

Consultation Response - Gedling Borough Council

Nottinghamshire County Council Waste Reduction, Re-use, Recycling and Composting Plan 2015/16

Feedback on the draft plan

Gedling Borough Council welcomes the opportunity to feedback on the draft plan and remains committed to waste reduction across the Borough and to increasing recycling and composting.

The draft plan contains suggestions and ideas that the Nottinghamshire Waste Partnership has already been working on and been promoting through its various media outlets to residents and businesses. It remains important we feel that the communication teams at each Local Authority share the information from the County Council to its residents and local businesses.

The Council's Waste Services team will continue to promote the waste hierarchy: waste prevention, re-use and recycling and work to further increase local participation in its schemes, whilst trying to improve the quality of waste sent to the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) for processing.

The following are comments on the particular sections of the plan:

2.6 – Textiles - Gedling Borough Council do not currently collect textiles. They have been collected in the past before the current alternate weekly scheme. To introduce a new scheme at this point would be too costly to provide. There are now many alternative outlets available to dispose of unwanted textile products, such as charity shops, rag buying shops, textiles banks and by using the numerous "charity" collection bags that are delivered to households on a regular basis. The Council would support more publicity across the County to encourage further increase in the recycling of textiles to avoid this product being disposed of through the residual waste stream.

3.6 – Residents' Waste Permit Scheme - Whilst the Council understands the rationale for this scheme we consider that this may have an adverse impact on our budgets because of the potential increases in fly tipping collection costs. The Council will closely monitor fly tipping incidents to assess the impact of this proposal if introduced.

3.7 – Inert Materials at Recycling Centres – We believe, based on current experiences that builders/tradesmen are responsible for the considerable increases we are experiencing in fly tipped rubble and other building materials across the Borough. It would be beneficial if smaller amounts (of less than one tonne) of inert waste were taken from traders and charged for at a reduced price (rather than paying a minimum tipping charge for a tonne) this would encourage them to take their waste to the recycling centre rather than disposing of it by other means. The charge for vans, trailers etc. may also increase householders fly tipping in the nearby rural vicinity and create additional costs for the Council (note: the Calverton area had over 200 incidents of fly tipping in 2014/15). The amount of inert waste fly tipped has increased over the year with 81 instances recorded within the Gedling Borough

Council area (a significant increase from the previous year). The proposed charge may also increase the amount of inert waste put in residual waste bins. The Council will continue to closely monitor fly tipping incidents to assess the impact of this proposal when introduced.

4.6 – Re-use - The Furniture Re-use Network website currently has only a few suggestions on it and none in the Gedling Borough Council area, although there are several local outlets which Gedling Borough Council signpost residents to. We would suggest that it may be useful to try to improve the number of outlets on this website that will take furniture for reuse rather than it being sent to landfill/incineration.

5.24 – Florescent Tubes – It is not feasible to collect florescent tubes in Gedling Council owned buildings due to the limited space available and the containers Veolia have made available are too large.

5.27 – Mattress Separation and Carpet Recycling – These are excellent initiatives that would be useful for bulky waste collected items too as mattresses make up a high percentage of our local collections. Gedling Borough Council welcomes any new schemes to increase the recycling or reuse of valuable resources.

5.30 – Food Waste – This makes up about a third of residual waste and whilst there is no strategic intent at present to develop food waste collections we consider it an option that should remain to be considered should a future business case support its introduction.

5.6 – Increase of Comingled Materials – We agree that the input specification to the MRF needs to be reviewed and broadened to take more recyclable materials, allowing our residents to recycle more of their household waste, this should at least include cartons (Tetrapak® types), foil, and other plastics.

5.16/5.17 - Increasing Kerbside Composting – The average increase for every 700 new customers is 0.84% increase in the composting rate. There are currently 51,700 households within the Borough and this is anticipated to grow considerably over the next 3 years. The Council's current scheme (which covers approximately 11,820 households) is now nearing capacity and considerable investment would be needed to introduce additional rounds within the Borough. Whilst a further option would be to reduce the charge to customers this is not financially viable for us without an ongoing grant payment from the County that would cover the costs of a reduced charged for service. We would be interested in exploring opportunities to work with other councils on the further development of this service. The compositional analysis and the weight of the residual bins in the summer does illustrate there is still significant amounts of garden waste that could be composted.

This Council would be willing to have further discussions with NCC to explore options to jointly invest in order to expand this service where this could be done with no detrimental impact on this Council's revenue costs.

5.19 - Kerbside Glass Collections – The Council agrees that this waste stream remains a priority for recycling activity and we are committed to doing what is financially possible to improve our performance in this area. We would welcome further discussion on the potential to work on new ideas for glass collection along

with the County and other District and Borough colleagues. We are interested in the feasibility of the option being considered in Ashfield concerning eight weekly collection cycles and the use of wheelie bins as opposed to 'collection boxes'.

The potential loss of income through recycling credits when glass becomes classified as contract waste in 2019, may force Gedling and other Councils to investigate the 'bring site' collection option that is currently working well across Rushcliffe. There can however be no guarantees that 'bring sites' will be effective in Gedling and changes could lead to more glass entering the residual waste stream as opposed to it being usefully recycled. The Council sees this as a significant risk to performance and would welcome the opportunity to discuss new ways of working in partnership with Nottinghamshire Councils to address this potential challenge.

6.7 – Bulky Waste Stripping – The Council supports this scheme and would favour its extension if the trial is successful. WasteDataFlow, the DEFRA data return that captures the detail of the recycled components would need to be amended to enable the Boroughs and Districts to capture this activity if the scheme was formally adopted in due course.

Figure 10, Recycling and Associated Tonnage Targets – We share the view that has been expressed by other local councils that using the words District/Borough Targets is not at all helpful in the context of this draft plan but expressing the desire to improve as a 'potential performance level' is acceptable, and more accurately describes a level of performance that the Council could strive for, if supported by NCC, and by working in partnership with Borough/District Councils.

We would therefore wish the reference to a Gedling District Target to be removed.

9.3 – Recycling Rate – Within Gedling the current recycling rate has remained stable and it is unlikely it will improve significantly. The dry recycling rate has decreased slightly as the composting rate has increased. The 45% recycling rate suggested in figure 10 (page 19) is ambitious in the current economic climate. A cost benefit analysis will be undertaken to assess the viability of increasing resources for the garden waste service and the Council will explore further opportunities with other local Borough/District Councils.

9.5 – The Compositional Analysis – This information is welcomed by the Council, and usefully included data for Gedling showing that approximately 15% of the residual household waste was in fact 'garden waste' which could have been diverted. It would be useful if the analysis is undertaken at different times of the year to illustrate seasonal variation.