



**Bromsgrove**  
District Council

[www.bromsgrove.gov.uk](http://www.bromsgrove.gov.uk)

# SCRUTINY REPORT

## REFUSE AND RECYCLING

—

## SCRUTINY REPORT

---

Completed January 2008

Committee Services Officer: Della McCarthy

# CONTENTS PAGE

	<b>Page Number</b>
Members	1
Summary of Role of Task Group	1
Summary of Recommendations	2
Terms of Reference	6
Background and Methodology	
▪ Public Involvement	6
▪ Witnesses	6
▪ Research	7
▪ Areas Covered	7
▪ The 'One Page Strategy'	8
Findings and Recommendations	
▪ Workforce Development (Recommendations 1-3)	10
▪ Increasing Recycling Rates (Recommendations 4-9)	13
▪ Green Waste Collection (Recommendation 10)	16
▪ Fortnightly Collections	17
▪ Communication (Recommendations 11-15)	18
Conclusion	20
Review	21
List of Appendices	22
<b>Appendix 1</b> – Task Group's Terms of Reference	
<b>Appendix 2</b> – A List of those the Task Group consulted	
<b>Appendix 3</b> – The 'One Page Strategy'	
<b>Appendix 4</b> – Extracts from Reports relating to NVQ Training	
<b>Appendix 5</b> – Information on Recycling Rates of Local Authorities	
<b>Appendix 6</b> – Incentive Scheme Trials	
<b>Appendix 7</b> – Extracts of comments made by local residents	

## **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

### **REPORT OF THE REFUSE AND RECYCLING TASK GROUP**

JANUARY 2008

#### **MEMBERS**

Councillors C. R. Scurrall (Chairman), Mrs. M. Bunker, Mrs. A. E. Doyle, S. P. Shannon and C. J. Tidmarsh

(Councillor C. B. Taylor was appointed Chairman initially and attended the first meeting of the Task Group. However, following the first Task Group Meeting, Councillor C. B. Taylor believed he had an interest and therefore resigned immediately. The Scrutiny Steering Board appointed Councillor C. R. Scurrall to continue as Chairman at its meeting in October 2007. Councillor C. R. Scurrall was already a Member of the Task Group and had received the required training to lead the scrutiny investigation.)

This Task Group wishes to acknowledge the assistance received from Mr. D. McGrath from Link Support Services (UK) Ltd who has helped the Task Group from the start of the investigation, with focusing on specific topic areas using the 'One Page Strategy', all the way through to the end of the scrutiny investigation when this report was finalised. Members would also like to thank all officers involved from Street Scene and Waste Management as well as the Committee Services Officer, Ms. D. McCarthy.

#### **SUMMARY**

The role of the Refuse and Recycling Task Group was to carry out a scrutiny exercise to identify issues affecting the efficiency and performance of the service since the introduction of two weekly collections, highlighting the promotional aspirations of the workforce as a means of strengthening the service and make general recommendations for strengthening the service.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Workforce Development – Recommendations 1 to 3**

With a view to achieving higher sustainable levels of resident satisfaction and improving the efficiency of the service, as well as giving employees an opportunity to obtain relevant qualifications, we recommend the following:

1. NVQ Training for Existing Workforce

NVQ Training in Waste Management from WAMITAB (Waste Management Industry Training Advisory Board) via NEW College is given to all refuse and recycling staff over a 2 year period commencing September 2008 with the following conditions:

- standards for 'performance criteria' and 'knowledge requirements' specific to this Council are built into the awards;
- the preferred primary assessment method is observation (rather than witness testimonies or personal statements); and
- that performance criteria is observed consistently over a certain time period rather than as a one-off

Please refer to pages 10-11 for more detail on recommendation 1.

*(Cost: Nil. Funding assistance via the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) is available and is believed to be worth in the region of £75,000 and £90,000 meaning there would be **no cost** to this Council.)*

2. NVQ Training for New Employees

It is made a requirement of all new employees to either hold the NVQ in Waste Management or achieve it within an agreed timeframe.

*(Cost: Nil. It is anticipated that future funding will be obtained via the Learning and Skills Council. )*

3. NVQ Training for Team Leaders

The following NVQ training is given to the three Refuse and Recycling Team Leaders:

- Team Leading in Refuse and Recycling via NEW College
- BITS (Business Improvement Techniques) via RDI (Resource Development International)

*(Cost: It is expected that a proportion of the funding (approximately 50%) will be available from the Learning and Skills Council. Therefore, it is anticipated that the total cost to this Council will be approximately £1500 and this can be met within the existing training budget.)*

**Increasing Recycling Rates – Recommendations 4 to 9**

One of the agreed outcomes of the Task Group was to investigate possibilities of improving recycling rates which led to the following:

4. Commingled Recycling Service  
Request that Street Scene and Waste Management Officers monitor the progress Worcestershire County Council is making in relation to building their own sorting plant by 2009, as this will enable a commingled recycling service to be launched (making it easier to recycle and likely to encourage more recycling) and therefore significantly improve this Council's recycling rates.  
*(Cost: Nil. There is a saving identified in 2010/11 of £100k as a result of the Council moving to commingle waste provision.)*
5. Recycling Additional Materials  
Street Scene and Waste Management Officers be requested to continue to encourage Worcestershire County Council officers to investigate recycling more materials through the Waste Management Forum.  
*(Cost: Nil)*
6. Benchmarking  
Request that Street Scene and Waste Management Officers continue to regularly and systematically benchmark against the top 10-15 local authorities in the recycling league table which are achieving higher recycling rates, with a view to adapting any parts of their services to Bromsgrove which may prove successful in helping to increase our recycling figures.  
*(Cost: Nil)*
7. Expanding the Recycling Service  
Street Scene and Waste Management Officers be requested to continually investigate ways in which the Council can expand the recycling service to reach the remaining 6% of the District.  
*(Cost: Nil)*
8. Eco-School Programme  
In order to educate as many children as possible to take responsibility for the future of their own environment and encourage more recycling throughout the District, Street Scene and Waste Management officers be requested to continue to encourage all schools to join the Eco-School programme, particularly primary schools.  
*(Cost: Nil)*
9. Incentive Schemes  
Request that Street Scene and Waste Management officers keep up to date with developments of the Defra pilot incentive scheme and when the results are known, the option of introducing such a scheme be investigated further.  
*(Cost: Nil)*

**Green Waste Collection – Recommendation 10**

It was agreed that the Green Waste Collection Service would be a specific topic area for the Task Group to investigate. Due to the recent decision in relation to the Medium Term Financial Plan 2008/09 -2010/11, our recommendation is:

10. Consultation

Request the Head of Street Scene and Waste Management to make certain there is thorough consultation with local residents in relation to the green bin charging arrangements due to be put in place. Effective communication will help ensure smooth implementation of the charging system which should avoid a reduction in customer service standards.

*(Cost: Minimal and can be met within the existing budget.)*

**Fortnightly Collections**

One of the agreed outcomes was that the satisfaction levels of the fortnightly refuse collections would be assessed. This has been completed and the Task Group agree that it is not necessary to make any recommendations regarding fortnightly collections. More details are given on page 17

**Communication – Recommendations 11 to 15**

The Council should adopt a clear communication strategy to help improve the recycling service as there is a strong correlation between communication and customer satisfaction:

11. Communication with local residents  
Increase communication with local residents wherever possible to encourage reducing, reusing and recycling. For example, ensuring local residents are aware that they can request more recycling boxes free of charge.  
*(Cost: Minimal and can be met within existing budget)*
12. Collection Arrangements  
To ensure that local residents are clear about which containers should be placed on the kerbside and when, officers be requested to investigate trialling wheelie bin stickers during 2008/09 or 2009/10, similar to Lichfield District Council.  
*(Cost: Nil. However, the cost of printing bin stickers instead of calendars would need to be considered if this recommendation is approved.)*
13. Member and Parish Council Training  
Similar to Daventry District Council, training/information sessions be arranged to inform Members of the following to ensure they have a sound knowledge of the Street Scene and Waste Management Services to pass on to local residents:
  - the history of the service;
  - where the Council is at present; and
  - plans to progress the service in future.Members of Parish Councils should also be invited to attend these sessions.  
*(Cost: Minimal and the cost of such sessions can be met within the existing budget.)*
14. Member Updates  
Updates relating to the refuse and recycling service be included in Members' Bulletins.  
*(Cost: Nil)*
15. Vehicle Tracking and Communication System  
The Head of Street Scene and Waste Management be requested to further investigate the effectiveness of various vehicle tracking and communication systems with a view to trialling a model in the future.  
*(Cost: Nil. At this stage, it is believed that further investigation is required to assess the potential benefits and financial implications. Any trialling should be at no cost to the Council.)*

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

At the meeting of the Scrutiny Steering Board held on 12th June 2007, it was decided a Task Group would be established to scrutinise issues relating to refuse and recycling.

