



MEETING OF THE HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL

TUESDAY, 17 JANUARY 2006 2.30 PM

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Elizabeth Channell
Councillor Nick Craft (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Donald Fisher
Councillor Bryan Helyar

Councillor Stan Pease
Councillor George Waterhouse (Chairman)
Councillor Avril Williams

OFFICERS

Head of Waste and Contract Services
Sustainable Waste Management Policy
Officer
Scrutiny Officer
Acting Scrutiny Officer
Scrutiny Support Officer

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Auger (Healthy Environment
Portfolio Holder)
Councillor G. Taylor
Councillor Wilks

1 Member of the local press

Mr. Chris Mountain (Managing Director – Mid
UK Recycling Ltd.)

56. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None.

57. MEMBERSHIP

None.

58. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors F. Hurst and Mrs. Radley.

59. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

60. ACTION NOTES

With the addition of a comment under action note 49:

“Large increases in expenditure on pension had been incurred with the withdrawal of

government funding. Full payment had to be covered by the relevant Trust.”

These were noted.

61. FEEDBACK FROM THE EXECUTIVE

A briefing note from the Economic Development Portfolio Holder was circulated for the information of the Panel.

One Member was concerned by the suggestion that designating land for medical use within the LDF would be a movable object. It was agreed that only the main hospital sites, should have protections put on them through the LDF.

It was noted that any restrictions would need to be submitted as part of the strategy document. The Panel agreed that they supported their original recommendation that there should be development restrictions on the three main hospital sites within South Kesteven.

CONCLUSIONS:

To recommend to the Economic Development Portfolio Holder that land at the main hospital sites within the District should be classified in the new Local Development Framework as being reserved for medical purposes.

62. WHEELED BINS AND DESIGN COMPETITION

Roll-out of Twin Bin Scheme

The Panel were advised that the provisional colour choice for wheeled bins for wheeled bins were black for residual waste and silver for recyclables. Black had been selected because it was associated with household and domestic waste. Silver was chosen for recyclables because it would be identifiable and had been popular in other authorities. Members of the Panel discussed the implications of different coloured bins: black and silver bins would hold their colour better over a longer period. The Head of Waste and Contract Services said the main problem with black bins would be that they would be difficult to pick out; a coloured strip could be added to make them easier to locate. One member suggested that the bins should be unobtrusive because people would have to live with them. If the bins blended in too well, there would be a danger of them being missed.

One member of the Panel was concerned that consultation had not been District-wide. Copies of SK Today, in which the questionnaire was circulated, had not been distributed to all houses in the District. Although questionnaires were also available on the Council's website, not all members of the public had access to the internet. Members were advised that when officers had been made aware that SK Today had not been delivered, copies of the questionnaire were reproduced and distributed.

A suggestion was made that a consultation exercise on colour should be carried out. There was some concern that if consultation were undertaken, the roll out of the scheme would be significantly delayed. It would be time consuming to produce and circulate questionnaires, collate their results and find consensus given the large number of available options. The Healthy Environment Portfolio Holder stated that some consultation was planned. The provisional colours for the bins would be publicised and members of the public would be asked what they thought. If someone suggested a strong reason against one colour, comments would be taken on board. A

majority of members agreed that black and silver were suitable colours.

The Head of Waste and Contract Services stated that the tendering process had begun. Tender advertisements for bins and bin lifts were out and some expressions of interest had been received. A full product specification would need to be produced in February 2006; this would include the colours for the wheeled bins.

A report had been submitted to the Cabinet on 9th January 2006 with a full project plan, which outlined key dates. Copies were circulated for information. Collection arrangements for areas where wheeled bins would be inappropriate were to be confirmed. It was suggested that the Waste Management Working Group should be reformed to allow regular updates on the roll out of the scheme. This was agreed.

Design Competition for Promotion of Twin Bin Scheme

Members discussed whether it would be feasible to run a design competition for schools to publicise the twin-bin scheme. The 'Rodney' logo was commonly associated with recycling in South Kesteven, featured at bring sites and on vehicles and literature. To replace this logo would mean great expense; the new logo would need to be heavily publicised to establish recognition. During past initiatives, the response from schools had been poor.

Provision for publicity of the scheme had been requested for budgetary consideration. There would be discussions with PR specialists on the most effective way to roll the programme out. The publicity campaign would involve door knocking, identified as one of the best ways of getting information to people.

