

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

AGENDA

STREETSCENE SCRUTINY PANEL

Date: Thursday, 14 March 2019

Time: 6.00 pm

Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

Members:

Councillor Miss T G Harper (Chairman)

Councillor G Fazackarley (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors J E Butts

Mrs L E Clubley

L Keeble

Mrs K Mandry

R H Price, JP

Deputies: Mrs T L Ellis

J S Forrest



1. Apologies for Absence

2. Minutes (Pages 5 - 8)

To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Streetscene Scrutiny Panel held on 01 November 2018.

3. Chairman's Announcements

4. Declarations of Interest and Disclosures of Advice or Directions

To receive any declarations of interest from members in accordance with Standing Orders and the Council's Code of Conduct and disclosures of advice or directions received from Group Leaders or Political Groups, in accordance with the Council's Constitution.

5. Deputations

To receive any deputations of which notice has been received.

6. Executive Business (Pages 9 - 10)

To consider any item of business dealt with by the Executive since the last meeting of the Panel, that falls under the remit of the Streetscene Portfolio. This will include any decisions taken by individual members during the same time period.

(1) Award of Tender - Contract for Textile Recycling Banks Service Concessions (Pages 11 - 12)

7. Resources and Waste Strategy and Government Consultation Report (Pages 13 - 32)

To consider a report by the Head of Streetscene on the proposals set out in the Resources and Waste Strategy recently published by the Government.

8. Waste and Recycling Collection Arrangements (Pages 33 - 34)

To receive a presentation by the Recycling Coordinator and the Refuse and Recycling Manager which outlines the current Refuse and Recycling arrangements and compares them with other Local Authority arrangements.

9. Streetscene Scrutiny Panel Priorities

To provide an opportunity for Members to consider the scrutiny priorities for the Streetscene Panel.



P GRIMWOOD

Chief Executive Officer

Civic Offices

www.fareham.gov.uk

05 March 2019

For further information please contact:
Democratic Services, Civic Offices, Fareham, PO16 7AZ
Tel:01329 236100
democraticservices@fareham.gov.uk

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Streetscene Scrutiny Panel (to be confirmed at the next meeting)

Date: Thursday, 1 November 2018

Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

PRESENT:

Councillor Miss T G Harper (Chairman)

Councillor G Fazackarley (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: J E Butts, Mrs L E Clubley, L Keeble, Mrs K Mandry and
R H Price, JP

Also Present: Councillor Mrs T L Ellis (Item 6) and Councillor S D Martin,
Executive Member for Streetscene (Item 6)



1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies of absence for this meeting.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Streetscene Policy Development and Review Panel held on 6 September 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced that the annual recycling leaflets, containing information about the Christmas Refuse and Recycling Collections have now been delivered to households across the Borough. She reminded members that the calendars are split between East and West so when talking to residents regarding this please ensure that the resident has the correct calendar for their area.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURES OF ADVICE OR DIRECTIONS

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

5. DEPUTATIONS

There were no deputations made at this meeting.

6. INTRODUCTION TO THE STREETSCENE SCRUTINY PANEL

The Panel received a presentation from the Head of Democratic Services which provided an introduction to the newly formed Streetscene Scrutiny Panel, and outlined the role and function of this new Panel. (The presentation is attached as Appendix A to these minutes).

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor S D Martin, Executive Member for Streetscene, and Councillor Mrs T L Ellis addressed the Panel on this item.

In addition to the presentation members were asked to consider the items of business that they felt would be relevant for the Panel to consider over the next 5 years, which would be added onto the Scrutiny Priorities list. These items would be driven by the Council's Corporate Strategy which currently runs from 2017-2023.

Members were directed to the Corporate Priorities that fall within the remit of the Streetscene Portfolio. Members put forward the following topics for consideration on the Scrutiny Priorities:

- Tax Relief on Public Toilets – Will this affect Fareham Borough Council and if so could this saving be used for grounds maintenance, for example weed killing treatment?