The Task Group's terms of reference, which were compiled by the first appointed Chairman, Councillor Taylor, were approved by the Board at its meeting held on 3rd July 2007, subject to additional wording. The full terms of reference are attached as **Appendix 1**. The Membership of the Task Group was also agreed at the same meeting.

The Task Group was given 4 months (from the date of its first meeting) to complete its work. To ensure effective scrutiny, the Task Group waited until after the scrutiny training held in August before commencing the scrutiny investigation. The first meeting was on 22nd August 2007.

As Councillor Taylor resigned due to an interest, Councillor Scurrrell was appointed Task Group Chairman by the Scrutiny Steering Board at its meeting in October 2007. The change in Chairmanship after one meeting delayed the work of the Task Group for a few weeks and therefore the deadline for completion of the scrutiny exercise was extended by the Board to 28th January 2008.

## **BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY**

### **Public Involvement**

A press release was issued informing the public the Refuse and Recycling Task Group had been set up. Members of the public were encouraged to submit their views, comments and suggestions for the Task Group to consider. Information about the Task Group was also uploaded on to the website where again the public were encouraged to voice their opinions and suggestions for improvement.

A total of almost 30 letters and emails were received which is the largest number for any Task Group so far. It is worth noting that almost half of the comments received were complimentary about the refuse and recycling service.

### **Witnesses**

The Refuse and Recycling Task Group worked closely with Street Scene and Waste Management officers as well as the Learning and Organisational Development Manager. The Task Group also believed it was important to gain input from the relevant Portfolio Holder.



The Task Group researched and contacted other local authorities with high recycling rates and those classed as waste and recycling beacon authorities who are seen as exemplars of sustainable waste management.

Others contacted to provide evidence were: Training providers, such as NEW College and RDI (Resource Development International) regarding NVQ training; Parish Councils; and local supermarkets (as well as Head Offices) regarding recycling, reusing and reducing waste schemes. Unfortunately, no response has been received to date from the supermarkets.

A full list of those contacted is set out in **Appendix 2**.

### Research

A wealth of background information was considered by Members in between meetings which included: information from the IDeA Beacon Scheme website, such as various case studies relating to the theme 'Waste and Recycling'; the Joint Municipal waste Management Strategy for Herefordshire and Worcestershire 2004-2034, Managing waste for a brighter future; the work of the Cabinet's Street Scene Advisory Group which also looked at the waste collection service; this Council's Refuse and Recycling Collection Policy; scrutiny reports from other local authorities; and information produced by Defra on letsrecycle.com.

### Areas Covered

There were a total of seven task group meetings and at the first meeting a schedule of work was devised.

The four main areas covered were:

- Workforce development
- Improving the recycling rates
- Green waste collection service
- Fortnightly refuse collection service

Further details on these main areas covered are included in the next section.

However, there were many issues discussed during the scrutiny investigation and below is a list of some of them (in no particular order):

- Reducing, reusing and recycling
- Waste Minimisation Strategy
- Customer Survey on Street Scene and Waste Management
- Recycling rates compared to other local authorities
- Various strategies used by other local authorities to improve recycling rates particularly at Broadland District Council, North Kesteven District Council and North Norfolk District Council (as suggested by Mr. McGrath, Facilitator)
- Audit Commission Report on Waste Management

- Work being carried out by Worcestershire County Council such as Jilt the Junk, Shop Smart and Love Food Hate Waste campaigns
- Publicity and consultation
- Home composting, sink macerators, organic waste shredding and green grow soil
- Parish Councils views on the Green Waste Collection Service
- Performance Indicators such as total tonnage collected
- Information from various external sources including the IDeA (Improvement and Development Agency), CfPS (Centre for Public Scrutiny), letsrecycle.com and Local Government News.
- Wheelie bins and recycling containers
- Local supermarkets (in relation to excess packaging and plastic bags)
- Plastic bag free town of Modbury in Devon
- Pay as you throw proposal
- Compost street sweeping and street recycling bins
- Eco-School Programme
- Draft reports compiled by Resource Futures consultants selected via Defra Waste Implementation Programme relating to Worcestershire County

### The 'One Page Strategy'

The Task Group had the opportunity to work with Mr. McGrath who most Members will have met through various training events held. Mr. McGrath acted as a facilitator and introduced the 'one page strategy'.

Bromsgrove District Council has a statutory duty to scrutinise issues of key concern to members of the public. In exercising this duty this Council has decided that its approach to Overview and Scrutiny will be 'Ambitious Scrutiny' which involves focusing on clear challenge areas with a view to:

- Spotting and exploring policy opportunities which hold the potential to improve service standards;
- Working within a project framework;
- Underpinning overview and scrutiny activity with relevant Member development and facilitation support to introduce best practice methodologies;
- Consulting widely with a particular emphasis on identifying best practice exemplars; and
- Producing specific and workable recommendations which hold the potential to improve service delivery

Members took part in 'ambitious scrutiny' training to assess the potential to employ this approach to the work of the Refuse and Recycling Task Group. It is understood that obtaining a clear focus and producing a succinct project plan is key to ensuring effective scrutiny within fairly tight timescales. Therefore, Members received training support from Mr. McGrath in a particular approach to

project planning - the 'one page strategy'. The one page strategy is used as an aid to:

- Gain a clear understanding of the focus of the review – aimed at the most productive 'payback' areas
- Articulate this focus clearly on one piece of paper
- Identify potential outcomes (to explore throughout the review) and
- Point out key activities for Task Group Members

It was clear from the outset that we wished to explore a variety of areas under the general umbrella of refuse and recycling. We, as a Task Group, acknowledged that refuse and recycling is a huge portfolio and so it was highly desirable to get a clear focus on specific areas to review.

Following a thorough discussion, a one page strategy was produced and is attached as **Appendix 3**. In brief, the one page strategy identified the four main areas of focus as:

- (a) **Workforce development (for waste management staff)** with a particular focus on measures aimed at improving customer, resident satisfaction and efficiency and performance of the service. Local and national research carried out by the authority indicates that satisfaction with household waste collection dropped by 7% to 76% satisfied. Nationally satisfaction levels with waste collection staff dropped by 5%.
- (b) **Exploring opportunities to further improve 'dry recycling rates'** noting that Bromsgrove was named recently via a Defra poll as one of the top ten most improved Councils in the country for recycling and composting.
- (c) **Assess potential to support green waste collection during the winter months.** It is understood that this particular issue has moved on since the Task Group commenced its investigation and this has been taken on board when making our recommendations in relation to green waste collections.
- (d) **Consultation to assess satisfaction levels regarding fortnightly bin collections**

To ensure the Task Group remained focussed on the specific topics agreed to be scrutinised, the 'One Page Strategy' was a standing item on every agenda.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Workforce Development (Recommendations 1-3)

One of the main areas the Task Group decided to investigate was developing the workforce through relevant training in order to further improve customer service and resident satisfaction. We believe residents of the District deserve a high performing and efficient workforce and therefore the Task Group considered this particular area in great detail.

It is important to both Members of the Task Group and officers that we provide the best service possible to local residents and the refuse and recycling collection service is no exception, particularly as this is the one service used by all residents. The Task Group was impressed by the Recycling Team achieving a level of customer satisfaction that puts them amongst the top 25% nationally and we want to help ensure they remain in the top quartile and improve further!

It is also our concern that refuse and recycling crews may feel undervalued but we believe staff morale could be improved by providing recognition to staff through giving them the opportunity to achieve a nationally recognised qualification.

Following the scrutiny training and through completing our 'one page strategy', we were encouraged to set 'unreasonable' ambitions in this area (as an aid to 'thinking the unthinkable and being creative') and expressed a desire for all refuse and recycling crews to be trained in efficiency improvement techniques and customer satisfaction at **no cost** to the Council.

Members and officers collectively identified two potential training providers who could deliver appropriate training for operatives and the Learning and Organisational Development Manager was asked to research the answers to a number of specific questions which were put to training providers and internal staff and to 'give evidence' to the Task Group. The Learning and Organisational Development Manager was also requested to assess the different training providers which were RDI (Resource Development International) and NEW College. **Appendix 4** is an extract of the reports from the Learning and Organisational Manager which provides more detail on the training providers and the NVQ Training.

Funding assistance via the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) is available to support the training, development and assessment of the refuse and recycling crews and therefore, there would be no financial implications for this Council. In fact, it should be pointed out that the level of funding available to support training and development of operatives is estimated to be worth in the region of £1500-£1800 per member of staff. Around 50 members of staff would participate

in the scheme (over a 2 year period) which means **this would attract support to the authority in the region of £75,000-£90,000**, notwithstanding benefits to the operatives, the Council and members of the public generated via the training. This would not be a 'quick fix' but a long term project.

