

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL
Executive Board - 16th January 2006

Report of: Philip Dunsdon City Works
Acting Business Manager
Tel no. 01865 252958
e-mail:pdunsdon@oxford.gov.uk

Title: New Recycling for Oxford

Ward: All

Report author: Peter Dobson/Danny Woodhouse
Contact Tel No:
E-mail address: phdobson@oxford.gov.uk

Key Decision: No

Lead Member: Councillor John Tanner

Scrutiny responsibility: Executive Board

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Executive Board agrees to:

1. Adopt option 1 of the report as a preferred method of collection. This will include alternate weekly collections, providing wheelie-bins for residual waste, blue boxes for mixed recyclables including plastic bottles, and extending the collection of cardboard and garden waste.
2. Consult about this option
3. Receive a further report at the April Executive Board into the outcome of the consultation and determine what modifications to make to the scheme
4. To defer £2,175,000 of capital spending on other projects so as to introduce the new recycling scheme, subject to final budget setting.
5. To allocate an additional £827K of revenue in 2005/6, £210K from 2007/8 onwards to fund the scheme, subject to final budget setting.
6. Seek funding from the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership to help fund the new recycling scheme.

Background:

Current Policy

1. The council currently collects household refuse and recyclables from all householders on a weekly basis. Paper, tins, glass and textiles are collected via the green box-recycling scheme. Garden waste and cardboard are also collected from 13,500 households on alternate week.
2. The current collection method has resulted in relatively low recycling across the city. As a result we may not achieve recycling targets set by the Government and this may have a detrimental effect on the county's combined recycling figures.
3. Oxford City Council achieved a combined recycling and composting rate (BVPI82a and BVPI82b) of 14.81% in 2004/05 against Cherwell District Council's 43% and Lichfield at almost 50%.
4. Oxford City Council do, however, continue to maintain one of the lowest values of waste collected per head of population (BVPI84) – on target to reach 336kg per head of population.
5. Reducing, re-using and recycling materials are important ways in which Oxford can contribute to a better environment. Oxford residents want to recycle more and charges for disposing of waste in landfill are steadily increasing. So it makes sense to recycle as much household waste as possible.

Oxfordshire Waste Partnership

6. There is an obligation on the City Council to work with neighbouring local authorities and the County Council to identify and actively support initiatives for the short, medium and long term waste minimisation, collection and disposal strategy. Therefore it is important that any City Council Waste Strategy integrates fully into the overall County Group Policy from 2010 onwards.

New Recycling for Oxford

7. Aims:

- To substantially increase the recycling and composting of household waste within Oxford City to achieve a combined compost / recycling rate of around 45%.
- To encourage greater participation by residents in recycling by implementing a kerbside alternate weekly collection service for residual waste and recyclables
- To capture even more garden waste and cardboard from the household waste stream for composting.

- To introduce new materials, including plastics, which can be recycled to enable Oxford City residents to recycle a higher percentage of their household waste.
 - To work with the Oxford Waste Partnership, as already agreed in the Memorandum of Understanding, to reduce the flow of domestic waste into landfill and to increase shared recycling targets through closer partnership working.
 - To keep open Oxford's options so that even higher percentages of household waste can be recycled in future.
8. Experience from around the country shows that the only way to significantly increase recycling rates is to simultaneously increase recycling facilities whilst limiting the amount of refuse that each household may put out for collection. This gives an added incentive to householders to participate in recycling and maximise the amount of materials recycled. Many local authorities use wheeled containers with a "closed lid and no side waste policy" to restrict the amount of refuse collected. It is estimated that approximately 4,000 households in Oxford cannot accommodate a wheeled container. These properties would be supplied with a fixed number of branded sacks for their refuse collection every six months. Collections of refuse sacks would be limited to those provided by Oxford City Council to ensure an equitable level of service to all householders i.e. these householders would also be provided with limited capacity to dispose of residual waste.
9. Most authorities, including Cambridge and Cherwell, provide 240 litre wheelie-bins although smaller wheelie-bins are available. Whilst these may be considered preferable by some, it may not be practical to have smaller containers with an alternate weekly collection, especially operating a 'closed lid, no side waste' policy. On the other hand, smaller houses and flats, and the need to reduce waste, may mean that smaller 140 litre wheelie-bins are better. Alternatively it might be possible for us to arrange, by agreement, the provision of 140 litre containers to householders who make such a request. This is one of the issues on which we recommend consultation.
10. Many options were considered and assessed. Those that would not deliver the desired increase in recycling rate were rejected. The preferred options are set out in Appendix 1 to 3 to this report. Each of the proposed schemes would enhance the range of materials that could be recycled by the householder. Each scheme introduces the use of wheelie-bins to hold residual waste. Wheeled containers are better than black sacks for health and safety and will also restrict the householders' capacity to store residual waste.
11. Option costs were calculated from first principles then compared with other local district councils that provide similar services and found to be comparable. From our findings most other authorities consulted agreed that "co-mingled" collections, where different types of recyclable materials

are mixed together, provided more flexibility than the current 'kerbside sort' option.

