

# REPORT TO CABINET

## REPORT OF: CABINET PORTFOLIO HOLDER HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

REPORT NO: SS08

DATE: 1 June 2009

<b>TITLE:</b>	Review of Recycling Bring Sites	
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	Key decision	
<b>PORTFOLIO HOLDER: NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Cllr John Smith - Healthy Environment Portfolio Holder	
<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Pat Swinton - Operations and Transport Manager <a href="mailto:p.swinton@southkesteven.gov.uk">p.swinton@southkesteven.gov.uk</a> 01476 406570	
<b>INITIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT:</b>	Carried out and Referred to in paragraph (7) below:	Full impact assessment Required:
<b>Equality and Diversity</b>	N/A	
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT:</b>	This report is publicly available via the Local Democracy link on the Council's website: <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a>	
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>		

## **1. RECOMMENDATIONS**

1.1 It is recommended that Cabinet advise on their preferred option regarding the continuation or cessation of the bring site service:

- a) Re-tender the service on a reduced number of sites providing appropriate facilities across the district.
- b) Reduce the number of sites as in a) and bring the service in- house.
- c) Withdraw the service by the termination date of the existing contract.

## **2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

2.1 This report sets out the options available for the bring site element of the Council's recycling service taking into account the objectives within the Quality Living priority, usage of the sites, the cost of the service and customer feedback on a recent consultation exercise.

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

### **Introduction**

3.1 The future of the bring sites has been considered by the Communities PDG in light of the fact that the extension on the existing contract expires at the end of August 2009. A non-key decision was approved by the portfolio holder to allow the contract to be extended for a limited period of time.

3.2 The bring site service has been a long-term service provided by the Council. that a comprehensive kerbside service was in place. However, sensitive to the message being conveyed by any potential withdrawal of the service, it was felt that it may be better to offer an in-house service option, purchasing the banks from the current Records exist from as early as 1992; however it is believed that some glass banks were in place before this time. We now have a total of 69 sites across the district, of which 26 are school sites.

### **Detail**

3.3 Appendix A to this report shows that there has been a significant decrease in the usage of the sites following the introduction of the kerbside recycling scheme which now operates across the district. Bring sites are not subject to any form of control and are thought to be used to some extent by businesses to recycle a small proportion of trade waste.

3.4 The Communities Policy Development Group (PDG) discussed the operational, financial and environmental issues involved with this service and considered a number of options, from withdrawing the service to letting a contract on a like-for-like basis.

3.5 The PDG questioned the value of maintaining the current bring site service now provider, with a view to a managed withdrawal of the service.

3.6 This option has been explored in more detail and would place an additional burden of £60,000 on the revenue budget and require approximately £52,000 of capital expenditure. There is no provision within the 2009/10 revenue or capital budgets to meet this additional expenditure.

3.7 An alternative option to re-tender a cut-down version of the existing service has also been considered but this again would place additional pressure (estimated to be at least £41,000) on the revenue budget. The actual cost of this option cannot be determined prior to completion of a formal tender process.

## **Consultation**

3.8 The Performance and Engagement team have carried out a consultation exercise with residents, Parish/town councils and supermarket chains to obtain their views on the bring sites and gain some understanding on the perceived value for money of this aspect of our recycling service.

3.9 Questionnaires were sent to local councils and supermarket outlets ( with recycling banks). Consultation with residents was carried out through a set of similar questions on the website. Members of the public were encouraged to become involved in this review through a press release issued to local media and advertising on the home page of the Council's website. Unfortunately only 26 replies were received which may indicate a low level of interest in the bring site service amongst the overall community.

3.10 The detailed report is attached at appendix B to this report however the key results are as follows:

### **Local councils (61% response rate):**

- 51% wished to retain their bring site, approximately 25% did not answer (as they did not have a recycling bank in their district) and 20% did not want to retain it
- 70% thought they provided a valuable service
- 42% thought they provided value for money, 30% said they did not and 28% didn't know
- 43% said they would support a scaled down service as long as there was district wide coverage
- Just under 50% said they would not support the withdrawal of the banks but would understand why we were considering it and 28% said they would support the withdrawal of the service

### **Supermarkets:**

- 6 supermarket outlets (where the highest amounts of waste are collected) were contacted. But only two responded both of whom thought that the sites present their stores with operational problems however there was some interest in supporting recycling.

