

## **Waste Management & Recycling Sub-Committee – 31 March 2005**

---

Minutes of the meeting of the **Waste Management & Recycling Sub-Committee** held on **31 March 2005** when there were present:-

Cllr P K Savill (Chairman)

Cllr C A Hungate  
Cllr C J Lumley

Cllr M G B Starke

### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr G A Mockford.

### **OFFICERS PRESENT**

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

## **13 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2005 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Members wished to place on record the Council's best wishes to Cllr G A Mockford and his family during this difficult time of his illness.

### **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.

## **14 KERBSIDE RECYCLING SCHEME**

It was noted that, following the last meeting of the Sub-Committee, officers had spoken to both contractors who had submitted proposals to clarify certain aspects of their proposals for a green waste contract and had subsequently circulated additional information to Members.

The Sub-Committee listened to proposals from the first contractor bidding to provide a green waste collection service.

In response to questions/concerns raised by Members, the first contractor

advised that:-

- The green 140 litre bins that had been used under the previous kerbside recycling scheme would be used for the green waste scheme. The Authority would have to pay the costs of purchasing any additional bins that may be required.
- It was estimated that it would take approximately 2 years to build up a green waste collection service to a level of 3,300 properties. This was the number required in order to meet their financial targets.
- It would be possible to commence the service in May 2005.
- The Authority would incur the difference in cost between the gate fee and the recycling credit per ton of green waste.
- There was a lot of contamination with green waste collections during the previous scheme, largely attributable to the fact that kitchen waste was also collected.
- The vehicle proposed for the scheme would be similar in size to a normal dustcart, ie, smaller than the large recycling vehicles.
- In the event of there being a large number of households, eg, in the region of 6,000, wishing to take up the service an additional vehicle would have to be purchased, which would double the costs to the Authority of providing the service.
- It was unlikely that there would be the potential for a sizeable profit share, particularly given that there would continue to be a weekly collection of the grey bins. The contractor was unable to provide any indication of the level of profit share to the meeting.
- In the event that take up of the green waste service was lower than the projected 3,300 properties per annum, any associated financial loss would be borne by the contractor.
- The green waste collection service would require a separate collection to those for the grey bins and for the current kerbside recycling service, as a new vehicle would be needed. This could, in theory, result on occasions in 3 separate vehicles arriving at properties on the same day.
- Although the green 140 litre bins should be adequate for a fortnightly green waste collection, the smaller bins could cause difficulties for crews because of compaction issues.

- The costs of re-distributing the old 140 litre green bins from the previous kerbside recycling service would be borne by the Authority.
- In the event of bins being damaged as a result of compaction difficulties, the contractor would replace bins on a like for like basis.
- Given that it would be the contractor administering the green waste service, and not the Local Authority, the contractor considered that residents would not be prepared to pay more than £30 per annum for a green waste service.
- The capacity of one vehicle could be greater than 3,300 properties, if properties were concentrated in one or two areas of the District. If properties were spread around the District it would be a struggle to achieve a capacity of 3,300 properties.
- The contractor would take all green waste to Pitsea where it would eventually be recycled as compost.

The Sub-Committee listened to proposals from the second contractor bidding to provide a green waste collection service.

In response to questions/concerns raised by Members, the second contractor advised that:-

- The green waste collection service would be restricted to Rayleigh, Hullbridge, Hockley, Hawkwell, Rochford and Ashingdon as it would not be economically viable to cover the rural areas of the District. However, the contractor proposed a fortnightly Saturday service where the green waste vehicle would travel to outlying parts of the District and park for 30 minutes to allow residents to leave green waste for the vehicle. There would be an additional cost of approximately £175 per Saturday to provide this, covering 4 – 6 locations per Saturday.
- The green waste collection service would be carried out by one vehicle with a crew of 2.
- In the event that take up of the green waste service was lower than the projected 3,000 properties per annum, any associated financial loss would be borne by the contractor.
- In the event of uptake by residents of the green waste service being in excess of the projected 3,000 properties, the annual costs of collection to the Authority would reduce by £2,500 per every thousand in excess, up to 6,000 properties. In the event of more than 6,000 households wanting a green waste service an additional vehicle may be required, dependant on the density of the collection rounds, at the same cost of that projected by the contractor for the first vehicle. Costs would therefore almost double.

- The contractor confirmed that the annual cost to residents for the green waste service would be rounded down to the nearest £10, from the charge contained within their tender submission.
- Costs of marketing the service would be borne by the contractor; marketing would include a full page advertisement in the local newspaper, a full-time sales person handing out leaflets and talking to residents in the first month of operation, and large sign boards on both sides of the collection vehicle. The contractor would also like to advertise the service in the *Rochford District Matters*.
- The contractor would pay the gate fees, and the contractor would retain recycling credits.
- The contractor would use a 6 X 4 Dennis cart, with 2 split levels on the back of the vehicle, which would be liquid retentive.
- Residents would be charged the annual fee in advance and on receipt of payment would arrange delivery of a green 240 litre bin, provided on a leasing basis; residents would simultaneously be provided with information relating to the timing of their green collection rounds.
- The contractor's operatives would collect grass and hedge cuttings; compost, soil, bushes, trees up to a diameter of 4 – 6 inches, but would not collect hard core, kitchen or food waste.
- The contractor would seek to commence collection rounds from 6.00 am in order to maximise the potential for avoiding vehicles causing an obstruction during peak times.
- Residents would be encouraged to clean bins once a year, but the contractor would provide a bin cleaning service at a modest cost to residents.
- The contractor would collect, at no cost to the Local Authority or the resident, the green 140 litre bins for all those residents on the previous recycling scheme signing up to the new green waste service.
- The service could commence within a month, on a limited basis, with a full service available within 3 months.

During debate there was a general consensus that the second contractor's proposal for a green waste service was superior to that of the first on the basis of cost efficiency and quality of service. Members further concurred that there would be merit in utilising any income accrued from the profit-sharing element of the current kerbside recycling scheme in order to fund a green waste service. It was perceived that this would help the Authority to achieve its recycling targets, particularly given that green waste was likely to be

weighty, but that the income from profit sharing was likely to be insufficient to enable development of cardboard or plastic recycling schemes within the District.

Officers advised that the County Council would invite bids from Local Authorities for a limited fund for recycling initiatives made available by DEFRA. During debate Members concurred that there would be merit in making a bid to this fund for an additional, smaller kerbside recycling vehicle to roll out the kerbside recycling scheme to those properties not currently on the scheme.

### **Recommended to the Policy and Finance Committee**

That a green waste kerbside collection service, as proposed by the second contractor, be implemented, subject to using income accrued from the profit sharing element of the kerbside recycling scheme, with the small deficit to be met from existing budgets. (CD(F&ES))

It was further:-

### **Resolved**

That a bid should be made to the County Council for DEFRA funding for the purchase of an additional, smaller kerbside recycling vehicle to roll out the kerbside recycling scheme to those properties not currently on the scheme. (CD(F&ES))

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am and closed at 1.25 pm.

Chairman .....

Date .....