

**Roberto Tambini
Chief Executive**

Please contact: Greg Halliwell
Please telephone: 01784 446267
Fax Number: 01784 446333
Email Address: g.halliwell@spelthorne.gov.uk
Our Ref: PGH/Cabinet
Date: 23 March 2011

NOTICE OF MEETING:

SPECIAL CABINET

DATE: WEDNESDAY 30 MARCH 2011

TIME: 5. p.m.

PLACE: GODDARD ROOM, COUNCIL OFFICES, KNOWLE GREEN, STAINES

TO: MEMBERS OF THE CABINET:-

Members of the Cabinet	Cabinet Member Areas of Responsibility
J.D. Packman [Chairman]	Leader of the Council
R.A. Smith-Ainsley [Vice-Chairman]	Planning and Housing
F. Ayers	Community Safety
S. Bhadye	Independent Living
C.A. Davis	Economic Development
G.E. Forsbrey	Environment
Mrs. D.L. Grant	Young People and Culture
Mrs. V.J. Leighton	Finance and Resources
Mrs J.M. Pinkerton	Communications

EMERGENCY PROCEDURE [THE LIFT MUST NOT BE USED]

In the event of an emergency the building must be evacuated. All councillors and staff should assemble on the Green adjacent to Broome Lodge. Members of the public present should accompany the staff to this point and remain there until the senior member of staff present has accounted for all persons known to be on the premises.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS AGENDA IS AVAILABLE IN LARGE PRINT ON REQUEST TO GREG HALLIWELL ON TEL: 01784 446267

IMPORTANT PUBLIC NOTICE

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY – ACCEPTABLE USE

Use of mobile technology (e.g. mobile telephones, Blackberries, XDA's etc.) in meetings can:

- Interfere with the Public Address and Induction Loop systems;
- Distract other people at the meeting;
- Interrupt presentations and debates;
- Mean that you miss a key part of a decision taken.

PLEASE:

Either switch off your mobile telephone etc. **OR** switch off its wireless/transmitter connection and sound for the duration of the meeting.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION IN THIS MATTER.

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for non-attendance.

2. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

To receive any disclosures of interest from Members in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct for Members.

3. FOOD WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE- KEY DECISION

[Councillor Forsbrey]

To receive the report of the Assistant Chief Executive (to follow).

FOOD WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE - KEY DECISION

Special Cabinet: 30 March 2011

Resolution Required

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive

REPORT SUMMARY

How does the content of this report improve the quality of life of Borough Residents

Since the successful introduction of the alternate weekly refuse/recycling scheme in 2007 some residents have asked about food waste collections and the Council did state that we would implement such a scheme as soon as we were in a position to do so. The scheme proposed provides a weekly collection of food waste, which is the element of residual waste we have had most comments about, particularly in the summer months.

Purpose of Report

To seek approval for implementing a food waste collection scheme to increase our recycling rate.

Key Issues

Implementation process

Risks to the Council

Financial aspects

Financial Implications

With support from Surrey CC for three years the scheme will balance in year one but show deficits in years 2 and 3 of £29k, and will rise to £56k in year four and beyond.

Corporate Priority Environment, Sustainable Financial Future.

Officer Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to:

- 1. Authorise the Head of Sustainability and Leisure to implement a food waste collection service with effect from October 2011.**
- 2. Note the arrangements which the Head of Streetscene will make to appoint eight new staff (loaders) for collecting food waste.**
- 3. Authorise the Head of Streetscene to procure the kitchen caddies, food waste bins and liners.**
- 4. Recommend that Council agrees a supplementary capital estimate of £265,000 for the procurement of kitchen caddies, food waste bins and liners.**
- 5. Progress the planning and implementation of the food waste scheme through a Leader's Task Group in the new Council.**

Report Author: Dr Sandy Muirhead Head of Sustainability and Leisure
Area of Responsibility: Liz Borthwick Assistant Chief Executive
Cabinet member: Councillor Gerry Forsbrey.

