

Minutes of a meeting of the Environment and Waste Management Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday, 25 October 2016 at Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 1730
Concluded 1910

Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT	GREEN
Gibbons	A Ahmed Thornton Watson	Stubbs	Warnes Love

Observers: Councillor Ferriby,
Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Environment, Sport and Culture
Councillor Ross-Shaw,
Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Regeneration, Planning and Transport.

Councillor Warnes in the Chair

24. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

No disclosures of interest in matters under consideration were received.

25. MINUTES

Resolved –

That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2016 be signed as correct record.

ACTION: City Solicitor

26. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no appeals submitted by the public to review decisions to restrict documents

27. THE MANAGEMENT OF WASTE AND RECYCLING ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE BRADFORD DISTRICT



The report of the Strategic Director, Environment and Sport, (**Document “J”**) provided a description of the current management of waste and presented an update on the work programmes established in 2016 and those planned for 2017/2018 to improve the management of waste to more sustainable levels in line with the Municipal Waste Minimisation and Management Strategy 2015 (MWMMS).

A detailed presentation on the waste service operations undertaken was provided and included an update on kerbside residual waste collections; kerbside recycling collections; the recent introduction of recycling collection nodes in the city centre for residents living in multi occupancy accommodation and statistics for the total tonnes of Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW) and Household Waste (HW).

It was clarified that LACW, formerly known as Municipal Waste, was the total amount of waste that the service managed and HW only included waste and recycling collected from households at the kerbside, waste and recycling delivered by residents to Household Waste Recycling Centres, recyclables delivered to Bring Sites and street litter collected from around the district.

It was noted that during discussions about the trial of alternate weekly collection of residual waste it had been reported that residents could fully co-mingle their dry recyclable waste. Members queried the changes which had occurred to allow that to happen and it was explained that there had been advances in separation technology and there now was an available market for plastic other than just bottles.

It was questioned if items previously composted were now utilised for energy recovery and Members were advised that organic fractions, essentially food waste contained in residual waste, were extracted and sent to anaerobic digestion.

Cost comparisons between the recently introduced recycling collection nodes and Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) and ‘Bring Sites’ were discussed. It was clarified that the nodes located in the city centre were refurbished and had been purchased at a reduced cost. There were a limited number of nodes available and due to their locations they needed to be smaller and more aesthetically pleasing than the large receptacles located elsewhere.

Members questioned if reductions in waste, depicted in Performance Indicators for HW , resulted in increases in waste elsewhere. It was explained that investigations had been made and no subsequent increases in fly tipping had occurred.

The aims of the Municipal Waste Minimisation and Management Strategy (MWMMS) were to get people to think about the waste generated and it was hoped that those reductions were as a result of that policy.

The presentation continued with an update on the work programmes established



in 2015 and those planned for 2017/18 to manage waste to more sustainable levels, e.g. minimise residual waste and increase recycling, in line with the MWMMS.

It was explained that a key element of the MWMMS was the introduction of the Domestic Waste and Recycling Policy (aka the Bin Policy). The policy had now been successfully implemented across the whole district

Its aim was to divert a greater percentage of recyclable waste from the residual green waste bin to the grey recyclable waste bin at the kerbside. The policy only allowed the emptying of one 240L residual (green) bin per household, or one 360L (for a household with 7 or more residents) and no side waste or overfilled bins presented at the kerbside per week.

In the five months to August 2016 compared against the same period for 2015 the total kerbside residual waste collected had reduced by 1,887 tonnes, and for the same period the total of kerbside recycling had increased by 992 tonnes.

It was reported that compliance with the policy was monitored and the service engaged with residents and the Council's own staff to ensure the policy was understood and complied with. Enforcement action taken was reported and Members were assured that generally compliance had been very positive with significant reductions in residual waste.

A Member questioned if a request made at a previous meeting that communications to residents be made available to residents who had English as a second language. In response it was explained that no specific literature had been developed, however, a video to school children demonstrated pictorially how waste could be separated. Wardens also spoke to residents plainly and pictorially and the issue had been discussed at Neighbourhood Forums.