### **Website respondents (26 responses in total):**

- 61.5% wished to retain the banks, 38.4 % did not
- 58% thought they were a valuable service, although 42% thought they did not
- 38.4% thought they provided value for money, 50% thought they did not

- 30.7% said they would support the withdrawal of the sites , 19.2% said they would not support withdrawal but understood why the Council might consider it

3.11 These consultation results indicate that recycling services are considered to be valuable however there are mixed views about the value for money aspect of the bring sites. The results from both parish/town councils and the small number of residents who responded via the website demonstrate a clear understanding within the community of why the Council may be considering withdrawal of the service.

### **Performance of the Bring Sites**

3.12 The most recent data suggests that the bring sites are likely to yield a little under 1000 tonnes of recycling during 2009/10. In total the Council collected 28,000 tonnes of recycling/green waste which resulted in a recycling/composting performance of 54.2%. The bring sites contribute approximately 2 percentage points to the overall recycling/composting target. Lincolnshire County Council pay a recycling credit to South Kesteven for every tone of household waste that is recycled. Twenty percent of the amount of recycling collected through the bring sites is discounted from the totals to allow for use by businesses.

3.13 The Council has set itself an ambitious target of achieving 58% this year and 60% by 2011. If the bring site service were to be withdrawn some of the recycling may be diverted into the kerbside system however this is not guaranteed.

3.14 The Council signed up to the Lincolnshire Joint Municipal Waste Strategy in 2008 which established a 55% target for the diversion of waste. South Kesteven's contribution is an important element of this collective performance target.

### **4. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

4.1 The Communities PDG considered a full range of options prior to making its recommendations referred to in the report. The options included in this report were found to be the most appropriate for Cabinet to consider regarding the future of the service.

### **5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The Street Scene service budget for 2009/10 was based on a zero-base budgeting approach and does have any capacity to absorb this additional expenditure. If a decision is taken to continue to provide a district wide bring site service then either an element or elements of waste collection or street cleansing activities will need to stop so that resources can be re-directed. Alternatively a supplementary estimate for additional budget provision would need to be submitted to Council for approval.

5.2 The Council has a statutory duty to collect household waste and this requirement is discharged through the kerbside system. However it does not have the same duty in respect of trade waste for which collections can be arranged on payment of an appropriate charge. At this moment in time the Council does not operate a comprehensive trade waste collection service although ad hoc enquiries are received from time to time and responded to individually. The Lincolnshire Waste Management Partnership has identified trade waste recycling as an area of

development for the future and it is intended to work with our partners to evaluate the feasibility of introducing such a scheme.

## **6. RISK AND MITIGATION**

6.1 If either option a) or b) are preferred there will be little change to the way in which the service is delivered to the public and a relatively minor impact on recycling performance. If the service is withdrawn there could be an adverse impact on recycling performance if bring site recycling is not diverted through the kerbside system.

6.2 If the service is brought in-house detailed risk assessments will be made to fully understand the associated health and safety issues and identify the steps required to remove or effectively control those risks.

## **7. ISSUES ARISING FROM EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

7.1 An equalities impact assessment has not been carried out in relation to the recommendations in this report since the service to the public will either remain the same or be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the service will not have a differential impact on any of our residents. People who require help with the recycling/waste collection bins are encouraged to ask for an assisted collection which may be made available following assessment by Street Scene staff.

## **8. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 There are no crime and disorder implications arising directly from this report.

## **9. COMMENTS OF SECTION 151 OFFICER**

9.1 The report states that should an in-house provision or a re-tender exercise be undertaken then additional costs will be incurred. As this is not included in the budget framework the recommendation would be referred to Council. Cabinet are respectfully reminded that the Council tax level has been agreed by Council for 2009/10 so any additional revenue costs will need to be met from the Council's revenue reserves. This is not a sustainable solution to financing additional costs and this will need to be considered in future budget setting proposals.

## **10. COMMENTS OF MONITORING OFFICER**

10.1 Following the extension of the existing contract in line with the provisions of that contract, it is essential a decision is made as soon as possible to allow sufficient time for the implementation of any proposal agreed by Cabinet. A retendering process may extend beyond the end of the current contract extension. Any retendering process will need to be started immediately. Any withdrawal of service will require reasonable notice to users to enable them to find alternative means of disposal.

## **12. APPENDICES:**

Appendix A : table showing the amount of waste collected from each bring site

Appendix B : Results of consultation