
REPORT TO:	Cabinet Organisation Improvement & Environment Commission
DATE:	18 October 2006 6 November 2006
DEPARTMENT:	Community Services
REPORTING OFFICER:	Director of Community Services <i>(Simon Johnson, Head of Environment)</i>
SUBJECT:	WASTE MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN – WASTE COLLECTIONS OPTIONS – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
WARDS AFFECTED:	All
FORWARD PLAN REF:	02/06 DCS 130

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This summary highlights the key conclusions and recommendations of the attached report.

2.0 KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MAIN REPORT

(numbering from main report)

2.4 That Cabinet adopt Option 4 as the preferred waste collection option on the basis that it's implementation, supported by the NYCC through a service level agreement, will be the most effective way of helping to deliver the North Yorkshire Joint Waste Strategy LAA targets.

2.5 That the preferred option is adopted subject to the required financial and infrastructure support being delivered by NYCC through a service level agreement, and is implemented over a 3 year period and is subject to the Council being able to find the necessary supporting funding.

2.6 That the implementation plan will contain policies which set out how exceptions and variations to participation in waste collection schemes will

operate, recognising some properties will not be suitable for full implementation.

2.7 That the expansion of the current green garden waste and dry recycling schemes continue over the next 2 years, as planned.

2.8 That Cabinet receive a report in November giving details of a budget costed implementation plan for years 1 and 2 and details of the negotiation and service level agreement process to be undertaken with NYCC.

Please note:-

Recommendations 2.1-2.3, recommended reasons for decision and alternative options rejected are set out in the main report.

3.0 DETAILS OF THE OPTIONS INVESTIGATED AS PART OF THE PHASE 2 APPRAISAL

3.1 Cabinet decided on 1 February 2006 to ask for two household waste collection options to be investigated further: -

Option 1

The collection of recyclates from the kerbside once a fortnight using a box and bag scheme; with residual waste and green garden waste being collected on alternate weeks using wheeled bins.

Option 4

The collection of recyclates from the kerbside once a fortnight using a wheeled bin for co-mingled dry recyclates and a box for glass, with residual waste and green garden waste being collected on alternate weeks using wheeled bins.

The investigation was to include the option of retaining the current scheme of a weekly black sack collection, and simply expanding the fortnightly recycling collection of the current range of materials using a kerbside box and bag scheme and wheeled bins for garden waste. This is referred to as the baseline option.

4.0 MAIN ASPECTS COVERED IN THE REPORT

- Current recycling performance at 21.54% with incomplete coverage of existing recycling schemes.
- Council's priorities and the Waste Partnership's targets for recycling.
- The need for North Yorkshire County Council to work with this Council to boost recycling to avoid £150/tonne landfill allowance exceedence penalties.
- An analysis of the cost differences between options.
- The fact that Options 1 and 4 will deliver the recycling performance required to meet Partnership targets, but that Option 4 is the Partnership's preferred option.
- The need to manage the risks, as listed.
- The need to have plans and policies in place to take account of the fact that the scheme will not be applicable to all properties in the district
- The proposal to deliver financial support to effect change through funding

provided by North Yorkshire County Council through a Service Level Agreement.

5.0 THE KEY CONCLUSIONS OF THE REPORT

- 5.1** A cost analysis of the preferred waste collection options show that expanding the baseline scheme is the least expensive option, but would fail to deliver the required recycling and composting performance. Options 1 and 4, which include alternative weekly collection of recyclables and residual waste, will deliver the required performance but, due to the cost of service change, are more expensive to implement and operate.
- 5.2** Because Harrogate Borough Council operate a weekly back-door sack residual waste collection service, the costs of moving to Option 4 are much greater than for Councils which are already operating a wheeled bin residual waste service. Harrogate Borough Council also operate an effective kerbside recycling service, so need financial incentives to move to Option 4.
- 5.3** A substantial proportion of the revenue cost of operating both Options 1 and 4 are due to the predicted gate fee for the delivery and handling of collected recyclates. Equally, there are very substantial capital costs in moving from the current recycling service to either Option 1 or Option 4. NYCC have indicated their willingness to provide funding for the move to the Partnerships preferred Option 4, through a service level agreement.

