

**MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - WASTE COLLECTION, RECYCLING & DISPOSAL - PART 2
MONDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2008**

Councillors Adamou, Dodds and Weber

Observer Sarah Mitchell – The Green Party

Apologies Councillor Edge

LC1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Edge.

LC2. URGENT BUSINESS

See Agenda Item 7.

LC3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST, IF ANY, IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA

None notified

LC4. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF WASTE COLLECTION, RECYCLING & DISPOSAL PART 2:

Terms of Reference

Members wanted clarification about the purpose of this review and it was agreed that the terms of reference should be considered after discussions with the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Director for Urban Environment.

LC5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON PART 2 OF THE REVIEW [ATTACHED]

In 2008 Overview and Scrutiny Committee commissioned a review into Waste, Recycling, Collection and Disposal. The review was completed in April 2008. The review made a number of recommendations on a range of issues aimed at improving performance across various activities within the service.

One of the Review's recommendations related to the different types of collection methodologies as follows:

“The Council should look at the conclusions of the Welsh Review into commingled and source-separated collections, in terms of value for money, overall environmental impact, employment considerations and the quality of the recycling. If the conclusions were to lead the Council to consider the possibility of developing the recycling service to become source-separated in the future, this should be taken into account when purchasing new collection trucks”

The Welsh Review entitled “Survey of Funding of Municipal Waste Management Kerbside Collection” considered the performance of Welsh Local authorities in the

MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - WASTE COLLECTION, RECYCLING & DISPOSAL - PART 2
MONDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2008

context of expenditure, income and future targets. The overall aim was to assess the current funding and future need for waste management operations in Wales, in order to meet recycling, composting and landfill diversion targets.

The debate about which of the two methods is better is ongoing. Haringey provide commingled services where the materials are collected from households and then taken to a Materials Recovery Facility [MRF] for sorting into constituent materials and from there are sent to the reprocessors. Some authorities operate the two systems side by side. Hackney has been running commingled collections systems on housing estates where there are communal collection containers and then source-separated collections for individual low rise properties.

One of the main issues regarding the commingled verses source separated collections debate is the level of contamination in commingled collections and the reject rates from the MRFs as well as the quality of the recyclate from the MRFs and the markets for the material resulting. Some UK reprocessors are reluctant to take material that has been collected from a commingled service. Levels of contamination are higher for commingled collections compared to source separated services.

The Cabinet responded to the recommendations on 15th July 2008 and commented that the Council's own comparison of source-separated and mixed material collection methodologies demonstrated that the latter [mixed, commingled] was more cost-effective for Haringey when this issue was examined in detail in 2006.

LC6. SOURCE SEPARATED OR COMMINGLED COLLECTIONS -

The panel considered a briefing note prepared by the Communications & Engagement Manager which outlined the current recycling collection services in Haringey and explained the difference between commingled and source separated collections. It was noted that the Recycling Strategy for Haringey was approved by the Cabinet in January 2007. The Strategy outlined the objectives and key actions for improving Haringey's performance on recycling and waste reduction.

An appraisal of the future of the service was carried out and the following three options considered:

- 1 A 'do nothing' approach, where existing services would remain unchanged.
Financial implications - £1,252k revenue and £0 capital expenditure.
- 2 Wider range of materials collected through the commingled system.
Financial implications - £1,677k revenue and £1,485k capital.
- 3 Wider range of materials collected through source separated system.
Financial implications - £2,255k revenue and £3,030k capital.

The Cabinet elected to pursue Option 2, namely to employ a commingled collection system for recycling. This would apply to kerbside services as well as facilities for flats and estates.

Concerns raised by the Panel

MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - WASTE COLLECTION, RECYCLING & DISPOSAL - PART 2
MONDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2008

Members wanted to know the rationale behind undertaking a review on the different methods when the Cabinet had agreed on a commingled collection system for Haringey.

There was a discussion on the merits of extending this review to cover wider issues such as the environmental impact of the collection methods and it was suggested that the terms of reference could cover such issues as CO2 emission; environment; resources quality and destination.

The original report also accepted that the current collection methods used in Haringey was agreed by the Cabinet in 2006. It was noted that the purpose of Part 2 of the Recycling Review was merely to undertake a short focussed research exercise into the merits and cost of the two systems, and if the conclusions were to lead the Council to consider the possibility of developing the recycling service to become source-separated in the future, this should be taken into account when purchasing new collection trucks..

Members were also reminded that the original review was only completed this year and an updated report will be presented to Overview and Scrutiny Committee in due course.

Members were told that the London Borough of Camden have commissioned an energy audit which looked at their co-mingled collection and the various kerbside sort collection scheme in the Borough. The report is Camden specific and suggests that the co-mingled collections were not very environmentally friendly and the carbon cost of commingling has been transferred to the MRF, it is therefore difficult to generalise about the carbon impacts of the collection methods as it depends on the distance to the MRF/depot and street density etc.

The Chair and officers were of the view that the panel should stick to the original intention, that of a short focussed research exercise into the merits of the collection methods.

However the panel wanted clarification on the following issues:

- Are there any plans to incorporate the recommendations from the Recycling review into the Recycling Strategy?
- The timescale for the Recycling Part 2 review.
- The timescale for awarding the Integrated Waste Management & Transport Contract [originally scheduled for Dec 09]
- Details of how Recycling Part 2 review fit into the Recycling Strategy?

Members of the Panel wanted to invite representatives from Friends of the Earth and Real Recycling to a meeting to discuss possible solutions on how to manage contamination of materials in co-mingled collection, for example separating glass to reduce contamination

LC7. URGENT BUSINESS:

Members discussed the proposed terms of reference for the review and felt that it could included the following:

MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - WASTE COLLECTION, RECYCLING & DISPOSAL - PART 2
MONDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2008

To consider the overall (life time) impacts of recycling by co-mingled and source separated collection methods to include issues of energy, CO2 and resource issues. Quality of recycling. Value for money Environmental impact; and Employment considerations.

The Panel requested that the Environment Director provide clarification as to how this review would fit in, in the light of strategic decisions having already been taken an example being that 75 separate on street recycling banks were imminently being converted to co-mingled on street banks. There would no longer be any separate paper; glass or can banks.

Cllr Gina Adamou

Chair