

Report of the Director of Communities & Neighbourhoods

Kerbside Recycling & Alternate Week Collection Expansion

Summary

1. This report requests the Executive to consider options for recycling and residual waste collections in the Leeman Road, Poppleton Road and Acomb areas, and also for other properties in the remainder of the city that do not have full recycling and fortnightly collection of residual waste.

Background

2. The Household Waste Recycling Act 2003 requires all Waste Collection Authorities to provide all households with kerbside collections for at least two recyclable materials by 31 December 2010.
3. In October 2007, Members agreed to the roll out of kerbside recycling to all households from April 2009 to meet the requirements of the Household Waste Recycling Act 2003. The details of the roll out were subject to findings arising from the Groves project that involved terraced properties and flats.
4. In September 2008, Members also approved that provision of full recycling should be supported by the introduction of an alternate weekly collection of residual waste and recyclables across the city.
5. In May 2009, Members approved that the roll out should continue on the basis of the collection model established in the Groves project.

City Wide Expansion Of Kerbside Recycling and Alternative Weekly Collection

6. The first part of the expansion programme involved approximately 1,000 properties (terraced and flats) in the Groves area. Properties receiving no recycling collection, or a limited service, were upgraded to full service. All properties were moved from weekly to alternative weekly collection of residual waste. Recycling and residual waste collections were rolled out in line with the collection model established in the Groves project.

7. Three petitions were received on 6 July 2009 from residents in Neville Street and Stanley Street. Two of the petitions were from residents opposed to storing wheeled bins in front forecourts and with a preference to continue with sack collections. The third petition was from residents opposed to wheeled bins being stored in front forecourts of properties on the opposite side of the street.
8. The main factor behind the petitions was the aesthetics of storing wheeled bins in front forecourts of terraced properties. The service, however, operated well with few problems and the survey work indicated that many residents had generally accepted wheeled bins.
9. It was therefore recommended and approved that the current service and the roll out of kerbside recycling and alternate weekly collection should continue.
10. The planned roll out of the revised recycling and residual waste collections continued in other parts of the city with service expansion firstly being targeted at flats and communal properties.

Leeman Road, Poppleton Road & Acomb Areas

11. In April 2010, the next phase of service expansion included 3,000 properties in the Leeman Road, Poppleton Road and Acomb areas of the city. This was implemented in line with roll out by collection round to free up resources to permit service expansion. These households had generally received waste collections from the lanes to the rear of properties. This phase of work coincided with the installation of gates in some back lanes that had been agreed as part of a separate process. This agreement, following consultation with residents included the change to front of property collection.
12. The service changes were implemented in line with the outcomes of the Groves trial project. These solutions, however, did throw up some challenges for some residents and with delivery of the service. Some residents expressed dissatisfaction with the new collection arrangements. Many residents, however, were pleased to receive a full recycling service. Residents' concerns prompted consultation and a review of the impact of the service changes.

Further Consultation

13. As a result of this situation a series of drop in sessions were arranged where residents had the opportunity to find out more about the new recycling and residual waste collections and to discuss any queries about the service.

14. Leaflets inviting residents to attend a drop in session were distributed and those unable to attend were encouraged to submit comments by telephone, in writing or by e-mail to the YourViewCounts account.
15. The drop in sessions were held at:
- **Leeman Road:** St Barnabas Church Hall, Salisbury Road on Tuesday, 18 May 2010 from 8am to 7pm.
 - **Poppleton Road:** St Paul's Church, Holgate, on Wednesday, 19 May 2010 from 8am to 7pm.
 - **Acomb:** The Gateway Centre, Front Street, on Tuesday 25 May 2010 from 8am to 7pm.
16. At the drop in sessions residents' were able to look at maps and photographs showing residual waste collection options for their street and discuss these with Waste Services staff. These options, in no preferential order, were:
- Option 1 - Wheeled bins at the front edge of property.
 - Option 2 - Wheeled bins at a central collection point.
 - Option 3 - Communal bins for residents to share.
 - Option 4 - Bags at front edge of property.
 - Option 5 - Bags at a central collection point.
 - Option 6 - Bags at rear of property.
17. Residents attending the drop in sessions were encouraged to complete a short survey about their recycling and rubbish collections. This was to help gauge residents views about services and to identify specific issues. The full survey results are detailed in Annex A to this report. The main findings of the survey are as follows:

Do you take part in kerbside recycling collections?