The Waste Collection Options Appraisal and Partnership Development work points to a clear way forward:-

- The implementation of Option 4 over a 3-year period with funding provided by NYCC, agreed.
- The expansion of current green garden waste schemes and dry recycling over the next 2 years (subject to a decision on the method of expanding dry recycling awaiting the outcome of funding negotiations with NYCC)
- The development of a budget costed implementation plan for years 1 and 2 to be reported back to Cabinet in November, together with details of the negotiations and service level agreement process to be undertaken with NYCC to seek funding for the later implementation of the preferred Option 4.

REPORT TO:	Cabinet Organisation Improvement & Environment Commission
DATE:	18 October 2006 6 November 2006
DEPARTMENT:	Community Services
REPORTING OFFICER:	Director of Community Services (<i>Simon Johnson, Head of Environment</i>)
SUBJECT:	WASTE MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN – WASTE COLLECTIONS OPTIONS
WARDS AFFECTED:	All
FORWARD PLAN REF:	02/06 DCS 130

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present the conclusions of the Phase 2 Waste Collections Options Appraisal and recommend a preferred option for implementation subject to the resources being made available.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 To note the progress the Council have made on investing in and improving on household waste recycling and composting performance to reach its target whilst continuing to perform well on constraining waste generation growth.

2.2 To note the outcome of the phase 2 Waste Collection Options Appraisal whereby the preferred Options 1 and 4 selected by Cabinet for further investigation would require additional investment compared with simply expanding the existing recycling scheme, but would deliver significantly improved performance in line with the York and North Yorkshire Joint Waste Strategy and the Local Agreement targets.

2.3 To note the obligation of the Council to work in partnership with NYCC, as set

out in the Strategy and Statement of Agreement Principles, and that the Partnership preferred method for waste collection aligns with Option 4.

- 2.4** That Cabinet adopt Option 4 as the preferred waste collection option on the basis that it's implementation, supported by the NYCC through a service level agreement, will be the most effective way of helping to deliver the North Yorkshire Joint Waste Strategy/LAA targets.
- 2.5** That the preferred option is adopted subject to the required financial and infrastructure support being delivered by NYCC through a service level agreement, is implemented over a 3 year period and is subject to the Council being able to find the necessary supporting funding.
- 2.6** That the implementation plan will contain policies which set out how exceptions and variations to participation in waste collection schemes will operate, recognising some properties will not be suitable for full implementation.
- 2.7** That the expansion of the current kerbside green garden waste and recycling schemes continue over the next 2 years, as planned.
- 2.8** That Cabinet receive a report in November giving details of a budget costed implementation plan for years 1 and 2 and details of the negotiation and service level agreement process to be undertaken with NYCC.

3.0 RECOMMENDED REASON FOR DECISION

- 3.1** To meet the Harrogate Borough Council's corporate objectives and its obligations under the Joint Waste Management Strategy and the draft Local Area Agreement.

4.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTION CONSIDERED AND RECOMMENDED FOR REJECTION

- 4.1** Not to expand recycling services to boost performance. Rejected as the Council has a corporate objective to improve recycling performance, and obligations to work in partnership with NYCC to develop services to avoid landfill exceedance penalties and meet Government targets.

5.0 THE REPORT – BACKGROUND

- 5.1** Cabinet decided on 1 February 2006 to ask for two household waste collection options to be investigated further: -

Option 1

The collection of recyclates from the kerbside once a fortnight using a box and bag scheme; with residual waste and green garden waste being collected on alternate weeks using wheeled bins.

Option 4

The collection of recyclates from the kerbside once a fortnight using a wheeled bin for co-mingled dry recyclates and a box for glass, with residual waste and green garden waste being collected on alternate weeks using wheeled bins.

The investigation was to include the option of retaining the current scheme of a weekly black sack collection, and simply expanding the fortnightly recycling collection of the current range of materials using a kerbside box and bag scheme and wheeled bins for garden waste. This is referred to as the baseline option.

5.2 Current Performance

5.2.1 In 2005/06, 21.54% of household waste was recycled or composted, meeting the Council's Best Value Performance Standard of 21%. The introduction of green garden waste recycling in 2005/06 to 10,000 properties was a key factor in meeting this target.

5.2.2 Even with incomplete (85%) coverage of the district the performance on recycling (glass, paper and cans) is good compared with other North Yorkshire Councils, at 17.09%, ranking 2nd of 7 North Yorkshire districts, and 9th of 16 Audit Commission Family Group districts.

