



**WASTE FRAMEWORK DIRECTIVE  
REPORT OF DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE (COMMUNITY DIRECTION)**

**WARDS AFFECTED: ALL**

---

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To request the Executive to endorse the assessment made to retain existing arrangements for kerbside recycling arrangements.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Executive endorse the assessment made to continue existing arrangements for the collection of dry recyclables on the basis that it is not economically or environmentally practicable to implement separate collection arrangements for paper, glass, metals and plastic.
- 2.2 That the position be reviewed in conjunction with the expiry of the external contract for dry-recycling services with Palm Recycling in 2018 against current and any subsequent guidance issued.

3. BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT

- 3.1 Articles 10 and 11 of the revised Waste Framework Directive (WFD) require the UK to take measures to promote high quality recycling. They include a specific requirement to set up separate collections of glass, paper, metal and plastic by January 2015 unless it is considered this is not necessary to facilitate or improve recovery of these materials or that separate collection of the materials is not technically, environmentally or economically practicable (TEEP). Government has not provided any guidance for councils to assess compliance against this requirement but a working group comprising local authority waste networks including the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) has provided a non-statutory route map to help local authorities interpret the requirements in a consistent way. As such, an assessment has been made of the Council's current recycling operations in conjunction with the Route Map against the requirements of the WFD.

4. HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL DRY RECYCLING COLLECTION ARRANGEMENTS

- 4.1 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council implemented a Dual Stream kerbside recycling service in April 2012. This system was introduced to improve the capture of recyclables and diversion of waste from landfill by making it easier for residents to recycle. The dual stream collection system keeps fibre materials (paper and card) separate from other materials in recognition the main concerns of fully co-mingled collection systems (where all materials are collected together) relate to contamination of fibre material by glass shards and/or liquids. The service is currently provided under contract by Palm Recycling until 2018. The Council also provides separate collections of glass, paper, metal and plastic from 15 public bring sites and from commercial premises as part of its trade service.

Necessity Test

- 4.2 The benchmark for considering whether it is 'necessary' for a separate collection of paper, glass, metal and plastic as required by the WFD is to consider whether the

same “quality” and “quantity” of materials can be attained by alternate methods of collection.

- 4.2.1 The Council initially collected dry recyclables separately via a bag and box system when first introducing a dry recycling service. The collection system has evolved and improved since inception to the current Dual Stream service. When comparing recycling performance of both collection methods used, it can be seen that larger quantities of recyclables are captured via the Dual Stream service thus improving the council’s overall recycling performance and diversion of waste from landfill. Table 4.1 below shows the resultant increase in recycling tonnage achieved specifically for glass, paper, metal and plastic of 620 tonnes recycled and a corresponding reduction in residual waste of 2,122 tonnes. *(Tonnage for “other recyclable materials collected” is also shown to show the major increase in tonnage resulted from the new collection method rather than the collection of new material streams of tetrapak and batteries introduced subsequent to 2010/11. 2011/12 was the transitional year in which wheeled bins were rolled out for the dual stream service so this year was a mixture of both multi-containers and wheeled bin/caddy being in operation – the data is not shown for this year as it is non-comparable for this reason).*

Table 4.1 – Dry Recycling kerbside collection tonnages by collection method

Collection Method	Collection of glass, paper, metal, plastic only (Tonnes)	Other recyclable materials collected (Tonnes)	Total recyclables processed (Tonnes)	Residual waste (Tonnes)
2009/10 Kerbside separate collection with multi-containers for glass, paper, metal, plastic and textiles	8419	0	8419	20401
2010/11 Kerbside separate collection with multi-containers for glass, paper, metal, plastic and textiles, tetrapak, batteries	8776	45	8821	20211
2012/13 Dual Stream Bin and caddy collecting glass, paper, metal, plastic, textiles, tetrapak, batteries	9396	116	9512	18089
Increase/Decrease in tonnage (2012/13 v's 2010/11)	+620			-2,122

- 4.2.2 The introduction of the dual stream system assisted the Council achieve a recycling rate of 55.5% in 2012/13 (latest audited data) compared to 50.6% in 2010/11. Un-audited data for 2013/14 indicates kerbside recycling tonnage of circa 9,364 tonnes retaining comparable performance to year 1 of the dual stream service and reaffirming the method continues to outperform the prior separate collection method with multi-containers. The increased amount of recycling tonnage achieved can also be correlated to high levels of satisfaction with the dual stream service introduced in April 2012 per table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2 – Resident satisfaction levels with the Recycling Service