It was hoped that a trip to North Kesteven (postponed from Thursday 12th January 2006), would provide lessons for roll-out. There was also the potential for the Waste Management Working Group and Cabinet members to visit Newark and Sherwood District Council to learn about the roll out of their scheme.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. **To recommend to Cabinet that wheeled bins should be:
Black – residual waste
Silver – recyclables**
2. **To reform the Waste Management Working Group made up of Councillors Waterhouse, Craft, Miss Channell and Helyar.**

63. BRING SITES

The Chairman welcomed Chris Mountain, Managing Director, Mid UK Recycling Limited.

At the request of the Chairman, an item on bring sites had been included on the agenda. There was concern that at weekends, bins were full and residual materials were left nearby. Discussion ensued on when it was possible to empty the bins. Planning at Lincolnshire County Council controlled permission for collection. The cut-off point for collection was 13:00 on a Saturday until Monday mornings. To reduce overflow during the week, 24-hour collections had been piloted. These had been stopped following complaints by local residents.

Mid UK Recycling was also limited by site capacity. The period between July and December 2006 had seen an increase of 55 tonnes. Mr. Mountain felt that the

introduction of the twin-bin scheme would make a big difference to the quantity of materials collected at bring sites.

More bring-sites had been rolled out to villages; village sites were emptied less frequently than sites in town. Each bin had its own collection pattern, calculated by tonnages. Quantities in bins fluctuate with weather and between term time and school holidays. Plastic has caused the greatest capacity problem because of the volume deposited. Slots on the bins had been adapted to encourage people to flatten card.

Following the installation of rubbish bins at a supermarket site in Stamford, the amount of residual waste from plastic bags had been reduced. It was suggested that including bins at all bring sites could further control the problem. There was concern that including bins at all bring sites could encourage fly-tipping. Following discussion, it was agreed that the installation of bins would not benefit bring sites.

Mr. Mountain stated that a new Mid UK site would be opened in Market Deeping on 1st February 2006. This would help process materials collected from bring sites in the Deepings, Stamford and Bourne. The company hoped to introduce recycling facilities for a wider range of products.

Mr. Mountain was thanked for his attendance at the meeting and the answers he had given the Panel.

64. SUPPLEMENTARY FREIGHTER SERVICES

The Chairman agreed to take this item as urgent business because any recommendations might require immediate action.

One Panel Member had been notified by a Parish Council that the supplementary freighter service which visited villages twice a year for the disposal of larger items would be stopped. The Panel advised that no decision to stop the service had yet been made. When enquiries had been received, members of the public were advised that funding for the service might be withdrawn.

The Head of Waste and Contract Services stated that the service provided Health and Safety risks. Additional restrictions included landfill capacity and the increased number of materials that can no longer be diverted to landfill.

A report on this issue would go to Cabinet. Members of the DSP were concerned that they had not been consulted; this was because no decision had been taken and information from the County Council was still confidential.

It was suggested that Panel members might want to consider what would happen to items normally collected by the service, if it was withdrawn. There was some concern that withdrawal could lead to flytipping. Items could still be deposited at public amenity sites, of which there was one in each major town within the District. The Council's contributory large goods collection service would also be available.

65. HIGH HEDGES

Following a report submitted to the full Council on 28th April 2005 on new High Hedges legislation, the Panel were advised that the Development Control Committee would soon take decisions accordingly. This was noted.

66. REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS

The letter sent in response to the consultation draft of the Access Criteria for Non-Urgent Patient Transport Requests Policy was noted. Members of the Working Group were thanked for their work.

67. BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Noted.

68. WORK PROGRAMME

Following the publication of the Cabinet Forward Plan from 1st February to 31st May 2006, the timescale for the waste collection item on the work programme would need to be amended to read: *“Not before February 2006”*.

Committee Room 1 would not be available for the next meeting of the DSP on 14th March 2006, so members were asked to consider an alternative venue. As representatives from both the Peterborough and Stamford Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and the United Lincolnshire Hospitals NHS Trust had been invited, it was agreed that the meeting should be held in Grantham as the central point. Members agreed that the next meeting should be held in the Council Chamber.

A consultation paper on new primary care trust arrangements in Trent was circulated. The Cabinet would receive a presentation on this on Monday 6th February 2006; all members of the Healthy Environment DSP were invited to attend the Cabinet meeting. The document would be discussed at the next meeting of the Panel.

69. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 16:28.