



Report to: SLWP Joint Waste Committee

Date: Tuesday 16th September 2014

Report of: South London Waste Partnership Management Group

Author(s): Cormac Stokes, Chair of SLWP Management Group

Chair of the Meeting:

Cllr Judith Saunders, Cabinet Member for Environmental Cleanliness and Parking,
London Borough of Merton

Report title:

Borough waste collection operating models and associated performance

Summary

This report sets out the current operating practices of each member borough of the South London Waste Partnership with respect to the collection of household waste.

It sets these practices against current performance with respect to household recycling rates in each borough, the levels of resident satisfaction with waste collection services and the overall costs of the services.

The report has been prepared to frame Member discussions on opportunities for further joint working in environmental service areas with particular reference to waste collection and opportunities to identify areas of best practice across the Partnership.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Committee note the contents of the report and consider opportunities for further joint working where deemed possible and appropriate.

Background Documents and Previous Decisions

None

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide Members with information relating to waste collection services that may assist in the framing of a discussion on opportunities for further joint working in environmental services and the public realm, with particular reference to waste collection.

2 DETAILS

- 2.1. The Chair of the South London Waste Partnership Joint Waste Committee (JWC), following discussions with fellow Members of the JWC, has requested a report setting out current waste collection operating models across the partner boroughs with a view to determining areas of best practice and to explore, through discussion, opportunities for joint working.
- 2.2. The tables below set out the current borough collection regimes providing details of contractual arrangements, containers provided and frequency of collections. This is broken down by standard household collections, collections from flats, trade waste collections, the provision of bring banks (Neighbourhood Recycling Centres) and charging arrangements for bulky waste and garden collections.

Residual	Kingston	Sutton	Croydon	Merton
Collection Contract	Outsourced contract with Veolia terminates 2022 (break at 2015)	In-house	Outsourced contract with Veolia terminates 2018.	In-house
Collection Container	Wheeled bin (Flats have communal bulk/wheeled bins)	Wheeled bin	Wheeled bin	Sack (Flats have communal wheeled bins)
Frequency of collection	Fortnightly – Houses Weekly - Flats and properties not suitable for wheeled bins	Weekly	Fortnightly	Weekly
No. of households served	65,320	80,700	146,400	82,070

Recycling	Kingston	Sutton	Croydon	Merton
Collection Contract	Outsourced contract with Veolia terminates	In-house	Outsourced contract with Veolia terminates	In-house

Recycling	Kingston	Sutton	Croydon	Merton
	2022(break at 2015)		2018	
Collection Container	Green box and white reusable bag	Wheeled bin	Green box and blue box (55 l)	green box purple box
Collection Frequency	Weekly	Fortnightly	Week 1: Green box Week 2: Blue box	Weekly
Collection System	Kerbside sort	Comingled	Kerbside sort	Comingled
Recyclate materials	Mixed cans, telephone directories, drinks cartons, aerosol cans, cardboard, paper, plastic bottles, glass, textiles and shoes, and household batteries	Cardboard, mixed cans, paper, plastic bottles and glass, plastic food containers, foil	Glass bottles and jars, mixed cans, paper, textiles and shoes (plus plastic bottles, mixed plastics and cardboard)	Paper, glass bottles and jars, cardboard, mixed cans, plastic bottles and yellow pages, aerosol cans, foil, cartons, lids, plastic food containers
Recycling from flats	Bulk bins for cardboard, paper, glass, tons and cans, plastics	As above	Comingled dry recyclables	Near-to entry receptacles for the same waste streams
Recyclate sale	Source segregated to Viridor	MRF Material to Viridor ~ 16ktpa	Ownership retained by contractor, revenue share	MRF Material to Viridor ~ 16ktpa
Properties serviced	63,868	62,946	124,826	82,070

Trade Waste	Kingston	Sutton	Croydon	Merton
Collection Contract	N/A	In-house	Veolia	In-house
Disposal	N/A	Viridor	Viridor	Viridor

Bulky Waste	Kingston	Sutton	Croydon	Merton
Collection	Veolia and Kingston	The Vine	Veolia	In-house /