5.2.3 The composting performance is still developing and is due to be improved in 2006/07 by the addition of a green garden waste kerbside recycling scheme centred in Knaresborough.

5.3 Service Cost

The Council has invested substantial capital and revenue sums to drive up recycling performance. In 2005/06, the cost per household of the refuse collection/recycling service was £52.89. The level of the service cost reflects the high quality of the current service and the unusual nature of the district with a combination of large built up areas distributed over a very large, sparsely populated rural district with waste reception facilities remote from the main towns.

5.4 Existing Plans for Expansion

Previous reports to Cabinet have given details of plans to expand green garden waste collection to 80% of the district, and multi-material recycling to service the 15% of the district's properties that do not currently receive it.

5.5 Containing Waste Generation

In 2005/06 the Council collected 363kg of household waste per head. Early indications are that if household waste collected at the household waste sites in Harrogate and Ripon are included, the overall performance is the best in the County. This performance is extremely important to the County Council,

as it affects the amount of waste going to landfill.

6.0 STRATEGIC CONTEXT

6.1 The Council has six corporate priorities, and has recently decided to make “Caring for our Environment” its top priority, encompassing the need to ensure the enhancement and protection of the environment, with recycling central to that protection, for this and future generations.

6.2 In July 2006, Harrogate Council endorsed the York and North Yorkshire Waste Management Strategy, along with the 6 other North Yorkshire districts, NYCC and the City of York.

6.3 The key recycling targets set in the Strategy are to recycle or compost 40% of household waste by 2010, 45% by 2013 and 50% by 2020, on the basis that higher levels of recycling are the most cost effective long term solution to delivering the Partnership’s objectives and diverting waste from landfill to avoid £150 per tonne exceedance penalties.

6.4 The draft Local Area Agreement, between the County Council and the Government, must include targets for waste management. Targets for the LAA have been submitted, and are in line with the recycling targets referred to in 6.3 above, with an associated requirement to reduce waste to landfill. They are binding on the Council as we are partners of the County Council in the delivery of the Local Area Agreement.

6.5 The Government’s review of national waste strategy will be completed this year. They are indicating a plan to maintain recycling targets at 2005/06 levels for 2007/08. The need to meet the national and waste disposal authority targets for the diversion of waste from landfill, as reflected in this report, and contained in the Joint Waste Management Strategy are now more important. The statutory performance targets appear to be functioning as a performance safety net.

7.0 PHASE 2 OF THE WASTE COLLECTION OPTIONS APPRAISAL

7.1 The successful tenderers for the consultancy project, Jacobs Babbie, were appointed to undertake this work. The full report deposited in the Member’s room.

7.2 Their report covers the cost, recycling performance and service implications of the 3 options. The infrastructure and operational requirements to implement the schemes are set out. Summaries of the resource requirements and costs for the options are included, backed up by a series of technical assumptions which were agreed with Council Officers.

7.3 An approach to implementation is included in the report, setting out what will be required in relation to round planning, phasing and staffing.

7.4 A more detailed analysis has enabled officers to recommend a preferred

option for implementation to meet Council and Partnership objectives. It must be stressed that the costs are indicative, and for that reason a detailed implementation plan, including budget estimates, requires development, once decisions about preferred options are made.

8.0 FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

8.1 Cost Analysis

The summary of costs for each option are shown at Appendices 1-3. The revenue costs shown are “above the line” exclusive of depreciation which is shown separately. Implementation of Options 1 and 4 is planned to take place over 3 years, but the information has been presented over a 7-year period, representing the waste collection “life-cycle” in line with the life of a refuse collection vehicle.

8.2 In order to show the costs of implementing the service changes for each option, the capital costs have been analysed over the first 3 years (see table in 8.3). As year 3 figures represent the fully implemented revenue costs of the options, they have been used to highlight the relative impact on revenue costs of each option (see table in 8.4).

8.3 In summary, the capital costs of implementation vary as follows:-

Costs in £k	Baseline	Option 1	Option 4
Capital costs (years 1-3)	1562	2304	3504
Difference from baseline	-	742	1942

8.4 The revenue costs of the implementation schemes (year 3) vary as follows:-

Costs in £K	Baseline	Option 1	Option 4
Revenue costs in year 3	3710	3710	3953
Difference from baseline	-	-	313

8.5 Analysis of Cost Variations between the Options

The key elements of the capital investment required for each option are given in Appendices 1-3.