To ensure the training has a noticeable impact on the service, we believe that specific local protocols aimed at reinforcing the high customer standards in the waste management operations need to be built in to help ensure residents' satisfaction is improved (e.g. Daventry District Council achieves 85% user satisfaction). Source IDEA Beacon case study published August 2006.

The Task Group therefore recommend the following:

<b>Recommendation 1</b>	<p>NVQ Training in Waste Management from WAMITAB (Waste Management Industry Training Advisory Board) via NEW College is given to all refuse and recycling staff over a 2 year period commencing September 2008 with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ standards for 'performance criteria' and 'knowledge requirements' specific to this Council are built into the awards;</li> <li>▪ the preferred primary assessment method is observation (rather than witness testimonies or personal statements); and</li> <li>▪ that performance criteria is observed consistently over a certain time period rather than as a one-off.</li> </ul>
<b>Financial Implications</b>	<p>There are no financial implications relating to this recommendation as funding assistance via the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) is available. As it costs in the region of £1500-£1800 per member of staff, this would attract support to the authority in the region of £75,000 and £90,000.</p>

To make certain the Council continues to have a high performing and efficient workforce, we believe it needs to ensure that all new refuse and recycling operatives are provided with the same training and development opportunities. Therefore, assuming the NVQ in Waste Management from WAMITAB (Waste Management Industry Training Advisory Board) is still being offered, we recommend the following:

<b>Recommendation 2</b>	<p>It be made a requirement of all new employees to either hold the NVQ in Waste Management or achieve it within an agreed timeframe.</p>
-------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications relating to this recommendation as it is anticipated that future funding will be obtained via the Learning and Skills Council.
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The Task Group fully support Team Leaders also being offered the opportunity to improve their skills as this can only be of benefit to our customers. Similar to the NVQ training for refuse and recycling staff, the training should still have standards built into the awards which are specific to this Council to ensure there is a link with improving customer satisfaction. Therefore, as suggested by the Learning and Organisational Development Manager, our final recommendation in relation to workforce development is:

<b>Recommendation 3</b>	The following NVQ training is given to the three Refuse and Recycling Team Leaders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Team Leading in Refuse and Recycling via NEW College</li> <li>▪ BITS (Business Improvement Techniques) via RDI (Resource Development International)</li> </ul>
<b>Financial Implications</b>	It is expected that a proportion of the funding (approximately 50%) will be available from the Learning and Skills Council. Therefore, it is anticipated that the total cost to this Council will be approximately £1500 and this can be met within the existing training budget.

## Increasing Recycling Rates (Recommendations 4-9)

We understand that our ‘unreasonable’ ambition of improving dry recycling waste by 10% is only likely to be achieved once Worcestershire County Council, as the disposal authority, has the facilities.

Worcestershire County Council will be building a MRF (Materials Recycling Facilities) which is anticipated to be up and running by 2009/10 and will therefore enable this Council to launch a commingled recycling service. This should see a dramatic increase in this Council’s recycling figures from 40% to approximately 50-55%. We would also support this as it could lead to savings for the District Council as there would be an ability to collect waste more economically.

Through research and questioning other local authorities with higher recycling rates, it appears that one of the main differences is that they provide a commingled recycling service.

It should be pointed out that although the Task Group, as part of its investigation, looked at increasing recycling rates, it also fully appreciates the hard work of officers which has ensured the Council is achieving very good recycling rates. We were pleased to learn that out of 393 local authorities, **Bromsgrove is ranked 50 for its recycling rates during 2006/07** and if you compare that to neighbouring authorities (Worcestershire County Council - 155, Wyre Forest - 224, Worcester City - 261, Malvern - 282, Wychavon - 333, Redditch - 354) this is an excellent achievement. (See **Appendix 5**)

However, some local authorities are achieving far higher recycling rates at around 50-55% and it is important that we strive to do even better. Particularly as other local authorities are improving which is why Bromsgrove is ranked 50 out of 393 in 2006/07 when it was ranked 21 out of 393 in 2005/06.

<b>Recommendation 4</b>	Request that Street Scene and Waste Management Officers monitor the progress Worcestershire County Council is making in relation to building their own sorting plant by 2009, as this will enable a commingled recycling service to be launched (making it easier to recycle and likely to encourage more recycling) and therefore significantly improve this Council’s recycling rates.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications. In fact, there is a saving identified in 2010/11 of £100k as a result of the Council moving to commingle waste provision.

As Worcestershire County Council is building its own sorting plant, this opens up the potential for this Council to recycle more materials. However, it is understood that what this Council is able to collect is dependent on what the County Council can dispose of and this leads to the next recommendation.

(For your information, Waste Management Forum Meetings are attended by the relevant officers from each local authority across Worcestershire, including Worcestershire County Council.)

<b>Recommendation 5</b>	Street Scene and Waste Management Officers be requested to continue to encourage Worcestershire County Council officers to investigate recycling more materials through the Waste Management Forum.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

Improvement is a Council Objective and to ensure we continue to improve the refuse and recycling service provided to our residents, we feel it is important that benchmarking is carried out on a regular basis.

<b>Recommendation 6</b>	Request that Street Scene and Waste Management Officers continue to regularly and systematically benchmark against the top 10-15 local authorities in the recycling league table which are achieving higher recycling rates, with a view to adapting any parts of their services to Bromsgrove which may prove successful in helping to increase our recycling figures.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

We believe the Council should aim to provide its services to as many local residents as possible if not all. We commend Street Scene and Waste Management officers in ensuring 96% of residents receive a recycling service, however, Members and officers agree that it is our aim to overcome barriers which prevent the Council offering its recycling service to all local residents and the Task Group would like to ensure that the last 6% of the District is not forgotten.

<b>Recommendation 7</b>	Street Scene and Waste Management Officers be requested to continually investigate ways in which the Council can expand the recycling service to reach the remaining 6% of the District.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.



The Eco-Schools programme helps children become more effective citizens by encouraging them to take responsibility for the future of their own environment. Pupil involvement is a key part of the Eco-Schools programme and it is hoped that this will improve children's awareness and encourage more recycling as well as encouraging reducing and reusing. The Task Group feel that this programme is an excellent way of educating children so that recycling, reducing and reusing becomes second nature.

<b>Recommendation 8</b>	In order to educate as many children as possible to take responsibility for the future of their own environment and encourage more recycling throughout the District, Street Scene and Waste Management officers be requested to continue to encourage all schools to join the Eco-School programme, particularly primary schools.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

We were interested to learn that five local authorities have been chosen to pilot incentives for household waste minimisation and recycling. The aim is to reward local residents who reduce, reuse and recycle and encourage those who do not to change their behaviour and there is a feeling that there is strong public support for such schemes. The Task Group feels it is important that the pilot schemes are monitored as with further information, we will be in a position to assess in the future whether such schemes would be appropriate for Bromsgrove District. (Further information is attached as **Appendix 6**)

<b>Recommendation 9</b>	Request that Street Scene and Waste Management officers keep up to date with developments of the pilot incentive scheme and when the results are known, the option of introducing such a scheme be investigated further.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

**Green Waste Collection**  
(Recommendation 10)

There has been much discussion in relation to the Green Waste Collection Service and some Members have aired very different view points from reintroducing the green bin collection during the winter months to scrapping the service altogether. However, things have moved on since we started this scrutiny investigation and earlier this month, Full Council agreed to introduce a charge from April 2009, anticipated to be £30 per household per year for a collection service between April and November or approximately £45 per household per year for a 12 month collection service, depending upon the uptake.

As the Council will be charging for the green waste service in future years commencing April 2009, we feel it is vital that there is thorough consultation with local residents in order to ensure customer service standards do not suffer. Through consultation, officers will be able to investigate the demand for the service and work out feasible arrangements to ensure smooth implementation. We need to learn from past mistakes and make certain we communicate effectively with all local residents in order to maintain a high level of customer satisfaction.

<b>Recommendation 10</b>	Request the Head of Street Scene and Waste Management to make certain there is thorough consultation with local residents in relation to the green bin charging arrangements due to be put in place. Effective communication will help ensure smooth implementation of the charging system which should avoid a reduction in customer service standards.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are minimal financial implications in terms of communicating to our residents, however, these are minimal and can be met within the existing budget.

## Fortnightly Collections

We had a very good response to the press release and information posted on to the website which informed the public of the Task Group and asked for views, comments on suggestions. What was perhaps more unusual was the level of very positive responses received which shows how hard all staff in Street Scene and Waste Management have worked to ensure our residents now receive a good standard of service. This is backed up by the fact that Bromsgrove was named recently via a Defra poll as one of the top ten most improved Councils in the country for recycling and composting. (Extracts from comments received from local residents are attached as **Appendix 7**)

One area where there appeared to be conflicting viewpoints was the satisfaction levels of the fortnightly refuse collections as opposed to weekly collections, particularly in light of private companies offering such a service. Therefore, it was decided that this would be an area which required further assessment. To do this, we contacted the Parish Councils to complete a very simple and concise survey on this particular point which we called the “Waste Matters” survey.

