A meeting of the Household Waste Services Task Group will be held at 5.30pm on Thursday 5 December 2013 in Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Rugby.

Councillor Miss Lawrence
Chairman

AGENDA

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Minutes – to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2013.

2. Apologies - to receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

3. Declarations of Interest.

   To receive declarations of –

   (a) non-pecuniary interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors;

   (b) pecuniary interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors; and

   (c) notice under Section 106 Local Government Finance Act 1992 – non-payment of Community Charge or Council Tax.

Note: Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their non-pecuniary interests at the commencement of the meeting (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a pecuniary interest, the Member must withdraw from the room unless one of the exceptions applies.

Membership of Warwickshire County Council or any Parish Council is classed as a non-pecuniary interest under the Code of Conduct. A Member does not need to declare this interest unless the Member chooses to speak on a matter relating to their membership. If the Member does not wish to speak on the matter, the Member may still vote on the matter without making a declaration.

5. Issues relating to Hunters Lane recycling centre and long term strategy for waste disposal sites – possible recommendations.

6. Date of next meeting – please bring your diaries to the meeting.

Any additional papers for this meeting can be accessed here via the website.

Membership of the Task Group: -

Councillors Miss Lawrence (Chairman), M Francis, Mistry, Mrs New, Mrs O’Rourke, Pacey-Day, Ms Robbins and Sandison

If you have any general queries with regard to this agenda please contact Linn Ashmore, Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer (01788 533522 or e-mail linn.ashmore@rugby.gov.uk). Any specific queries concerning reports should be directed to the listed contact officer.

If you wish to attend the meeting and have any special requirements for access please contact the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer named above.
Household Waste Services Task Group – 5 December 2013

Household waste collection in new housing developments – summary of conclusions and possible recommendations

1. INTRODUCTION

The task group is charged with producing a set of recommendations to inform the development of policy in waste services and in the associated planning policy.

The purpose of this paper is to identify key themes that have emerged so far in relation to this.

2. METHOD OF STORAGE OF WASTE

The design guide (circulated with the 10 October agenda) states a preference for using underground waste storage systems in developments of flats and courtyard terraced housing where individual provision is not practical. The principle of using underground storage is therefore established, even though it has yet to be tested in Rugby.

It is acknowledged that the three-bin system will continue to be the norm in all but the densest developments. Where the three-bin system operates, the design guide requires a place to be provided to keep the bins within the curtilage of each property or in a communal store if each property’s private garden space is too small or inaccessible. Although it is preferable from an operational point of view for all properties to be accessible from a road along which a collection vehicle may travel, it is unrealistic to expect developments of narrow cul-de-sacs to be refused. Where such layouts are approved, the design guide states that the developer should provide a place where bins will be left for collection.

The task group may wish to look critically at underground storage, asking questions such as the following:

- Is it sufficiently well tested on a non-continental public?
- What about bigger items that will currently fit comfortably in a bin but not in a chute? Won’t people just fly-tip by the chutes?
- Will contamination of recyclables increase because the perpetrator can’t be identified?

The advocates of underground storage argue that its success depends on the shared interests of the users. This shared interest may not be purely social in nature: it may also be financially motivated (see Section 3).
3. WHO PAYS?

The large-scale development of the mast site provides an opportunity to achieve a step-change in the way in which householders manage their waste.

For the three-bin system, the average amount of council tax allocated to waste collection each year is £120 per property. New bins alone cost about £80 per property but, when the cost of delivery and setting up the round is taken into account, the true cost is nearer £150. As 540 property completions are expected in 2013/14, this may amount to expenditure approaching £81,000. With this repeating every year, this would place a financial burden on the council.

Before councils introduced black sack – and later wheeled bin – collections, it was standard practice to require occupiers to provide their own dustbins. It would be possible to move the cost of wheeled bin from the council to the occupier, as has been done in some other councils.

In the case of other forms of waste storage such as underground storage, the option also exists not only for the developer to be required to provide the equipment but also for the facility not to pass into the council’s ownership. Instead, a management company would manage the facility, and the residents would make a contribution to the management company. This is similar to the arrangement that exists for a range of common services – including refuse storage – in blocks of flats.

4. ESTATE DESIGN

The task group has looked at the good and bad points of different estate layouts from the point of view of waste collection and street scene.

