste service.

During debate there was a general consensus that there would be merit in inviting the applicants to present their proposals to the Sub-Committee at a specially arranged meeting.

The following points were noted, in response to Member enquiries:-

- Serviceteam's annual recycling tonnage estimate was based on the whole District, and not just those 29,000 households currently on the scheme.
- It was inevitable that some residents would continue to use the grey bins rather than recycling materials.
- Officers would investigate whether it would be possible to establish whether grey bin waste increased during non-recycling weeks.
- Officers were investigating a range of options, including the changing of recycling rounds, to address the problem of the recycling lorry, on Thursday mornings, not being able to get to properties in the vicinity of the service road by the doctor's surgery, as a result of parked vehicles.
- Accessibility would be taken into consideration with respect to the positioning of further bring banks.
- Various costed options for bags to replace the red ones currently used, together with options for adding on to the kerbside recycling scheme those 4,500 households that were currently omitted as a result of access difficulties, would be brought to a meeting of this Sub-Committee in April.
- Any contract for a green waste collection service would run until 2008, in line with the existing kerbside recycling and refuse collection contracts.

On a Motion moved by Cllr P K Savill and seconded by Cllr M G B Starke it was:-

Recommended to Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

That the Council should not replace its stock of 240 litre grey bins with 180 litre bins.

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.

11 ESSEX JOINT PROCUREMENT PROCESS

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

It was noted that on 7 March 2005 Cllrs G A Mockford and M G B Starke

Waste Management & Recycling Sub-Committee – 21 March 2005

attended a PFI training seminar. The seminar addressed a wide range of issues in addition to PFI and laid out clearly for all those who attended the whole procurement process, together with details of set timescales. Attendance was very good, with representation from most of the partner Local Authorities.

The estimated procurement costs county-wide were approximately £4 million; this Authority's share of the costs would total £9,271.

Joint Committees would be formally constituted in late May/early June. The Environmental Services Committee would consider a report on 6 April outlining the constitution and business plan for the Thames Gateway Joint Committee for Members' approval.

12 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday, 31 March 2005 at 10.00 am to receive presentations from applicants for the provision of a green waste collection service.

The meeting closed at 12.55 pm.

Chairman

Date