- Recycling Rate – Could this be improved by the Introduction of kerbside Glass Collection?
- Refuse Collection – Could there be a report examining how other authorities manage waste collection, to see if there are ways in which Fareham could improve this service?
- Changes to the Materials Recovery Facility and the Energy Recovery Facility and how this would impact on local authorities.
- Recycling Confusion – What are the issues and how can this be better reported to residents.
- Dog Fouling – What are the main issues and how can these be resolved. Are there enough Enforcement Officers in place to be able to deal with this ongoing issue? How can the Council better educate repeat offenders to prevent this from happening in the future?
- Fly Tipping – What measures could the Council put in place to try to prevent this from happening.
- Titchfield Country Park – Do we have enough Countryside Rangers to be able to maintain this country park alongside the others that are already managed by the Council?
- Hedge Cutting – Now this service has been brought back in house, how is operating, is it performing better now than when it was contracted out? How does it compare cost wise, has there been any savings?
- Graffiti – Are we hitting our Service Level Agreements?
- Speed Tracking for Council Vehicles – Have we considered using this on the Council's fleet, it has been proven via other companies to not only prevent accidents but to also reduce fuel consumption.
- Grounds Maintenance – What are the challenges and priorities for the team, how is the service performing, how has the Vanguard intervention changed the service?

RESOLVED that the Chairman and Head of Streetscene discuss suggestions made by Members and work them into the new Scrutiny Priorities Plan.

7. EXECUTIVE BUSINESS

The Panel considered the Executive items of business which fall under the remit of the Streetscene Portfolio, including Individual Executive Member decisions, that have taken place since the last meeting of the Scrutiny Board on 4 June 2018.

The Panel considered the decisions shown as item 7 (1) of the agenda.

RESOLVED that the Streetscene Scrutiny Panel considered the following items of Executive Business:

(1) Single Use Plastic Policy

No comments were received.

8. STREETSCENE SCRUTINY PRIORITIES

The Panel considered this item in conjunction with Minute Item 6 (Introduction to the Streetscene Scrutiny Panel).

(The meeting started at 6.00 pm
and ended at 7.43 pm).

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to Streetscene Scrutiny Panel

Date **14 March 2019**

Report of: **Head of Streetscene**

Subject: **EXECUTIVE BUSINESS**

SUMMARY

One of the key functions of this Scrutiny Panel is to hold the Executive Portfolio Holder and Senior Officers to account in the delivery of the service and the Improvement Actions identified in the Council's Corporate Priorities and Corporate Vision.

Members are therefore invited to consider the items of business which fall under the remit of the Streetscene portfolio and have been dealt with by the Executive since the last meeting of the Panel. This also includes any decisions taken by individual Executive Members.

The relevant notices for decisions taken are attached for consideration.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Members consider the items of Business discharged by the Executive since the last meeting of the Panel and make any comments or raise any questions for clarification.

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

2018/19
Decision No.
2093

Record of Officer Delegated Decision

Monday, 4 March 2019

Portfolio	Streetscene
Subject:	Award of Tender - Contract for Textile Recycling Banks Service Concession
Report of:	Head of Streetscene
Corporate Priority:	Protect and enhance the environment

Purpose:

To let a service concession for the installation and management of textile recycling banks on public land.

In 2013, the Council let a service concession for the installation, servicing and on-going management of textile banks on public land. The sale of the material provides an income which is returned to the Council.

The form of contract is a framework agreement which permits other neighbouring Councils to set up their own service concession. Other users of the framework may independently issue call-off service concessions at any time within the framework period should they wish to do so.

The service concession has now been re-tendered and this report seeks approval to award the service concession to the preferred supplier.

Options Considered:

As recommendations.

Decision:

RESOLVED that the contract be awarded to the tenderer who submitted the most advantageous tender for the textile recycling bank service concession, as ranked 1st in the confidential appendix to the report.

Reason:

To continue to provide a brink bank service for the collection of textiles on public land in the Borough.

Confirmed as a true record:

Andrew Wannell
Director of Finance & Resources
Monday, 4 March 2019

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to Streetscene Scrutiny Panel

Date: 14 MARCH 2019

Report of: Head of Streetscene

Subject: GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON RESOURCES AND
WASTE STRATEGY

SUMMARY

This report provides a high-level overview of the proposals set out in the Resources and Waste Strategy recently published by the Government. It also provides an overview of the four related consultations that were published on 18 February 2019 and require a response submitted by 13 May 2019.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Streetscene Scrutiny Panel consider and comment on the proposals set out in the Resources and Waste Strategy and related consultation.

INTRODUCTION

1. The Government published its Resources and Waste Strategy for England on 18 December 2018. The Strategy sets out how the country will preserve material resources by minimising waste, promoting resource efficiency and moving towards a circular economy. The strategy covers a broad range of topics and the proposals which are most likely to directly impact upon local government are summarised in this report .
2. Four consultations relating to the strategy were released by DEFRA on 18 February with a 12-week consultation period. They cover Deposit Return Schemes(DRS); Extended Producer Responsibility(EPR); Consistency in collection; and the proposed tax on plastic packaging. The report provides an overview of the consultations and sets out how the Council will respond.