12. The options summary (Appendix 1) sets out that Option 1 offers the greatest flexibility in terms of interoperability of vehicles and manpower. It also offers the greatest possibility of achieving the 45% combined target and would allow for more materials to be recycled. It also offers potential to extend the range of materials collected for recycling adding them to the glass/paper round. It is anticipated that the new collection regime based on this option could be phased in over a six-month period commencing October 2006

Financial Effects and Risk Assessment Based on all Options

13. Capital funding would be required to finance the acquisition of vehicles, plant and equipment in accordance with Best Value criteria
14. The project would incur both start-up and ongoing revenue costs in year 1 plus ongoing annual revenue costs.
15. Additional annual revenue of £500,000 was approved last year for recycling in 2007/08, and this has been taken into account in all calculations set out below in the options summary. (see Appendix 1)
16. A project team of officers would be set up to consider implementation plans and develop policies to govern the new scheme.
17. The options presented each provide for the provision of 110-litre reusable garden waste sacks. Note: Should legislation change and food waste need to be included for collection it will necessitate the provision of suitable containers for this purpose at an extra capital and revenue expense.
18. A full risk assessment will be carried out prior to implementation.
19. A full health and safety review will be conducted to assess the collection methods of the options under consideration

Recommendation

20. The recommendation of the officers is to adopt option 1. The options summary (Appendix 1) sets out that option 1 offers the greatest flexibility in terms of interoperability of vehicles and manpower. Additional staff required under option 1:
 - 3 drivers and 8 operatives to staff the expanded green waste scheme
 - 1 field officer and 2 administrators for a period of nine months to assist with implementation of the new services
 - 1 field officer to assist with supervision of new services

21. It also offers the greatest possibility of achieving the 45% combined target and would allow for more materials to be recycled. It also offers potential to extend the range of materials collected for recycling adding them to the glass/paper round. It is anticipated that the new collection regime based on this option could be phased in over a six-month period commencing October 2006.

This report has been seen and approved by:

Councillor John Tanner – Portfolio Holder
Sharon Cosgrove – Strategic Director
Jeremy Thomas – Legal Services
Andy Collett – Financial Services

Background papers: None

Summary of Options

Option 1: Kerbside Sort and Commingled Recycling Service. Refer to Appendix 1

Week 1: Residual Waste.240/140 litre container / Glass - Paper 55 litre green box

Week 2: Commingled Recycling 55 litre blue box / Green Waste 110 litre Bag

It is anticipated that this option will achieve 40- 45% recycling rate.

	2006/07	2007/08
CAPITAL	£2,175,000	
START UP COSTS	£228,586	
ADDITIONAL REVENUE £	£599,568	£209,685
EXISTING REVENUE	£2,606,273.00	£2,606,273
TOTAL REVENUE	£3,205,841	£2,815,958

Option 2: Kerbside Sort Recycling Service. Refer to appendix 2

Week 1: Residual Waste.240/140 litre container / Dry Recycling 55 litre green box

Week 2: Plastic blue box / Green Waste 110 litre Bag

It is anticipated that this option will achieve only 30 - 35% recycling rate because many materials such as lower grade paper and card would continue to be disposed as refuse.

By doubling the capacity of the fleet of recycling vehicles it is anticipated

	2006/07	2007/08
CAPITAL	£2,410,000	
START UP COSTS	£228,586	
ADDITIONAL REVENUE £	£710,904	£426,390
EXISTING REVENUE	£2,606,273	£2,606,273
TOTAL REVENUE	£3,2317,177	£3,032,663

Option 3: Commingled Recycling Collection without Glass. Refer to Appendix 3

Week 1: Residual Waste.240/140 litre container / Green Waste 110 litre Bag

Week 2: Commingled 55 litre green box

It is anticipated that this option will achieve only 30 - 35% Recycling rate because an estimated 3,500 tonnes of glass could not be disposed of with commingled recycle

	2006/07	2007/08
CAPITAL	£2,175,000	

START UP COSTS	£228,586	
ADDITIONAL REVENUE £	£486,968	£66,100
EXISTING REVENUE	£2,606,273	£2,606,273
TOTAL REVENUE	£3,093,241	£2,672,373



Option 1 – Kerbside Sort and Commingled Recycling Service

This option would introduce:

- alternate weekly collections of containerised residual waste
- alternate weekly collections of good quality paper and mixed glass via the 55-Litre green box
- alternate weekly collections of commingled recyclate via the 55-Litre blue box
- alternate weekly collections of garden waste and cardboard via the 110-Litre garden waste sack

Under this regime it is anticipated that a combined recycling/composting rate of between 40 - 45% could be achieved within eighteen months of implementation across the whole city