Contract	Community Furniture	Project		EWC
Charges	<p>Non reusable items: up to 4 items, £30; 5-8 items, £50</p> <p>Reusable items: up to 4 items, £15; 5-8 items, £25</p>	Yes – 3 items for £25	Up to 7 items collected for £10	<p>5 items free every 3 weeks</p> <p>Up to 5 more £20</p> <p>Up to an additional 3 more £10</p> <p>9th and 10th item £4 each</p> <p>Fridges and freezers £12.50 each</p>

Green Waste	Kingston	Sutton	Croydon	Merton
Kerbside Contract	Veolia	In house	Veolia	In-house
Container	Chargeable opt in service - wheeled bins and/or biodegradable bags.	2 x Reusable sacks (can purchase additional single use sacks)	Up to 10 sacks collected fortnightly	Chargeable opt in service – wheeled bins
Frequency	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Fortnightly
Treatment	Viridor - In vessel composting	Through Viridor	Through Viridor	Through Viridor – In vessel composting
Properties served	7,000	62,946	116,400	6,000

Food waste	Kingston	Sutton	Croydon	Merton
Kerbside Contract	Veolia	N/A	Veolia	Viridor
Container	<p>Houses - 23L external container, 5L internal and corn starch liners for internal caddy.</p> <p>Flats – 240L wheelie bin, 5L internal</p>	N/A	23 l external, 7 l internal	23 l external, 7 l internal plus liners

	and corn starch liners for internal caddy.			
Frequency	Weekly	N/A	Weekly	Weekly
Treatment	Aerobic digestion	N/A	AD Composting	AD Composting
Properties served	62,500	N/A	144,000	80,000

Bring Sites	Kingston	Sutton	Croydon	Merton
Contract	Veolia and LMB textiles	In house	Veolia	In house
Number and range of materials collected	4 bring sites Paper, Cardboard, glass, plastics, cans, textiles and shoes.	30 bring sites, Comingled material (as recyclables in households)	18 Paper and card in blue banks, plus glass, cans and plastics in green banks.	Paper, cardboard, mixed glass bottles, food and drink cans, plastic bottles, cartons, textiles, DVDs, CDs, books.

2.3. As can be seen from the above there are complex arrangements and many variables in the design of the many services provided across the partnership with respect to waste collection.

2.4. A useful indicator of the success of the approaches adopted is the level of satisfaction with waste collection amongst residents of the borough. However, this must be placed in the context of not only the design of the service but also the perceived successful delivery and efficiency of the service from the users' perspective. Set out below is a summary of findings with respect to resident satisfaction with waste services over the past few years. Unfortunately each borough takes a different approach with respect to ascertaining user views on services and one must be wary of making direct comparisons.

2.5. Resident Satisfaction: London Borough of Croydon

2.5.1 The London Borough of Croydon has survey residents with respect to satisfaction with waste services in 2009 and 2012. The findings are set out in the table below:

	2009	2012
Waste collection	79%	73%
Recycling	71%	74%
Street cleaning	53%	64%

2.6. Resident Satisfaction: Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames

2.6.1 There have been a number of specific surveys carried out over the past 5 years that provide an indication of the levels of resident satisfaction.

- Waste Watch was commissioned in 2011 to ascertain the effectiveness of the “bin tagging” communications campaign carried out in October of that year. Out of the 1,407 comments recorded during this face to face survey, 65% were from residents who regarded the waste service to be a good service.
- More recently this view was echoed on the “Your Kingston, Your Say” survey carried out between August – October 2013:
 - 79% of residents were very satisfied or fairly satisfied (37% and 42% respectively) with Kingston’s landfill waste collection service.
 - 76% were very satisfied or fairly satisfied (40% and 36% respectively) with Kingston’s doorstep recycling collection service.
 - 72% of residents were either Very Satisfied or Fairly Satisfied (24% and 48% respectively) with Kingston’s street cleansing service.
- A small survey in late 2013 regarding proposed changes to recycling services in a Kingston Neighbourhood showed that 85% of residents (243 out of 284 responses) were Fairly to Very Satisfied with the Council’s waste collection service.