Yes - 92.6% No - 3.7% No answer - 3.7%

Has the change to alternating waste collections (where rubbish is collected one week and recycling the next) encouraged you to recycle more?

Yes - 42.6% No - 48.1% No answer - 9.3%

Are you happy with your new recycling collection?

Yes - 56.5% No - 37.0% No answer - 6.5%

Are you happy with your new rubbish collection?

Yes - 18.5% No - 65.7% No answer - 15.8%

Comments

Property Type	No	Top Comments
Semi Detached	10	No green waste collection (60%) Do not like front of property collection (10%)
Terrace with forecourt	30	Do not like carrying boxes or bags through house (53%) Prefer CCP / end of lane collection (23%) Do not like presentation point at front (10%) Poor communications (10%)
Terrace without forecourt	58	Do not like carrying boxes through house / unhygienic (62%) Prefer CCP (31%) Poor communications (9%) Boxes too big (5%)
Detached	2	Concerns with storing rubbish for 2 weeks (50%) Concerns with wheeled bins being left out for 2 weeks (50%)
No property type given	8	Do not like carrying refuse through house (25%) No green waste collection (13%)

Future Service Expansion & Development Options

Leeman Road, Poppleton Road & Acomb Areas

18. Following the consultation, detailed above, there is a clear need to review refuse arrangements in the area. Many streets are making the arrangements work, though residents may not be happy with them. Residents in other streets are clearly not happy with the new arrangements and are not making them work effectively.
19. To gain a better understanding of why refuse arrangements are working in some streets, but not in others, there is a need to carry out further consultation with residents. This will provide an opportunity to establish what options are available for residents to improve refuse arrangements in the area.
20. In order to make refuse arrangements work we will need to fully engage with the community and build strong links with them. This has already been discussed with the Neighbourhood Management Team and they are looking to create a 'partner task group' in the area made up of ward members, council representatives, Police and other influential community groups. The objective being to develop Central Collection

Points (CCP), which satisfy the needs of the community and supports the community in improving the use of these facilities. This arrangement will apply to both gated and non-gated back lanes, however, gated back lanes are likely to be selected for trials in the first instance.

21. There are some streets where changes have had to be made for the reasons of safety. The safety issues are those of manoeuvring large vehicles or employees carrying heavy bags over long distances. These streets, listed at Annex B, will remain at front of property collection for the reason shown. However the team will work with residents to find appropriate solutions in each case.
22. Options for the remaining streets where safety is not an issue, and where gates are not installed, are as follows:

Option 1

Revert back to previous refuse collection arrangements but maintain fortnightly, rather than weekly, collection of residual waste.

Option 2

Continue with recently revised arrangements but work with residents to help improve refuse arrangements. This option involves two elements of work:

a) Beaconsfield Street / Gladstone Street / Milner Street areas

Recently changed refuse arrangements have been working in these streets although some residents are not happy with the presentation at the front of property. To improve customer satisfaction it is proposed that there should be further consultation with residents to help identify service improvements. Residents would be given a choice on using wheeled bins or sacks, and whether refuse is picked up from the front of property or from a central collection point (CCP). To help operate and enforce the service more effectively where wheeled bins are in use, it is proposed that any containers supplied should be marked in some way to identify ownership. Residents' opting to use sacks could also be offered a wheeled bin for storing the refuse sacks between collections. It will require all waste to be stored within the curt ledge of the property between collections. Any service changes introduced following this consultation would be monitored and the suitability for extending into other streets in the area assessed.

b) Leeman Road Area

Residents' are generally not happy with the refuse arrangements and these are not working satisfactorily. A recent survey identified problems with CCPs for wheeled bins (official and unofficial locations) not operating satisfactorily and storage of refuse in back lanes creating very

untidy conditions. As outlined in paragraph 20 it is proposed that a 'partner task group' should be set up to work with residents to tackle these problems and to help make service improvements. The Neighbourhood Management Team will provide a further report to the ward committee with more details about what work is proposed for the 'partner task group'.