Perhaps surprisingly, as we have always had a good response rate from Parish Councils in the past with scrutiny investigations, only 9 out of 20 Parish Councils responded, even though they were given 3 months to respond and reminders were sent. One Parish Council decided rather than give a collective response, individual Members were asked to complete the survey and 3 responses were received. Alvechurch Village Society (AVS) asked to be included in the survey and also responded taking the total number of responses to 12.

Out of the 12 responses received from the Parish Councils and AVS, **9 stated they were either ‘very satisfied’ or ‘satisfied’** with the fortnightly refuse collection service as opposed to a weekly collection service and only **3 stated they were ‘dissatisfied’**.

The Task Group also believe that the fortnightly collection helps to ensure the recycling rates remain high by encouraging local residents to recycle. We received a number of positive comments about the recycling service in particular and in light of the comments received from the public and Parish Councils, as well as taking into account the major financial implications, we believe moving to a weekly collection service would be of no benefit and would be a backward step.

We are satisfied that the fortnightly refuse collections (as opposed to weekly) are not a major issue for our local residents, particularly to those who recycle, and therefore we have no recommendations to make relating to this topic area.

**Communication with local residents**  
(Recommendations 11-15)

We believe that promoting reducing, reusing and recycling is key to sustainability. It is an excellent achievement to have the high recycling rates that we do and we need to ensure this continues. We feel this can be addressed through further communication with residents. For example, it appears that not all residents are aware that they can request more recycling boxes free of charge. If residents are not aware of this, they may be placing recycling into their grey bins unnecessarily.

<b>Recommendation 11</b>	Increase communication with local residents wherever possible to encourage reducing, reusing and recycling. For example, ensuring local residents are aware that they can request more recycling boxes free of charge.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are minimal financial implications which can be met within the existing budget.

Since the refuse and recycling kerbside collection was introduced, we are aware that officers have tried various methods to make it clear to local residents which containers should be placed on the kerbside and when.

We would like to suggest that, similar to Lichfield District Council, a bin sticker showing when and what is to be collected could be very useful to our residents.

<b>Recommendation 12</b>	To ensure that local residents are clear about which containers should be placed on the kerbside and when, officers be requested to investigate trialling wheelie bin stickers during 2008/09 or 2009/10, similar to Lichfield District Council.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications to investigating this option. However, the cost of printing bin stickers instead of calendars would need to be considered if this recommendation is approved.

During our investigation, we considered the work of beacon authorities. The IDeA Beacon Scheme website gives information on various case studies relating to local authorities who are providing residents with an effective waste collection and recycling service. Two of the case studies we looked at related to Daventry District Council. What we learnt from Daventry District Council in particular, which is one of the UK's leading recycling Council's, is officers and Members have a shared awareness of the need to support local residents. What they found particularly helpful was enabling communication with Parish Councils and local residents. This led the Task Group to discussing how this Council could support the local communities it serves in a similar way. It is felt that to ensure Ward Members and

Parish Councils can support the public, there needs to be a thorough understanding of the service.

We believe that there is a strong correlation between communication and customer satisfaction so in order for Members to effectively communicate with local residents on the refuse and recycling service, which is the one service used by ALL residents in the District, we want to recommend that:

<b>Recommendation 13</b>	Similar to Daventry District Council, training/information sessions be arranged to inform Members of the following to ensure they have a sound knowledge of the Street Scene and Waste Management Services to pass on to local residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the history of the service;</li> <li>▪ where the Council is at present; and</li> <li>▪ plans to progress the service in future.</li> </ul> Members of Parish Councils should also be invited to attend these sessions.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	Minimal financial implications which can be met within the existing budget.

To ensure Members are continually updated by Street Scene and Waste Management in relation to the refuse and recycling service, we also recommend the following:

<b>Recommendation 14</b>	Updates relating to the refuse and recycling service be included in Members' Bulletins.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

Vehicle tracking was discussed by the Task Group including possible benefits as it was understood that a particular vehicle tracking device was being trialled by Redditch Borough Council. However, we understand that a 2-way communication device could have more advantages. For example, with a 2-way communication system, officers would be able to contact the crews and vice versa. Crews would be able to inform other officers of issues such as, reasons for missed bins. Therefore, there is a strong possibility this could further improve customer service. Although crews do use mobile phones, a communication system would ensure there is an auditable trail and there are also health and safety issues to consider in relation to mobile phone use when on the rounds as opposed to a communication system.

Although this is potentially a good proposal, we understand that financial implications may be an issue and at this stage, it is difficult to conclude whether or not the benefits justify the cost of installing such a device in refuse vehicles (of

which there are approximately 20). Therefore, we would like to recommend the following:

<b>Recommendation 15</b>	The Head of Street Scene and Waste Management be requested to further investigate the effectiveness of various vehicle tracking and communication systems with a view to trialling a model in the future.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	There are no financial implications.

## **CONCLUSION**

Members of the Task Group believe that although Street Scene and Waste Management officers are doing an excellent job, we should not be complacent. As previously mentioned, the refuse and recycling collection service is the one service used by all residents and therefore, it is not surprising that it is often used to judge the performance of the Council. It is, therefore, particularly important that we ensure we provide the best service possible.

It should be pointed out that our recommendations link to two Council Objectives, Improvement and Environment, as well as two Priorities, Customer Service and Clean Streets and Recycling. There is also a strong connection to one of the Council's Values, Customer First. We found officers from Street Scene also fully supportive of the recommendations included within this report.

Officers and Members of the Task Group agree that although recycling is important, we should also work hard at ensuring we are reducing waste as well as reusing. After all, if we are able to reduce the waste we produce and collect, this will automatically increase our recycling figures. Although it is not within our powers to ensure manufacturers reduce the amount of packaging they use, we can work with local residents to do our part. We firmly believe that educating and communicating with the public are crucial to encouraging everyone to do as much as possible to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill.

We are already providing a good service compared to many other local authorities across the county which shows just how far the service has improved. It is thanks to the hard work of officers and local residents who have made certain the Council is achieving very good recycling rates. Let's keep improving.

We have found this scrutiny exercise very valuable and hope the Cabinet will see the benefits of the recommendations put forward for consideration. We would also like to take this opportunity to once again thank all those who contributed to our scrutiny investigation, including the officers from Street Scene and Waste Management and Mr. McGrath our facilitator.

## **REVIEW**

The Refuse and Recycling Task Group will reconvene in 12 months time to carry out a review of the outcome of this report including whether or not recommendations were approved and implemented and the impact of these actions.

**Councillor C. R. Scurrell**  
Chairman of the Refuse and Recycling Task Group

### **Contact Officer**

Name: Della McCarthy

Email: [d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:d.mccarthy@bromsgrove.gov.uk)

Tel: 01527 881407

# APPENDICES

**Appendix 1** – Task Group’s Terms of Reference

**Appendix 2** – A List of those the Task Group consulted

**Appendix 3** – The ‘One Page Strategy’

**Appendix 4** – Extracts from Reports relating to NVQ Training

**Appendix 5** – Information on Recycling Rates of Local Authorities

**Appendix 6** – Incentive Scheme Trials

**Appendix 7** – Extracts of comments made by local residents



**REFUSE AND RECYCLING TASK GROUP**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The attached scrutiny exercise scoping checklist (which acted as the Refuse and Recycling Task Group's terms of reference) was approved by the Scrutiny Steering Board on 3rd July 2007, subject to additional wording being included in the 'specific subject to be scrutinised' section so that it read as follows:

"Identifying issues affecting the efficiency and performance of the service since the introduction of two weekly collections, highlighting the promotional aspirations of the workforce as a means of strengthening the service and make general recommendations for strengthening the service."

The terms of reference was also agreed by the Task Group at its first meeting on 22nd August 2007.

## SCRUTINY EXERCISE SCOPING CHECKLIST

This form is to assist members to scope the scrutiny exercise in a focused way and to identify the key issues it wishes to investigate.

When the Board decides to set up a Task Group to scrutinise a particular subject, the appointed Chairman of the Task Group should complete this checklist. Completed forms will be considered by the Board and by the Task Group as a whole at the Task Group's first meeting.

▪ General Subject Area to be Scrutinised: *Quality of refuse + recycling Service.....*

▪ Specific Subject to be Scrutinised: *Identifying issues affecting.....  
the efficiency and performance of the Service since the  
introduction of two weekly collections, highlighting the  
promotional expectations of the workforce as a means  
of strengthening the Service.....*

▪ Should the relevant Portfolio Holder(s) be invited to give evidence? **YES/NO**

▪ Should any Officers be invited to give evidence? **YES/NO**

If yes, state name and/or post title: *H.R. and Legal  
and Street Scene*

▪ Should any external witnesses be invited to give evidence? **YES/NO**

If so, who and from which organisations? *Unions*

▪ Should the Task Group receive evidence from other sources other than witnesses? **YES/NO**

If so, what information should the Task Group wish to see and from which sources should it be gathered? *Finance / Budget HR?*

▪ Should a period of public consultation form part of the Scrutiny exercise? **YES/NO**

If so, on what should the public be consulted? *To be decided*

Have other authorities carried out similar scrutiny exercises? **YES/NO**

If so, which authorities?..... *Unknown* .....