The design guide is already clear about the need for developers to make provision for accommodating the existing type of bins. It also makes clear the preference for underground storage in certain situations. The challenge is, at an early stage, to ensure the operational viability of the solution agreed with the developer.

There are some parallels between this review and the Planning for Play Review. In the case of that review the task group was seeking ways of influencing planning to ensure that play provision was built into development proposals at the earliest stage. This is now done through routine discussion between officers of the Planning and Parks and Grounds services as soon as preliminary proposals are received.

It would be neither practical nor desirable to draw up a set of rigid criteria on how waste provision should be made, so a similar arrangement may also be the answer to the problem of achieving an optimal balance between the planning, operational and business factors that come into play in planning a development.
5. POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS

Below is a list of possible review recommendations.

The task group should consider whether it has sufficient evidence to support these.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The emphasis in the design guide on streamlining of refuse storage, including underground storage, be supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At the earliest possible stage in a pre-application discussion, Environmental Services be consulted on estate layout and provision for storage of waste.</td>
<td>No evidence required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Where the three-bin system operates, the principle of charging the occupier for bins be supported, subject to the occupier being given the option of providing bins that comply with the council’s specification.</td>
<td>It may be useful to have evidence of how this operates elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The principle of not taking waste storage facilities into council ownership be adopted.</td>
<td>Is the task group confident that a management company will provide adequate safeguards in relation to the questions in the bulleted list in Section 2 above? Does the management company have any sanction against non-compliant freeholders? What happens elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the above will be added recommendations on other aspects that the task group has considered such as the 2012 Waste Regulations, Hunters Lane and other waste disposal concerns.

Paul Ansell
28 November 2013
1. INTRODUCTION

The main focus of this review is the future options for recycling and refuse collection in new developments.

The scope of the review also includes several topics touched on during phase 1 including Hunters Lane hours and restrictions, the long-term strategy for waste disposal sites and the monitoring of the effects of closure of the local recycling centres.

The first two of these issues were discussed at an evidence-gathering meeting on 7 November attended by members of the task group and Councillor Jeff Clarke, WCC Portfolio Holder for Corporate Business and Environment, and WCC Group Manager Glenn Fleet. The notes of this meeting are appended.

2. POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS

The task group is asked to consider whether it wishes to develop recommendations on any of the matters raised. In so doing, it is important that the recommendations are based on clear evidence that can be presented in the review’s report to Cabinet. If such evidence is not available, but the task group wishes to pursue the matter, further information may be gathered and presented to a future meeting.

For each topic listed below, members are asked to: (1) cross the topic off the list if they do not wish to make a recommendation; or (2) where they are in possession of enough evidence to do so, indicate what recommendation should be made; or (3) indicate where further evidence is needed with a view to developing a recommendation; and (4) suggest any other topics on which recommendations should be made. The list of points raised, starting on page 7 of the discussion notes, may be referred to as a starting point for further recommendations.

Possible topics for recommendations about future waste disposal arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. High cost to the council of having to use Whitley instead of Ling Hall.</th>
<th>WCC has firm commitment to Whitley. Can recommendation be made that will produce real improvements? Proposals on discussions on Malpass Farm?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Need to expand Hunters Lane facility or provide an additional facility to cater for urban expansion.</td>
<td>WCC argument is that there would be no need to expand or find another site if behaviour could be changed. Could constructive proposals on this be made?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Issues surrounding the future evaluation of tenders for waste treatment and disposal services, taking into account the full cost to the public purse and environmental impact.

Possible topics for recommendations about Hunters Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests to WCC:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Publicity on access restrictions for larger vehicles and the availability of permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consider ways of dealing with the number of pedestrians likely to use the site following the building of the housing development on the nearby GEC site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Make it clear that there is help with lifting available for those who need it</td>
<td>WCC have since reported that this is clear at Hunters Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Opening times</td>
<td>This was dealt with quite comprehensively at the 7 November meeting. Is there any aspect that members wish to investigate further?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RBC officers to:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Pursue ways of introducing the storage of waste paint at Hunters Lane.</td>
<td>This could be a matter of arguing out the issues with WCC. It could be a matter of finding out whether local charities would wish to run it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paul Ansell
28 November 2013
NOTES OF MEETING BETWEEN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD WASTE SERVICES TASK GROUP AND WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL PORTFOLIO HOLDER AND SERVICE MANAGER