2.7. Resident Satisfaction: London Borough of Merton

2.7.1 The table below provides information relating to levels of satisfaction with refuse, recycling and street cleaning. The London Borough of Merton carries out an annual survey of residents through the London Council’s Annual Resident survey process:

Year	Waste	Recycling	Street cleaning
2009/10	69%	66%	50%
2010/11	72%	73%	57%
2011/12	70%	67%	57%
2012/13	71%	74%	57%
2013/14	72%	69%	54%

2.8. Resident satisfaction: London Borough of Sutton

2.8.1 The table below provides information relating to levels of satisfaction with refuse, recycling and street cleaning. The London Borough of Sutton carries out a bi-annual survey of residents using Ipsos Mori:

Year	Waste	Recycling	Street cleaning
2013/14	88%	85%	76%
2011/12	88%	83%	74%
2008/09	78%	74%	70%
2006/07	75%	78%	67%

2.9. Recycling Performance

2.9.1 Another useful indicator of the success of waste collection regimes is how the system design assists and encourage users to manage their waste in a more sustainable manner: maximising recycling and minimising residual waste having to go to landfill or another form of residual waste treatment. The table below sets out the recycling performance figures for each of the partner boroughs since 2009/10.

	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
LB Croydon	32.22%	33.46%	38.06%	44.30% ¹	N/A ³
RB Kingston	46.16%	47.40%	46.79%	46.31%	46.29%
LB Merton	33.5%	36.3%	37.1%	38.0%	38%
LB Sutton	37.51%	37.55%	37.37%	36.53% ²	37.06%

¹ Current operating model introduced in October 2011

² Double shifting introduced in April 2012

³ Please note that not all figures are yet available for 2013/14 and those that are provided are as yet unaudited.

2.9.2 Apart from significant improvements in Croydon's performance, relating to the service change introduced in October 2011, moving to alternate weekly collections of residual and recycling waste and introducing food waste collections, levels of recycling performance have remained relatively static since 2009/10.

2.9.3 The steady rise in recycling levels in Merton between 2010 and 2012 has largely been the result of gradually phasing in a borough-wide separate collection of food waste.

2.10. Financial information

2.10.1 A final key indicator with respect to operational effectiveness of waste services is the cost at which the services are provided. The table below sets out a summary of the whole costs of waste collection. These figures do not take into account the associated costs/revenues from recycle or the processing costs of food, garden or residual waste.

	LB Croydon	LB Merton	RB Kingston	LB Sutton
Overheads ¹	£1,323,167	£1,018,151	£323,756	£1,252,897
Staff ²	£4,039,881	£2,669,800	£2,875,575	£1,889,776
Vehicle ³	£3,183,037	£1,524,737	£1,300,495	£1,455,086
Total	£8,546,085	£5,212,688	£4,499,826	£4,597,760

¹ All service overheads including premises cost admin / supervisor support cost

² All front line staff cost (loaders and drivers)

³ All front line vehicle cost including fuel and damages

2.10.2 The following table shows these costs as a percentage of spend.

	LB Croydon	LB Merton	RB Kingston	LB Sutton
Overheads	15%	20%	7%	27%
Staff	47%	51%	64%	41%
Vehicle	37%	29%	29%	32%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

3.1. Not Applicable

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

4.1. Not Applicable

5 TIMETABLE

5.1. Not applicable

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.1. None

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

7.1. At present the functions delegated by the partner boroughs to the JWC cover waste disposal functions only, as set out in the Inter-Authority Agreement including the Constitution of the Committee.

7.2. Should the Committee wish to consider and make decisions on matters directly relating to waste collection and other environmental services there will be a requirement to seek agreement from the partner boroughs to review the current functions delegated to the Committee and agree to amend the Inter-Authority Agreement accordingly.

8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

8.1. None contained within this report

9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1. None contained within this report

10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

10.1. None contained within this report

11 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

- None

12 BACKGROUND PAPERS

12.1. None

This page is intentionally left blank