



- 3.1 The city centre has a high housing density and a high turnover of population. Many properties do not have outside space. Most properties in the area receive a weekly recycling collection rather than fortnightly because many residents do not have the room to store recycling for a week. The high population turn over makes it difficult to communicate with residents about collection days and how they can access the service. These factors contribute to recycling rates in the city centre being lower than in suburban areas as evidenced by relatively low tonnages of recycling collected per household.
- 3.2 Where residents do recycle, boxes are used as litter bins by passers by, which affects the quality of the recycling and can result in wind blown litter.
- 3.3 In November 2011 3,200 residents in Brunswick and Adelaide ward were asked whether they wanted to give communal recycling a go. 87% of respondents were in favour of the trial and it was introduced in April 2012. The trial has gone very well. There have been very few complaints during the roll out and all of these were addressed quickly.

*Response to consultation*

- 3.4 In July 2012 residents in the trial areas were asked for their feedback. The results of the consultation are summarised below and a full copy of the consultation report is attached as Appendix 1.
- 3.5 Questionnaires were sent out to 3274 properties on 26 roads. 637 responses were received (a response rate of 19 %). Of the respondents:
- 64% feel communal recycling is easier to use than the black box scheme;
  - 35% of people recycle more; 50% recycle about the same and 8% recycle less
  - 14% did not recycle using the black box scheme, now only 4% do not recycle
  - 78% agree the streets look better without the black boxes; 8% disagree
  - 75% agree the existing bin locations are suitable; 16% disagree
  - 73% prefer the new scheme; 17% prefer the black box scheme.
- 3.6 The results show residents have a strong preference for communal recycling over the kerbside collection scheme. Respondents had the option of providing specific comments which are also detailed in the report. The most comments were for requests for more glass bins. Locations for glass bins are very restricted as they need to be located away from people's homes because of the noise of glass smashing on glass and against the metal container. Within the trial area there is limited scope to increase the number of glass bins. Officers have explored with bin manufacturers ways of trying to silence the impact of glass without success. However the tonnage of material collected for recycling has increased significantly indicating that the availability of glass bins is not preventing residents from recycling it.
- 3.7 The second most frequent comment was that the bins required more frequent emptying especially at weekends. In response to this feedback additional bins have been put in place and bins emptied just before a weekend. However, the council will need to operate a weekend service in line with the current communal refuse service, to minimise the number of bins on the highway and ensure bins are not overflowing.

3.8 The additional collections over the weekend would result in a maximum of two vehicles tipping at the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) up to two times per day (up to 8 tips over the weekend). In line with current permissions no processing of materials would take place over the weekend. The change to the opening times to enable the vehicles to tip would require a consequential amendment to conditions attached to the planning permission for the MRF. Cityclean officers are working with colleagues from planning and Veolia, to progress the application.

#### *Impact on Recycling Tonnage*

3.9 The tonnage of material collected for recycling was measured before and after the trial. Before the trial the recycling rate was approximately 12.5%. In July the tonnage of material collected had increased by 70% bringing the recycling rate to 21%. Based on these projections, if communal recycling is rolled out across the whole communal refuse area it would result in a citywide increase in recycling rates of approximately 3%.

#### *DCLG Weekly Collection Support Scheme Bid*

3.10 In February 2012 DCLG launched its £250 million Weekly Collection Support Scheme designed to help authorities to increase the frequency and quality of waste collections and make it easier to recycle. In May 2012 the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee approved the submission of an outline bid to extend communal recycling to the remainder of the communal refuse area and authorised the Strategic Director of Place and Director of Finance to sign off the final bid which was submitted in August.

3.11 The bid was for £840,000 to cover the costs of a roll out including:

- The purchase of two new collection vehicles
- The purchase of a new van for a maintenance crew to repair and maintain the bins
- The purchase of 700 communal recycling bins and the equipment required for their installation
- Project management, consultation, engagement and evaluation costs

3.12 In November it was announced that the bid was successful. The authority will be able to draw down £800,000 worth of funding in 2013/14 and £40,000 in 2014/15.

#### *Consultation & Roll Out*

3.13 Following the success of the trial and securing the funding, permission is sought to consult residents on the roll out of the scheme to the communal refuse area, which amounts to a further 29,000 households in addition to the 3,200 which are already part of the trial. The proposed area excludes the Hanover area and Lewes Road/ Triangle area which have recently been consulted on communal refuse containment. An outline of the area is shown in Appendix 2.

