



Haringey Council

NOTICE OF MEETING

RECYCLING REVIEW – WASTE COLLECTION, RECYCLING & DISPOSAL PART 2

MONDAY, 22ND SEPTEMBER, 2008 at 18:00 HRS - CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH ROAD, WOOD GREEN, N22 8LE.

MEMBERS: Councillors Adamou, Dodds, Edge and Weber

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [IF ANY]

2. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of urgent business. Where the item is already included on the agenda, it will appear under that item but new items of urgent business will be dealt with at item 7

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

A member with a personal interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the Authority at which the matter is considered must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest at the commencement of that consideration, or when the interest becomes apparent.

A member with a personal interest in a matter also has a prejudicial interest in that matter if the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the member's judgement of the public interest.

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

To consider the Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny Review.

**5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON PART 2 OF THE REVIEW [ATTACHED]
(PAGES 1 - 4)**

6. SOURCE SEPARATED OR COMMINGLED COLLECTIONS -

To consider a briefing report from the Communications & Engagement Manager,
Environmental Resources Team

7. URGENT BUSINESS:

To deal with any items of urgent business admitted at item 2 above.

Yuniea Semambo
Head of Members Services
225 River Park House
Wood Green N22 4HQ

Sharon Miller
Principal Scrutiny Support Officer
Tel No: 020 8489-2928
Sharon.miller@haringey.gov.uk



Briefing for:	RECYCLING REVIEW – PART 2 SCRUTINY REVIEW PANEL
Title:	Co-mingled and Source-separated Collection
Purpose of briefing:	To provide members with the background information relating to the above.
Lead Officer:	Sharon Miller
Date:	16 September 2008

This briefing provides the background to the review.

1. 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

The Review Panel recommended that:

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.

2. The Welsh Review entitled “Survey of Funding of Municipal Waste Management Kerbside Collection” considered the performance of Welsh Local authorities in the 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.
3. Please find attached the Welsh Assembly summary report: “Survey of Funding of Municipal Waste Management Kerbside Collection in Wales”. It shows that Kerbside Sort outperforms Commingled collection in value for money terms as well as achieving higher quality of

materials. London Borough of Camden have commissioned a review of the carbon impact of commingled vs source separated collections.

4. The debate about which of the two methods is better is ongoing. Haringey provide a commingled service 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 a commingled collections systems on housing estates where there are communal collection containers and then source-separated collections for individual low rise properties.
5. 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.
6. The following are general points about commingled vs source separated, however, it is difficult to generalise about the carbon impacts of the collection methods as it depends on the distance to MRF/depot and street density etc:

Source separated:

- Increased revenue from sale of materials from higher quality materials
- Global carbon impact – recycling into like for like materials within the UK or Europe as higher quality can be collected rather than low quality which can not be reprocessed in UK and gets sent abroad to China etc.
- Additional materials such as batteries, textiles, etc can easily be added to the range collected.
- More immediate feedback - to householders by leaving material which can't be accepted for recycling with a note, while still taking those materials which can be accepted. In the commingle bin residents may put non-recyclable items in their bin but it won't get noticed until the MRF.
- Public relations - people have greater confidence that source separated waste will be recycled efficiently as they can see it happening. The collection van is a highly visible advert for recycling.
- More vehicles on road.

Commingled:

- Greater choice of collection container e.g. sack or wheelie bin which can lead to a reduction of street litter
 - Fewer collection vehicles on the road
 - Wastage rates are much higher, typically 12 – 15% for English MRFs, compared with less than 1% for source separated collections
 - contamination restricts materials which can be commingled – in particular, glass and textiles are mutually exclusive, and paper is contaminated if collected with glass. However, new MRF technology may become available in the future.
 - The trend in recyclate markets is likely to be towards requiring higher quality (so the Far East markets for commingled waste may not always be there)
7. Members might want to consider the following points contained in the Scrutiny Review recommendation.
- Value for money
 - The environmental impact,
 - employment considerations
 - The quality of the recycling.
8. A copy of the Walsh Review is attached for reference.

This page is intentionally left blank