

<b>Title of meeting:</b>	Environment & Community Safety Decision Meeting
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	25 January 2017
<b>Subject:</b>	Household Waste Collection in Portsmouth
<b>Report by:</b>	Director of Property and Housing
<b>Wards affected:</b>	Fratton, Paulsgrove, Hilsea, Copnor, Milton, Baffins, Cosham
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Full Council decision:</b>	No

---

## **1. Purpose of report**

- 1.1. To provide feedback on the trial to provide some residents in Cosham with a wheelie bin for rubbish.
- 1.2. To provide options, and a recommendation, for the development of the collection of household rubbish in Portsmouth.

## **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1. That the operational roll-out, measures and feedback of the trial for wheelie bins for rubbish in Highbury are noted.
- 2.2. That the options available are reviewed, taking note of the legal and financial comments
- 2.3. In line with the current strategic approach of the council, it is recommended that Option 3 is taken forward. This would see the following:
  - 2.3.1. Continue with the trial in Highbury for at least another six months.
  - 2.3.2. Extend the trial of wheelie bins for rubbish across selected parts of the city
  - 2.3.3. Undertaking a trial for rubbish restriction in an area where the houses are flat-fronted.

## **3. Background**

- 3.1. The council has an obligation under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA 1990) to collect and dispose of household waste. The current methods for doing this were outlined in a report to the Cabinet Member for Environment & Community Safety on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2016.

## **4. Trial of wheelie bins for rubbish in Highbury**

- 4.1. Following the decision taken by the Cabinet member for Environment & Community Safety on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2016, a trial was undertaken to provide residents in the Highbury part of Cosham with a black wheelie bin for rubbish. Collections remained weekly on the existing collection day of the week.
- 4.2. Communications began in July and the first collections from the new bin took place on 23<sup>rd</sup> September.

- 4.3. All houses were provided with a 140ltr wheelie from which rubbish would be collected. Any waste not in the bin was left.
- 4.4. A detailed report on the operational roll-out of the trial is shown in Appendix 1. The main summary points are as follows:
  - 4.4.1. The trial was delivered to the original timetable.
  - 4.4.2. A range of direct communications was used, including several opportunities on the doorstep for residents to talk to council officers.
  - 4.4.3. Biffa supplied the bins to the council at a lower cost than originally anticipated, to minimise risk on quality and delivery times. Bins cost a total of £21,089 and were delivered to residents within three days.
  - 4.4.4. Bins were provided at least one week before the first collection. Some residents put their bin out for collection a week early, but this was handled by the Biffa crew.
  - 4.4.5. The first week of the trial raised a number of operational problems, such as use of the lifting equipment and location of the bins, which were resolved either on that day, or within 1-2 weeks.
  - 4.4.6. Written feedback was provided to residents who had put out additional waste, telling them what had gone wrong, and what they needed to do to resolve it.
  - 4.4.7. Only a small number of residents (>4%) have contacted the council to formally ask for a larger bin. Of these, less than 2% require one because they are recycling all they can and produce large amounts of waste on a regular basis.

## **5. Measures of the trial**

- 5.1. Details of the various measures of the trial are shown in Appendix 2. The main findings from this were as follows:
  - 5.1.1. The amount of waste tonnage collected has reduced by approximately 15% (2.3 tonnes) since the start of the trial. This compares with there being no significant change across the whole city.
  - 5.1.2. Some of this waste has been transferred into the recycling stream, with a rise of 0.5 tonnes per fortnight. The recycling rate for this area has risen from 20.7% to 24.7%.
  - 5.1.3. On the first week of collection 91.5% of houses put all of their waste in the bin correctly and presented it at the right place for collection. This figure has risen to 99% over the first two months of the trial.
  - 5.1.4. The standard of cleanliness was found to be high before the trial, and audits during the trial have found that this has been maintained. The survey of residents shows that 61% perceive the roads are cleaner since the trial began.
  - 5.1.5. It is not possible to show if residents are taking their waste to the Household Waste Recycling Centre. However, probably due to other changes at the site, the overall tonnage at the HWRC has fallen compared to the same period in 2015.
  - 5.1.6. There has not been a recorded change in the amount of household rubbish being dumped or fly-tipped.
  - 5.1.7. The survey shows that the majority of residents (74%) would rather keep the wheelie bin for rubbish than return to sacks on the streets.