7 NOVEMBER 2013

PRESENT:

Councillors Miss Lawrence (Chairman), M Francis, Mrs New, Mistry, Ms Robbins and Sandison

Councillor Jeff Clarke (WCC) and Glenn Fleet (Group Manager, WCC)

Sean Lawson (Head of Environmental Services), Andy Smith (Works Services Manager), Gill Russell (Environment & Resources Services Manager), Paul Ansell (Scrutiny Officer) and Linn Ashmore (Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer)

Questions for WCC portfolio holder and service manager

Q1. Can the rules be changed to allow free access to the Hunters Lane recycling centre to people carrying domestic waste in vans, pick-ups, larger 4x4s and trailers? It is not unusual for residents to have such vehicles and to exclude them from a service for which they pay council tax seems unreasonable. What do you class as a trade customer at Hunters Lane?

A. It is normal for authorities to have policies in place restricting the use of vans etc. The current rules exist primarily:

   - To control the levels of materials being disposed of illegally and restrict traders.
   - For safety reasons to protect the public.

   It was estimated that the measures taken to restrict traders had resulted in savings of £1 million.

   The policies were introduced several years ago and have been refined over time to accommodate residents’ vehicles. If the vehicle is the only one in the household WCC will consider issuing a permit.

   Over the past year 61 residents in Rugby have applied for permits and 54 of these have been approved. The rest of the applications were rejected because either the vehicles were too big, or the household had another vehicle. These figures are low compared with other local authorities. Mr Fleet was of the view that residents knew they could apply but members disagreed.

   This system was reviewed in 2010. The size limits for trailers used for green waste were increased, and opening times were set when bigger vehicles may use the facility. There are particular rules in place for maximum vehicle sizes and the number of visits bigger vehicles may make to the site, using a voucher system. If anyone needs to dispose of a bulky item, RBC’s charged-for service is available.
The number recognition system is used to track vehicles, particularly vans. WCC have the right to remove permits if they are being abused. The system is mainly used to keep checks on vans and look out for commercial operators.

DIY waste is defined as trade waste, even if it is being generated by a householder. There is a limit of 75 kilos per month and high level users are stopped.

The Hunters Lane site is run as a commercial operation and must compete for trade waste with other businesses, but the county council is not allowed to make large profits from commercial businesses.

**POINT**
Residents are not aware they can apply for permits, or of the times and arrangements for the use of bigger vehicles. They find out if they are stopped at the site, or via the WCC website. Improve communication/information.

**Q2. Could it be made easier for pedestrians and cyclists to use the Hunters Lane facility?**

A. Cyclists are allowed onto the site but pedestrians are a problem from a safety point of view. The WCC policy allows residents that live within one mile to use the facility provided they pre-book an appointment. This information is available on the WCC website. If a member of the public turned up with some rubbish this would be accepted but they cannot access the ramp. This does not prevent them going to the Age UK shop.

**POINT**
WCC may wish to give some thought to the levels of housing being built on the former GEC site and improved road links.

**Q3. Could the facilities at Hunter’s Lane be made easier for people who are less strong such as some women and people with disabilities?**

A. All WCC sites have assistants who will help people use the facilities. A survey was held on this topic in April and of 85% residents who were offered assistance only 15% accepted it. No complaints have been received.

Members commented that it would be useful if there was signage letting people know assistance was available. Examples of poor service were noted.

**POINT**
Signage and improved communications.

**Q4. Where should Rugby residents dispose of waste paint? Given the rate of expansion of Rugby and the borough’s good recycling record, is there not a case for adding paint to the list of materials that can be taken to Hunters Lane?**

A. No, the nearest paint disposal site is at Leamington Spa. Focus has been made to educate the public on how to deal with paint before disposing of the empty container locally. There is a re-use store based at Stockton.

Gloss paint that is not water based is classed as a hazardous substance while in its wet form. Once it is dry, the can and its contents can be disposed of in the black bin.

Hunters Lane is not licensed for hazardous waste.

WCAVA run re-use facilities at Stockton and Wellesbourne. The nearest chemical store is at Leamington Spa.