Service	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
% of residents satisfied with the Recycling Service*	92%	93%	95%
Service	Multi containers	Transitional year to bin/caddy	Wheeled bin/caddy system

\*Source: Annual Winter Satisfaction Survey

4.2.3 The quality of material collected remains high with paper and cardboard being collected separately to other materials. A small amount of reject material is apparent with collection of glass, metal and plastic together as part of the dual stream service but this only equates to 4% or 236 tonnes of these materials (2012/13 audited data). As noted at table 4.1, increased capture of 620 tonnes of glass, metal and plastic provides a net increase of 384 tonnes of recyclables captured after deduction of the reject figure of 236 tonnes.

#### 4.3 Technically, Environmentally and Economically Practicable (TEEP) test

##### Technically Practicable

4.3.1 It would be “technically” possible for the Council to introduce separate collection of paper, glass, metal and plastic as per the method previously operated. This would mean returning to a multi-container system and a change of vehicle provision which would be dependant on a variation to existing contractual arrangements (see 4.3.4).

##### Environmentally Practicable

4.3.2 In view of the performance difference noted between the schemes at table 4.1, it is not considered “environmentally” beneficial to return to separate collection of glass, paper, metal and plastic in view a larger percentage of recyclables are recovered from the residual waste stream via the Dual-Stream collection method. It would also be necessary to collect and recycle existing blue-lidded bins which would not be a sustainable use of this resource and for which a large capital investment (circa £1M) was made.

##### Economically Practicable

4.3.3 There would be a significant “economic” cost to the Council to return to a separate collection system. Spend on kerbside dry-recycling collection arrangements has been reduced due to the transition to the more efficient collection method facilitated by the dual stream service.

4.3.4 A reduction of £313,225 was achieved from moving from a separate collection service in 2010/11 to the current dual stream costs for 2013/14. Palm Recycling are currently contracted to deliver the dual stream service until 2018. If the Council wished to move away from this agreement there may be contractual variation or termination costs incurred as the contractor has resourced itself with the vehicle type and labour provision to deliver the dual stream service and would require operational change to provide separate collections of glass, paper, metal and plastics. Termination of the existing contract now or post 1 January 2015, would result in the Council potentially incurring costs equivalent to the annual contractual cost (£203,575 for 2013/14) multiplied by the residual number of years left for the contract to run (3 years to 2018). Based on the previous contractual price for a separate collection service, the estimated service cost would increase by £411,192 per annum for the separate collection of glass, paper, metal and plastic discounting termination or variation to contract costs.

4.3.5 In addition to the revenue costs noted above, substantial capital expenditure would be required to provide multiple containers to residents to facilitate separate collection of paper, glass, metal and plastic. The product currently available that both reduces the manual handling risk to operatives and would most closely match the space required to store the existing wheeled bin is a 3 box stack system on wheels. This would provide for separate collection of glass, metal and plastics with a yellow bag being used for collection of paper/cardboard. The capital and revenue cost to supply residents with these receptacles and to collect existing blue-lidded bins would be circa £2M (see 5.3).

- 4.3.6 An additional vehicle and crew would be required to continue to provide a recycling service to flats who are unable to house multiple containers and are serviced by larger wheeled bin. The cost to provide this service would be an additional £19,000 per annum.
- 4.3.7 The Council has previously considered the implementation of food waste kerbside collections both in partnership with the Disposal Authority and individually via contribution from the governments Weekly Collection Fund. Food waste collections are not considered to be financially sustainable without financial contribution from the Disposal Authority to subsidise collections through savings achieved from non-disposal previously and this remains the present position.

#### 4.4 Conclusion

- 4.4.1 The Council has positively developed its kerbside recycling service and achieves a commendable recycling rate of 55.5%. Both separate collection and dual-stream collection methods have been utilised by the Council with dual stream collections outperforming separate collection both in terms of environmental (diverting more waste from landfill) and economical benefit (cost to provide the service).
- 4.4.2 Within Leicestershire the Disposal Authority has secured alternate treatment arrangements for residual waste to ensure that wherever possible recyclable materials not placed in the recycling stream are extracted prior to landfill. This includes the use of Mechanical and Biological Treatment(MBT) to remove recyclable materials to produce a compost like output(CLO) or Refuse Derived Fuel(RDF).

