

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Strategic Waste and Recycling Review Task and Finish Group held on
Thursday, 10 September 2009 at 4.00pm

Members:	RE Barrett Mrs SM Ellington Mrs CAED Murfitt Mr B Warr	BR Burling Dr SA Harangozo Mrs HM Smith
Officers:	Lawrence Green Steve Hampson Stuart Harwood-Clark Kylie Kavanagh Paul Quigley Dale Robinson Ian Senior	Health and Safety Advisor Executive Director, Operational Services Environment Operations Manager Waste Recycling & Minimisation Officer Environmental Services Manager Corporate Manager, Health & Environmental Services Democratic Services Officer

7. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

9. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

Members accepted the notes of the previous meeting as a correct record.

Members noted that the visit to Cambridgeshire County Council's Mechanical Biological Treatment plant (Note 4 refers) had not yet been finalised.

10. REVIEW OF REFUSE AND RECYCLING SERVICE CONFIGURATION

The Strategic Waste and Recycling Review Task and Finish Group considered a report informing Members about issues relating to the future configuration of the Service, and proposing an optimum service configuration that would best meet Members' priorities.

In considering changes to service configuration, Members took into account indicative costs and potential savings.

Officers demonstrated three alternative waste and recycling systems, namely

- Kerbside sort
- Two stream co-mingled
- Single stream co-mingled

Members discussed a number of elements relating to those three systems, including participation rates, costs, and the implications of contamination and price fluctuations.

Officers highlighted the range of additional materials it was intended should be recyclable in future. They demonstrated the functionality of the available containers, including the

kitchen waste and paper caddies. Members noted the reduction in footprint that could be achieved by adopting a caddy system (box within a third wheeled bin) compared to having a number of boxes. Such a caddy system would also be beneficial in terms of handling and transportation.

In response to concern from HS that the paper caddy system could prove difficult for some people, including those in wheelchairs, DSR explained that its design meant that the caddy was could remain in the wheeled bin at all times.

In response to Member concern about the kitchen waste caddy, DSR recommended that that particular system be disregarded at this time.

The importance was recognised of education in increasing awareness as to what can and cannot be recycled. In response to a comment from SAH, officers highlighted the Council's design guide adopted some time ago and due to be incorporated into a forthcoming Supplementary Planning Document. Among other things, this guide addressed the issue of bin storage on new developments.

Members noted the seven options listed in Table 3 in the report. They noted that Option 2 could be added at a future date, if desired. They noted issues surrounding the recycling of glass and the noise implications arising therefrom, and recognised the longer-term possibility of minimising non-recyclable waste to such an extent that the Council might be able to justify collecting such waste on a monthly basis (subject to there being strong support from residents). While Option 7 carried an additional capital cost, DSR informed Members that this additional sum could be mitigated were the Council to place an order before 31 December 2009. BW added that Cambridgeshire County Council was willing to contribute up to £500,000 from a budget that needed to be used by 31 March 2010. Members considered the details of each Option. DSR explained the benefits of employing two extra support officers to facilitate introduction of the new service. Their principal role would be to help those residents confused by the new process and to avoid bad publicity by enhancing the feel-good factor. They could potentially save a lot of money, as a result of misunderstanding among residents, as contaminated loads would be rejected and landfilled. This could lead to householders losing faith in the service, and a consequent reduction in participation rates.

Concluding discussion, the Strategic Waste and Recycling Review Task and Finish Group recommended that the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder

- a. adopt preferred option 7 (Recycling – two stream co-mingled) as described in the report
- b. give consideration be the collection of small batteries
- c. give future consideration to funding the kitchen food sacks
- d. give future consideration to weekly collection of kitchen food waste

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Members noted that the Strategic Waste and Recycling Review Task and Finish Group would meet for the last time on Thursday 8 October 2009, starting at 4.00pm in the Monkfield Room.

The Meeting ended at 6.30 p.m.