3.14 As part of the scheme, communal bins for mixed recycling (paper, card, cans, and plastic bottles) would be placed in most streets, where possible adjacent to existing communal refuse bins. The bins will be smaller in size than the refuse bins. They will have 1100 litre capacity (as opposed to the 3200 litre refuse bins) and they will be held in place with fixing posts. They will be emptied by standard

refuse trucks. The number of bins in each location will depend on capacity requirements (in terms of number of households) and space available.

- 3.15 Glass bins will be sited in locations which are further away from domestic properties to reduce the noise impact on residents.
- 3.16 The area has been surveyed to identify proposed bin locations which do not form an obstruction to pedestrians or road users, are safe to use and service, and minimise nuisance for residents. The final locations have been agreed with Highways officers, parking and the emergency services. As far as possible loss of parking space has been minimised. Across the whole area it is anticipated that 153 permit holders' spaces will be lost, 107 shared bays and 11 Pay and Display bays.
- 3.17 As part of the scheme it is also proposed to introduce 12 new recycling points along the seafront using the same collection system, namely 1100 litre bins held in place with fixing posts. They would be serviced as part of the normal collection rounds.
- 3.18 Meetings have been arranged with Ward Councillors to get any feedback on the scheme and bin locations before the wide-scale public consultation.

*Improvements in Efficiency*

- 3.19 Communal recycling is more efficient than the existing black box collection service. The existing service is provided by three crews consisting of a driver and two loaders (9 employees) each using a kerbside collection vehicle. The new service would consist of two crews consisting of one driver and one loader and bin maintenance crew consisting of two operatives (6 employees). If the scheme was introduced the reduced staff numbers would be managed without the need for redundancies.
- 3.20 With the grant funding to cover the set up costs the scheme is expected to result in revenue savings of £741,000 to the Cityclean recycling collection budget and £237,000 worth of savings to the PFI waste reserve over six years as set out in the table below. Taking in to account the reduction in parking surplus the overall saving to the council is expected to be £516,000 in the first six years.

<b>Year</b>	<b>DCLG Grant</b>	<b>Saving to Cityclean budget</b>	<b>Saving to Waste PFI Reserve</b>
2013/14	£800,000	£ 47,000	£ 7,000
2014/15	£40,000	£ 65,000	£45,000
2015/16		£104,000	£47,000
2016/17		£170,000	£46,000
2017/18		£166,000	£46,000
2018/19		£189,000	£46,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£840,000</b>	<b>£741,000</b>	<b>£237,000</b>

**4. INCENTIVE SCHEMES**

*Incentive Scheme*

- 4.1 If communal recycling is rolled out it is proposed to introduce two incentive schemes to encourage residents to recycle more. The incentives would be funded through reduced disposal costs. Every tonne recycled rather than disposed results in a net saving of £44. The proposed incentive schemes are summarised below.
- 4.2 Incentive schemes run by private companies such as those run by Windsor and Maidenhead have been considered. These schemes offer residents points which they can redeem in a number of ways including discounts in shops. The rewards are based on the weight of recycling residents put out for collection. These schemes are complex, high cost and high risk to the authority. They would be more difficult to implement in the city centre because the amount of recycling put out for collection can not be attributed to individual households. The incentives proposed are simple low cost and low risk and can be amended and rolled out more widely if successful. They have been designed based on experience across the country.

#### *On The Spot Rewards*

- 4.3 This scheme has been developed to help raise the profile of the new service at the time of launch. Residents who use the communal recycling bins may receive a book of vouchers to use in local businesses or at local attractions. This will be presented when they place their recycling in the bin. The Commissioner for Arts and Culture and local businesses would be closely involved in the design and delivery of the scheme. The Tourism Alliance supports the scheme and discussion are on going with the Business Improvement District representing many small businesses. Officers would work with residents associations and groups to target different areas on different days and different times to hand the vouchers out. Waste reduction and re-use will also be promoted.
- 4.4 This scheme would initially run for a period of 12 months to help raise the profile of the service with a view to running it for two years depending on if it works or not.
- 4.5 A letter of support for the scheme from the Tourism Alliance is attached as Appendix 3.

#### *Community Rewards*

- 4.6 A community fundraising scheme has been developed to allow community groups to benefit directly from an increase recycling rates over and above the improvements expected as a result of the new service. Residents would be able to vote for charities or local community projects who would receive a share of the savings arising from increasing recycling rates and reduced disposal costs. The proportion of funding ring fenced for the incentive would depend on how much the recycling rate increases but is expected to be up to £10,000 per year. The performance of the scheme has been modelled conservatively based on experience of a similar scheme in Lewes which saw an increase of 17%.
- 4.7 As part of the consultation residents would be able to vote for the charity or project of their choice and the three with the highest votes will receive a share of the savings. It is anticipated that the charities and community groups will further encourage people to increase the amount they recycle, incentivised by the income they would receive.