8.6 The cost issues identified in the study which explain the cost variations between the options can be summarised as follows: -

- The dry recyclables collection for Option 1 and 4 require a greater number of additional vehicles which has an impact on both capital and revenue spending particularly due to vehicle costs and greater staff requirements.
- Options 1 and 4 requires wheeled bins for residual waste collections contributing significantly to the cost of these options.
- Option 4 requires the sorting of co-mingled dry recyclates at a materials

recycling facility and the associated gate fee is a significant contributing factor to the additional cost. There is a similar but lesser cost for the handling of recyclates for Option 1.

- The baseline option assumes no additional staff are employed to manage the overall service.
- The cost for the green waste and bulky waste collection services are the same for all options.
- The residual waste service is most expensive in the baseline option due to the ongoing cost of black sacks and the greater number of vehicles and staff required to deliver a weekly rather than a fortnightly service.

9.0 WASTE RECYCLING AND COMPOSTING PERFORMANCE

9.1 In the report to Cabinet in February 2006 details of the projected indicative performance of the preferred options were given. Options 1 and 4 were anticipated to provide recycling rates well in excess of the baseline, with Option 4 outperforming Option 1. Jacobs Babbie were asked to undertake a further estimation of recycling and composting rates for each option.

9.2 Their projections take into account estimated participation rates, and the materials and properties covered by each option. The rates quoted below are based only on household waste collected at the kerbside (and exclude all other recycling collections e.g. from bring sites):-

	Projected recycling and composting rate for kerbside recycling (Jacobs Babbie)	Estimated recycling and composting rate including non-kerbside recycling (Officer projection from Jacobs Babbie kerbside figures)
Baseline	18.6%	25.6%
Option 1	25.3%	32.3%
Option 4	25.3%	32.3%

9.3 The introduction of an alternative weekly collection service creates an extra incentive for residents to recycle. The consultant's view is that slight variations on performance between Options 1 and 4 are not expected to result in significant change to the overall diversion rate. This is in contrast to the views of the consultant used in the Phase I study and with consultants used by the YNY Waste Partnership which both predict a greater diversion rate from the Option 4, co-mingled collection of recyclables.

9.4 Up-to-date and audited data on this issue are not available more recently than 2003/04. In this year, 7 of the top 12 recycling/composting performing district councils collected their household waste co-mingled in a wheeled bin, the remainder using a kerbside sort scheme.

10.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR RESIDENTS

10.1 The key issues from the Consultant's report are summarised in the tables below:-

	Convenience	Storage Space	Incentive to Recycle
Baseline	No change (Different collection days)	No change	No change
Option 1	Clear and simple frequency of collection on same day. Residual collection frequency reduced. Some bin odour in summer.	May be limited for some residents in their houses (more containers). May be limited for some residents outside their house (2 wheeled bins)	Alternate weekly collection will boost recycling.
Option 4	As Option 1 Increased recycling container capacity	May be limited for some residents outside their houses (3 bins and a glass box).	As Option 1

11.0 OTHER KEY CONSIDERATIONS

11.1 Recycling coverage – policies and practices

11.1.1 Multi-materials kerbside recycling is available to 85% of local residents. Many rural areas, and some pockets of urban areas remain uncovered. This report proposes that work starts now to plan to plug these gaps. An approach will be needed which enables the Council to cost-effectively service the most rural areas of the district, expand services to cover those urban areas not yet covered, and develop techniques and policies to service flats and other multi-occupied properties.

11.1.2 Option 1 and 4 – coverage

The general thrust of Options 1 and 4 is to provide a 3 stream weekly waste collection service using wheeled bins and a box for glass. Not all properties will be suitable for this. For example, houses without gardens will not require a garden waste service, and some flats, maisonettes and terraced housing will not have the storage capacity. Some areas may not be accessible to the vehicles to be used.

Equally some residents will require assistance. A few may need additional storage containers. The options appraisal has made broad assumptions about the coverage of the recycling services, and the alternative weekly collection of residual waste using wheeled bins.

More detailed work to recommend implementation policies and practices, particularly on assisted collections, coverage and side waste will be needed as part of the implementation plan.