MAIN REPORT

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Since the introduction of the alternate weekly scheme in autumn 2007 we have seen our overall recycling rate move from 18% in 2007 to 37 % in the last quarter of 2010. However, over the last eighteen months we have seen most other Surrey authorities, as shown below, introduce food waste collections which have boosted their recycling rates to over 50%.

	Recycling July to September 2010	Commenced
Epsom and Ewell	46.61%	Spring 2009 ✓
Guildford	52.18%	Autumn 2009 ✓
Elmbridge	50.18%	Autumn 2009 ✓
Woking	52.68%	Spring 2010 ✓
Mole Valley	53.63%	Summer 2010 ✓
Runnymede	25.87%	January 2011 ✓
Surrey Heath	64.23%	Autumn 2009 ✓
Waverley	36.25%	Following the launch of the 'bolt-on' pilot (to 6,000 homes) in June 2010, extended in Nov 2010 to take in a further 2,500 homes. With new contract in 2012 intend to rollout food waste to all of Borough ✓
Reigate and Banstead	30%	Under consideration but understand they intend to rollout food waste in 2012/13 if they secure capital funding ?
Tandridge	35%	No current plans X
Surrey CC	50.79%	Community recycling Sites

- 1.2 The proposed target for recycling for Surrey County Council is 70% by 2013. It is expected this target to be achieved jointly by the waste collection authorities and County's community recycling centres. This has also been incorporated as an aspirational target in the Surrey wide Plan for Waste Management. This Plan has been endorsed by all of Surrey's local authorities.
- 1.3 This wish to improve recycling rates has opened up further dialogue between County and the Districts and there is now an offer from Surrey CC towards the capital and revenue cost of implementing a food waste collection scheme. The vision for the county is one in which resources are used and managed efficiently so that:-
- The amount of waste produced will continue to be reduced or reused
 - Materials reused, recycled or composted will exceed 70%
 - The environment will be protected and enhanced for future generations
- 1.4 To achieve food waste collections Surrey CC initially entered into three year arrangements with three Waste Collection Authorities (WCAs) over the course of a few months, in Guildford, Epsom and Surrey Heath. All subsequent arrangements, for both capital and revenue contributions, were made on the basis of so much per household, based on the average of what had been paid to the first three. This meant that those first three authorities were paid slightly above average in one category, and below in the other. Surrey CC also found that evidence from the Partnership visits they made to all WCAs indicated that the introduction of food waste, and all the related benefits from changes in collection methods, has achieved savings that offset much of the extra cost incurred with food waste. In authorities running food waste services there is general satisfaction that great improvements have been achieved in the service and in recycling performance at relatively low cost.
- 1.5 The Government charges a Landfill Tax on every tonne of domestic waste sent to landfill. By 2007/08 landfill tax stood at £24/tonne having risen at £3/tonne per year. However, a landfill tax escalator increased landfill tax by £8/tonne starting 2008/09. Landfill tax will continue to increase at this rate until it reaches £72/tonne in 2013/14. This is just the landfill tax and excludes the gate fee charged by a landfill operator or haulage costs which are greater the longer the distant travelled to the site.
- 1.6 The 2007/08 waste composition analysis indicated that Surrey districts sent approximately 82,700 tonnes of food waste to landfill incurring a c. £2M in Landfill Tax that year. Without action on food waste this burden would double by 2010/11, ultimately reaching approximately £6 million per year by 2013/14. By not landfilling food waste a considerable portion of this cost would be avoided by Surrey CC.
- 1.7 The Landfill Directive (2003) specifically seeks to reduce the amount of biodegradable waste – primarily food and garden waste-being sent to landfill.

Year	Target (% reduction in biodegradable waste to landfill)
2010	75% of 1995 levels
2013	50% of 1995 levels
2020	35% of 1995 levels

- 1.8 To incentivise achievement of these targets the Landfill Directive threatens fines of up to £150/tonne through the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS). In 2005/6

Surrey was one of the areas which came closest to exceeding its LATs allowance. Policy 5 of the Surrey Plan for Waste Management targets 0% landfill, which would remove all pressures on Surrey CC's LATS allowance.