Analysis of options 1 and 2

Disadvantages Option 1

- We have not tested the previous arrangements when operating alternate week collections. Data from collections prior to the new arrangements, when compared to data since the changes, shows that we are collecting between 50 and 60 per cent more waste on each collection day. Reverting back will require additional resources.
- Residents using back lanes as storage areas for recycling and rubbish leads to bags being strewn across lanes and attracting fly-tipping which is difficult to enforce.
- Collection vehicles cannot always access back lanes and crews have to carry bags out. This is very time consuming and increases the risk of injury.
- Back lane collections, of either bins or bags, can often lead to an excessive number of additional bags being left in lanes or next to wheeled bins. It is difficult to establish where bags have come from and to prevent it from happening.
- Some residents with wheeled bins do not store them on their property between collections. Instead they leave them in back lanes or unofficial corals, which attract waste throughout the period between collections.

Advantages Option 1

- Resolves the main issue raised by some residents about carrying bagged rubbish through homes for front of property collection.

Disadvantages Option 2

- Residents may not have the space to store the current size of wheeled bin within their property. This will be identified during the consultation and option for alternative sized containers will be offered.

Advantages Option 2

- That we address the needs of the residents and set in place their support for recycling.
 - Wheeled bins are offered for the first time in bag areas.
 - There is no evidence on the streets of the waste collection service between collections.
 - Incidents of fly tipping and bins out early are easier to police.
 - Waste trained within the boundaries of the property will further encourage the use of the recycling service.
23. In terms of other issues raised during the consultation process we will continue to monitor residual and recycling collections following revised arrangements coming into place and advise residents who present bins and/or recycling boxes at the wrong collection points. Collection crews will also be advised about returning bins and boxes to the correct place. Further work also needs to be carried out at student properties so that waste storage and collection systems can be improved.

Roll out of Recycling and Alternative Weekly Collection to the Remainder Of City

24. The Council is still committed to the provision of the Household Waste Recycling Act 2003. Given the issues detailed previously in this report, the previous roll out programme is now delayed. We need to consider options for getting the roll out back on schedule whilst removing any potential for further issues that may affect it.
25. The options for committing to the Household Waste Recycling Act 2003 are:

Option 1

Provide households with full recycling and move to fortnightly residual waste collection but make no change to collection point of the grey waste. There may be some changes that are necessary due to safety reasons where the risk assessment result shows a high risk or to improve service delivery. Any changes will be communicated with residents, executive members and ward members well in advance of any changes being made.

Option 2

Provide households with full recycling and move to fortnightly residual waste collection and also change to front of property collection.

Analysis of Options

Option 1 - Advantages

- Meet the requirements of the Household Waste Recycling Act 2003 (except for rural properties).
- Removes much of the potential for customer dissatisfaction regarding changes to refuse collection arrangements.

Option 1 - Disadvantages

- Will affect some of the efficiency work being carried out across the service.

Option 2 - Advantages

- Standardised service with front of property collection and alternative weekly collections throughout the city.

Option 2 - Disadvantages

- Potential for further customer dissatisfaction if refuse collection arrangements are changed.
- Any further customer dissatisfaction may delay in meeting the requirements of the Household Waste Recycling Act 2003.

26. Assuming that option 1, outlined in paragraph 25, is adopted (providing households with full recycling and move to fortnightly residual waste collection but make no change to collection point) the proposed implementation timetable is as follows:

Collection Service Changes	Collection Day (Round)	Properties
September 2010	Friday	3,275
October 2010	Wednesday	5,378
October 2010	Tuesday	2,732
December 2010	Monday	5,216
	Total	16,601

27. There are around 750 properties not covered in the timetable above. These are properties that are rural or remote and we will look to introduce recycling and Alternative Weekly Collection arrangements to these properties in February 2011. This will not affect our commitment to the Household Waste Recycling Act 2003 as these properties are classed as not reasonably practical to collect recycling from at this stage.