Table 1 – Materials To Be Presented By Householder

WEEK 1	
MATERIAL	CONTAINER
RESIDUAL WASTE	240-LITRE CONTAINER
GLASS/PAPER	55-LITRE GREEN BOX
WEEK 2	
COMMINGLED RECYCLATE	55-LITRE BLUE BOX
GARDEN WASTE	110-LITRE SACK

Table 2 – Financing

TOTALS		
CAPITAL	2006/07	
EXTRA CAPITAL	£2,175,000.00	
START UP COSTS	2006/07	
TOTAL	£228,586.14	
ADDITIONAL REVENUE £	2006/07	2007/08
EXTRA REVENUE	£624,978.25	£891,935.20
EXTRA INCOME	£25,409.91	£182,249.91
IDENTIFIED EXTRA REV	£0.00	£500,000.00
TOTAL	£599,568.34	£209,685.29
TOTAL REVENUE	2006/07	2007/08
EXISTING REVENUE	£2,606,273.00	£2,606,273.00
EXTRA REVENUE	£599,568.34	£209,685.29
TOTAL REVENUE	£3,205,841.34	£2,815,958.29

- Capital expenditure (vehicles) = **£2,175,000** in 2006/07
- Start up capital = **£228,586** in 2006/07
- Extra revenue required after additional income has been taken into account is **£599,568** in the second half of 2006/07 and **£209,685** in the first full year in 2007/08

1.3 Option 2 – Kerbside Sort Recycling Service

This option would introduce:

- alternate weekly collections of containerised residual waste
- alternate weekly collections of good quality paper, tins and mixed glass via the 55-Litre green box
- alternate weekly collections of plastic via the 55-Litre blue box
- alternate weekly collections of garden waste and cardboard via the 110-Litre garden waste sack

Under this regime it is anticipated that a combined recycling/composting rate of between 30 - 35% could be achieved within eighteen months of implementation across the whole city.

Table 3 - Materials To Be Presented By Householder

WEEK 1	
MATERIAL	CONTAINER
RESIDUAL WASTE	240-LITRE CONTAINER
GLASS/PAPER/TINS	55-LITRE GREEN BOX
WEEK 2	
PLASTIC	55-LITRE BLUE BOX
GARDEN WASTE	110-LITRE SACK

Table 4 – Financing

TOTALS		
CAPITAL	2006/07	
EXTRA CAPITAL	£2,410,000.00	
START UP COSTS	2006/07	
TOTAL	£228,586.14	
ADDITIONAL REVENUE £	2006/07	2007/08
EXTRA REVENUE	£826,194.50	£1,205,996.21
EXTRA INCOME	£115,289.91	£279,605.91
IDENTIFIED EXTRA REV	£0.00	£500,000.00
TOTAL	£710,904.59	£426,390.30
TOTAL REVENUE	2006/07	2007/08
EXISTING REVENUE	£2,606,273.00	£2,606,273.00
EXTRA REVENUE	£710,904.59	£426,390.30
TOTAL REVENUE	£3,317,177.59	£3,032,663.30

- Capital expenditure = **£2,410,000** in 2006/07
- Start up capital = **£228,586** in 2006/07
- Extra revenue required after additional income has been taken into account is **£710,904** in the second half of 2006/07 and **£426,390** in the full year of 2007/08

1.4 Option 3 – Commingled Recycling Service

This option would introduce:

- alternate weekly collections of containerised residual waste
- alternate weekly collections of commingled recycle via the 55-Litre green box
- alternate weekly collections of garden waste and cardboard via the 110-Litre garden waste sack
- This option excludes collection of glass from Kerbside

Under this regime it is anticipated that a combined recycling/composting rate of around 30 - 35% could be achieved within eighteen months of implementation across the whole city.

Table 5 - Materials To Be Presented By Householder

WEEK 1	
MATERIAL	CONTAINER
RESIDUAL WASTE	240-LITRE CONTAINER
GREEN WASTE	110-LITRE SACK
WEEK 2	
COMMINGLED RC	55-LITRE GREEN BOX

Table 6 – Financing

TOTALS		
CAPITAL	2006/07	
EXTRA CAPITAL	£2,175,000.00	
START UP COSTS	2006/07	
TOTAL	£228,586.14	
ADDITIONAL REVENUE £	2006/07	2007/08
EXTRA REVENUE	£186,258.25	£219,990.90
EXTRA INCOME	-£300,710.09	-£346,110.09
IDENTIFIED EXTRA REV	£0.00	£500,000.00
TOTAL	£486,968.34	£66,100.99
TOTAL REVENUE	2006/07	2007/08
EXISTING REVENUE	£2,606,273.00	£2,606,273.00
EXTRA REVENUE	£486,968.34	£66,100.99
TOTAL REVENUE	£3,093,241.34	£2,672,373.99

- Capital expenditure = **£2,175,000** in 2006/07
- Start up costs = **£228,586** in 2006/07
- Extra revenue required after additional income has been taken into account is **£486,968** in the second half of 2006/07 and **£66,100** in the full year of 2007/08