Document "J" also revealed that the service was undertaking a project in conjunction with the University of Bradford and a Leeds based company Hebeworks. The Binnovation project was looking at introducing smarter ways of bin collection in households utilising sensory detectors in trial bins. It was revealed that an opt in trial would be undertaken of 60 households in the Shipley area and in response to questions it was explained that any Members wishing to take part in that trial should contact the service via email. The rollout to households was expected to commence in October/November. Members queried if the technology could trace the owner of a bin should that be stolen and it was explained that the location not the owner could be traced.

The chargeable Garden Waste Service, introduced on 1st June 2016, was discussed. The cost implications of residents not involved in that scheme who deposited garden waste in residual bins were questioned. In response it was explained that the 'bin policy' stated that garden waste must not be placed in the residual bin. The potential for garden waste to be hidden in those bins had been considered but it was believed that limited capacity in the bins and fortnightly



collections would address that issue. The amount of residual waste tonnes had reduced so it was not felt that the practice was occurring.

The potential to reuse the unwanted garden bins was raised and Members were advised that options were being considered. Arrangements for composting were discussed and it was explained that details were available on the Council's website.

The rationale for not allowing all residents to fully co-mingle their dry recyclable waste following the advances in separation technology and the available market for plastic other than just bottles was questioned. In response Members were advised that the service would like to extend the trial being undertaken in the Wyke Ward. The trial was, however, in its early stages and was required to assess the scheme's effectiveness. The trial would conclude in six months time, however, it was felt that more information would be available prior to Christmas.

The Cashless Systems and Charging Policy, introduced for discretionary services within the Waste Service were questioned and the ability for residents to pay for bulky waste collections in cash was raised. In response it was explained that pay point facilities were still available which residents could request by telephone.

Resolved –

- (1) That the contents of Document “J” be noted.**
- (2) That the Strategic Director, Environment and Sport, be requested to provide a progress report in 12 months time.**
- (3) That, when the information becomes available, the Strategic Director, Environment and Sport, be requested to circulate to all Members of the Committee the results of the trial of the alternate weekly bin collections in the Wyke Ward.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Environment and Sport

28. UPDATE ON THE FUEL POVERTY FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION FOR THE BRADFORD DISTRICT AND THE BETTER HOMES YORKSHIRE PROGRAMME

The report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration, (Document “K”) provided an update on the progress on the Fuel Poverty Framework for Action and related Programme of Work since the document was adopted by the Council in September 2015. It also introduced an updated work programme for the 2016 to 2018 period.

The report also provided an update on progress of the regional Better Homes Yorkshire Programme and related issues including the Green Deal Communities schemes, the Central Heating Fund scheme and the project arising from the



successful Local Growth Fund Bid.

Members were reminded that Fuel Poverty continued to be a significant issue in the Bradford district. Statistical information was contained in the report and figures from the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) showed that 13.2% of households in the District were considered to be in fuel poverty in 2014. It was explained that the relatively high level of fuel poverty was due to the high level of deprivation in parts of the District, low household incomes and the poor quality of the housing stock.

It was explained that the actions contained in the initial programme of work for the Fuel Poverty Framework for Action had been completed and a progress update for each action was contained at Appendix 1 to the report.

The report revealed that Leeds City Council had recently entered into a partnership with Robin Hood Energy, a not for profit licensed energy company, (a subsidiary of Nottingham City Council) to create an Energy Supply Company (ESCo) that would seek to redress balance in the energy supply market by being geared towards providing residents with stable prices at the lower end of the price spectrum.

It was intended that the ESCo would be branded as White Rose Energy and would be launched in autumn 2016, with the potential to expand its scope to cover the entire Leeds City Region (LCR). Officers would bring forward proposals for Bradford's participation in the partnership to extend its benefits to include the Bradford District. Members questioned if that move to an LCR ESCo would reduce the control which the service had and have an impact on the Civic Quarter Heating scheme.

In response it was explained that there were many partners working on similar projects across the LCR. Nottingham City Council had been the first to set up a retail energy company and had utilised energy from waste points for a long time. They had secured significant investment; had been subject to a lengthy compliance process and would now offer their skill and expertise to others. Leeds City Region would provide Robin Hood Energy tariffs and no development costs would be incurred.