RESOURCES & WASTE STRATEGY

3. The strategy document is made up of 8 chapters covering a wide range of topic areas. A key strategic aim is the government's commitment to the EU Circular Economy package, which it signed up to in March 2018. This includes targets for recycling municipal waste as follows:
 - 55% by 2025
 - 60% by 2030
 - 65% by 2035
4. A summary of the key issues that impact on local authorities are as follows.
 - Introduction of Deposit Return Scheme(DRS) for single use drinks containers (subject to consultation).
 - Extension of the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) scheme. Producers of packaging will have to pay 100% of the costs of everything related to packaging waste. Costs of managing packaging waste will be funded by industry from the EPR system. This will see industry pay higher fees if their packaging is harder to reuse or recycle and will encourage sustainable design. EPR for packaging will raise between £800 million and £1 billion a year for recycling and disposal (subject to consultation).
 - New legislation specifying a core set of materials to be collected by local authorities (Subject to consultation on what the core materials will be and how they will be collected).
 - Non-binding targets for recycling that account for local authorities' different circumstances.
 - Minimum service standards for recycling (subject to consultation).
 - Provision of free garden waste collections (subject to consultation).
 - Mandatory separate food waste collections by 2023) (subject to consultation).

- Move away from weight-based targets to impact-based, with a focus on natural capital and greenhouse gas emissions. The indicators in the strategy are weight-based ones - total waste generated, residual waste per person, recycling rates and tonnes to landfill (subject to consultation).
- Goal for min 65% of municipal waste by weight to be recycled by 2035, with no more than 10% in landfill.
- A review of the effectiveness of current arrangements of local authority waste management and joint working will make recommendations for improvement, such as greater joint working between two tier authorities, or sharing of assets for handling household and commercial waste.
- Review recycling credits and two-tier cost sharing (dependent on implementation of EPR).
- Review Controlled Waste Regulations in relation to charging at recycling centres, (subject to consultation).
- No incineration tax, but not ruling one out in the future if reduction and recycling performance doesn't improve.
- Local authorities will receive additional resource to meet new net costs arising from the policies set out in the strategy once implemented. Including both net up front transition costs and net ongoing operational costs (likely to be funded through EPR).
- Through the Waste Infrastructure Delivery Programme. The Government is committed to spending £3bn by 2042 on developing new waste infrastructure, including facilities to help improve recycling such as Anaerobic Digestion(AD) plants for processing food waste.

CONSULTATIONS

5. Many of the ambitions set out in the Resources and Waste Strategy are subject to consultation. The Government published a 12-week consultation period on Deposit Return Schemes; Extended Producer Responsibility; Consistency in collection; and a tax on plastic packaging, on 18 February.
6. The following provides a summary of the consultations:
7. **Extended Producer Responsibility(EPR)** The proposal is for businesses to bear the full net cost of managing the packaging they handle or place on the market at end of life. This should include the cost of collection, recycling, disposal, the clear-up of littered and fly tipped packaging, and communications relating to recycling and tackling littering.
8. Fees raised from obligated businesses will be used to support the management of packaging waste and the achievement of agreed targets and outcomes. This is to include the collection of a common set of packaging materials for recycling across the UK.

9. The proposed definition of full net cost covers:

- Collecting and transporting household/household-like packaging waste for recycling
- Sorting and treatment of household/household-like packaging waste (where required) for recycling. The income obtained from the sale of recyclable materials would be netted off.
- Treating/disposing of any packaging disposed of in the residual waste stream
- Providing information to consumers on recycling packaging waste and anti-littering
- Clean up of littered and fly-tipped packaging items
- The collection, collation and reporting of relevant packaging and waste management data (including litter and fly-tipping)

10. The consultation document has over 90 questions. A copy of the document can be found at the following link: <https://consult.defra.gov.uk/environmental-quality/consultation-on-reforming-the-uk-packaging-produce>

11. **Deposit Return Scheme (DRS)** DEFRA are consulting two different options for a DRS.

12. The first option, known as the 'all-in' model, would target a large amount of drinks beverages placed on the market, irrespective of size.

13. The second option, known as the 'on-the-go' model, would restrict the drinks containers in-scope to those less than 750ml in size and sold in single format containers. This model would target drinks most often sold for consumption outside of the home (while 'on-the-go').

14. The government suggest this could drive up the recycling of an estimated three billion plastic bottles which are currently incinerated, sent to landfill or left to pollute streets, countryside and the marine environment.