### 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS [SJE]

- 5.1 It is recommended as stated in section 2 to continue with the external contract for dry-recycling services until 2018. A full review can be undertaken at this time to consider the financial implications going forward.
- 5.2 As stated in sections 4.3.4 and the tables below, the costs of terminating the existing contract and making alternative collection arrangements is not a viable financial option at this time.

#### Historical Revenue Costs Analysis

Financial Year	Latest Budget (£)	Kerbside recycling cost (£)	Year-Year Cost Change (£)	Service
2010/11	516,800	516,800	-	Separate collection of glass, metals and textiles
2011/12	448,800	483,061	- 33,739	Transitional year from multi containers to bin and caddy
2012/13	195,800	195,231	-287,830	Dual Stream Step 2 wheeled Bin and Caddy
2013/14	212,390	203,575	+8,344	Dual Stream wheeled Bin and Caddy

The difference of £516,800 less £203,575 to give £313,225 is the variance in revenue cost associated with the separate collection of paper, glass, metals and plastic compared to the current system.

5.3 Capital and revenue costs to supply replacement containers to facilitate separate collection of glass, paper, metal and plastic (based on supplier quotes)

Item	Cost (£)
3 box stack system 46,240 properties*	1,734,000
Yellow bag 46,240 properties*	64,736
Collection and recycling of wheeled bins and caddies	70,000
Delivery of containers to residents	55,000
Total	1,923,736

*\*excludes flats with communal bin service*

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS [MR]

- 6.1 The Directive's provisions enable a local authority to make an assessment of the impact of compliance with those provisions and to take a decision based on that perceived impact. In the absence of any formal guidance from the government it would seem reasonable for HBBC to make its assessment based on the "Route map"
- 6.2 The report provides a sufficiently robust assessment to enable the council to take a reasoned view on whether or not it is economically or environmentally practicable to implement separate collection arrangements

7. CORPORATE PLAN IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Recycling collections contribute to the Corporate Plan aim:

"Reduce our impact on the environment": The Councils experience of employing a kerbside recycling service collecting separate materials with multiple containers does not provide the same level of landfill diversion as that provided by a dual stream service with wheel-bin and caddy system.

- 7.2 "Efficient, effective and proactive services": There would be significant increase to service costs for the Council to return to separate collection services.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 Residents complete an annual service satisfaction survey. The results detailed at table 4.2 show the highest levels of satisfaction for the recycling service were attained following implementation of the dual stream service in April 2012.

9. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 It is the Council's policy to proactively identify and manage significant risks which may prevent delivery of business objectives.
- 9.2 It is not possible to eliminate or manage all risks all of the time and risks will remain which have not been identified. However, it is the officer's opinion based on the information available, that the significant risks associated with this decision / project have been identified, assessed and that controls are in place to manage them effectively.

9.3 The following significant risks associated with this report / decisions were identified from this assessment:

Management of significant Risks		
Risk Description	Mitigating actions	Owner
Impact on customers – customers would see the return to multi-collection as a backward step	Retain dual stream collection method following review of existing arrangements against Waste Route Map	Darren Moore
Capital and revenue: Negative impact on Councils MTFS to reintroduce separate collection of glass, paper, metal and plastic against existing budget pressures and budget reductions following cuts in government funding	Retain dual stream collection method following review of existing arrangements against Waste Route Map	Darren Moore
Impact on environment: reduction in recycling rate and missed opportunity to divert more waste from landfill: Previous experience shows dual stream collections divert more waste from landfill	Retain dual stream collection method following review of existing arrangements against Waste Route Map	Darren Moore

## 10. KNOWING YOUR COMMUNITY – EQUALITY AND RURAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 Recycling services are provided to all residents. A bag and box system is retained for a limited number of properties where there are difficulties with access issues. The Council operates an assisted collection service for occupancies whereby residents are not able to present their bins themselves.

## 11. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

11.1 By submitting this report, the report author has taken the following into account:

- Community Safety implications
- Environmental implications (reduced recycling performance)
- Human Resources implications (addition staff and health and safety of operatives particularly in respect of manual handling)

Background papers: Waste Regulations Route Map

Contact Officer: Darren Moore x5976

Executive Member: Councillor Bill Crooks