## **EXTRACT FROM CABINET MINUTES**

# MINUTE 47 – Implications of the Lancashire Municipal Waste Strategy and PFI Funded waste disposal arrangements

# **Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Barry)**

The Head of City Council (Direct) Services submitted a report informing members of the implications of adopting the New Waste Management Strategy for Lancashire 2008 to 2020 and to determine a course of action with regard to the adoption of it.

The options, options analysis, including risk assessment, were set out in the report as follows:

## **Food Waste**

Option	Pro	Con	Risk
Option 1	Food waste can	This is a high	In low
All households to be provided with a 23 litre caddy  Replace refuse	be collected separately from all households on a weekly basis. There	cost option	participation areas the capacity of the food waste
collection vehicles with two compartment vehicles for separate food waste collection. Introduction of this option would be phased over 4 years in line with the replacement of existing collection vehicles.	will be no increase in the number of vehicles collecting waste from households		compartment of the vehicle could be under utilised, leading to operational inefficiencies
Option 2 Weekly collection of food waste.  All households to be provided with a 23 litre caddy.  For householders with green bins (approx 50,000) collect food waste mixed with garden waste on one week and	This is the lower cost option, in the longer term, that provides for a weekly collection of food waste.	This option will cost more than <b>Options</b> 3 and 4 and it will require the services of an extra collection crew to visit every household on a fortnightly basis	Potential for customer dissatisfaction at the number of vehicles deployed for the waste collection service

use purpose built vehicle to collect food waste on 'grey weeks' from a 23 litre caddy .  For householders without green bins (approx 10,000) collect food waste each week from the 23 litre caddy.			
Option 3 Collect food waste fortnightly on 'green weeks' providing an additional collection resource for households without gardens. Only households without green bins (approx 10,000) to be provided with a 23 litre caddy	This is the lowest cost option that provides a fortnightly collection of food waste from all households	Householders will have to keep food waste for two weeks. Alternatively, they can also dispose of it in the grey bin as part of the residual waste stream. The process at the waste treatment plant will then yield a lower grade compost	Customer dissatisfactio n that food waste is collected only fortnightly leading to greater risk of attracting vermin and flies.
Option 4 Take no action. Householders with green bins could dispose of food waste in these bins	There will be no extra cost if this option is taken up	Householders without gardens will have to continue disposing of food waste in the grey bin as part of the residual waste stream. This will yield a lower grade compost from the treatment plant	Complaints and criticism of the scheme. This could compromise the Council's position with the Lancashire Waste Partnership and the County Council could discontinue the paying of the cost

sharing allowance. (currently
£973,800 pa)

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Optio n 4
Refuse Collection Vehicles	12 vehicles upgraded over four years as current leases expire.	None	None	n/a
18 Tonne Vehicles	None	2 in 2010/11 2 in 2011/12	1	n/a
HGV Driver	None	2 in 2010/11 2 in 2011/12	1	n/a
Refuse Loader	12 over four years	2 in 2010/11 2 in 2011/12	2	n/a
Kerbside Caddy	60,000 over four years	30,000 in 2010/11 30,000 in 2011/12	10,000	n/a
Kitchen Caddy	60,000 over four years	30,000 in 2010/11 30,000 in 2011/12	60,000	n/a
Supervisor	From 2010/11	From 2010/11	None	n/a
Driver	From 2010/11	From 2010/11	None	n/a
Vans (2 NO.)	From 2010/11	From 2010/11	None	None

# **Trade Waste**

	Pros	Cons	Risks
Option 1	This will increase the	Any extra collection	Customers
Enhance the	tonnage of trade waste	vehicles would cost	can, at any

trade waste collection service by investing in extra vehicles	that is recycled	from £110,000 per vehicle	time, terminate collection contracts with the Council, rendering vehicular resources to be redundant.
Option 2 Officers continue to investigate enhancements to the service whilst maintaining resources deployed at the current level.	No extra costs	It may not be possible to increase the tonnage, or range of materials recycled without further investment	None at present

The officer preferred option for food waste was Option 2, which provided for a weekly collection service of separated food waste from every household in the District and at a lower cost than Option 1

The officer preferred option for trade waste is Option 2, because of the risk attached to any further investment at this time, given the unpredictability of the trade waste market.

It was moved by Councillor Barry and seconded by Councillor Blamire:-

"That Recommendation 3, as set out in the report, be approved."

Members then voted as follows:-

## **Resolved unanimously:**

(1) That the council does not currently expand the capacity of the trade service but officers continue to investigate service efficiencies that may afford greater recycling opportunities for trade waste customers. Officers will continue to assess the impact of issues like LATS and the new waste disposal facility and ensure the financial implications are built into the MTFS.

Councillor Barry then proposed and Councillor Blamire seconded that Recommendations 1 and 2 as set out in the report be approved.

Councillor Gilbert then proposed as a friendly amendment:

"That Recommendations 1 and 2, as set out in the report, be approved subject to amendment of the wording in Recommendation 1, to read "(Options 1 and 2)" instead of "(Option 2)".

This friendly amendment was accepted by Councillors Barry and Blamire.

By way of amendment, it was moved by Councillor Mace and seconded by Councillor Kerr:-

- "(1) That the costs outlined within the report for the collection of food waste (Option 3) are built into the forthcoming review of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), for subsequent referral on to Council.
- (2) That subject to the outcome of (1) above, a service for the separate collection of food waste, as outlined in Option 3 of the report is implemented in April 2010, but with no expenditure on equipment or materials being contracted for by the City Council until progress with developing the County's proposed new facility for dealing with mixed green and food waste is such as to confirm that it will be on stream to process mixed green and food waste at the time the City's collection of such waste is planned to start."
- 3 Members (Councillors Charles, Kerr and Mace) voted in favour of the amendment, 6 Members voted against (Councillors Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Burns, Fletcher and Gilbert), whereupon the Chairman declared the amendment to be lost.

Members then voted as follows on the original proposal:

#### Resolved:

6 Members (Councillors Barry, Blamire, Bryning, Burns, Fletcher and Gilbert) voted in favour, 3 Members (Councillors Charles, Kerr and Mace) voted against.

- (1) That the costs outlined within the report for the collection of food waste (Options 1 and 2) are built into the forthcoming review of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), for subsequent referral on to Council.
- (2) That subject to the outcome of (1) above, a service for the separate collection of food waste is implemented in two phases starting in April 2010 and April 2011.

## Officers responsible for effecting the decision:

Corporate Director (Community Services). Head of City Council (Direct) Services.

# Reasons for making the decision:

The decision is in line with the new Lancashire Municipal Waste Strategy 2008-2020, which sets challenging targets for waste collection authorities, including, by 2010, both the collection of food waste for composting and a segregated collection service for trade waste. The decision will provide officers with notice of the preferred options at an early stage, which is necessary to plan and prepare for roll out in 2010/11. Both options 1 and 2 provide for a weekly collection of food waste whereas in option 3 the waste food collection is fortnightly.