15. DEFRA claims that similar schemes already operate successfully in other countries – for example, total return rates of drinks containers in Denmark, Finland, Germany, Norway, the Netherlands and Sweden are at 90%, 92%, 98%, 92% and 85% respectively.

16. The consultation document has over 80 questions. A copy of the document can be found at the following: <https://consult.defra.gov.uk/environment/introducing-a-deposit-return-scheme>

17. **Plastic Packaging Tax** – At the Budget 2018, government announced that from April 2022 it would introduce a world-leading new tax on the production and import of plastic packaging with less than 30% recycled content, subject to consultation.

18. The government's call for evidence on single-use plastic waste last year highlighted that recycled plastic is often more expensive than new plastic, despite its lower

environmental impacts. The Government wants to shift the economic incentives involved in the production of more sustainable plastic packaging, encouraging greater use of recycled plastic and helping to reduce plastic waste.

19. The government is now seeking views on proposals for how the tax will work. For example, which packaging should be in scope of the tax, how to assess recycled content, and which businesses will be liable for the tax.

20. The consultation sets out the policy proposals for the plastic packaging tax and seeks views on its design to ensure it is introduced in a way that best meets its objectives while minimising burdens on business and includes over 50 specific questions on the following areas:

- defining products within the scope of the tax
- setting a threshold for recycled plastic content
- the approach to rates
- the precise point at which the tax is charged and who will be liable to pay
- how to minimise administrative burdens for the smallest operators and/or low volumes of production or import
- the treatment of imports and exports
- promoting compliance and preventing opportunities for tax avoidance or evasion
- how business can demonstrate the recycled content of their products in a robust way without introducing unnecessary administrative burdens

21. A copy of the document can be found at the following:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/779345/181213_Plastic_packaging_tax_condoc_template_final_1.0.pdf

22. **Consistency in Household and Business Recycling Collections in England** – The consultation on consistency will look to see all councils collect the same materials with an indication from Defra that aluminium foil, pots, tubs and trays are likely to be the sort of the things the public want collected.

23. In addition, weekly food waste collections are proposed as are free garden waste collections (WRAP has calculated that if all local authorities collected garden waste for free this would contribute 4% to the recycling rate).

24. The consultation covers 20 different proposals. The following table contains a brief synopsis of the proposals:

1. All authorities in England to collect core set of recyclable materials at kerbside from flats and houses.	2. Core set of materials will be glass bottles and containers, paper and card, plastic bottles, plastic pots tubs and trays, and steel and aluminium tins and cans.
3. Core set of materials should be	4. By 2023 to legislate for local

regularly reviewed by government and, if appropriate, expanded over time.	authorities to provide all kerbside properties and flats with access to at least a weekly separate collection service for food waste, including provision of containers and liners.
5. Provide funding and support to local authorities to help put in place the necessary collections infrastructure.	6. It would be desirable for local authorities that have contractual commitments with In-Vessel Composting(IVC) facilities, which needs mixed garden and food waste, to require separate presentation of food waste but then be able to mix it with garden waste for treatment purposes. This is because our evidence shows that separate presentation of food waste leads to higher yields.
7. Households generating garden waste should be provided with access to a free collection service. If introduced this this would be a minimum fortnightly collection service of a 240-litre capacity container (either bin or sack). Local authorities may provide additional capacity or more frequent services and would be able to charge for this additional provision.	8. In addition to the new core set of materials that will be required to be collected, propose to promote separate collection of materials, where this is feasible, which can help to improve quality. Propose to amend the law to clarify this and will include guidance in proposed statutory guidance on minimum service standards to help local authorities and waste operators in decision making on separate collection.
9. Assuming a core set of materials must be collected for recycling, the government welcomes views on whether England should move to standardised waste container colours for those materials, together with residual waste, food and garden waste.	10. Statutory guidance on the minimum service standards to which local authorities will be required to have regard (detail of this guidance will be subject to consultation).
11. Continue support for Recycle Now and the tools produced by WRAP to help local authorities to communicate effectively on recycling.	12. Work with local authorities and others to improve transparency of information available to householders on the end destination for household recycling.
13. Additional comments section.	14. Propose developing a set of non-binding performance indicators for local authorities to use to monitor waste management and recycling and to highlight where services can be improved to delivery higher