28. A Communications Plan will be devised to advise residents in the Leeman Road, Poppleton Road and Acomb areas of the outcomes of the drop in sessions and the proposed way forward.
29. A Communication Plan has been devised to underpin the roll out of service to the remainder of properties in the city. This communications plan is attached as Annex C to this report. The standard elements of the plan for each phase of the roll out will include:

Residents

- Notification letter sent to residents 4 weeks in advance of any service change.
- Articles in local press, radio ads, update CYC's website.
- Drop in session

Internal Communications

- Notification for Members, YCC, Street Environment and Housing Services.

Corporate Priorities

30. The Without Walls Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-2025 will provide a sustainable framework, which will aim for York to be a city with low levels of pollution and waste production and high levels of recycling. The roll out of kerbside recycling and alternate week collection throughout the city will make a significant contribution to fulfilling this aim.
31. This work contributes strongly to the corporate strategy direction statement of placing environmental sustainability at the heart of everything we do.
32. The roll out of kerbside recycling and alternate week collections throughout the city is an important factor in the delivery of the corporate priority of decreasing the tonnage of biodegradable waste and recyclable products being sent to landfill for disposal.
33. This work also contributes to delivering the aims of the Corporate Sustainability Strategy by reducing York's CO2 emissions, increasing recycling and managing waste to the best practice standards.

Implications

34. Implications of the roll out of kerbside recycling and alternate week collections are:

Financial - Members have approved the budget for the city wide expansion of kerbside recycling and alternate week collections. All other communication work will be completed within the current budget restraints.

Human Resources (HR) - There are no implications in this report.

Equalities - A strategic equality impact review has been undertaken following the corporate model. This is available for inspection as required.

Legal - The legal implications are contained within the report.

Crime and Disorder – The options of allowing the CCP of wheeled bins near to the gated back lanes has been discussed with the Police and they have agreed to be part of the Task Group to encourage residents to maximise the benefits of these gates.

Information Technology (IT) - There are no implications in this report.

Property - There are no implications in this report.

Risk Management

35. The general risks associated with this service are contained in the Magique Risk Register. This report identifies additional risks for the service but proposes measures to mitigate these risks.

Recommendations

36. Members are asked to consider and approve the service expansion and development options as outlined below:
- To continue with the recently revised kerbside recycling and Alternative Weekly Collections arrangements in the Leeman Road, Poppleton Road & Acomb areas but work with residents to improve refuse arrangements as outlined in Option 2 of paragraph 22 of this report.

Reason: To ensure that the Council can provide a service that meets the needs of residents, the requirements of the collection service and within available budget.

- To note the work that will be done for the communication plan in paragraph 28 and to agree the communication plan in paragraph 29.

Reason: To ensure that the Council is communicating clearly with residents and are supportive of the efforts to increase recycling.

- To provide the remaining 16,601 households with full recycling, and move to fortnightly residual waste collection, but make no change to collection point except where there are clear safety concerns (as outlined in Option 1 of paragraph 25 of the report). To ensure that services are delivered cost effectively it is proposed that the collection points should be reviewed at some point in the future.

Reason: In order that the Council can meet the requirements of the Household Waste Recycling Act 2003 to provide all households with kerbside collections for at least two recyclable materials by 31 December 2010.

Contact Details

Author:

John Goodyear
Assistant Director
Ext 3204

Geoff Derham
Head of Waste, Cleaning &
Fleet Services
Tel No.: ext. 3111

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Sally Burns
Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods

Report Approved Date 7 July 2010

Sally Burns
Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods

Report Approved Date 7 July 2010

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Implication: Technical

Name: Shaun Donnelly

Title: Waste Management Officer

Tel No.: ext. 3200

Implication: Neighbourhood Management

Name: Kate Bowers

Title: Head of Neighbourhood Management

Tel No.: ext. 1817

Wards Affected: *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

- 'Waste Management Strategy 2007/8 to 2013/14' Executive Report, October 2007.
- 'Waste Management Strategy 2008/2014 - Refresh' Executive Report, September 2008.
- 'Kerbside Recycling: City Wide Expansion 2009 - 2010' Executive Report, 12 May 2009.
- 'Kerbside Recycling & Alternate Week Collection Expansion - Petitions' Executive Member for Neighbourhoods Decision Session Reports, 15 September 2009 & 17 November 2009.