What were their conclusions and what can we learn from them?..... *Unknown* .....

Will the Scrutiny exercise cross the District boundary? *Possibility* **YES/NO**

If so, should any other authorities be invited to participate?..... *Yes* .....

.....  
.....

- Would it be appropriate to co-opt anyone on to the Task Group whilst the Scrutiny exercise is being carried out? **YES/NO**

If so, who and from which organisations?.....

.....  
.....

What do you anticipate the timetable will be for the scrutiny exercise?

*Unknown* .....

.....  
.....

- Approximate number of Task Group Meetings?..... *Unknown* .....

Signed:..... *[Signature]* .....

Chairman of behalf of the: *Refuse + Recycling Service 7* .....

Date:..... *20 June 2009* .....

Please return completed forms to:  
Della McCarthy  
Committee Services Officer  
Legal and Democratic Services  
Bromsgrove District Council

**A List of those the Task Group Consulted**

**External Witnesses:**

Public:

- Members of the Public via press releases and the Council's website. A total of 26 emails and letters were received.

Other Local Authorities:

- Broadland District Council
- North Kesteven District Council
- North Northfolk District Council
- Worcestershire County Council

Parish Councils:

- All Parish Councils were contacted twice during the scrutiny investigation asking for views via the "Waste Matters" survey.

Supermarkets and Stores:

- Alldays Stores
- Asda Stores (Both the Manager at the local store and the Chief Executive based at their Head Office in Leeds)
- Iceland
- Morrisons Supermarket
- One Stop Community Stores
- Somerfield Stores
- Spar Supermarkets
- Tesco Express

Waste Contractors:

- Severn Waste (Worcestershire County Council's Waste Contractors).

Other:

- Alvechurch Village Society (AVS) – requested to be consulted when Parish Councils were contacted.

It should be noted that Mr. D. McGrath, Link Support Services (UK) Ltd, was also present at most of the meetings to act as a Task Group facilitator.

**Internal Witnesses:**

Street Scene and Waste Management:

- Mr. M. Bell, Head of Street Scene and Waste Management
- Mr. K. Hirons, Street Scene and Waste Manager
- Ms. A. Wardell, Waste Policy and Promotions Manager

Human Resources and Organisational Development:

- Ms. H. Parkinson, Learning and Organisational Development Manager

Cabinet Member:

- Councillor Mrs. M. A. Sherrey JP, Portfolio Holder for Street Scene and Recycling.

Mr. Hirons and Ms. Wardell attended all Task Group Meetings between them. For the majority, both were present.

All relevant officers were made aware of the recommendations and were given an opportunity to comment.

As with all scrutiny reports, all financial implications were checked by the Head of Financial Services and all legal implications were checked by the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services and/or a Senior Solicitor.

## THE 'ONE PAGE STRATEGY' – FOR THIS OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY TOPIC

Last Updated: 26 November 2007

### OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY: KEY QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

**What is the broad Topic area?** Refuse & Recycling/ Waste Management

**What is the specific topic areas?** 1/ Workforce development to improve customer service & resident satisfaction 2/ Assess potential to support green waste collection during winter months 3/ Assess satisfaction levels of fortnightly collections 4/ Strategy to improve overall 'dry' recycling rates

**What is the unreasonable ambitions?**

- 1/ Workforce development training for collection staff fully funded by LSC
- 2/ Report to assess options for some level of green waste collection during winter
- 3/ Ward based consultation in some areas to assess whether fortnightly collection is problematic and how we can deal with complaints more effectively
- 4/ Improve dry recycling waste from 22% to 32% in 12 months

**How well do we perform at the moment?**

Reports requested on current performance levels for (a) resident satisfaction with collection service and (b) current recycling rates

**Who shall we consult about the current service and how we can improve it?**

**Residents of Bromsgrove** some local ward newsletters or Council newspaper  
**Businesses:** Learning Skills Council training provider and local supermarkets  
**Expert Witnesses/ other Councils:** BDC Officers in Waste Management, Parish Councils, Training Dept. and Portfolio Holder

**What other help do we need?**

**Research help:** which Councils are best recycling performers, who can we contact/visit?

**Training:** Preparing a questioning and listening plan, preparing for a benchmarking visit if required, preparing a 'change' plan to produce realistic and achievable recommendations

**How long should it take?**

**4 months** (28th January 2008) – within which timescale we will complete:

- ✓ Workforce development plan recommendations
- ✓ Green waste/ winter collection recommendations
- ✓ Overall recycling plan recommendations

**What will be the outcomes?**

- (a) *all collection staff trained in efficiency improvement techniques & customer satisfaction - fully funded externally*
- (b) *Assessed satisfaction of fortnightly collection*
- (c) *Options assessed to support winter collection*
- (d) *Key recommendations to improve overall recycling rates*

Below are extracts from various reports that the Task Group received during its scrutiny investigation from the Learning and Organisational Development Manager in relation to NVQ training for refuse and recycling crews:

**Briefing Note – 21/11/07**

**From Helen Parkinson – Learning & Organisational Development Manager**

Training / NVQ provider	Pros	Cons
NEW College – NVQ in waste management operations from Waste Management Industry (WAMITAB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Qualification is industry-specific</li> <li>o Assessment and training is carried out on site, out on the rounds</li> <li>o No agency backfill costs associated with taking staff off the rounds</li> <li>o Includes a basic skills assessment, training and support</li> <li>o Relationship already established with NEW College and discussions about qualifications underway since May</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Qualification not specifically aimed at improving the business</li> <li>o Lingering concerns about how NVQs can be used to drive up standards of service</li> </ul>
RDI – NVQ in Business Improvement Techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Qualification specifically aimed at improving the business</li> <li>o Includes support for basic skills issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 14 weeks (half day sessions) of training for groups of 10, on site, but off the rounds – <b>agency backfill costs of £14,000</b> (@ £100 per person per day)</li> <li>o Qualification is not industry specific</li> </ul>

**Briefing Note – 12/12/07**

**From Helen Parkinson – Learning & Organisational Development Manager**

Information received from Mr. B. Johnson, Workforce Relationship Manager at NEW College:

“...research has shown that above and beyond developing the skills of employees the benefits are improved morale and reduced staff turnover.

Improved morale amongst staff generally leads to more productive interactions with clients and improvements in customer service.

We would be happy to give you reference to employers, that have employees who have completed NVO's with us, so that you can ask them directly for their views, or if you go on to the website of [www.traintogain.gov.uk](http://www.traintogain.gov.uk) they have numerous reported success stories already collated from actual employers.

NEW college is Beacon Status and there are only 98 other organisations within the country that have this and other colleges often come to us for guidance. We have also achieved 5, 1's in OFSTED."

Qualifications take upwards of 6 months to complete normally but some employees may complete their training within a shorter timescale whilst others may take longer. A lot depends on how many assessors NEW College can provide.

### **Briefing Note – 17/12/07**

**From Helen Parkinson – Learning & Organisational Development Manager**

The current issue with resident satisfaction is caused by the current customer standards for refuse and recycling not always being carried out consistently, e.g. the placement of recycling boxes or grey bins after emptying. This assumes that if the service is carried out 'perfectly' to the agreed standard, residents will be satisfied. This assumes in turn that the customer standard is based on what residents have said would satisfy them.

The training and qualification will be used to reinforce the standard, ensure it is carried out consistently, thus having potential to drive up customer satisfaction. The training/qualification will be carried out within the WAMITAB NVO framework, with 'local conventions' to make the standard specific rather than general.



The information below is taken from [www.letsrecycle.com](http://www.letsrecycle.com)

Please note that **Bromsgrove District Council** and **neighbouring authorities** within Worcestershire County are highlighted in **YELLOW**.

You will see that **Bromsgrove District Council** is ranked 50 out of 393

## English local authorities - performances on waste (2006/07)

The following table contains municipal waste data issued by Defra to letsrecycle.com in November 2007 for the period covering the financial year 2006/07.

The data shows household waste recycling and composting rates for English councils from April 1, 2006 to March 31, 2007, showing recycling rate (dry recyclables), composting rate (green waste and food waste) as well as the total amount of combined recycling and composting for the year.