5.1.8. The total cost of the trial was £28,105. Of this £21,089 was spent on bins, with the rest being spent on communications and council officer time, which was diverted from other duties

5.1.9. The total saving from reduction in rubbish, and small increase in recycling collected, is approximately £9,000pa. There are no savings associated with the collection of the waste.

## **6. Options**

6.1. Learning from the trial in Highbury and the financial constraints upon the portfolio budgets, officers have identified a number of options for changing the way that rubbish is collected in Portsmouth. These are outlined in Appendix 3 as follows:

6.1.1. Option 1 - Don't extend the wheelie bins for household rubbish trial beyond the current area and do a different trial to reduced household rubbish in flat-fronted areas.

6.1.2. Option 2 - Undertake two trials for the fortnightly collection of rubbish, one in the current trial area and one in a flat-fronted area.

6.1.3. Option 3 - extending the trial of wheelie bins for rubbish to some new parts of the city, and undertaking a different trial to reduced household rubbish in flat-fronted areas.

6.2. To meet the council's current strategy to retain weekly collections of rubbish, yet, minimise rubbish, improve recycling and improve street cleanliness, the recommend option is Option 3. The details of this are as follows:

6.2.1. Continue with the trial in Highbury for at least another six months. There are no anticipated costs to this change as the bins have already been provided and the existing vehicle and crew would continue with the collections as they currently do.

6.2.2. Extend the trial of wheelie bins for rubbish in a number of other parts of the city.

- To establish the impact of wheelie bins for rubbish on a larger scale, and in other parts of the city, it is proposed that the trial is extended to four other areas across the city, comprising approximately of 6,500 households.
- Bins would be procured directly from a supplier to maximise the value for money to the council.
- A new lifter would be fitted to the back of a single vehicle (Refuse 1), who would collect rubbish from wheelie bins on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.
- The total cost from this trial would be approximately £133,000, with an estimated annual saving from the reduction in waste disposal of £41,446.

6.2.3. Undertaking trials for rubbish in an area where the houses are flat-fronted. Undertaking two trials within a single collection round in the Fratton part of the city to restrict rubbish in areas where the houses generally have a small or no forecourt in which to store a wheelie bin. These are:

- Provision of seagull proof sacks
- Provision of council refuse bags

By controlling the amount of rubbish collected each week the aim is that recycling rates and street cleanliness will improve.

Residents would be provided either with a reusable seagull proof sack or a number of disposable plastic bags and only rubbish which is presented in these would be collected. Weekly collections, would remain and residents would be given support in recycling by being able to get bigger or more recycling bins and advice about local bring banks.

Enforcement will take place if persistent incorrect presentation of waste (littering, dumping etc.) arises. Enforcement officers will patrol any hotspot areas and can use relevant legislation as required.

## **7. Reasons for recommendations**

- 7.1. Portsmouth has one of the lowest recycling rates in England. This is unsustainable and has a significant negative impact on the total cost of waste collection and disposal in the city.
- 7.2. Many streets become dirty as a result of rubbish bags being placed out for collection and, before the collection crew arrive, are attacked by animals and vermin.
- 7.3. The trial of a wheelie bin for rubbish in Highbury has proven to reduce the amount of waste collected, and improve recycling whilst also being popular with the majority of residents. A continuation of this trial, and an extension to some other suitable areas in the city, will help to establish the overall impact from this scheme whilst discovering any other issues not seen in the existing trial.
- 7.4. Undertaking an alternate trial in flat-fronted areas will show if a reduction in rubbish can be achieved without the use of wheelie bins.
- 7.5. Officers recognise the administration's current strategy for retaining weekly collections of rubbish. The option which meets this is option 3.