11.2 Handling and Marketing Recyclables

11.2.1 The consultant's report refers to the need to deliver recyclables collected by the Council for onward transmission to recycling contractors (for Option 1) or to a Materials Recycling Facility (for Option 4).

11.2.2 Currently recyclates are handled at the Council's depot in Harrogate or a Yorwaste facility near York. Capacity does not exist to handle the additional quantities of kerbside sorted recyclate envisaged in this report and further bulking facilities or a contract to receive and market the recyclates would be required. The consultants have included for the cost of this in their report as a gate fee.

11.2.3 For Option 4, access to a Materials Recycling Facility (or MRF) would be required. A MRF is a factory dealing with the sorting and bulking of mixed (or co-mingled) dry recyclables. The proposal in Option 4 is that a MRF is provided through a contractor who would charge a gate fee per tonne of recyclate delivered.

11.3 Health & Safety at Work

11.3.1 All waste collection operations are subject to risk assessments, and training is given to all staff. The Health and Safety Executive have recently carried out a review of Waste Management in Local Authorities, guidance is expected early in 2007. There are indications in a Health and Safety Laboratory report that for recycling, the co-mingled wheeled bin method is preferred, but it is understood that the HSE are looking at a "cradle to grave" approach to health and safety in waste management rather than focussing on one aspect. Recently a HSE inspector visited Harrogate Council's existing schemes with no adverse comment.

11.3.2 Currently the residual waste collection service is operating using a sack system. Both Options 1 and 4 would mean that operatives would wheel a bin rather than pick up sacks. It is expected that this would reduce:-

- (i) the risk of manual handling accidents; and
- (ii) the likelihood of ill health retirements, with the associated attendance and additional cost benefits.

11.4 Industrial Relations

Any major changes in collection method will have substantial implications for the staff and managers of the service. Meetings are held on a regular basis with Union representatives updating them on progress with this appraisal process, and bulletins are issued to all staff. Whichever option is chosen for

future implementation, there will be consultations with staff and their representatives to ensure they are aware and involved in the changes.

11.5 Trade Waste

- 11.5.1** The Government have indicated the need for more action to support the recycling of trade waste. Advice is available to support local businesses. Locally, Harrogate Borough Council ran a Green Business Club in 2005 for 20 businesses, one of the aims of which is to encourage trade waste recycling and reduction.
- 11.5.2** The Council offer a trade waste collection service to local businesses, as do private sector providers. The charges for this service are levied in accordance with the Council's legal duty to make a reasonable charge for the service. The Council provide advice and guidance to local businesses seeking recycling providers. The Harrogate Chamber of Trade & Commerce have proposed that Harrogate Borough Council should offer a free disposal service for waste materials which cannot be economically recycled, justified on the terms that business rates are paid and that the waste collected will contribute to the achievement of targets. It is not legally possible for the Council to do this.
- 11.5.3** The Council's current focus is on waste collection services for its local residents. Notwithstanding that, the concerns of the Chamber of Trade are understandable.
- 11.5.4** Discussions on how to encourage and support trade waste recycling are taking place within the Partnership as part of a county-wide initiative. In the meantime, it is proposed to respond to the Chamber setting out the legal position, and this Council's requirement to focus on household waste as a priority.

12.0 WASTE PARTNERSHIP ISSUES

- 12.1** The Joint Waste Strategy states that there is a joint objective to seek to provide at least one location within each district to which refuse and recyclables can be delivered for later processing or disposal. The precise location for these are currently under discussion. The current partnership thinking is that it is to one of these points that Harrogate Borough Council will deliver collected recyclates, garden and residual waste, with a co-mingled system similar to Option 4 being the preferred method of collection, so that the County Council would procure a contractor to provide a delivery point and MRF facilities to handle the waste. If Option 1 is chosen, this would run counter to the current thinking of the partnership and may prejudice this approach.
- 12.2** In 2005 the Member's Group of the Partnership endorsed a Statement of Agreed Principles for the Partnership, which although not legally binding, is a formal agreement between the constituent authorities; necessary to support the effective and efficient delivery of the joint strategy, and to help manage

the associated risk, capital investment and long term contract arrangements required to deliver the strategy's objectives. The Statement was signed up to by each Council, including Harrogate.