4.8 The incentive schemes will be worked up in further detail and presented to a future Committee meeting for approval should the consultation on the scheme be favourable.

## **5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION**

5.1 As part of the trial, early engagement took place with residents associations and groups, and an exhibition was held. All residents were written to three times, once to ask if they wanted to give the trial a go, the second time to inform them of the decision to go ahead with the trial and further details of how it would work and the final time to get their feedback after implementation.

5.2 This report seeks permission to consult the remaining 29,000 households on proposals to roll out communal recycling in their area. The format will be the same as that used for the trial. Residents will be asked to comment on the scheme in general and on specific bin locations in their street and those in nearby streets. The consultation document will be very similar to that used in the trial and is attached as Appendix 4. The loss of parking spaces will be made clear in the document.

5.3 On completion of the consultation a report will be presented to this committee detailing the outcome of the consultation and recommendations based on that outcome.

## **6. TIME SCALES**

6.1 The key time-scales for the project are set out below.

<b>Month</b>	<b>Activity</b>
January 2013	Brief ward councillors
February 2013	Commence Consultation
May/ June 2013	Report to Committee with outcome of consultation and recommendations.

6.2 If following the consultation the decision is made to go ahead with the scheme the roll out would take place between September and December 2013.

## **7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Financial Implications:

- 7.1 Brighton and Hove City Council has been awarded funding of £840,000 to finance the roll out of the scheme. By introducing communal recycling, savings of £16,000 are forecast for the first year, net of the lost parking revenue. This is expected to rise to £151,000 by year six. The overall savings to the Council are estimated to be £517,000 over a six year period, having taken into account the impact of the loss of parking revenue in the affected bays.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw*

*Date: 02/01/13*

Legal Implications:

- 7.2 The council has powers to specify and provide the types of receptacles to be used for depositing waste for collection and may also require particular locations, including the highway, to be used. There are no adverse Human Rights Act implications to be taken into account.

In carrying out consultation the Council is under a general duty to ensure that any consultation is fair. This means that it must be carried out when proposals are being formulated, that adequate time and information about proposals must be given to consultees to ensure that they can provide a proper response, and that any consultation responses must be properly considered in reaching the decision.

*Lawyer Consulted: Elizabeth Culbert*

*Date: 13/1/13*

Equalities Implications:

- 7.3 Communal collections have been subject to an equalities impact assessment. Representatives of groups who may have difficulty accessing the service have been consulted. Any resident who has trouble accessing the communal recycling service would be offered an assisted doorstep collection. They will receive a weekly collection from their property on an agreed day of the week.

Sustainability Implications:

- 7.4 The trial has shown that communal recycling leads to a significant increase in recycling rates. Analysis of the tonnage of material collected for recycling before and after the trial showed an increase of 70%. If the scheme is rolled out across the city centre it is anticipated that the citywide recycling rate will increase by approximately 3%.
- 7.5 Communal recycling is also expected to reduce street clutter caused by recycling boxes being left out and reduce wind blown litter.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 7.6 There are no crime and disorder implications.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 7.7 Communal collections in the city centre are proven through the communal refuse scheme which was rolled out widely in 2009. In addition the communal recycling service has been trialled since April 2012 to fully understand how the residents would find the scheme, how it would work and reduce any problems and risks.

Public Health Implications:

- 7.8 There are no public health implications

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 7.9 If communal recycling is rolled out in the city centre it is expected to result in the city-wide recycling rate increasing by 3%.

**8. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):**

- 8.1 Recognising the difficulty residents face in storing recycling in the city centre the collection frequency with the current service is already weekly, compared to fortnightly for the remainder of the city. Despite this higher frequency of collection participation rates and recycling rates are still low.

- 8.2 Underground recycling bins have been considered but are too costly to install in a city like Brighton due to underground services and structures.

**9. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 9.1 Consulting with residents on the proposed scheme will help inform recommendations regarding whether the scheme should be rolled out or not.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Appendices:**

1. Consultation Report summarising the outcome of the consultation in the trial area (July 2012)
2. Map showing outline of proposed Communal Recycling Area
3. Letter of Support for Incentive Scheme from Tourism Alliance
4. Draft consultation document