MINUTES OF HOUSEHOLD WASTE SERVICES TASK GROUP

5 DECEMBER 2013

PRESENT:

Councillors Miss Lawrence (Chairman), Buckley, Mistry, Mrs New, Mrs O’Rourke, Ms Robbins and Sandison

Sean Lawson (Head of Environmental Services), Andy Smith (Works Services Manager), Sarah Fisher (Strategy and Development Manager), Paul Ansell (Scrutiny Officer) and Linn Ashmore (Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer)

Note – these minutes are a record of the discussion. Comments recorded do not necessarily represent the views of the task group or of the council.

14. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2013 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

15. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence from the meeting were received from Councillor M Francis and Pacey-Day.

16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs New declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of her employment by Warwickshire County Council and as a member of Sustainable Rugby.

Councillor Mrs O’Rourke declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of being a Warwickshire County Councillor.

Councillor Sandison declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of being a member of Sustainable Rugby.

17. HOUSEHOLD WASTE COLLECTION IN NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

The task group considered the report at agenda item 4 concerning recommendations to inform the development of policy in waste services and in the associated planning policy, and also identifying the following key themes that have emerged in the review so far.

Method of storage of waste

It was clear provision for waste disposal in the future needed to change and a flexible approach to the planning process was required.

The design guide states a preference for using underground waste storage systems for high density housing but the three bin service will still be considered to be the norm. Flexibility is the key.
Who should pay?
The cost to supply a property with a set of new bins was approaching £150. The overall cost to supply bins for the Rugby Radio Station site would be huge and would swallow up all of the first year of each property’s council tax revenue allocated to waste collection.

There were two alternative options: Charge the householder). Pass the cost of providing the infrastructure and management onto the developer.

Estate design
The design guide is already clear about the need for developers to make provision for accommodating the existing bin system and a preference for underground storage in appropriate situations.

It would be impractical to draw up a set of rigid criteria on how waste provision should be made for planners to follow and an approach based around incorporating scope for negotiation and involving the waste collection service at an early stage may be preferable.

During discussion the following points were made:

Passing the costs onto developers would be beneficial in terms of supporting discussions of suitable waste storage and management systems. The council would remain responsible for collecting waste.

Additional staff resources would not be required.

Where the three-bin system is used, if the provision of bins were the responsibility of householders, there might be a reluctance to pay, and it might encourage the theft of bins.

It was agreed that the council should charge the developer, and not the householder, for bins for each new property. The bins should form part of the property and not be removed by householders if they move. If the developer passed the cost on as part of the house prices this additional cost would be small in terms of the overall price of a new house.

Wheeled bins have a value and could be stolen or vandalised. In such cases householders would be advised to report the matter to the police and make a claim on their household insurance.

The cost of bins for council-owned properties would be passed onto the housing service.

Long term plans are needed and bin stores should be designed to be flexible and not just built to accommodate the existing bin type.

Large families may still require additional bins though they will be steered away from having extra black bins. There would be no issue with providing further green or blue bins where necessary.

Exceptions, such as clinical waste needs, will be dealt with on an individual basis.
The section 106 agreement for the Rugby Radio Station site has been drafted and does not include provision for waste storage or disposal.

There is an opportunity to achieve a step-change in the way householders manage their waste. The council would need to educate householders and also influence the planning and design of new developments.

Concerns were raised about the difficulty of creating a balance between the desire of developers to maximise land use and the cost of introducing new waste systems.

The task group requested that further evidence be provided on underground storage systems which are already being used in other areas.

Communal underground stores would be emptied as often as necessary.

The task group discussed possible review recommendations and agreed these as follows:

<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>Short term</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>Short term No evidence required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Where the three-bin system operates, the principle of charging the developer for bins be supported.</td>
<td>It would be useful to have evidence of how this operates elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Scrutiny Officer agreed to prepare a draft review report that contained background information and information about other authorities that charge for the supply of bins.

18. **ISSUES RELATING TO HUNTERS LANE RECYCLING CENTRE AND LONG TERM STRATEGY FOR WASTE DISPOSAL SITES**

The task group considered the report at agenda item 5.

The task group discussed other topics previously touched on during phase 1 of the review including Hunters Lane hours and restrictions and the long term strategy for waste disposal sites and what recommendations should be made.

During discussion the following points were raised:

Following the evidence-gathering meeting on 28 December attended by Councillor Jeff Clarke, WCC Portfolio Holder for Corporate Business and Environment, and WCC Group Manager Glenn Fleet it was clear that influencing WCC would be challenging.
During that meeting they had not demonstrated how WCC would meet the needs of Rugby borough following the expected urban expansion. The main focus of WCC appeared to be in relation to budget cuts without considering the impact on collection authorities.

It was mentioned that the target levels for recycled waste are expected to rise to 62% and additional resources may be required. However, it was agreed that action to tackle this issue was beyond the scope of the review.

A suggestion was made that other district authorities could be consulted for their views.

Opportunities for transporting commercial waste to Malpass Farm should be explored to see if this could be a viable alternative.

The task group did not agree with the WCC argument that there would be no need to expand the Hunters Lane facility or find another site. The representatives from WCC did not appreciate the impact that the additional 6,000 homes due to be built would have.

The Development Strategy Manager informed the task group that the Rugby Radio Station site was due to be considered by Planning Committee in January 2014 and confirmed that there would be no monies available from Section 106 agreements of CIL for any waste collection or disposal services from the development.

There would be additional council tax revenue collected from new properties but it was unlikely this would be forthcoming until at least 12 months’ time.

The task group were informed that the Hunters Lane site is not licensed for hazardous waste and currently cannot accept waste paint. A new transfer station was planned near Bedworth meaning Rugby was the only County authority without this facility.

Charity shops situated at waste sites may decide to accept paint but only for redistribution and not for disposal. This arrangement does not exist at Hunters Lane.

Members agreed WCC should be requested to seek an amendment to their licence and provide a facility.

The late night opening at Hunters Lane is on Wednesday, which is the quietest day of the week. Members stated that WCC should be asked to make changes, highlighting the irregularity and inequality of the service it provides to Rugby compared with other authorities.

The task group agreed that the following review recommendations (copied from the Scrutiny Officer’s report) be incorporated in the draft review report, subject to updating by officers to reflect the task group’s further comments and views:

**Recommendations about future waste disposal arrangements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. High cost to the council of having to use Whitley instead of Ling Hall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC has a firm commitment to Whitley. Opportunities for transporting commercial waste to Malpass Farm should be explored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Need to expand Hunters Lane facility or provide an additional facility to cater for urban expansion.

WCC argument is that there would be no need to expand or find another site if behaviour could be changed. The representatives from WCC did not appreciate the outcomes the additional 6,000 homes due to be built would have.

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.

Recommendations about Hunters Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests to WCC:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Publicity on access restrictions for larger vehicles and the availability of permit.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Make it clear that there is help with lifting available for those who need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Opening times. Highlight the inequality of the service at Rugby compared with other authorities across the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Make changes to the hazardous waste licence and introduce the storage of waste paint at Hunters Lane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A copy of the final review report including all the relevant evidence should be sent to the Leader of WCC.

19. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The task group agreed to hold a final meeting on 23 January 2014. The Sustainable Environment Portfolio Holder should be invited.

CHAIRMAN