- 12.3** The Statement is attached at Appendix 4. Each partner authority is recognised as an equal partner in the delivery of the strategy and equally accountable for ensuring its delivery, so that the interests of one partner will not take precedence over any other, and implementation plans will have regard to the interest of the Council Tax payer generally, over the interests of individual partners.
- 12.4** Although the Statement states that the autonomy of each partner authority shall be preserved, the partners are expected recognise that integration and harmonisation of waste collection or management policy may bring additional benefits and opportunities not otherwise available, which may include, for example, the potential to reduce overheads, development and purchasing costs.
- 12.5** The key paragraph in the Statement refers to Collection Methodology, whereby the partners recognise that the area may require systems which use the kerbside collection of a locally determined range of mixed, dry recyclables for later separation.
- 12.6** The Statement acknowledges the need for a Service Level Agreement to be drawn up to formalise this Statement. The document exists in draft form, and the need for it has now been agreed at Member level.
- 12.7** Harrogate Borough Council, as signatories to the Statement, and key partners, must make decisions on recycling collection methodology having regard to the principles it contains.
- 12.8** A cost model worked up by consultants acting on behalf of the Partnership has concluded that the co-mingled collection system is more economical than the kerbside sort system. The model applies across North Yorkshire, and does not take account of implementation, transitional and capital acquisition costs. Neither does it take into account, transitional costs for an authority like Harrogate, operating on a black sack refuse system. The model underpins policy development, but does not represent a budget estimate of implementation.
- 12.9** The Jacobs Babbie cost model is indicating that the capital and revenue cost of introducing co-mingled dry recyclate collection on an alternate weekly basis is higher than that for the kerbside sort system.

13.0 DEVELOPING A SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT TO SUPPORT SERVICE CHANGE

13.1 The costs of Option 1 and Option 4 vary for 2 main reasons:-

13.1.1 Option 1 requires more staff and vehicles to help sort the waste at the

kerbside. The sorted waste still needs handling and bulking up for transport to recyclers, but it is cheaper to do this than sending co-mingled waste for sorting (see next section)

13.1.2 Option 4 requires less staff and vehicles, as co-mingled waste is collected. However separate glass collection puts this cost up (needed to avoid contamination of waste paper). The increased costs are in the need to provide wheeled bins for recyclates and sort the waste at the MRF plant.

13.2 Negotiations with the County Council will focus on how they can support this Council regarding the cost of introducing alternate weekly collection to boost recycling performance, and the cost of including a co-mingled collection (Option 4), including the cost of the gate fee as outlined in 13.1.2 above, bearing in mind the £150/tonne penalty the County will pay for landfill exceedence.

14.0 RISK MANAGEMENT

14.1 Any change of a front line service involves risks to the Council. This area of work is particularly high profile and previous recycling expansions have been implemented successfully, with good risk management.

14.2 Financial risk

There is a risk that the financial basis upon which the recommendations are based are not sufficiently accurate. More detailed budget estimates will be prepared to address this.

14.3 Markets for recyclates could fail. The Government's whole strategy would be undermined, and they have taken steps to secure markets nationally. There will always be fluctuations in the value of recyclates. Sharing risks with the County Council and its contractors will help here.

14.4 As waste costs increase concerns about value for money may arise. This is why Option 4 is being proposed as it has the benefit of maximising recycling performance and optimising the use of resources, once fully implemented. The support of the County Council is crucial in helping to manage the implementation and operating costs.

14.5 Reputational risk

Local residents without a recycling service are keen to see one put in place. The proposals in this report will enable current recycling schemes to expand, addressing these concerns.

14.6 Wholesale change in service provision putting the onus on local residents to recycle may create concern, particularly among those not currently recycling. Clear plans, policies and practices (including exemptions for properties unable to fully participate) will be needed to manage these risks along with effective communications, as part of an overall implementation plan.

14.7 Plans to implement Option 4 depend on the ability of the key partners to deliver an agreement and on the North Yorkshire County Council to provide the necessary infrastructure in good time. A service level agreement approach is essential ensuring that political and funding obligations are clearly set out.

14.8 Commitment

The commitment of Members and staff is crucial to the success of this approach. Clear and regular communication with them to gain their support and show that plans are properly funded and phased, will be essential. Concerns about changing job roles will have to be addressed.