	recycling and minimise waste. In addition to the headline household recycling rate for the local authority we would propose 4 additional indicators covering the yields of dry recycling, food waste for recycling, garden waste for recycling, and residual waste. We would also work with local authorities to develop these and other indicators to reflect areas such as quality or contamination levels and service delivery.
15. Look at metrics that can sit alongside weight-based metrics and will work with stakeholders to develop these as set out in the Resources and Waste Strategy.	16. Support and enable greater collaboration and partnership working between authorities where this would accelerate the move to consistent collections and improve recycling and delivery of services.
17. Increase recycling from businesses and other organisations that produce municipal waste. We think the most effective way of doing this would be to legislate so that these establishments have to segregate their recyclable waste from residual waste so that it can be collected and recycled by waste operators.	18. Where a business, public body or other organisation produces sufficient quantities of food waste we propose to legislate for this to be separated from residual waste and arrangements made for it to be collected and recycled.
19. If 18 adopted, support businesses, public sector and other organisations to make the transition. In particular we would like to find ways to reduce the impact on small and micro businesses.	20. Work with waste producers and waste collectors in the non-household municipal sectors to improve reporting and data capture on waste and recycling performance of businesses and other organisations.

25. The consultation document has over 60 questions and a full copy can be found at the following: <https://consult.defra.gov.uk/environmental-quality/consultation-on-consistency-in-household-and-busin/>

RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATIONS

26. There is a total of 286 questions in the four separate consultation documents. These cover a very wide range of varied and complex issues that affect both local authorities and business.

27. Undoubtedly the introduction of a DRS and PRS has the potential to have a significant

impact on the waste and recycling collection arrangements currently provided by the Council. In addition, there could also be a reduction in the income it receives from Hampshire County Council for the sale of dry mixed recyclables.

28. The proposals in the Consistency in Household and Business Recycling Collections document, are the most relevant to the services arrangements currently delivered by this Council. Ultimately, if they are introduced by the government, this will result in a significant change to the way residents are required manage their waste and recycling.
29. Officers will work with the Head of Project Integra to prepare a response to all four consultations. Project Integra will respond on behalf of the partnership that represents all local authorities in Hampshire. Fareham Borough Council, will provide its own separate response to the four consultations.
30. It's important that the comments and views of the Streetscene Panel members inform the Councils response to the consultation. However, seeking the views of the panel on all 286 questions and coordinating a response within the prescribed timescale would be impracticable.
31. Therefore, the focus for the Streetscene Panel meeting will be on the Consistency in Household and Business Recycling Collections consultation. A report will then go to the April meeting of the Executive seeking approval for the Head of Streetscene to be given delegated authority to submit a response to the four consultations. This will be done in consultation with the Executive Member for Streetscene.
32. A full set of questions from the Consistency in Household and Business Recycling Collections document, as summarised in paragraph 20, are included in Appendix A.
33. In particular, it would be helpful receive the Streetscene Panel Members comments on the following key questions:
 - **Proposal 2:** We propose that the core set of materials will be glass bottles and containers, paper and card, plastic bottles, plastic pots tubs and trays, and steel and aluminium tins and cans.
 - **Proposal 4:** By 2023 we propose to legislate for local authorities to provide all kerbside properties and flats with access to at least a weekly separate collection service for food waste, including provision of containers and liners
 - **Proposal 7:** We are seeking views on whether households generating garden waste should be provided with access to a free collection service. If introduced this this would be a minimum fortnightly collection service of a 240-litre capacity container (either bin or sack). Local authorities may provide additional capacity or more frequent services and would be able to charge for this additional provision
 - **Proposal 8:** In addition to the new core set of materials that we will require to be collected, we want to promote separate collection of materials where this is feasible and can help to improve quality. We propose to amend the law to clarify this in our proposed statutory guidance on minimum service standards to help local authorities and waste operators in decision making on separate collection.
 - **Proposal 9:** Assuming that we progress with proposals for a core set of materials that must be collected for recycling, the Government welcomes

views on whether England should move to standardised waste container colours for those materials, together with residual waste, food and garden waste.

RISK ASSESSMENT

34. There are no significant risk considerations in relation to this report

CONCLUSION

35. The report provides a high-level overview of the proposals set out in the Resources and Waste Strategy recently published by the Government. It also provides an overview of the four consultations that are currently out and require a response submitted by 12 May 2019.

36. Officers are working with the Project Integra partnership to collate an appropriate response to each of the consultations. Each individual authority will submit their own response. The comments from the Streetscene Panel will be incorporated into the Councils response.

37. A report will be submitted to the April meeting of the Executive seeking approval for the Head of Streetscene to be given delegated authority to submit a response to the four consultations. This will be done in consultation with the Executive Member for Streetscene.