- 1.9 The National Waste Strategy for England (2007) proposed to increase investment in infrastructure and encourage recycling and energy recovery using a mix of technologies. This included a pledge to encourage anaerobic digestion. This was reinforced by the coalition agreement in May 2010 which stated that "The parties agree to implement a full programme of measures to fulfil our joint ambitions for a low carbon and eco-friendly economy, including measures to promote a huge increase in energy from waste through anaerobic digestion."
- 1.10 As a result of these factors. Surrey CC, as the waste disposal authority, have now agreed that there will be support beyond the original 3 years, through a mechanism to be finalised with the Surrey Waste Partnership, to involve a base payment plus a performance related element. This new mechanism will partially be funded through saved disposal costs and will be available to all authorities. To ensure "best value" Surrey CC will need to be provided with and understand our base costings, and advised of future progress and spend.
- 1.11 Surrey CC will dispose of the food waste, and require assurance that such waste will be made available for treatment at the planned anaerobic digestion plant, or designated alternative. Surrey will bear the cost and risk of treatment of food waste, and therefore, no recycling credit payment will be due.

2 KEY ISSUES

- 2.1 The alternate weekly recycling and rubbish collection scheme (AWC) has worked well. In 2006/7, prior to the launch of AWC, there was discussion of the inclusion of a kitchen waste scheme, but at the time, lack of detail on robust collection systems and costs meant that Spelthorne did not progress with kitchen waste collections.
- 2.2 However, at the Performance Management and Review Committee of 1 August 2007, officers informed Members that they would continue "to explore the best means for delivering a kitchen waste service", particularly in relation to the long term sustainability and effectiveness. Also, at the Executive of 17 June 2008 Members agreed to the principle of food waste collections and authorised officers to investigate different options with a view to the introduction of this service.
- 2.3 The current vehicle leasing arrangement ended in Autumn 2010 and we are currently "spot hiring". Vehicles are available which are split bodied, with or without a food waste pods and refuse/recycling sections. A separate report was agreed by Cabinet in terms of vehicle provider for food waste/rubbish/recycling vehicles in February 2011.
- 2.4 Although it is proposed that vehicles will be leased, there are increased vehicle costs over standard refuse freighter costs due to the extra complexity of the vehicles with the additional pod for food waste. Currently there is limited operational experience of operating the pods at Spelthorne, but other authorities (using the proposed system) have fed back positively on ease of use. Training on the new vehicles will mitigate any potential issues.
- 2.5 From 16 November 2009 both our refuse and recycling has been going to Colnbrook. The contract for refuse runs out in 2012 whilst the proposed Eco Park (subject to Planning permission) is anticipated in 2013. To avoid having to visit

Charlton Lane to dispose of food waste Surrey CC have strongly indicated that they would look to put in a food waste collecting point at Colnbrook. This arrangement would need to be in place until the expiration of the Material Recovery Facility (MRF) contract in 2017. Surrey CC have indicated that they will provide a food waste disposal area at the Colnbrook site. However, this site does not currently have a licence to hold food waste. Grundons have indicated that they will make an application, but there is a risk that this may be refused and even if given permission arrangements would not be in place before the proposed food waste collection scheme starts in October 2011. Therefore, tipping will have to take place at Charlton Lane or the Depot in the interim.

- 2.6 Food waste tipping facilities are already in existence at Charlton Lane to counteract issues that arise due to shutdowns for any reasons at Grundons. As Surrey CC and SITA are keen to ensure food waste collections can be carried out they are looking a number of options to help provide service resilience and ease of operation.
- 2.7 We will also be able to include other plastics (yoghurt pots, food trays – not plastic bags or films) in the recycling collection from May 2011. The campaign for this could be tailored in with the communications campaign on food waste collection, thus maximising effective use of limited communication resources.
- 2.8 Effective communication is a key aspect of the success of the introduction on a new service and, therefore, appropriate resources need to be provided, including possible assistance from Surrey CC. **Appendix 1** outlines operational, customer service and communication issues to address. Officers will use the experience gained from the successful marketing and communications plan for the AWC introduction to ensure a professional and consistent message to the public with regard to food waste.