15.0 CONCLUSIONS

15.1 Harrogate Borough Council's performance is good on household waste recycling and waste generation containment, but there are limits to what can be achieved by simply expanding our current recycling schemes to cover all accessible residential properties.

15.2 To achieve the levels of recycling required to help meet the County Council's landfill waste diversion targets and avoid £150/tonne fines for local Council Tax payers, substantial additional investment is required to boost recycling rates.

15.3 The York and North Yorkshire Joint Waste Management Strategy, and the North Yorkshire Local Area Agreement require Harrogate Borough Council and North Yorkshire County Council to work together to deliver the required diversion of household waste from landfill.

15.4 A cost analysis of the preferred waste collection options show that expanding the baseline scheme is the least expensive option, but would fail to deliver the required recycling and composting performance. Options 1 and 4, which include alternative weekly collection of recyclables and residual waste, will deliver the required performance but, due to the cost of service change, are more expensive to implement and operate.

15.5 Work done by the Partnership indicated that Option 4 is the most cost effective method of work collection for North Yorkshire, and this is reflected in the jointly agreed Statement of Agreed Principles and draft Service Level Agreement.

15.6 Because Harrogate Borough Council operate a weekly back-door sack residential waste collection service, the costs of moving to Option 4 are much greater than for Councils which are already operating a wheeled bin residual waste service. Harrogate Borough Council operate an effective kerbside recycling service, so need financial incentives to move to Option 4.

15.7 There are significant benefits to local residents in moving to an alternate

weekly collection service with increased recycling container capacity, as their day of collection for either recycling or residual waste will not vary as they do now for many residents. However policies and practices will need to be designed to accommodate collection for properties which cannot participate, and 100% coverage is not anticipated and has not been modelled. In the meantime plans are needed to plug gaps in current coverage particularly in the rural areas, and some pockets of urban areas, together with flats, maisonettes and difficult to access properties.

- 15.8** A substantial proportion of the revenue cost of operating both Options 1 and 4 are due to the predicted gate fee for the delivery and handling of collected recyclates. Equally, there are very substantial capital costs in moving from the current recycling service to either Option 1 or Option 4. NYCC have indicated their willingness to provide funding for the move to the Partnership's preferred Option 4, through a service level agreement.
- 15.9** The Waste Collection Option Appraisal points to a clear way forward:-
- The implementation of Option 4 over a 3-year period with funding provided by NYCC, as agreed.
 - The expansion of current green garden waste schemes and dry recycling over the next 2 years (subject to a decision on the method of expanding dry recycling awaiting the outcome of funding negotiations with NYCC)
 - The development of a budget costed implementation plan for years 1 and 2 to be reported back to Cabinet in November, together with details of the negotiations and service level agreement process to be undertaken with NYCC to seek funding for the implementation of the preferred Option 4.
- 15.9** The targets set for local councils focus on the management of household waste. Although there is a need to address the national and local approach to tackling recycling in the business sector, the current priority is to plan to divert waste from landfill, and help avoid landfill allowance exceedance penalties.

Background Papers –

York and North Yorkshire Waste Management Strategy 2006
Manual handling in kerbside collection HSL/2006/25
WRAP/ROTATE Options appraisal of kerbside recycling scheme November 2005
Cabinet report - Waste Collection Options Appraisal Phase 1 February 2006
DEFRA Consultation on National Waste Strategy review
DEFRA Proposals on future recycling performance targets
HBC Procurement documents – Waste Collection Options Appraisal Phase 2
Jacobs Babbie Waste Collection Options Appraisal Phase 2 – Draft Report
WRAP Guidance on Alternate Weekly Waste Collection

OFFICER CONTACT: Please contact Simon Johnson, Head of Environment, if you require any further information on the contents of this report. The officer can be contacted at the Department of Community Services, Springfield House, Kings Road, Harrogate, HG1 5NX, by telephone on 01423-556845 or by e-mail – simon.johnson@harrogate.gov.uk

SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT/CRIME AND DISORDER

		Implications are		
		Positive	Neutral	Negative
A	Economy	X		
B	Environment	x		
C	Social Equity		X	
i)	General		X	
ii)	Customer Care/People with Disabilities		X	
iii)	Health Implications		X	
D	Crime and Disorder		x	

If all comments lie within the shaded areas, the proposal is sustainable