SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Notes of a meeting of the Strategic Waste and Recycling Review Task and Finish Group held on Thursday, 2 July 2009 at 4.00pm

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs SM Ellington – Environmental Services Portfolio Holder

Members: RE Barrett Dr SA Harangozo

Mrs CAED Murfitt Mrs HM Smith

Mr B Warr

Officers: Steve Hampson Executive Director, Operational Services

Kylie Kavanagh Waste Recycling & Minimisation Officer

Paul Quigley Environmental Services Manager

Dale Robinson Corporate Manager, Health & Environmental

Services

Ian Senior Democratic Services Officer

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor BR Burling.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor BR Burling.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. REMIT AND PURPOSE, TIMETABLE AND PROCESS

The Strategic Waste and Recycling Review Task and Finish Group considered a report on its remit and operating guidelines, and the timetable to which it was working.

At paragraph 15 of the report (Timetable), those present noted that, because of member unavailability, the proposed second meeting on 7 August 2009 had been cancelled. Configuration options would now be considered at the meeting on 10 September, and it was agreed that procurement options would form the basis of discussion at a new third meeting to be held on 8 October 2009.

At paragraph 15 (Remit), DR said that the four items listed

- 1. A cost effective and efficient service
- 2. A high level of customer satisfaction/perception
- 3. Providing future flexibility to respond to external influences
- 4. Minimising environmental impact.

were in priority order but were not mutually exclusive.

SE said that flexibility would be enhanced by not committing to a single supplier. SAH asked for the Council's definition of the term 'minimising environmental impact'. In reply, PQ said the aim was to reduce the amount of waste sent to landfill and 'future-proof' the service.

At paragraph 15 (Within Scope), HMS was surprised at the omission of any mention of recycling banks. In response, DR said that the Task and Finish Group should focus on the major issues, and only if such issues had an impact on them should its members then deal

with ancillary matters such as recycling banks

At paragraph 15 (Out of Scope), HMS asked about joint commissioning. DR said that there was minimal interest locally for the joint commissioning of refuse and recycling collection services although, in ReCAP (Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough), there was joint working in areas such as glass recycling and the collection of abandoned vehicles.

At paragraph 11, SAH asked for examples of legislative change. DR referred him, and the Task and Finish Group, to the Benefits Realisation Analysis carried out by officers, tracking back from the four bullet points listed above and identifying sub-benefits and enablers.

The Strategic Waste and Recycling Review Task and Finish Group **noted and endorsed** the remit and guidelines set out in the report from the Corporate Manager (Health and Environmental Services).

4. REVIEW OF REFUSE AND RECYCLING SERVICE PERFORMANCE

The Strategic Waste and Recycling Review Task and Finish Group considered a report on the performance of the refuse and recycling service outlining

- current configuration of the service
- performance of the service against a range of performance measures
- strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges

DR highlighted the priorities set out in paragraph 71 of the report as being key to the entire review process.

Referring to paragraph 38 of the report, SE said it was very important that the Review does not overlook the needs and expectations of hard-to-reach groups, such as those living in flats or on gypsy and traveller sites. DR assured the Task and Finish Group that the Council's aim was to achieve its policy objectives in terms of refuse and recycling, even if that meant that, in the case of hard-to-reach groups, it had to deliver its services other than in the way adopted elsewhere in the district.

Referring to paragraph 18 of the report (final bullet point) and responding to a question from CAEDM, KK said that while South Cambridgeshire District Council's performance was lower during 2009-10 than in 2008-09, it remained in the top quartile.

At paragraph 24, CAEDM sought clarification of the distinction between 'residents' and 'customers'. DR explained that those who contact the Council are referred to as customers, whereas those who do not are referred to as residents. He added that it was important to establish whether or not there was a difference of perception between these two groups in terms of satisfaction with services provided by Health and Environmental Services.

Those present discussed a number of issues arising from Table 4 (Provisional Top 10 Councils for recycling and composting in 2008-09). These included

- the cost, capacity and number of bins
- control and flexibility of the refuse and recycling service
- Service design and configuration
- The impact of composting
- Management of bins

In relation to paragraph 45, DR highlighted the need to take health and safety issues into account. He said that, in developing the refuse and recycling services, the Council would seek to minimise all risks so far as is reasonable practicable.

SJH said that the Task and Finish Group's Terms of Reference should include the aim of minimising and recycling business waste.

Those present discussed a number of issues arising from paragraph 55. BW undertook to arrange for the Task and Finish Group to see Cambridgeshire County Council's Mechanical Biological Treatment plant in operation.

SAH raised the idea of offering rewards or incentives as a means of encouraging user engagement in the service review process.

The Task and Finish Group discussed the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Challenges set out in paragraphs 64 to 69 of the report.

Concluding its consideration of the report from the Corporate Manager (Health and Environmental Services) and points (a) to (k) in paragraph 71, the Strategic Waste and Recycling Review Task and Finish Group **recommended** that the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder treat the following with greater weight in the evaluation of configuration options, namely

- 1. Increasing capture rates
- 2. Improving on the dry recycling rate
- 3. Reducing the cost of collection through changes to collection configuration
- 4. Ensuring high quality recycled material is delivered to the re-processors / end market, thus reducing the risk of rejection, price reduction and the effects of market volatility
- 5. Ensuring that future health and safety risks are considered and either eliminated altogether or else reduced so far as is reasonably practicable
- 6. Maintaining flexibility to respond to change and external influences

The other items listed in paragraph 71 were to be part of the re-configuration options evaluation together with the following additional matters

- 1. Business and schools waste recycling
- 2. Incentives and rewards

Members requested that the configuration options report should also include commentary on access issues such as private roads and effects on assisted collections

5. CONSULTATION PROPOSALS

The Strategic Waste and Recycling Review Task and Finish Group noted a report outlining proposals for consultation with users of the Council's integrated refuse and recycling collection service.

PQ outlined how the Council envisaged conducting the survey so as to identify public aspirations.

The key objectives of follow-up engagement would be to promote behavioural changes and obtain further feedback via focus groups informed, but not facilitated, by the Council.

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Group noted that it had been necessary to cancel the proposed meeting on 7 August
2009. As a result, the proposed meeting on 10 September 2009 would now be its second
meeting. Members agreed to meet for a third time on Thursday 8 October 2009, starting
at 4.00pm in the Monkfield Room.

The Meeting ended at 6.20 p.m.