3 OPTIONS ANALYSIS

Option 1 Not to introduce a separate food waste collection scheme.

Option 2 To collect food waste weekly from spring/summer 2012 using separate kitchen caddies on the same day as refuse or recycling.

Option 3 To revert to weekly refuse collections.

Option 4 To collect food waste weekly from October 2011 using separate kitchen “caddies” on the same day as refuse or recycling.

4 PROPOSALS

- 4.1 Not to collect food waste (**Option 1**) - If we do not collect food waste we will not significantly increase our recycling rates. Also, adding in food waste seems to assist in increasing the amount of dry recyclables collected, as it makes people think more about their waste.
- 4.2 To delay food waste (**Option 2**) - To delay until spring/summer 2012 may cause issues regarding procurement of the vehicles as the arrangement for the current fleet cannot be extended indefinitely.
- 4.3 To revert to weekly collections (**Option 3**) – Would cost substantially more than implementing food waste. Food waste collection does provide a weekly collection of the waste portion most people complained about not being collected, when moving

from weekly to fortnightly collections. Also, weekly refuse collections without considerable marketing effort to educate the public, is likely to lead to a reduction in dry recycling tonnages.

- 4.4 To collect food waste (**Option 4**) - To undertake the scheme will increase our recycling rate. The new scheme will require eight new posts to be created within the Streetscene structure to provide one extra loader for each of the existing crews (driver and two loaders) plus one spare loader to provide some cover for sickness/holiday.
- 4.5 Therefore, it would seem appropriate to move forward with option 4 the collection of food waste from October 2011. To the majority of residents already on alternative weekly collections, this will require the purchase and delivery of approx 38,000 kitchen caddies and food waste bins and a supply of larger 240 litre bins to be provided for flatted developments or properties that do not have their own individual bins. An evaluation would need to be done as soon as possible to identify properties that would not be considered as appropriate areas for the collection of food waste. Members are asked to agree to this principle as it will address residents concerns voiced when AWC was rolled out about food waste in their bins for two weeks.
- 4.6 If members support the recommendation, more detailed communication and operational plans will be prepared. Across Surrey the new service launches of food waste have improved performance on waste and recycling from existing services. However, internally Spelthorne needs to note the resource that will be required to deliver a food waste service if it goes ahead. Also some external assistance may be necessary with the rollout. In this way, a smooth marketing and operational delivery of the scheme will be assured.

5 BENEFITS AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 5.1 Waste is a major environmental issue and recycling material is better than disposal.
- 5.2 Whilst undertaking communications we will also continue to encourage residents to minimise waste production and recycle mixed plastics (food trays, yoghurt pots, margarine tubs – not plastic bags or film) that can now be accepted.
- 5.3 To ensure effective implementation of the scheme we will need to update our policies on collections including issues such as side waste for rubbish closed bin lids and unwrapped food waste. This will form a separate report in due course.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 It should be noted that the County Council funding is available for three years with further funding beyond that time with base and performance related elements. Officers are confident that our performance will improve in order to have as little impact on our budget as possible
- 6.2 This report is directly linked to the report on vehicle procurement and the procurement of the food waste vehicles is part of a package involving one provider and this report with costs for vehicles has previously been agreed.
- 6.3 In year one the budget will balance. There is, based on the estimates of costs of adding in food waste collections, a potential shortfall of £29k over years two and three (**Appendix 2**). However, this reduced deficit is calculated on the basis (and

Surrey CC have agreed to this) that some capital is changed into revenue and we utilise capital in the budget currently earmarked for compost bins and carried forward marketing monies to add to the pot for the rollout campaign. The financial calculations include the need for Streetscene to create eight new posts to provide the extra staff on each of the existing crews.

- 6.4 Members will be aware of the pressure on the Council's budget from recent detailed budget reports 2011-2012. In essence, we will have less government grant in the future, continued pressure on income (particularly interest rates for investment income), less capital money to spend and, therefore, more pressure on our ability to increase our reserves (£100k contribution to reserves in 2013/14). Therefore, ensuring the cost of a food waste scheme is reduced it is essential in terms of our medium term budget pressures, particularly as there is continued uncertainty about the future levels of government grant (RSG).