## **8. Equality impact assessment**

- 8.1. A full Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken on the service changes in Highbury and is attached in Appendix 4.
- 8.2. Preliminary Equalities Impact Assessments will be completed for the new trial areas if the recommendations within this report are accepted.

## **9. Legal implications**

- 9.1. The legal implications arising from the recommendations in this report are broadly the same as those previously identified in respect of the original wheeled bin trial and are as follows.
- 9.2. Waste collection is a function carried out by local authorities, as prescribed in Sections 45 and 45A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA 1990).
- 9.3. Section 46 of the EPA 1990 relates to receptacles for the placing of household waste for collection (most commonly refuse sacks or wheeled bins). Section 46(1) provides that "*Where a waste collection authority has a duty...to arrange for the collection of household waste from any premises, the authority may, by notice served on him, require the occupier to place the waste for collection in receptacles of a kind and number specified.* The City Council will rely on this report together with the additional written communications outlined, as meeting the statutory

requirement to give notice of the change. The receptacle for collection to be specified in the notice to occupiers will be a wheeled bin of 140ltr (or larger as deemed appropriate by the city council) or refuse sacks or seagull proof sacks as appropriate for the purposes of the alternative trial proposed

9.4. During the extended trial and the alternative trial, Section 46(3)(a) of the EPA 1990 will be applied, in that the wheeled bin, refuse sacks or seagull proof bags (as appropriate) will be provided free of charge. All wheeled bins, sacks and seagull proof bags will remain the property of the Council and the Council retain the right, at any point before, during or after the trial, to remove them from the properties. In the event of loss or damage to the wheeled bin, sacks or seagull proof bags the City Council may rely on Section 46(3)(b) of the EPA 1990 to require the resident to pay for replacements.

9.5. Under Section 46(4) of the EPA 1990 the City Council is able to include in the notice to occupiers provisions relating to the placing of the receptacle for emptying and the substances or articles which may or may not be put into them. These requirements will be made clear in communications with residents affected by the trials.

9.6. Under Section 46(5) of the EPA 1990 the City Council is required to obtain consent from the relevant highway authority for the wheeled bins or other waste receptacles to be placed on the highway and arrangements must be made as to the liability for any damage arising out of them being so placed. This issue will be discussed with the highway authority and the PFI contractor and permission obtained before any extended or alternative trial takes place.

## **10. Director of Finance's comments**

10.1. The recommendations contained within this report seek to extend the waste trial, to other parts of the City. It also seeks approval to undertake a trial in flat fronted properties, where residents would be provided with either a reusable seagull proof bag or a number of disposable plastic sacks and only rubbish which is presented in these would be collected.

10.2. The cost of the two trials and the anticipated annual savings are as follows:

Capital Cost:	Wheeled bins	£96,200
	Lifter for vehicles	£15,000
		<b>£111,200</b>
Revenue Costs		<u>£44,000</u>
<b>Total Cost of Trials</b>		<b>£155,200</b>
<b>Anticipated Annual Savings</b>		
Reduction in disposal costs		£42,800

Increase in recycling income

£300

Total Annual Savings

**£43,100**

- 10.3. Whilst the revenue costs are anticipated to be covered from existing portfolio reserves, the additional capital cost of £111,200 will require a contribution from corporate capital resources. Full Council will approve the Capital Programme at its meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017.
- 10.4. In the event that Full Council do not approve the funding of the proposals within this report, a subsequent report identifying an alternative funding would be required in order to enable the waste trial extension.

.....  
Signed by:  
Director of Property & Housing

#### **Appendices:**

Appendix 1 - Operational roll-out  
Appendix 2 - Measures and feedback  
Appendix 3 - Options for the household rubbish collection system  
Appendix 4 - Equality Impact Assessment  
Appendix 5 - Map of the city's rubbish collection rounds  
Appendix 6 - Report on the use of seagull proof sacks in Clacton.

#### **Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972**

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

<b>Title of document</b>	<b>Location</b>
Environmental Protection Act 1990	<a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/43/contents">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/43/contents</a>

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/  
rejected by ..... on .....

.....  
Signed by:  
Portfolio holder for Environment & Community Safety