Councils are listed in overall performance order:

Rank	Local Authority	Recycling	Composting	Total
		%	%	
1	North Kesteven District Council	28.08	27.41	55.49
2	South Shropshire District Council	21.84	31.36	53.2
3	Rushcliffe Borough Council	27.07	25.11	52.18
4	Huntingdonshire District Council	24.49	27.23	51.72
5	Ryedale District Council	20.13	30.88	51.01
6	South Cambridgeshire District Council	18.24	32.74	50.98
7	Teignbridge District Council	19.84	30.6	50.44
8	St Edmundsbury Borough Council	23.2	26.83	50.03
9	South Hams District Council	27.7	21.06	48.76
10	Harborough District Council	19.64	28.96	48.6
11	Cambridgeshire County Council	22.08	26.42	48.5
12	Waveney District Council	26.33	22.08	48.41
13	Melton Borough Council	22.79	25.11	47.9
14	Lichfield District Council	23.31	24.28	47.59
15	Fenland District Council	19.54	27.83	47.37
16	Somerset County Council	26.5	20.78	47.28
17	Daventry District Council	17.1	29.93	47.03
18	Forest Heath District Council	22.06	23.96	46.02
19	Devon County Council	26.2	19.6	45.8
20	South Somerset District Council	27.02	18.69	45.71
21	Broadland District Council	32.27	13.42	45.69
22	Three Rivers District Council	20.4	25.2	45.6
23	Kettering Borough Council	22.3	22.78	45.08

## Appendix 5

24	Chiltern District Council	32.44	12.59	45.03
25	Vale Royal Borough Council	19.02	26.01	45.03
26	Canterbury City Council	28.08	16.91	44.99
27	Cherwell District Council	22.96	21.67	44.63
28	South Staffordshire Council	20.65	23.6	44.25
29	South Ribble Borough Council	22.5	21.7	44.2
30	Chorley Borough Council	23.53	20.55	44.08
31	Mid Devon District Council	17.77	26.31	44.08
32	Hambleton District Council	14.69	29.23	43.92
33	Peterborough City Council	19.22	24.53	43.75
34	Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council	24.96	18.21	43.17
35	Dacorum Borough Council	20.61	22.42	43.03
36	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	17.93	25.09	43.02
37	Suffolk County Council	23.92	18.98	42.9
38	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	21.97	20.79	42.76
39	Uttlesford District Council	30.06	12.69	42.75
40	Leicestershire County Council	20.57	21.96	42.53
41	Dorset County Council	23.78	18.56	42.34
42	Mendip District Council	22.55	19.35	41.9
43	Oswestry Borough Council	18.45	23.39	41.84
44	North Norfolk District Council	26.08	15.53	41.61
45	Cotswold District Council	18.11	22.93	41.04
46	Taunton Deane Borough Council	23.95	17.08	41.03
47	North Shropshire District Council	13.03	27.9	40.93
48	Erewash Borough Council	25.49	15.41	40.9
49	South Northamptonshire District Council	15.93	24.95	40.88
50	<b>Bromsgrove District Council</b>	<b>21.22</b>	<b>19.61</b>	<b>40.83</b>
51	Oadby and Wigston Borough Council	22.85	17.52	40.37
52	Lincolnshire County Council	23.27	17.04	40.31
53	Macclesfield Borough Council	20.37	19.87	40.24
54	Stratford-on-Avon District Council	14.32	25.91	40.23
55	Wyre Borough Council	19.23	20.96	40.19
56	Shepway District Council	26.79	13.37	40.16
57	Buckinghamshire County Council	23.51	16.59	40.1
58	West Wiltshire District Council	18.79	21.31	40.1
59	Fylde Borough Council	17.81	22.2	40.01
60	Bexley LB	22.21	17.79	40
61	York City Council	23.3	16.63	39.93
62	Bath and North East Somerset Council	25.59	14.24	39.83
63	Cambridge City Council	17.09	22.54	39.63
64	West Devon Borough Council	20.65	18.98	39.63
65	South Gloucestershire Council	20.76	18.78	39.54
66	Wycombe District Council	21.01	18.39	39.4
67	Northamptonshire County Council	21.4	17.9	39.3
68	Eden District Council	21.05	18.17	39.22
69	Mole Valley District Council	31.61	7.56	39.17
70	Lancashire County Council	24.83	13.91	38.74
71	Broxtowe Borough Council	26.54	12.12	38.66
72	Breckland Council	27.55	10.92	38.47

## Appendix 5

73	Norfolk County Council	26.1	12.36	38.46
74	Blaby District Council	27.52	10.9	38.42
75	North Lincolnshire Council	17.27	21.15	38.42
76	Woking Borough Council	27.18	11.21	38.39
77	Fareham Borough Council	27.18	11.19	38.37
78	Oxfordshire County Council	22.83	15.52	38.35
79	Tamworth Borough Council	23	15.34	38.34
80	Suffolk Coastal District Council	16.55	21.76	38.31
81	Wiltshire County Council	24.24	14.04	38.28
82	West Lancashire District Council	18.11	19.89	38
83	Shropshire County Council	17.81	20.11	37.92
84	Nottinghamshire County Council	25.29	12.54	37.83
85	Horsham District Council	14.91	22.84	37.75
86	Bridgnorth District Council	19.66	18.01	37.67
87	Eastleigh Borough Council	31.26	6.2	37.46
88	Northampton Borough Council	20.41	16.81	37.22
89	Cannock Chase Council	18.64	18.41	37.05
90	Staffordshire County Council	19.55	17.44	36.99
91	Epping Forest Borough Council	25.17	11.79	36.96
92	Castle Morpeth Borough Council	28.41	8.51	36.92
93	Ipswich Borough Council	18.92	17.86	36.78
94	Hampshire County Council	25.19	11.55	36.74
95	East Lindsey District Council	19.23	17.44	36.67
96	Kennet District Council	22.98	13.67	36.65
97	Gedling Borough Council	32.08	4.49	36.57
98	Derbyshire Dales District Council	18.25	18.24	36.49
99	Babergh District Council	28.63	7.83	36.46
100	Bournemouth Borough Council	29.11	7.16	36.27
101	Lincoln City Council	17.64	18.63	36.27
102	Cheshire County Council	17.93	18.29	36.22
103	Congleton Borough Council	13.39	22.68	36.07
104	Charnwood Borough Council	27.95	7.94	35.89
105	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council	20.86	15.03	35.89
106	Weymouth and Portland Borough Council	24.64	11.25	35.89
107	Hertfordshire County Council	19.69	16.09	35.78
108	Forest of Dean District Council	14	21.76	35.76
109	Braintree District Council	23.4	12.1	35.5
110	Bracknell Forest Borough Council	23.93	11.56	35.49
111	North West Leicestershire District Council	14.31	20.96	35.27
112	Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	14.28	20.91	35.19
113	North Devon District Council	18.43	16.68	35.11
114	East Cambridgeshire District Council	16.8	18.3	35.1
115	North Yorkshire County Council	18.9	16.17	35.07
116	Milton Keynes Council	24.38	10.57	34.95
117	Telford and Wrekin Council	19.82	15.09	34.91
118	Waverley Borough Council	31.15	3.74	34.89
119	Bedfordshire County Council	21.27	13.59	34.86
120	East Hampshire District Council	29.31	5.52	34.83
121	Carlisle City Council	17.23	17.28	34.51

## Appendix 5

122	Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	25.87	8.58	34.45
123	Watford Borough Council	18.43	16.01	34.44
124	Exeter City Council	29.17	5.15	34.32
125	Mid Suffolk District Council	34.21	0	34.21
126	Essex County Council	21.28	12.91	34.19
127	West Sussex County Council	22.34	11.83	34.17
128	Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	18.38	15.72	34.1
129	Guildford Borough Council	25.65	8.41	34.06
130	Easington District Council	13.14	20.85	33.99
131	Wokingham Council	22.82	11.17	33.99
132	Alnwick District Council	28.86	5.08	33.94
133	Chichester District Council	32.6	1.22	33.82
134	Chelmsford Borough Council	16.17	17.41	33.58
135	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	22.11	11.47	33.58
136	Poole Borough Council	23.32	10.26	33.58
137	Northumberland County Council	24.08	9.47	33.55
138	Hyndburn Borough Council	24.91	8.6	33.51
139	South Oxfordshire District Council	27.17	6.11	33.28
140	South Bucks District Council	26.18	7.04	33.22
141	North Hertfordshire District Council	15.26	17.95	33.21
142	West Lindsey District Council	19.6	13.41	33.01
143	Gloucestershire County Council	19.24	13.77	33.01
144	Mid Bedfordshire District Council	24.44	8.52	32.96
145	Allerdale Borough Council	16.83	16.09	32.92
146	Maldon District Council	19.77	13.1	32.87
147	South Norfolk Council	28.58	4.27	32.85
148	Derby City Council	18.63	14.09	32.72
149	Warwickshire County Council	15.93	16.79	32.72
150	Stockport MBC	15.61	16.9	32.51
151	Kent County Council	21.79	10.64	32.43
152	Medway Borough Council	20.12	12.27	32.39
153	Arun District Council	25.72	6.66	32.38
154	St Albans City and District Council	19.14	13.16	32.3
155	<b>Worcestershire County Council</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>9.78</b>	<b>32.28</b>
156	Cumbria County Council	18.42	13.79	32.21
157	Swindon Borough Council	22.52	9.61	32.13
158	Carrick District Council	23.95	8.1	32.05
159	Blackpool Borough Council	20.03	11.94	31.97
160	South Bedfordshire District Council	16.78	15.17	31.95
161	Bristol City Council	21.44	10.5	31.94
162	Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Council	24.62	7.31	31.93
163	South Kesteven District Council	18.06	13.83	31.89
164	Bromley LB	25.96	5.89	31.85
165	Pendle Borough Council	21.23	10.61	31.84
166	Richmond upon Thames LB	22.78	8.93	31.71
167	Chesterfield Borough Council	15.28	16.41	31.69
168	North Dorset District Council	24.59	7.06	31.65
169	Richmondshire District Council	16.89	14.75	31.64
170	Derbyshire County Council	19.01	12.61	31.62