7 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 An Equality and Diversity assessment will be required to ensure that disadvantaged areas of the community can take part in the scheme.

8 RISKS AND HOW THEY WILL BE MITIGATED

- 8.1 Not addressing development of waste collections could make Spelthorne one of the lowest recyclers in Surrey, and increasingly in England, as other Councils implement further recycling collections for residents. Taking out the food waste element helps mitigate issues around weekly collections.
- 8.2 There is a risk that MRF recycling savings are not as high as anticipated, but these will be mitigated by further encouraging recycling amongst low recyclers, minimising contamination of loads and encouraging more to be recycled out of the residual waste.
- 8.3 There is the potential that participation rates may cause problems with vehicle loads and increase overall vehicle requirements and costs.
- 8.4 If Surrey CC do not make appropriate arrangements for food waste to be tipped at Colnbrook, and we were forced to tip at Charlton Lane, the extra tipping and vehicle down time may have a severe impact on collection rounds that may result in uncollected food waste and or rubbish and recycling. Most authorities have found the food waste scheme much simpler to operate than anticipated and tipping much more straightforward. All have seen a general increase in recycling rates.
- 8.5 To collect food waste effectively could require the use of a slave bin by the food collection waste operative. There is the potential that this exposes the collectors to rotting food. It is unclear at present whether or not this collection method will affect staff and increase sickness (not found in other authorities) but it will need to be closely monitored, as an increase in sickness and or provision of extra personal protective equipment will have financial implications. Other authorities have undertaken training and risk assessments on this and to date have not found it to be an issue, and are usually overcome by wearing appropriate PPE equipment.
- 8.6 Insufficient communications to residents. Surrey CC will assist with "in kind" marketing support in year one to mitigate any risk on communication. Costs would

be mitigated by using rolled forward communications budgets within Sustainability and Leisure.

- 8.7 Most authorities have included one roll of biodegradable bags to residents to help introduce the system. Officers have included a one year capital contribution in the cost analysis. Experience from other authorities has shown that not providing future funding for bags does not have a significant impact on collection rates.

9 TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- 9.1 The timetable for implementation is dependent on the procurement/build of the vehicles however, at this time it is anticipated that food waste will be implemented in October 2011. (**Appendix 3**).

**Report Author: Sandy Muirhead Head of Sustainability and Leisure (01784)
446318**

Background Papers:

Joint Municipal waste Management Strategy - A Plan for Waste Management in Surrey
2010

Performance and Review Committee minutes 1 August 2007

Executive 17 June 2008

Cabinet minutes 15 February 2011

Communication and Operational Areas to be covered

1. Containers

- a) Residents demand that food waste bins must be durable, reliably lockable and well sealed. In Surrey the 23 litre food bin has proven robust and easy to handle – Note this should carry some labelling to instruct residents **not to use plastic bags** and to wrap their food prior to recycling it.
- b) Operators require them to be easy and safe to handle
- c) Kitchen caddies have proved to be popular with residents and effective in maximising participation.
- d) In other parts of Surrey bio liners if issued at the start have not been issued on a permanent basis:-
 - The Government's Waste Resources and Action Programme (WRAP) established that provision of bio liners did not have a significant impact on performance

2. Delivering containers

- a) The careful delivery of containers to households will generate confidence in the new service.
- b) If contractors used (often helpful) they should be accompanied by a dedicated council supervisor along with comprehensive route information. This will ensure quality and accurate deliveries (and avoid deliveries properties to which services are not being launched)
- c) Clear and appropriate information should always be given when delivering new containers. This is especially important with food waste where the containers are small and new to residents and where literature may have been placed inside to protect it from the rain. Suggestions are comprehensive leaflet stays in bin and a label on the bin handle alerts residents and points to information within the food bin.
- d) Launch information should include the following key aspects:-
 - When the service start, and an ongoing collection calendar
 - Any changes to collection days
 - How to use the new containers
 - What can/cannot be recycled
 - Clear guidance on wrapping food waste, including where to obtain bio-liners locally
 - A summary on what happens to recycled food.
- e) Ideally new containers should be delivered on the normal day of collection, one week prior to first collection. this helps avoid confusion over collection days

3. Publicity

The Waste Resources Action Programme trials showed considerable popularity of food waste recycling. However, food waste may not necessarily be recognised by all residents as a key recyclable before the event, and may be viewed with concern by some. It therefore remains important to pre-publicise services and engage with residents to answer questions and address concerns.