Appendices: Appendix A - Consultation on Consistency in Household and Business Recycling Collections in England

Background Papers:

Reference Papers:

Our Waste, Our Resources: A Strategy for England – 18 December 2018

Consultation on Reforming the UK Packaging Producer Responsibility System – 18 February 2019

Consultation on Introducing a Deposit Return Scheme in England, Wales and Northern Ireland – 18 February 2019

Consultation on Consistency in Household and Business Recycling in England – 18 February 2019

Plastic Packaging Tax Consultation – 18 February 2019

Enquiries:

For further information on this report please contact Mark Bowler. (Ext 4420)

APPENDIX A - Consultation on Consistency in Household and Business Recycling Collections in England

Questions 1 – 4 relate to organisation.

Proposal 1: We propose that all local authorities in England should be required to collect a core set of dry recyclable materials from houses and flats.

5. Setting aside the details of how it would be achieved, do you agree or disagree with the proposal that local authorities should be required to collect a set of core materials for recycling?

- ☐ Agree – local authorities should be required to collect a core set of materials
- ☐ Disagree – local authorities should not be required to collect a core set of materials
- ☐ Not sure/don't have an opinion

6. We think it should be possible for all local authorities to collect the core set of materials. Do you agree with this?

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

If you disagree please provide further information and evidence on what circumstances it is not practicable to collect the full set of materials in below:

7. What special considerations or challenges might local authorities face in implementing this requirement for existing flats and houses in multiple occupancy?

8. What other special considerations should be given to how this proposal could apply to flats? Please provide additional information on your answer.

9. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 1?

Proposal 2: We propose that the core set of materials will be glass bottles and containers, paper and card, plastic bottles, plastic pots tubs and trays, and steel and aluminium tins and cans.

10. Do you believe that all of these core materials should be included or any excluded? (Required) Should be included in the core set Should be excluded from the core set

- ☐ glass bottles and containers
- ☐ paper and cardboard
- ☐ plastic bottles

- ☐ plastic pots, tubs and trays
- ☐ steel and aluminium tins and cans

11. What, if any, other products or materials do you believe should be included in the core set that all local authorities will be required to collect?

- ☐ food and drinks cartons
- ☐ plastic bags and film

12. If you think any of these or other items should or should not be included in the core set immediately please use the box below to briefly explain your view.

13. If you think these or other items should be considered for inclusion at a later stage, what changes would be needed to support their inclusion?

14. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 2?

Proposal 3: We propose that this core set of materials should be regularly reviewed by government and, if appropriate, expanded over time provided that a) evidence supports the benefits, b) there are viable processing technologies for proposed materials, c) there are sustainable end markets, d) local authorities would not be adversely affected, including financially.

15. Do you agree that the core set should be regularly reviewed and, provided certain conditions are met, expanded?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure/ don't have an opinion

16. Do you believe that the proposed conditions a) b) c) and d) above are needed order to add a core material?

- ☐ Yes -but would also add some (please specify in box below)
- ☐ No -some/all should be removed (please specify in box below)
- ☐ No - some should be added and some removed (please specify in box below)
- ☐ Not sure/don't have an opinion

17. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 3?

Proposal 4: By 2023 we propose to legislate for local authorities to provide all kerbside properties and flats with access to at least a weekly separate collection service for food waste, including provision of containers and liners

18. Which aspects of the proposal do you agree and disagree with?

- ☐ a separate collection of food waste (i.e not mixed with garden waste)
- ☐ services to be changed only as and when contracts allow

- ☐ providing free caddy liners to householders for food waste collections

19. Are there circumstances where it would not be practical to provide a separate food waste collection to kerbside properties or flats?

- ☐ Yes - please provide further details in the box below
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure/don't have an opinion/not applicable

20. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 4?

Proposal 5: We will provide funding and support to local authorities to help put in place the necessary collections infrastructure.

21. If you are responding on behalf of a local authority, what kind of support would be helpful to support food waste collection? (tick as many as apply)

- ☐ I am not responding on behalf of a local authority
- ☐ Specific financial support (please specify)
- ☐ Procurement support, (e.g. free advice on renegotiating contracts; centralised purchasing of containers)
- ☐ Communications support, (e.g. free collateral that can be adapted and used locally)
- ☐ Technical support, (e.g. free advice from a consultant about round re-profiling)
- ☐ Other (please specify ...)

22. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 5?

