

## **Recycling Sub-Committee – 22 March 2004**

---

Minutes of the meeting of the **Recycling Sub-Committee** held on **22 March 2004** when there were present:-

Cllr P K Savill (Chairman)

Cllr C A Hungate  
Cllr C J Lumley

Cllr C R Morgan  
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

### **5 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2004 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr C R Morgan declared a personal interest by virtue of representation on the Waste Management Advisory Board and the Consortium of Waste Collection Authorities.

### **EXCLUSION OF THE 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 8 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 would be disclosed.

### **7 KERBSIDE RECYCLING EXPANSION/ADDITIONAL DEFRA FUNDING**

The Sub-Committee considered a presentation from the first bidding contractor on proposals for expanding recycling collections within the District.

It was noted that the first contractor was proposing a fortnightly dry recycling collection that would include glass, tins, newspapers and magazines. A recycling box would be provided to residents for placing glass and tins and plastic sacks would be provided for newspapers and magazines. Collections would take place on the same day as the usual refuse collections. The contractor would receive all recycling credits, based on an annual collection rate of approximately 3,000 tonnes, but confirmed that any profits from

recycling credits collected in excess of this tonnage would be split equally with the Authority.

Two vehicles would be purchased, each with 5 separate recycling compartments, that would each be able to collect recycling from 10,000 – 12,000 properties within the Rochford District. It was anticipated that the first vehicle would enter into service in September 2004, with the second vehicle starting in February 2005, thus a potential 20,000 – 24,000 households would receive a recycling collection by this date, in addition to the 6,200 households currently receiving a recycling collection from Serviceteam.

Each of the two vehicles would be staffed by one driver and 2 operatives who would collect the boxes and sacks and sort the materials into the separate compartments on the vehicle at the kerbside. The contractor intended to recruit staff locally and to provide them with quality training that would include a grasp of how the recycled materials would be processed, post collection.

Responding to a Member enquiry regarding contingencies in the event of vehicle breakdown, the contractor confirmed that a simple, caged vehicle would be employed in such situations. However, in such instances the recyclable materials collected would have to be sold to recycling companies as a mixed load, as no sorting would have taken place. This would inevitably lead to a lower recycling credit for the contractor on such occasions.

In response to a further enquiry relating to fallback staffing arrangements in the event of sickness or holidays, the contractor confirmed that staff could be re-deployed from the company where the bulking of recyclables collected by them would take place, for the purpose of covering staff shortages. The contractor further confirmed that their proposed costs for each recycling collection round did not include a contingency for inflation with respect to staff salaries. The contractor did not, however, believe this to be an issue as the salaries proposed were generous. The contractor further confirmed that the costings provided included some marketing support for the recycling scheme.

The Committee thanked the contractor for the presentation and for answering all questions. The contractor then left the meeting.

The Committee then considered a further presentation from representatives of the second bidding contractor on proposals for expanding recycling collections within the District.

It was noted that the second contractor was proposing a fortnightly dry recycling collection, to be offered to all households District-wide. This would replace the current recycling collection undertaken by Serviceteam. The collection would include newspapers, magazines, mixed glass items and mixed tins and would take place on the same day as the usual refuse collection.

One 55 litre blue box would be provided to each household for placing all

items in. The contractors would receive all recycling credits based on an annual collection rate of approximately 2,260 tonnes. However, the contractor's representatives confirmed that it might be possible to offer the Authority a share of any profits associated with recycling credits in the event of the collection of a higher tonnage. The recyclables would be bulked at Canvey Island.

Four 5-bay vehicles would be purchased, one of which would be utilised in the event of vehicle breakdown. Three vehicles would go out on collection rounds, each comprising a driver and 2 operatives. Recyclable materials would be sorted at the kerbside. It was proposed that the vehicles would be the property of the Council and that the vehicles would be maintained by the contractors. All 3 collection rounds could be introduced before Christmas.

The second contractor furthermore proposed the introduction of a green waste collection round, to be offered to residents as an optional, additional service, for which they would be charged approximately £45.00 per annum. Residents opting to purchase this additional service would be provided with a 240 litre wheeled bin, which would be emptied of green waste on a fortnightly basis.

Responding to a Member enquiry relating to the possible fall in demand for recycled materials, the contractor's representatives confirmed that there would be no risk to the Council with respect to an increase in cost; the risk was only associated with tonnage.

In response to a further enquiry about recycling cardboard, the contractor's representatives confirmed that there would certainly be capacity within the 5-bay vehicles for cardboard, but that it would be necessary to roll out the recycling rounds for a certain period to establish whether there would be capacity within the working day for cardboard to be added to the materials collected.

Mindful of Member concern that the blue boxes currently emptied on a weekly basis by Serviceteam were often supplemented by bags filled by residents, the contractor's representatives nevertheless pointed out that, under their proposal, plastic items would no longer be collected. The volume of recyclables placed in the blue boxes fortnightly should therefore not be at the same, current high level.

The contractor's representatives further confirmed that the costings provided would include some marketing support for the recycling scheme.

The following concerns raised by Members with respect to both companies' recycling proposals were noted:-

- Scheduling the recycling collections on the same day as refuse collections could result in complaints from residents with respect to vehicles blocking roads.

## Recycling Sub-Committee – 22 March 2004

---

- Sorting out recycling materials at the kerbside could also lead to traffic congestion.
- Plastic items would not be collected because, although the volume of items would be likely to be large, the resulting tonnage would be light. The costs of collection would therefore be prohibitive.

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am and closed at 1.00 pm.

Chairman .....

Date .....