The Level of resource required to provide such engagement will vary depending on the type of activity chosen. A variety of activities have been used such as road shows, press releases, articles in council magazines, radio interviews pre-launch letters and vehicle advertising via Agripa boards.

In particular residents are keen to understand:-

- Why food waste is being targeted, how it can help the environment and what impact it will have on Council Tax
- When they will receive the new services
- What can/cannot be recycled
- What difference this will make to the Council's recycling performance
- How food waste is processed
- What the new container's will look like, how big they are (and whether residents believe they will have the space), how they work, whether they are secure from pests e.g. rats/foxes and how they can be kept clean and free from smells/flyes.
- What impact the new service has on the locality (additional vehicles and how food waste will be contained on vehicles) and current services
- How the service could work for flats
- Options for changing containers longer term e.g. downsizing refuse bins when replacements are needed/new developments occur

Reference to previous food waste experience, WRAP trials and other services in Surrey can be important in generating confidence.

WRAP also advises that follow up publicity is essential to maintain participation. Clear and consistent branding across all relevant media (e.g. leaflets, letters, calendars, labels) maximises recognisability and the chance that the information will be read.

All councils are encouraged to use the Surrey Waste Partnership logo and strap line.

4. Liaison with Customer Services

Liaison with all relevant customer facing staff is vital during planning, publicity and container delivery phases as well as during operations.

- Planning – need to ensure literature is easy to understand thus reducing the need for people to contact the Council
- Publicity - customer services need to know where and when events are taking place as well as understanding any issues
- Delivery - Customer Services should know the delivery process and schedule in advance in order to be able to anticipate and handle any questions arising. Once deliveries start, a clear, live process for advising Customer Services needs to be established again helping to anticipate and manage queries. There should be honest and speedy feedback of any delivery issues e.g. missed roads or properties.

5. Recycling Performance

Where food waste has been introduced it has contributed significantly to recycling performance.

When a new food waste service starts there is a general tendency for strong collections immediately after a launch followed by a waning. It is suggested two factors may contribute to this:-

- Residents, seeing in isolation the amount of food waste they are wasting, may reduce their food waste.
- Participation may fall away.

The only exception to this trend across Surrey is Surrey Heath which is increasing its kilogram's collected per household. Given this is one borough out of 7 currently operating the service it may be seen as a risk to us that this may happen but not necessarily.

The food tonnage in residual waste in 2010/11 in Spelthorne is 4,750 tonnes (32% of residual). Based on experience elsewhere and the fact that not all flats will be on the system it is estimated that Spelthorne will collect up to 3,500 tonnes per year. Based on collection/participation rates it is estimated that each household will generate around 1.97kg/week. If collection rounds involve 1000 properties per day, and assuming all participate this would mean 1.97 tonnes of food waste collected each day. If assume 65% participation then each day 1.28t of food waste would be collected.

This is important because if less than 2m³ per day is collected (which equates to around 2 tonnes) then the crews will only need to tip food waste once per day. This is critical for two reasons:-

- a) Gives a bit more flexibility on where tip food waste as could be at the depot for example, if Grundons could not accommodate a tipping point, as could tip at the end of the day. Although this will be subject to a planning application and Environment agency permit.
- b) Ensures that the compartment for recyclables and rubbish is not reduced by too much thus again avoiding tipping more than twice a day which is currently the norm on most days.

There may be occasions when food waste collections do require two tips these are:-

- a) At start when residents seem to hoard food waste!
- b) Halloween – pumpkins weigh a lot!
- c) Christmas.

To mitigate these effects it is important the crews are made aware of these issues especially in relation to the start of the service, when demand for a period may be high.