Proposal 6: We believe it would be desirable for local authorities that have contractual commitments with in-vessel composting (IVC) facilities, which needs mixed garden and food waste, to require separate presentation of food waste but then be able to mix it with garden waste for treatment purposes. This is because our evidence shows that separate presentation of food waste leads to higher yields.

23. What are your views on this proposal?

Proposal 7: We are seeking views on whether households generating garden waste should be provided with access to a free collection service. If introduced this this would be a minimum fortnightly collection service of a 240-litre capacity container (either bin or sack). Local authorities may provide additional capacity or more frequent services and would be able to charge for this additional provision

24. Which aspects of the proposal do you agree or disagree with?

- ☐ a free garden waste collection for all households with gardens

- ☐ (ii) A capacity to 240l (bin or other container eg sack)
- ☐ (iii) A fortnightly collection frequency (available at least through the growing season)
- ☐ (iv) ability to charge households for additional capacity/collections/containers over the set minimum capacity requirement
- ☐ this new requirement to start from 2023 (subject to funding and waste contracts)

25. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 7?

Proposal 8: In addition to the new core set of materials that we will require to be collected, we want to promote separate collection of materials where this is feasible and can help to improve quality. We propose to amend the law to clarify this in our proposed statutory guidance on minimum service standards to help local authorities and waste operators in decision making on separate collection.

26. Do you agree the proposed approach to arrangements for separate collection of dry materials for recycling to ensure quality?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure / don't have an opinion

27. What circumstances may prevent separate collection of paper, card, glass, metals and plastics? Please be as specific as possible and provide evidence.

28. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 8?

Proposal 9: Assuming that we progress with proposals for a core set of materials that must be collected for recycling, the Government welcomes views on whether England should move to standardised waste container colours for those materials, together with residual waste, food and garden waste.

29. Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Agree - bin colours should be standardised for all waste streams
- ☐ Agree in part - bin colours should be standardised for some waste streams but not all please specify which
- ☐ Disagree -bin colours should not be standardised for any waste streams
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

30. There would be potential for significant costs from introducing standardised bins colours from a specific date. What views do you have on a phased approach or alternative ways to standardising the colours of containers for different materials?

- ☐ Phased approach 1 - as and when contracts are renewed
- ☐ Phased approach 2 - as and when old/unserviceable bins are replaced
- ☐ Other ways please specify in box below

31. Do you have any other comments about Proposal 9?

Proposal 10: We are proposing to prepare statutory guidance on minimum service standards to which local authorities will be required to have regard. We will consult separately on what should be included in the statutory guidance.

32. Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to publish statutory guidance?

- ☐ Agree - government should publish statutory guidance
- ☐ Disagree - government should not publish statutory guidance
- ☐ Not sure/ no opinion/ not applicable

33. We propose reviewing the guidance every few years, revising it as required and then allowing sufficient lead-in time to accommodate the changes. Do you agree or disagree with this timescale?

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree - it should be more often
- ☐ Disagree - it should be less often
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

34. Subject to further analysis and consultation we propose to use the guidance to set a minimum service standard for residual waste collection of at least every alternative week. Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree - it should be more often
- ☐ Disagree - it should be less often
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

35. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 10?

Proposal 11: We will continue our support for Recycle Now and the tools produced by WRAP to help local authorities to communicate effectively on recycling.

36. Do you have any comments to make about Proposal 11?

37. What information do householders and members of the public need to help them recycle better?

Proposal 12: We will work with local authorities and others to improve transparency of information available to householders on the end destination for household recycling.

38. Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- ☐ Agree – government should work with local authorities and other stakeholders on this
- ☐ Disagree – government should not work with local authorities and other stakeholders on this
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

39. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 12?

Proposal 13: Government recognises that for the proposed waste collection and recycling measures to work effectively, stable markets for waste commodities need to be developed. Government's view is that consistent collections by local authorities, with associated implementation of minimum service standards, and improved material quality, will give investors greater confidence that there will be a steady, sustained supply of quality recyclable materials to enable them to deliver required waste sorting and recycling infrastructure in the UK.

40. Please use this space to briefly explain any comments you have on this proposal.

Proposal 14: We propose developing a set of non-binding performance indicators for local authorities to use to monitor waste management and recycling and to highlight where services can be improved to delivery higher recycling and minimise waste. In addition to the headline household recycling rate for the local authority we would propose 4 additional indicators covering the yields of dry recycling, food waste for recycling, garden waste for recycling, and residual waste. We would also work with local authorities to develop these and other indicators to reflect areas such as quality or contamination levels and service delivery.

41. Do you agree or disagree that introducing non-binding performance indicators for waste management and recycling is a good idea?