Paint may be dried out by adding soil or sawdust and leaving the can open. It is liquid paint that is classed as hazardous.

This information is available on the WCC website along with a paint calculator to help people to avoid buying too much paint.

Paint cans can only be recycled if they are completely clean. Most emulsion and some gloss paints are water soluble and could be washed out, but there are other environmental concerns with this.

Q. Could a secure paint storage area be installed at Hunters Lane?
A. WCC will be reviewing its policies in February but spending cuts will impact on all services. There may be opportunities to look at this again in the future.

Officers commented that Hunters Lane accepts other forms of hazardous material such as asbestos. Mr Fleet said that, to have a licence from the Environment Agency, there must be an on-site chemist.

Q. Why does Leamington Spa have a facility but not Rugby?
A. There needs to be a chemist on site and proper storage facilities.

Q. How have CAVA overcome this?
A. This is a pilot scheme, aimed being self-financing, and is based on paint being donated that is re-usable and can be passed onto community groups. CAVA manage this.

POINT
Better communication needed. Include some reference or information on RBC website. Consider other methods of communication other that website.

Consider a scheme similar to the CAVA one at Stockton for Hunters Lane.
Q5. Could the opening hours of the Hunters Lane recycling centre be changed so the facility is more likely to be open when people most need it? How do you assess whether you have the right opening times to match the demand?

A. As part of a wider review that took place in 2011/12 the opening times were evaluated. Results were:

- Saturday was the busiest day with peak trading hours of 11-12noon
- Wednesday was the quietest day and quietest hours were 8am-9am and 5-6pm

As part of the review members of the public were asked if they would prefer shorter opening hours and more days, or longer opening hours and fewer days.

- 1200 people across Warwickshire were surveyed.
- 170 responses were received from the Hunters Lane Site
- Overall the public were satisfied with the current opening hours. This equated to 82.7% overall and 75.8% for Rugby.
- All sites – 30% of people visit once a month and 33% every two months
- Rugby – 35% of people visit once a month and 34% every two months
- Rugby – 34% of people were aware of the late night opening compared to 18% overall.
- Rugby - 84.5% of people were aware assistance was available.
- Rugby – number of visits (2010) was 199,000.

During the period April-October the site is open on Wednesdays until 6.30pm.

Q. Would evening opening be better on a different day?

A. No, this is based on trend data.

Q6. The relocation of our main residual waste disposal point from Ling Hall to Whitley has had a detrimental effect on the cost-effectiveness of our waste collection service. What solution are you able to offer as Rugby’s urban area expands and the problem becomes even worse?

A. An excess haulage payment is made at £5 per tonne (excluding trade). Other considerations included:

- vehicle life, which was estimated at 7 years if used for hard standing. This should result in additional saving realising capital over the next two years; and
- using a shunting service.

Rugby has reduced the number of its rounds in recent years.

RBC officers commented that:

- The extra tonnage payments were received for both Bubbenhall and Whitley but it was not enough.
- A number of solutions have been tried. Shunting does not resolve the problem and has been tried in Rugby but does not work for us.
Appendix

- There are delays caused by vehicles queuing at Whitley.
- How often vehicles needed to be replaced would not be known for several years and we have already factored in extended vehicle replacement frequencies.
- Experience of using landfill sites has been good and Rugby has made few complaints.
- The relocation to Whitley was not announced until 1st April.
- Rugby crews already worked a full day and there was no spare resource for the additional trips needed.
- At Rugby the resource cost is a key factor. Crews are offloading three times per day.
- Once vehicles have offloaded waste is bulked up so rounds can be completed by the end of the day.

WCC have been reviewing this for the past three years. Project Transform was based on diverting waste away from landfill sites.

It was pointed out that some parts of Rugby borough are nearer to Whitley than Ling Hall but, in response it was reported that there was is an average of 6 miles extra per trip (each way).

Fuel costs for hauling were £6 per gallon and at a rate of 1 gallon for each 6 mile trip it should still be cost effective.

Shunting works well at Nuneaton and Bedworth BC.

Q. Rugby is growing and there are several large housing developments due to be built on the urban fringes. The situation will get worse. How will WCC deal with this?