## Appendix 5

171	Burnley Borough Council	22.02	9.59	31.61
172	East Dorset District Council	21.52	10.06	31.58
173	Torrige District Council	18.03	13.46	31.49
174	Brentwood Borough Council	19.82	11.39	31.21
175	North Somerset Council	18.19	12.98	31.17
176	Colchester Borough Council	18.45	12.51	30.96
177	Surrey County Council	21.46	9.49	30.95
178	South Lakeland District Council	16.83	14.11	30.94
179	Chester City Council	15.77	15.09	30.86
180	Hart District Council	25.91	4.94	30.85
181	Corby Borough Council	18.61	12.05	30.66
182	Cornwall County Council	21.58	9.07	30.65
183	Hillingdon LB	18.56	12.08	30.64
184	Copeland Borough Council	15.18	15.35	30.53
185	Purbeck District Council	30.32	0.13	30.45
186	Wellingborough Borough Council	17.83	12.49	30.32
187	Havant Borough Council	29.92	0.39	30.31
188	Wealden District Council	13.5	16.77	30.27
189	Sutton LB	20.81	9.45	30.26
190	Sevenoaks District Council	24.59	5.54	30.13
191	Hertsmere Borough Council	12.46	17.4	29.86
192	Surrey Heath Borough Council	20.15	9.65	29.8
193	Isle of Wight Council	14.89	14.87	29.76
194	North East Derbyshire District Council	13.49	16.21	29.7
195	Stafford Borough Council	11.4	18.26	29.66
196	Enfield LB	19.36	10.28	29.64
197	East Riding of Yorkshire Council	20.8	8.79	29.59
198	Selby District Council	14.45	15.14	29.59
199	Barnet LB	17.92	11.55	29.47
200	Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council	23.97	5.46	29.43
201	Warwick District Council	15.27	14.08	29.35
202	Bolton MBC	18.5	10.76	29.26
203	Durham County Council	16.62	12.63	29.25
204	Southend-on-Sea Borough Council	19.83	9.31	29.14
205	Vale of White Horse District Council	22.82	6.28	29.1
206	Derwentside District Council	19.47	9.54	29.01
207	East Sussex County Council	18.38	10.54	28.92
208	Luton Borough Council	19.53	9.26	28.79
209	New Forest District Council	26.27	2.44	28.71
210	Preston Borough Council	16.24	12.33	28.57
211	Craven District Council	17.72	10.63	28.35
212	Rotherham MBC	17.21	11.13	28.34
213	Durham City Council	16.99	11.32	28.31
214	Cheltenham Borough Council	16.56	11.71	28.27
215	Ashfield District Council	27.62	0.59	28.21
216	East Staffordshire Borough Council	12.5	15.7	28.2
217	City of London	28.1	0.09	28.19
218	Rossendale Borough Council	21.29	6.85	28.14
219	Camden LB	22.38	5.67	28.05

## Appendix 5

220	Welwyn Hatfield Council	12.94	15.1	28.04
221	Wansbeck District Council	22.03	5.96	27.99
222	Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council	13.86	14.1	27.96
223	Warrington Borough Council	15.62	12.32	27.94
224	Wyre Forest District Council	27.89	0	27.89
225	North Cornwall District Council	21.1	6.66	27.76
226	Harrow LB	14.7	13	27.7
227	Reading Borough Council	22.86	4.78	27.64
228	Hartlepool Borough Council	17.22	10.4	27.62
229	Broxbourne Borough Council	13.71	13.89	27.6
230	South Derbyshire District Council	14.25	13.33	27.58
231	Teesdale District Council	17.42	10.11	27.53
232	West London Waste Authority	17.37	10.16	27.53
233	East Northamptonshire Council	23.26	4.26	27.52
234	Waltham Forest LB	17.23	10.28	27.51
235	West Dorset District Council	27.04	0.3	27.34
236	Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council	20.62	6.69	27.31
237	Brighton and Hove Council	23.86	3.41	27.27
238	Bedford Borough Council	14.26	12.97	27.23
239	Leicester City Council	16.3	10.88	27.18
240	Test Valley Borough Council	21.61	5.4	27.01
241	Caradon District Council	20.69	6.21	26.9
242	Stevenage Borough Council	15.85	11.02	26.87
243	Plymouth City Council	19.92	6.94	26.86
244	Mansfield District Council	21.34	5.48	26.82
245	West Oxfordshire District Council	22.98	3.83	26.81
246	East Hertfordshire District Council	14.48	12.08	26.56
247	Tynedale District Council	21.85	4.71	26.56
248	Wear Valley District Council	18.23	8.26	26.49
249	Crawley Borough Council	26.14	0.29	26.43
250	Tewkesbury Borough Council	17.97	8.42	26.39
251	Walsall MBC	14.17	12.2	26.37
252	North East Lincolnshire Council	11.97	14.37	26.34
253	Sedgefield Borough Council	16.61	9.67	26.28
254	Kerrier District Council	18.43	7.79	26.22
255	Boston Borough Council	26.15	0	26.15
256	Torbay Council	18.48	7.58	26.06
257	Basildon District Council	18.77	7.29	26.06
258	Elmbridge Borough Council	24.01	1.98	25.99
259	Herefordshire Council	18.59	7.33	25.92
260	Castle Point Borough Council	16.74	9.13	25.87
261	Worcester City Council	25.79	0.06	25.85
262	Newcastle-upon-Tyne City Council MBC	15.27	10.54	25.81
263	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	25.76	0	25.76
264	Lancaster City Council	15.88	9.88	25.76
265	Greater Manchester WDA (MBC)	17	8.72	25.72
266	Newark and Sherwood District Council	25.71	0	25.71
267	Amber Valley Borough Council	25.64	0	25.64
268	Adur District Council	25.22	0.4	25.62

## Appendix 5

269	Penwith District Council	18.82	6.75	25.57
270	Southampton City Council	17.77	7.74	25.51
271	Trafford MBC	14.7	10.75	25.45
272	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council	10.87	14.36	25.23
273	Mid Sussex District Council	20.54	4.65	25.19
274	Halton Borough Council	14.55	10.5	25.05
275	Merton LB	21.33	3.72	25.05
276	Sheffield City Council	18.31	6.63	24.94
277	Restormel Borough Council	22.18	2.75	24.93
278	North Warwickshire Borough Council	9.76	15.16	24.92
279	Ealing LB	17.97	6.95	24.92
280	Haringey LB	19.35	5.37	24.72
281	Bradford City MDC (MBC)	12.52	12.18	24.7
282	Malvern Hills District Council	24.7	0	24.7
283	Oxford City Council	16.93	7.77	24.7
284	Chester-Le-Street District Council	17.08	7.58	24.66
285	Gravesham Borough Council	24.58	0	24.58
286	West Somerset District Council	22.14	2.29	24.43
287	Doncaster MBC	15.68	8.72	24.4
288	Tameside MBC	18.44	5.84	24.28
289	Wakefield City MDC	13.38	10.9	24.28
290	Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	23.58	0.7	24.28
291	Winchester City Council	22.33	1.93	24.26
292	Coventry City Council	13.14	11.07	24.21
293	Rugby Borough Council	12.51	11.67	24.18
294	Rutland County Council	13.15	11.02	24.17
295	Barnsley MBC	14.01	10.09	24.1
296	Gosport Borough Council	22.78	1.32	24.1
297	Tandridge District Council	24.1	0	24.1
298	South Tyneside MBC	12.56	11.4	23.96
299	Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames	18.37	5.53	23.9
300	Nottingham City Council	15.22	8.57	23.79
301	Wolverhampton MBC	9	14.79	23.79
302	Sefton MBC	15.3	8.43	23.73
303	Sunderland City Council	14.95	8.77	23.72
304	Thurrock Council	18.2	5.5	23.7
305	Western Riverside Waste Authority	21.96	1.72	23.68
306	Hammersmith and Fulham LB	22.74	0.89	23.63
307	Greenwich LB	21.28	2.33	23.61
308	Blyth Valley Borough Council	22.7	0.86	23.56
309	Islington LB	18.85	4.65	23.5
310	Solihull MBC	15.35	8.12	23.47
311	Salisbury District Council	18.53	4.85	23.38
312	Stroud District Council	23.24	0	23.24
313	Harrogate Borough Council	17.74	5.46	23.2
314	Lambeth LB	20.54	2.56	23.1
315	North London Waste Authority	15.95	7.14	23.09
316	Portsmouth City Council	19.36	3.67	23.03
317	Dudley MBC	12.85	10.12	22.97