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree (please explain in the box below)
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

42. Do you agree or disagree that the proposed indicators are appropriate?

- ☐ Agree

- ☐ Disagree (please explain why in the box below)
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

43. Do you have any comments to make about Proposal 14 or examples of indicators currently in use that may be of assistance?

Proposal 15: We will look at metrics that can sit alongside weight-based metrics and will work with stakeholders to develop these as set out in the Resources and Waste Strategy.

44. Do you agree that alternatives to weight-based metrics should be developed to understand recycling performance?

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree (please explain why in the box below)
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

45. Do you agree that these alternatives should sit alongside current weight-based metrics

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree (please explain why in box below)
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

46. What environmental, economic or social metrics should we consider developing as alternatives to weight-based metrics?

Proposal 16: We want to support and enable greater collaboration and partnership working between authorities where this would accelerate the move to consistent collections and improve recycling and delivery of services.

47. Do you agree that greater partnership working between authorities will lead to improved waste management and higher levels of recycling?

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree (please explain why in the box below)
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

48. What are the key barriers to greater partnership working?

49. How might Government help overcome these barriers?

50. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 16?

Proposal 17: We want to increase recycling from businesses and other organisations that produce municipal waste. We think the most effective way of doing this would be to legislate so that these establishments have to segregate their recyclable waste from residual waste so that it can be collected and recycled by waste operators.

51. Do you agree or disagree that businesses, public bodies and other organisations that produce municipal waste should be required to separate dry recyclable material from residual waste so that it can be collected and recycled?

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree (please explain in the box below)
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

52. Which of the 3 options do you favour?

- ☐ Option 1 mixed dry recycling and separate glass recycling; no food waste collected for recycling
 - ☐ Option 2 mixed dry recycling and separate food recycling; no glass recycling
 - ☐ Option 3 mixed dry recycling, separate glass recycling, separate food recycling
- Something else (please explain in the box below)
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

53. We would expect businesses to be able to segregate waste for recycling in all circumstances but we are interested in views on where this may not be practicable for technical, environmental or economic reasons

- ☐ Yes – it should be practicable to segregate waste for recycling in all circumstances
- ☐ No – some exceptions are needed for particular circumstances (please provide examples below)
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

54. Should some businesses, public sector premises or other organisations be exempt from the requirement?

- ☐ Yes (which ones and why? Please use box below)
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

55. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 17? For example, do you think that there are alternatives to legislative measures that would be effective in increasing business recycling?

Proposal 18: Where a business, public body or other organisation produces sufficient quantities of food waste we propose to legislate for this to be separated from residual waste and arrangements made for it to be collected and recycled.

56. Do you agree or disagree that businesses, public bodies or other organisations that produce sufficient quantities of food waste should be required to separate it from residual waste so that it can be collected and recycled?

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree (please explain in the box below)
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

57. Do you agree or disagree that there should be a minimum threshold, by weight, for businesses public bodies or other organisations to be required to separate food waste for collection?

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree (please explain in the box below)
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

58. Do you have any views on how we should define 'sufficient' in terms of businesses producing 'sufficient' quantities of food waste to be deemed in scope of the regulations?

59. Do you have any views on how we should define 'food-producing' businesses?

60. In addition to those businesses that produce below a threshold amount of food waste, should any other premises be exempt from the requirement?

- ☐ Yes (which ones and why? Please use box below)
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

61. Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 18?

Proposal 19: If the measures at Proposal 18 are adopted, we would like to support businesses, public sector and other organisations to make the transition. In particular we would like to find ways to reduce the financial burden on small and micro businesses.

62. What are your views on the options proposed to reduced costs?

63. Are there other ways to reduce the cost burden that we have overlooked?

64. Do you have any other views on how we can support businesses and other organisations to make the transition to improved recycling arrangements?

Proposal 20: As part of implementing consistency, we will work with waste producers and waste collectors in the non-household municipal sectors to improve reporting and data capture on waste and recycling performance of businesses and other organisations. Any requirements will be subject to consultation.

65. Do you have any views on whether businesses and other organisations should be required to report data on their waste recycling performance?

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree (please explain why in the box below)

☐ Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

66. Do you have any other comment on Proposal 20?

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Presentation to Streetscene Scrutiny Panel

Date: 14 March 2019

Subject: Waste and Recycling Collection Arrangements

SUMMARY

This presentation will outline the current Refuse and Recycling arrangements and compare them with other Local Authority arrangements.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Members consider the contents of the presentation and make any comments or raise any questions for clarification.