A. There are no funds available for a transfer station.

Comments made included:

In line with the Core Strategy Rugby is building another 10,800 homes and Government is pushing for more.

(WCC) WCC will get an allowance via CIL - this will only be realised once development has taken place.

(WCC) Whitley will cope for the next 25 years.

POINT
Further discussion on the use of the MBT facility is needed in the future.

Q7. The expansion of Rugby town will put even more pressure on Hunters Lane. The urban expansion will generate significant council tax income, so what improvements does the County Council propose to make to its waste disposal and recycling services in response to this?

A. Waste analysis both at Hunters Lane and at the kerbside was carried out. Results included:
Appendix

- 47% of material taken to Hunters Lane could be recycled at the kerbside. This could realise an income at £40 per tonne.
- 19% of material in black bins could be recycled.

Rugby has a good rate of recycling but this could be improved.

Q. How much is the allowance per house?
A. £41 goes towards waste management. WCC had asked for CIL money

Comments made included:

It was understood that the mast site would provide no CIL money (though this would need to be confirmed).

Members raised concerns that traffic already queues out onto the road at Hunters Lane and this situation will get worse.

Q. What are your plans for the future? Will you provide an additional facility or expand Hunters Lane?
A. There are no plans for this. There needs to be more focus on changing behaviour and raising recycling levels. 47% of all material at Hunters Lane could be recycled at the kerbside.

Examples of recylates found in general waste included paper/newspapers etc., cardboard, dense plastic and food waste.

Textiles cannot be put into blue lidded bins but there are opportunities to make a profit from it. Local pilot schemes to collect this at the kerbside have not been successful.

The assistants at the Hunters Lane site are there to advise people and educate them on the recycling process.

Members gave examples of assistants at the Hunters Lane site advising people to put recylates in with general waste.

Waste from street bins goes straight to disposal. Attempts to recycle on the street have not proved to be ideal.

POINT
Improvements to signage at Hunters Lane. Better levels of communication and education.
Q8. As Project Transform no longer exists could you provide details of the County Council's proposals for waste treatment/disposal in future years as part of the revised waste strategy? When future WCC treatment/disposal contracts are being procured, will the County Council consider the following when carrying out the any tender evaluation?

- Whole cost not just gate fee. As such giving full consideration to the overall costs of collection as well as treatment/disposal.
- Environmental as well as economic factors, providing the ability to reduce the overall carbon footprint associated with both the collection and disposal/treatment elements of waste.

Q. Officers repeated concerns that Rugby will need to transport refuse to Whitley for several years when there are facilities in the town.

A. There would be a need to go out to private tender and Whitley would be included in that process.

Informal discussions were held with SITA as part of soft market testing and their prices were high. SITA’s priority is to take commercial waste.

Officers commented that environmental impact should be considered. The SITA site at Malpass Farm removes recylates during the process, which the facility at Whitley does not. The end product is a valuable resource that is more environmentally friendly and helps support the economy and industry in general.

The Whitley facility will pipe steam into Coventry that is used to heat buildings.

Arrangements should be put into place that suit local areas.

Q. Has a risk assessment against the climate change policy been carried out?

A. An evaluation against additional mileage and carbon has been done.

There is a need to spread the risk and go out to the market. A private tendering process would allow for objections but it was felt unlikely SITA or Biffa would come forward.

Points that were raised following the question and answer session:

- Some form of waste flowchart could be produced.
- There is a need to look at the future and put plans in place to deal with increased growth.
- Contact could be made with Age UK regarding the possibility of a paint re-use centre.
- Liaise with twin hatters to gain more support.
- Rugby is not as well catered for as Leamington Spa or Nuneaton and Bedworth. Look into the licensing of hazardous waste possibilities at Hunters Lane.
- Make contact with independent sources regarding paint storage and possible solutions.
Not sure comments about SITA only taking trade waste are accurate.

WCC are facing budgetary challenges.

Look at ways of changing behaviours, education and communication.

Officers from local authorities are due to attend a series of meetings on the Warwickshire Waste Strategy where how to achieve ambitious targets will be discussed.

A major step change is needed to reach the target of 65% recycling.

WCC have provided some funding for promotional material in the past.

The work of the task group needs to be a little broader but should not stray too far from its main focus of looking at future options for recycling and refuse collection in new developments.