6. Other issues

Spillage: the system we are proposing can involve the use of use slave bins and spillage from experience in other areas has not necessarily been a problem. There is the odd occasion but this is true of all materials.

Operative discontent: this can be mitigated by fully explaining the new scheme and anticipating any crews that may complain and explain further to them. Though there has been mention of some authorities having issues for others including those with in house Depots it has not been an issue.

Wrapping Food waste It's true that some residents don't wrap their food waste. Operatives have occasionally in other services spoken about to push residents to wrap food waste but it doesn't seem to be a major issue that is generally raised by the crews.

Loading: that loading via a side pod, as opposed to the back end, has not been a problem elsewhere. For those using slave bins, the operative doing the food is generally working on his own and keeping clear of the guys working at the back end, which avoids congestion at the rear. Further, the food waste operative has relatively few bins (he has maybe 60% participation compared to maybe 75-80% for the operatives at the back end collecting recyclables/rubbish) and does not go to the vehicle with each container, so there is an overall balance in the speed of operation.

Vehicle width: to deal with urban areas some authorities use narrow-bodied Dennis Eagle vehicles which match the overall dimensions of previous RCVs and have therefore not had any adverse impact on operations. Note: rear-steer does make the vehicles more manoeuvrable but you do get high accident rates at first and have to train drivers. In the light of the availability of narrow-body pods it does not seem relevant to slowing collection rates.

Suitability of food bins: Other authorities have not always had problems with damaged bins, finding the Straights bins (used across the Surrey authorities) to be pretty robust. They can be a blown away on windy days but kerbside boxes do the same! Some authorities had an issue with caddies being left inside food bins after launch (and so landing up in the food waste vehicles and having to be replaced) but we can learn from that and ensure our publicity covers this issue.

Effects on other services

Across Surrey the new service launches have improved performance from existing services. However, internally Spelthorne needs to note the resource that will be required to deliver the service if it goes ahead. Particularly impacted are environment, streetscene,

communications and customer services. It needs to be acknowledged that other areas under the remit of these services may have to be put on a back burner.

Food waste recycling in Surrey is having direct and significant effects on Surrey Waste Partnerships (which Spelthorne has approved) key drivers by, for example,

- Reducing the amount of waste sent to landfill
- Reducing the biodegradable content of waste sent to landfill
- Stimulating existing recycling services

From the information collated to date across Surrey participation surveys are recommended to underpin the service. Resources and costs are being considered for future funding through the Surrey Waste Partnership. Post launch publicity actions are recommended by WRAP to maintain and stimulate participation. These can be partially considered under the auspices of the Partnership and their efficiency maximised by experience from all Surrey authorities. The Surrey Waste Partnership's work with Love Food Hate Waste is a good example of this work.

Across Surrey there remains little provision of food waste recycling in flats. Woking and Guildford are about to focus on this area and therefore there will be opportunities to learn from their experiences.

Appendix 2

							Initial 3 year introductory funding			Following 3 year phase		
							Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
							£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Revenue Costs												
Net additional leasing cost of vehicles (for pod adapted vehicles)							60	60	60	60	60	60
Increased cost under subsequent leasing contract												???
Extra loaders (7 plus 1 spare) (Note 1)							168	168	171	174	177	181
Fuel (Note 2)							10	11	12	13	14	15
Increased staffing costs in year 1							12					
Additional revenue costs							250	239	243	247	251	256
MRF contract savings							-12	-12	-12	-12	-12	-12
Increase in recyclables over years							-10	-12	-13	-14	-14	-14
Additional Revenue Income including Surrey funding and contibution from capital to revenue							-250	-226	-227	-193	-193	-193
Shortfall							0	13	16	54	58	63
Notes:												

1) Pay freeze for years 1 and 2, 1.5% pay increase assumed for year 3, and 2% thereafter

2) Fuel assume 10% per annum

3) Marketing: Assistance in kind from SCC. In year 1 there will be approximately £30k marketing spend but this will be met from existing budgets.

4) £302 capital from Surrey CC towards scheme

