

# LANCASHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP REPORT

## Introduction

I have now attended two full committees and two meetings of the Strategy Sub Group at County Hall.

The more important initiatives of the full committees have filtered through to the Community Services reports to yourselves from our officers.

One was the increase in the items being accepted for recycling by the County to include pots, tubs and trays, additional marketing material being supplied to promote this to our residents. Another activity was the offer by the County to financially support approved schemes we put forward to attempt to increase recycling rates, such as to purchase additional blue bins for schools and larger bins for larger families - County eventually only agreed to provide finance for replacing lilac bags, where appropriate.

In the long-term, L.C.C. aim to increase recycling rates as much as possible, to assist in achieving national targets, to reduce the cost of land-fill and because morally much of the electorate are keen to save the planet. The boroughs always have a tension with the County over the way of achieving these aims, because the costs of more complicated collection fall on their ratepayers in terms of vehicles staffing and running expenses. The chairman decided to recreate the member Sub Group to try to develop some 'blue sky' thinking to help with finding ways of improving efficiency and recycling rates across the County. This report focuses on some of the work that is being done.

## Comparison of District Recycling

Research was done by County officers to compare our performance with other comparable districts, though since the figures were produced, ours have substantially improved - we are now around 38 % recycling by weight.

In our county, Wyre was 42.9%, whilst Fylde was 47.5%. Lower recycling rates include Rossendale at 34.1%, Blackburn at 30.0%, Blackpool at 35.8%, Preston at 29.8%, Hyndburn at 33.3%, Pendle at 31.9% and Lancaster at 35.6%, though some of these rates may have increased since the reports were made.

The performance of a district is very much conditioned by the population, average distance between collection points and the council/ business tax/government income to fund the service. County believe that Derbyshire Dales (based around Matlock) are a fair comparison with similar geography and a population of 75,000, though our population is around 25% less. The Waste Management Officer has drawn up a comparison spread-sheet between the two districts (Appendix 1), Derbyshire Dales claiming a recycling rate of 60%. The main differences are that Derbyshire Dales collect residual waste every fortnight, food waste separately every week and use Serco instead of a direct labour force. Councillors and the general public in Ribble Valley have a great enthusiasm for weekly collections and from past experience of Serco I believe we get a much better service from direct labour. County think that residents will recycle more on a fortnightly residual collection, because residents will be coerced into using the recycling bins more due to lack of red bin space.

At the Sub Group, the Chair decided not to analyse individually the details of all the comparison sites with Lancashire districts, but instead to ask us to see if we could determine ourselves where we might make improvements. Recently, the County Service Development Manager has sent out a briefing paper entitled Reduction and Recycling Plans to each district.

Before leaving this section of the report, it is worth noting that none of the Lancashire districts collect food waste currently, because the County does not currently support the disposal of a food waste stream. All the comparison districts from outside the County did collect food waste, so of course their recycling figures were helped above ours by not having food waste in the red bin. Apparently, the Environment Bill may be asking us to collect food waste separately, and we will need to consider how we handle this. In anticipation of this possibility, County are running trials in two villages in Lancaster evaluating the food waste processing in a plant at Thornton. They would anticipate building a new plant that would process 20 tonnes food waste at a time, to produce an inert land-fill that has a moderate commercial value.

### Reduction and Recycling Plans

The Reduction and Recycling Plans are aspirational documents (without costings at this stage) that will be produced by each borough/ collection authority, to indicate how they would hope to progress over the long-term. They will not only show how they would hope to increase recycling rates, but also how to encourage the public to reduce what is put in the red bin in the first place. The main Waste Partnership Committee is hoping to start considering what all boroughs have suggested at future meetings, starting on 26<sup>th</sup>. March, but I think this may be a bit over optimistic. Our officers may wish to comment.

### Other Issues arising during Member Sub Group

The Sub Group has not been well attended, but a number of other issues have been discussed within.

The issue of bring sites was raised, because Derbyshire Dales had more than us. The development manager believed, even if developed, these could not make a significant difference to our recycling rate. (Subsequent research showed that Derbyshire have removed all glass bring sites in 2016 since introducing recycling bins at home, we did this last year due to poor tonnage values, contamination and fly-tipping at the sites. 51 tonnes glass collected over 12 months from 11 sites). For example, glass that potentially provides a useful stream only contributes 3 – 4 % of residual waste, despite its value and heavy energy consumption in production. Our residents naturally welcome chances of recycling as many different materials as possible, but this may end up as being more psychological window-dressing than effective.

