

RECYCLING AND WASTE STRATEGY CABINET PANEL

Tuesday, 3rd December, 2013

Present:- Councillor Mrs Ann Beech – in the Chair

Councillors Bailey, Fear, Mrs Hambleton, Loades, Miss Reddish and Mrs Williams

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 July, 2013 be agreed as a correct record.

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest Stated

4. **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS FOR FUTURE COLLECTION SERVICE**

The Council's Head of Recycling and Fleet Services recapped from the previous meeting regarding the meaning of the Technically Environmentally Economically Practicable (TEEP) principle. An explanatory note circulated at the meeting is attached as part of these minutes.

Information was handed round including a letter from DEFRA explaining the Governments requirements for Local Authorities to comply with this approach.

An interactive presentation was given to Members providing detailed information including cost, risks and benefits for 13 different collection options available to the Council. A copy of the presentation is attached as part of these minutes.

Members were then asked to consider the following options for the future collection service:

Option E - Basic Service

This would be a very basic service comprising of only weekly residual collections, fortnightly basic recycling of paper, with fortnightly chargeable collection of garden waste and no separate food recycling. Members were not happy with this option as this would lead to a massive drop in the Council's recycling and was likely not to comply with legislation. Members also did not accept the principle of universally charging for garden waste collections. For these reasons Members discounted this option.

Option D – Weekly Recycling and Food with Monthly Residual collections. (Kerbside, Dual Stream and Comingled.

Members felt that residents would at this time be unable to cope with the reduction of residual waste collections to a monthly frequency, even with recycle and food

Recycling and Waste Strategy Cabinet Panel - 03/12/13

waste being collected weekly. Members were concerned that a number of residents would need larger bins or additional collections due to a number of reasons. For these reasons Members discounted this option.

Option C – Alternate Weekly Collections with no Food (Kerbside, Dual Stream and Comingled).

Members felt that residents that use the food service like it and it has been responsible for reducing the amount of food waste generated and thus has saved residents money. It is also clear that it is very likely that legislation may be introduced within the next service cycle making it mandatory for Councils to provide such a service. Members considered the risks involved in removing this service and having to reintroduce at a later date, especially as this reintroduction will come at an inflated cost. For these reasons Members discounted these options.

Option A or B – Weekly or Fortnightly Fully Comingled Recycling

Members felt that these options would open the council up to the risk of challenge under TEEP and lead to an increase in contamination of recyclate and possible rejection of materials from the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF). This service would be likely to cost the council more in revenue cost due to the loss of income from materials and increase capital costs due to the requirement of providing an additional wheeled bin to each household. For these reasons Members discounted these options.

Option A or B – Weekly or Fortnightly –Dual Stream Recycling and weekly Food

Members felt that these options would open the council up to the risk of challenge under TEEP and lead to an increase in contamination of recyclate and possible rejection of materials from the MRF. This service would be likely to cost the council more in revenue costs due to the loss of income from materials and increased capital costs due to the requirement of providing an additional wheeled bin to each household. For these reasons Members discounted these options.

Option B – Fortnightly –Kerbside Sort Recycling and Weekly Food

Member felt that this option would not give the Council the opportunity to simplify the current collection service by reducing the number of containers residents are required to sort their recycling into. However it was noted that this option would ensure that the Council was fully compliant with TEEP. For these reasons Members discounted these options.

Option A – Weekly – Kerbside Sort Recycling and Weekly Food

Member felt that this option would enable the Council to reduce and simplify the number of containers into which residents need to sort their material, whilst ensuring that maximum value was achieved from recyclate and this option would ensure that the Council was fully compliant with TEEP. This option would also lead to an increase in the amount of recyclate collected. There were also potential significant revenue savings associate with this option when compared to the current cost of the service. For these reasons Members favoured this option.

There was also a discussion regarding whether services should be provide in-house or by contractor, Members felt that an in-house solution would provide the Council with more flexibility and control.

Resolved:- Members requested officers to undertake additional work to develop a business case for the preferred option: - 'Option A – Weekly – Kerbside Sort

Recycling and Weekly Food with fortnightly Residual and Green waste collection' provided via an in-house service. Members requested that officers arrange a visit to see the type of service in operation

5. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION FOR POSSIBLE SHARED SERVICE WITH STAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Members were advised that going down this route would make considerable savings.

This option was still being discussed by both Authorities and it would be further investigated once Stafford Borough Council's intentions were known.

Resolved:- That the information be received.

COUNCILLOR MRS ANN BEECH
Chair