If a supply of heat through Bradford's own network was developed it would require significant investment and licensing costs. It was explained that there was no one size fits all approach and there were many models for providing energy companies in the future. The District Heat Network would consider the best arrangements available at the appropriate time.

Concern that the poorest people were paying the most for energy was raised and it was felt that the issue needed tackling nationally by the Government. The proportion of Bradford's housing stock in each Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) category was questioned. Members were advised that a housing stock condition survey had been commissioned to provide a snapshot of the situation. The level of data produced was not that detailed and unable to link EPC to



construction type.

It was asked if landlords would have to produce new EPC figures each time the property was let and it was clarified that, unless a landlord had taken measures to improve the property, the EPC rating would only need to be recalculated every 10 years.

It was noted that legislation was to be introduced in 2018 that would require landlords to bring their rental units up to a minimum EPC rating of E when properties were let to new tenants; the requirement would be necessary for existing tenants from 2020.

That 11% of properties in the Private Rental Sector fell into category F or G in the EPC was raised as a matter for concern together with the subsequent effect that those properties being taken out of commission, because of the legislation, could have. The percentage of properties in the D and E categories also troubled Members as that equated to 84% of housing stock in a low energy efficiency category.

The serious nature of the issue was acknowledged and Members were assured that housing colleagues were aware of the matter.

The potential for privately rented property to go unregulated was raised. It was acknowledged that the new legislation could place an enforcement burden on the Council and, whilst those measures had not yet been formalised, it was agreed to update Members in a future report.

The condition of social housing was questioned and it was reported that Incommunities, as the largest social housing provider, had done a lot of work to improve their stock. It was believed that virtually all of their properties had an EPC rating of D or above.

Penalties which could be imposed on landlords who did not comply with the legislation were questioned. In response it was explained that landlords may have some get out clause regarding the viability of the cost of improvements, however, the legislation was not yet clear on that matter. Concern was expressed that landlords who made improvements could increase the rent for tenants who were already in fuel poverty or that get out clauses utilised would result in tenants remaining in inferior housing. It was agreed that a future report was required to consider the scale and scope of the Private Rented Housing Sector in the District and the impact of the legislative changes on that sector in with particular reference to EPC and enforcement.

Members asked why external wall insulation measures, contained in Document "K", had not been carried out in wards depicted as having the highest concentrations of fuel poverty. In response it was explained that the funding received had been for solid wall insulation and had been carried out in areas that were in the 10% most deprived Lower Super Output Areas (nationally). The dwelling stock in the most deprived inner-city areas was not suitable for external



wall insulation.

Key Performance Indicator Targets for Better Homes Yorkshire were questioned and it was explained that a shift in ECO funding had meant that some targets would be unachievable. Officers believed that the targets were fair for the Bradford District. In response to concerns that targets would not be delivered Members were assured that because they were delivered through the service officers could identify areas where marketing was taking place and examine invoices for that work.

Resolved –

- 1. That the contents of Document “K” be noted and the programme of work for the new Fuel Poverty Framework for Action be endorsed.**
- 2. That officers from the Energy and Climate Change Unit and Public Health be thanked for their management of the Fuel Poverty Framework for Action.**
- 3. That the Strategic Director, Regeneration, be requested to provide a progress report in 12 months time.**
- 4. That the Strategic Director, Regeneration, be requested to provide a report on the scale and scope of Private Rented Housing Sector in Bradford District and the impact of legislative changes on that sector particularly with reference to energy performance certification and enforcement.**

ACTION: Strategic Director, Regeneration

29. ENVIRONMENT AND WASTE MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17

Members were advised that an Air Quality report would be provided for discussion at the meeting scheduled for 20 December 2016. As agreed earlier in the meeting a report on the scope of the Private Rented Housing Sector, including the impact of legislative changes, would be added to the work programme.

An amended Work Programme 2016/17 would be circulated and separate email communications sent regarding the water management sessions.

No resolution was passed in respect of this item.

CHAIR'S NOTE

The Chair thanked Councillor Love for his hard work whilst presiding over the Committee for the previous five years. His contribution to the Committee was acknowledged and much appreciated by Members.



Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Environment and Waste Management Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER

