

Report of the Strategic Director Place to the meeting of Environment and Waste Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be held on 28th February 2017.

AA

Subject:

Update on policy relating to the collection of bulky waste and Household Waste Recycling Centre Permits.

Summary statement:

Members of Environment & Waste Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee require an update on a review of arrangements to increase the items collected by the bulky waste service, and changes to Household Waste Recycling Centre Permits

Steve Hartley
Place Strategic Director

Portfolio:

Environment, Sport & Culture

Report Contact: Richard Longcake
Principal Officer Waste Services
Phone: (01274) 432855
E-mail: richard.longcake@bradford.gov.uk

Overview & Scrutiny Area:

Environment & Waste Management



1. SUMMARY

Members of Environment & Waste Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee require an update on a policy review of arrangements to increase the items collected by the bulky waste service, and the issuing of Household Waste Recycling Centre Permits.

2. BACKGROUND

Following a report to E&WMO&S Committee in April 2016, into the policies for bulky waste collection and Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC), members, being concerned whether such policies might be adding to fly tipping within the district, requested to see if there was scope to improve policy, specifically the increase in scope of bulky waste collections to include certain fixtures and fittings (which are not currently in scope) and improve accessibility of resident only permits to use HWRCs.

3. HWRC RESIDENT ONLY PERMITS

The resident only permits for Bradford residents to use any of our 8 HWRC's, was introduced in April 2013. In order to obtain a permit, residents are required to visit (usually their nearest) HWRC, bring proof of identity and residency, a permit similar to a vehicle tax disc is then issued for residents to display in their car windscreen in order to identify themselves to site staff when using their HWRC. To date some 90,000 permits have been issued.

Members noted that the total number of residences in Bradford district is circa 215,000, clearly not every household has a permit, the present coverage being around 40%.

Outcome

Other Councils that have introduced similar permit schemes have adopted differing ways of issuing them. In reviewing these, and looking forward also to the introduction of Alternate Weekly Collections (AWC) later this year, the present system is to be replaced by the issue of a new and different designed permit (though again to be displayed in the car windscreen) to every household in the district via the annual council tax bill due to be delivered in the next few weeks following the budget setting process. This will ensure all 215,000 households will have a resident only permit to use any of our HWRC's, thus providing 100% coverage.

4. BULKY COLLECTIONS

The longstanding basis for items which would be removed as part of a bulky collection, is only to remove those items that a resident would take if they moved house, therefore fixtures and fittings would not fall within the scope of a bulk and would not be removed. At the April 2016 E&WO&S Committee members



challenged this basis, in particular in relation to kitchen, bedroom and bathroom fixtures.

Issues

Removal

The ability to remove fixtures from kitchens, bedrooms and bathrooms has been considered by operational managers. The staff and collection vehicles involved can successfully collect this material, provided the scope doesn't include building or dangerous materials, e.g., hardcore from knocking down walls, or items likely to shatter and become projectiles given that we collect using a compaction vehicle. Therefore getting the scope right is important.

Scope

The suggested scope for such fixtures be limited to the actual fitments themselves (e.g., kitchen base/wall units, bedroom cabinets, wardrobes, vanity and bedside table units, bathroom shower cubicle, toilet, wash basins, bath and cabinets), with no building rubble, mirrors or glass. Presentation of the fixture in terms of manual handling to load the material would need to comply with our present policy requirements, in order to protect the health and safety of our employees.

Lack of any clear scope could lead us into the realms of general site/yard clearance – this is to be avoided.

Charge

In reviewing possible scale of charge, consideration has been given to what is on offer in the market place to residents. The current rate for the popular 4 cu metre skip from private skip operators is typically £130 per lift.

However the charges levied by Councils for bulky collection can only cover the collection costs, and not the disposal costs, therefore charges must be based on an average time for collection of fixtures if we are to retain the up front payment method, which is clearly desirable. Were each bulk requiring removal of fixtures to be priced individually, in order to retain an upfront payment arrangement, this would require an officer to visit the household to give a price prior to removal, an exercise which is costly in itself. Removing the fixture as a bulk and charging afterwards on an actual time basis is not favoured (residents would not know up front cost, with possible disputes and bad debts ensuing).

Clearly a standard charge per fixture is preferable. For example assuming that to remove a fixture would take the equivalent time for the current maximum number of bulky items under the present policy (21-25 items), then the same charge of £35 would be levied per fixture or part thereof. Thus if a resident had both a kitchen and bathroom fixture the charge would be $£35 \times 2 = £70$, and if fixtures included kitchen, bedroom and bathroom, it would be $£35 \times 3 = £105$.



However there is a word of caution. As stated above, cost of disposal are not part of the bulky waste charge, thus if we were to significantly undercut the charge for a skip, and the service proved popular, we could be taking on increased disposal costs (circa £90/tonne), at a time when budgets are severely stretched, and which is not recovered in the charge.

Capacity

Currently all bulky collections are serviced by a single crew of two operatives and vehicle working a 4 day week Tuesday to Friday. The maximum number of bulk jobs undertaken per day is circa 50.

Since the introduction of charging for bulks in September 2013, the number of service requests (cases) is as follows:

Year	Cases	Tonnes
2014	10,683	1,088
2015	10,408	1,060
2016	10,655	1,113

It can be seen that the above is consistent and equates to 200 jobs per week or around 50 per day. Since the introduction of charges, the resident is given a set day for collection. As a paid for service residents expect us to turn up on the day stipulated. Failure to achieve this would see complaints rise.

Clearly the bulk crew is working at capacity under the present service demand. The service is indeed working very well under the present arrangements, with few complaints being logged, most complaints arising from residents placing out unlisted items for collection or not presenting the waste as per instructions given to them at the time of service request.

Introduction of further jobs which take longer to load than the common 1-5 jobs (£15 charge) which accounts for 90% of cases could jeopardise the ability of the crew to meet demand and collect the bulk on the day advised to the resident. This would be a backward step.

It may be possible to relegate all such collections of fixtures to overtime say on Saturdays, this creates a problem of charges when premium rates would be paid (x 1.5), and any crew working a Saturday would require a minimum of 4 hours work. Currently it is not known what the level of demand for removal of fixtures would be, if there was only 1 job, it would be costly to employ a crew for 4 hours. Alternatively jobs could be accumulated to provide 4 hours worth of work, but then we may be unable to say in advance which Saturday such a bulk would be collected. It may also mean a resident waiting a number of Saturdays for collection. Working the crew longer days during the week to accommodate the collection of fixtures is also difficult as this starts to infringe on drivers hours regulations.



Again not knowing the level of demand, it would clearly not be economical to set on another crew during the week, as there would not be sufficient work from fixtures to justify this.

Alternative Collection

Officers are currently exploring other areas of the service, to see if it is possible to remove fixtures without disrupting the current operational arrangements, and some discussions have taken place with operational managers in other areas to see if capacity can be freed up and collection made without the downside issues noted above.

5. FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL

As stated in the April 2016 report maintaining a residents only permit prevents Bradford from paying for the management and disposal of non residents waste (£150,000 per annum). Though difficult to quantify, a permit for every household may lead to increased inputs into HWRC's and thus costs, however a 75% recycling performance at these sites will negate much of this, and ultimately could be a cheaper option to the Council then if any extra waste was otherwise disposed of via spurious means.

The level of charge for collection of fixtures is difficult to quantify, and the possible danger of increasing disposal costs is very real. It is therefore possible that should such a step to collect fixtures be taken, that costs of collection are closely monitored, with a view to reviewing the position after a period of time, say 6-9 months.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES

There is a risk to increasing the Council's waste disposal costs.

7. LEGAL APPRAISAL

There are no legal issues arising from this report which is for information and discussion only.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

8.1 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY

There are no negative equality and diversity implications apparent within the context of the report, providing resident permits to all households can only have a positive equality and diversity impact.



8.2 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

The correct management of household waste and reducing disposal of waste via spurious means can contribute positively towards the sustainable agenda.

8.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS

The content of the report does not have a negative climate change impact, should incidence of fly tipping be reduced there will be a carbon saving from less vehicle and miles needed to remove fly tipped waste.

8.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

There are no community safety implications.

8.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

There are no known Human Rights Act implications.

8.6 TRADE UNION

There are no staffing implications arising from this report.

8.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS

There are no individual Ward implications.

9. NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS

None

10. OPTIONS

N/A

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

That Environment and Waste Management Overview & Scrutiny Committee consider the information presented in this report, particularly in relation to the inclusion of fixtures in the scope of bulky waste collections. The committee asks officers to seek a conclusion on the operational considerations to collect these or otherwise as soon as possible, and in any event to be reported back to this committee no later than June 2017.



12. APPENDICES

None.

13. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Report to the E&WMO&S Committee 4th April 2016.