## Appendix 5

318	Eastbourne Borough Council	18.14	4.78	22.92
319	Bury MBC	12.98	9.93	22.91
320	Tendring District Council	22.88	0	22.88
321	Wandsworth LB	22.6	0.27	22.87
322	Christchurch Borough Council	21.21	1.58	22.79
323	Darlington Borough Council	16.02	6.69	22.71
324	South Holland District Council	22.57	0.07	22.64
325	Rushmoor Borough Council	19.7	2.77	22.47
326	Slough Borough Council	14.68	7.79	22.47
327	Merseyside WDA (MBC)	13.73	8.66	22.39
328	Leeds City Council MBC	15.83	6.47	22.3
329	North Tyneside Council	12.9	9.25	22.15
330	Lewes District Council	21.48	0.66	22.14
331	West Berkshire District Council	15.89	6.23	22.12
332	Gateshead MBC	12.95	9.13	22.08
333	Wychavon District Council	21.95	0.05	22
334	Sedgemoor District Council	15.32	6.57	21.89
335	Wigan MBC	12.92	8.95	21.87
336	Worthing Borough Council	18.8	2.83	21.63
337	Kirklees MBC	16.27	5.31	21.58
338	St Helens MBC	8.69	12.89	21.58
339	Brent LB	11.25	10.27	21.52
340	Ribble Valley Borough Council	12.5	8.91	21.41
341	Gloucester City Council	15.18	6.13	21.31
342	Calderdale MBC	15.15	6.15	21.3
343	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	15.17	6.09	21.26
344	Barking and Dagenham LB	15.15	5.93	21.08
345	North Wiltshire District Council	16.41	4.65	21.06
346	Kingston-upon-Hull City Council	14.21	6.81	21.02
347	Bassetlaw District Council	20.98	0	20.98
348	Epsom and Ewell Borough Council	19.69	1.24	20.93
349	Berwick-upon-Tweed Borough Council	20.12	0.41	20.53
350	Havering LB	13.48	6.95	20.43
351	Sandwell MBC	14.09	6.3	20.39
352	Westminster City Council	19.57	0.81	20.38
353	Salford City Council MBC	13.56	6.81	20.37
354	Redditch Borough Council	20.31	0	20.31
355	Bolsover District Council	9.55	10.58	20.13
356	Croydon LB	14.63	5.48	20.11
357	Stoke-on-Trent City Council	14.81	5.18	19.99
358	High Peak Borough Council	15.14	4.82	19.96
359	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	19.31	0.6	19.91
360	Aylesbury Vale District Council	19.04	0.81	19.85
361	Hounslow LB	15.7	3.92	19.62
362	Hackney LB	14	5.57	19.57
363	Ashford Borough Council	14.33	5.15	19.48
364	Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council	13.5	5.98	19.48
365	Spelthorne Borough Council	17.05	2.41	19.46
366	Harlow District Council	17.61	1.69	19.3



## Appendix 5

<b>367</b>	Maidstone Borough Council	12.82	6.39	19.21
<b>368</b>	Manchester City Council MBC	15.05	3.94	18.99
<b>369</b>	Dover District Council	11.73	7.05	18.78
<b>370</b>	Scarborough Borough Council	9.05	9.66	18.71
<b>371</b>	Rochdale MBC	11.48	7.21	18.69
<b>372</b>	Dartford Borough Council	18.63	0	18.63
<b>373</b>	Redbridge LB	13.63	4.97	18.6
<b>374</b>	Runnymede Borough Council	16.76	1.8	18.56
<b>375</b>	Southwark LB	14.28	4.18	18.46
<b>376</b>	Birmingham City Council	11.66	6.73	18.39
<b>377</b>	East London Waste Authority	13.46	4.91	18.37
<b>378</b>	Norwich City Council	18.37	0	18.37
<b>379</b>	East Devon District Council	18.36	0	18.36
<b>380</b>	Hastings Borough Council	17.62	0.63	18.25
<b>381</b>	Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council	9.7	7.9	17.6
<b>382</b>	Thanet District Council	14.11	3.16	17.27
<b>383</b>	Rochford District Council	15.21	1.79	17
<b>384</b>	Rother District Council	16.43	0	16.43
<b>385</b>	Knowsley MBC	8.62	7.37	15.99
<b>386</b>	Swale Borough Council	15.06	0.7	15.76
<b>387</b>	Lewisham LB	15.49	0.26	15.75
<b>388</b>	Oldham MBC	10.14	5.41	15.55
<b>389</b>	Middlesbrough Borough Council	13.54	1.88	15.42
<b>390</b>	Wirral MBC	9.1	5.05	14.15
<b>391</b>	Newham LB	11.76	1.82	13.58
<b>392</b>	Liverpool City Council	8.37	4.35	12.72
<b>393</b>	Tower Hamlets LB	11.64	0.11	11.75

## Waste Strategy for England 2007: Incentives for Recycling by Households

Following consultation over the summer of 2007 we announced that the Climate Change Bill will provide a power for local authorities to pilot incentives for household waste minimisation and recycling. This will allow pilot authorities to recognise more effectively the efforts of those householders who reduce, reuse and recycle their waste, and provide an incentive to those who do not change their behaviour.

A maximum of five local authorities will be able to pilot the schemes. Councils will be able to come forward with their own schemes, for approval by the Secretary of State, that fit local circumstances. This approach will allow us to monitor the impacts of incentives in England and report back to Parliament before a decision is made whether to roll them out more widely.

Powers in the Bill would enable authorities to pay rebates to householders for good performance on recycling and waste minimisation. They would also allow an authority, if it wanted to, to collect incentive based payments from householders for their waste collection. To avoid placing additional burdens on local residents, we are requiring that any pilot requesting payments from householders must return to residents all the revenue it collects. This means that residents as a whole will not be paying more. We are also enabling authorities to pay back rebates, and collect any payments, through Council Tax, should they wish to do so. (Once the powers come into force Government will publish guidance on the operations of the schemes.)

We have built in further checks and balances to help ensure the right level of public protection. Pilots could only be introduced where there was a good kerbside recycling service in place. Authorities will have to take account of the needs of, or impacts on, potentially disadvantaged groups – for example families with young children or the elderly. Pilot authorities will also have to have a flytipping prevention strategy in place. Evidence from other countries suggests that fly tipping would not necessarily increase, but we consider that having a strategy in place is good common sense. (Guidance would give more detail of these safeguards.)

Government also intends to retain a reserved power to create a cap in the future on the level of incentive, should this be necessary. We consider that this power provides a further protection for households.

**Below is a selection of extracts of some of the comments made by local residents in response to the Refuse and Recycling Task Group requesting their views:**

---

“We find these services (Refuse and Recycling) very good. Having, in the beginning, doubts about the use of these large wheelie bins we have been won over completely.”

- “1. Recycling is **THE** major success of BDC and from our UK travels and UK holidays is one of the best in England.
2. We have had **NO** problems with our grey bin – even when we were a family of 5.”

“I would like to say that we are very happy with the fortnightly system and have adjusted to it without any problems.”

“We need to review your barmy and disgusting decision to leave festering food rubbish around for up to two weeks.”

“I should like to express my support for and approval of the current waste collection arrangements.”

“As far as I am concerned there are two main areas of concern, namely the insistence that the collection is every fortnight for household rubbish which, to my mind, is unhealthy. The second issue is that, although the Council are prepared to congratulate themselves on the amount that is recycled, there are omissions to the types of material that can be dealt with.”

“Thank you very much for a reliable and regular Rubbish Collection.”

“Please bring back weekly collections. Food waste, no matter how well wrapped, is encouraging rodents.”

“I think it requires a return to the weekly collections...”

“My experience is that the current provision of the boxes for paper and plastic waste for recycling and a large green wheelie bin for garden waste – does not reflect our particular needs and we have to dispose of potentially recyclable material in the black wheelie bin.”

“I’m all for the recycling service – but when are we going to get it??!!”

“I write to applaud the current bin collection service with alternative collections on a weekly basis.”