County believe that we would get a higher paper recycling rate (potentially we would at a cost to the council and for no income at the present time), if we used bins, instead of paper sacks. Figures (Appendix 2) show that a majority of other boroughs in Lancashire do get a higher proportion of paper relative to residual waste. This would result in an improvement in the recycling rate, but bins (and their collection) are more expensive than paper sacks. Some colleagues may want to review how we revise paper collection, but this may be complicated. ahead, we were told recently at

Committee that the market price of paper had collapsed from around £100/tonne to near zero, because of China's decision not to import any more recycled paper. Amongst many others, Langho Village Hall can consequentially no longer fund raise through a skip paper collection scheme.

The Environment Bill will give us some good things. Stronger fly tipping legislation is expected. Absolute volumes of waste are likely to be reduced by the possible introduction of a packaging tax and some Deposit Recycling Schemes will be encouraged, if not forced. Companies are demonstrating some awareness, such as Tesco in removing the plastic wrapping around multiple can offers. Operation of the refuse collection by combinations of authorities will be allowed by statute. Several other Lancashire authorities operate direct labour forces, though all collect residual waste fortnightly.

The County are looking to us making further increases in recycling, at least to 50%. Figures have been produced showing that at this level, the land-fill cost of Ribble Valley's residual waste as paid by Lancashire would be reduced by around £300,000 and they are suggesting that they might pass on some of this saving back to us. If food waste processing has to be introduced, the County have said that they will investigate ways of reducing the districts' costs indirectly by joint procurement deals for the necessary vehicles and caddies.

Cllr. Tony Austin  
Waste Partnership Member for Ribble Valley Borough Council

	Derbyshire Dales	Ribble Valley
RESIDUAL	Supply 140 bin as standard	same
	240 bin for 5 or more residents	240 bin for 6 or more
	Fortnightly	weekly
FOOD COLLECTION	23litre food waste caddy	none
	Weekly collection	
PAPER/CARD	Supply 240 bin	Sacks
	Fortnightly	same
GREEN	Supply 240 bin	240 bin standard
	fortnightly	fortnightly
	Currently free, intend charges	free
RECYCLING	Supply 240 bin	140 bin
	Fortnightly	same
	Excess collected if clearly identified as recycle	No excess collected
BATTERIES	Collection in clear plastic bag	No collection
	fortnightly	
COMPOSTING	Discounted bin scheme	No scheme
NON BIN CUSTOMERS		
Residual	Black sacks-resident to provide	Lilac sacks issued free
	Max 4 bags per fortnight	52 bags for year
Paper	'ikea' type bag	Plastic sack
	fortnightly	fortnightly
Plastic Bottles	'ikea' type bag	No provision
	fortnightly	
Glass, tins, plastics,aerosols	Plastic box	No provision
	Fortnightly	
Green	Plastic sacks 42/year foc	No provision
	Fortnightly	
TRADE	No recycling service	Same
BULKY WASTE	Up to 3 items £21.50	Up to 4 items £15.00

	4-6 items      £35.00	Extra items £4.50 each
	Washers/fridge/freezer etc      £18.50	As above
	2-3 washers etc £24.50	
		Bulky waste £48/hr
	Concessions for over 65	No concessions
<b>BIN CHARGES</b>	All charged for	Charged
	Missing/replacement- charged	free
	Recycling replacement free	free
	Larger bin- charged for	Free exchange
<b>HWRC</b>	4	2
	Open 7 days/week	Open 5 days/ week
	08.30-18.00	09.00-17.00
<b>BRING SITES</b>		
Textile banks	16	14
Books, CD's DVD's	8	1
Shoes	18	7
<b>OPERATOR</b>	Serco	In-house

These figures are extracted from November's Waste Partnership reports with my calculated percentages comparing paper and residual tonnages for each borough over a rolling year -

Authority	Residual	Paper	%
Chorley	22642	3804	16.8
Burnley	19251	1905	9.9
Fylde	17454	3257	18.7
Hyndburn	14185	2576	18.2
Lancaster	28802	3607	12.5
Pendle	21427	2301	10.7
Preston	34913	4565	13.1
South Ribble	21784	3581	16.4
Blackpool	39184	3714	9.5
*Ribble Valley	15545	1544	9.9
Rosendale	16036	1795	11.2
West Lancs	22474	4694	20.9
Wyre	23325	4333	18.6