DECISION-MAKER:		OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE		
SUBJECT:		WASTE MANAGEMENT		
DATE OF DECISION:		15 OCTOBER 2015		
REPORT OF:		CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT		
		CONTACT DETAIL	<u>s</u>	
AUTHOR:	Name:	Colin Rowland	Tel:	023 8083 3561
	E-mail:	colin.rowland@southampton.gov.uk		
Director	Name:	Mark Heath	Tel:	023 8083 2371
	E-mail:	mark.heath@southampton.gov.uk		

STATE	MENT OF	F CONFIDENTIALITY	
None.			
BRIEF	SUMMAF	RY	
		ides an update on waste and recycling, which includes recycling 15/16 budget position, and an update on waste enforcement.	
RECOM	MENDA	TIONS:	
	(i)	to note the contents of the report; and	
	(ii)	to note that changes are required to the Council's Waste Enforcement Policy to take account of the Deregulation Act 2015.	
REASC	ONS FOR	REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS	
1.	At the re	equest of the Chair of the OSMC.	
ALTER		OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED	
2.	None.		
DETAI	_ (Includi	ng consultation carried out)	
	Introduction		
 3. This report provides an update to OSMC on a number of aspe management service namely: 1. The Council's recycling performance 2. The 2015/16 budget position 3. An update on the waste enforcement policy 		port provides an update to OSMC on a number of aspects of the waste ement service namely:	
		he 2015/16 budget position	
	Appendix 2 to this report contains information on complaints and service requests which was not part of the original OSMC request for information but links to the issues in the paper.		
	Background		
4.	The Council currently spends around £13 million on waste management. Approximately £3.5 million income is generated by commercial waste and garden waste collection services.		
	There h	ave been a number of notable service improvements in the last two	

	years including the introduction of a city wide sweep system to enable more efficient collections and the introduction of glass and chargeable garden waste collections.		
5.	The service faces a number of challenges which include rising waste disposal costs, a growing city population and the need to help residents improve their waste and recycling behaviours.		
6.	Southampton's disposal costs are relatively low when compared to other local authorities in the UK due to the investment in waste disposal infrastructure over the last 20 years made by the Council in partnership with Hampshire County and Portsmouth Councils. The percentage of waste being sent to landfill is one of the lowest in the country as the majority of the city's waste is incinerated and used to generate electricity.		
7.	However, in order to reduce costs significantly and contribute towards the Council's overall cost reduction targets the key objective for the waste service needs to be to increase recycling. Increasing recycling generates income but crucially can reduce the amount of and cost of waste going to landfill.		
	Recycling Performance		
8.	Increasing recycling would also contribute to the Government's 2020 mandatory National recycling target of 50%.		
9.	Increasing recycling levels is a complex and significant challenge. Many factors play a part such as the ability to communicate effectively with residents and resident knowledge and motivation to recycle. The City's population is diverse with over 40,000 students and other significant transient populations who recycle less. This is evidenced in the city by the amount of waste collected per household which can be found in Appendix 1.		
10.	The City's recycling rate is made up of dry mixed recycling (DMR), glass, and garden waste and recycling from the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC). Southampton's overall recycling rate was 28% in 2014/15. The recycling rate in the City has actually bucked a national trend of falling rates over the last 3 years and increased by 2%. However, the city's recycling rate remains low when compared to other local authorities.		
11.	The Council, using government funding, has introduced a range of educational activities to communicate with residents and school children about the importance of recycling and reducing waste.		
12.	Research indicates however, that the only way to enable significant increases in recycling is through infrastructural change. Currently there are limited opportunities to recycle additional materials at the kerbside.		
	Budget Position 2015/16		
13.	There is a current forecast adverse spend for the service of around £0.65M due to the cost of temporary agency cover for staff sickness/holidays, vacancy management and the move from weekly to monthly pay.		

14.	An action plan for the service is set out in the following table, which was estimated in the Month 5 financial monitoring period to improve the forecast position by £0.05M :			
	Action	Amount Saved/Income increase	Expected Delivery Date of Saving	
	Implement changes to collection arrangements and simplify procedures to improve efficiency and reduce costs.	An improvement of £0.025M over the last 6 months of the year. This is not currently included in the forecast.	March 2016	
	Online Waste Collection Calendar.	A print saving of £0.025M is not currently forecast.	October 2016	
15.	There has been a reduction in recycling income due to falls in commodity prices. These prices are determined globally and the following materials have reduced in price: glass, paper, plastic and ferrous metal.			
16.	 There is currently an adverse forecast on waste disposal costs (£0.22 M which is mainly linked to the economic recovery and population growth and falling HWRC recycling income. Further work is being undertaken to reduce disposal costs and bring further savings in 2016/17, which includes; Producing a solid recovered fuel from HWRC waste leading to landfill cost 			
	savings,Making use of the Altor	n mixed paper baler to impro	ve quality to market,	
	 Recycling street sweepings, Purchasing spare waste incineration capacity from Portsmouth CC an The retender of the HWRC contract. 			
	Enforcement			
17.	Cabinet approved a revised enforcement policy for waste in January 2013 which brought together all aspects of waste management including local environmental quality issues such as litter, graffiti and fly tipping as well as domestic waste and recycling collections. It also provided an education and enforcement framework to enable the Council to take prioritised enforcement activity relating to enviro-crime and waste management offences.			
18.	The policy is underpinned by a 'case by case' approach based on an assessment of the severity of impact on risk to public safety and public health.			
19.	The Policy remains fit for purpose as a framework document but changes are required in light of new legislation introduced in the Deregulation Act 2015 (which came into force in late spring this year). The decimalisation of low level offences in effect makes formal enforcement action more difficult and costly.			
20.	refocus education/enforcer support to frontline service securing evidence and taki	es and capacity have resulte ment activities to ensure they s. However, given the difficu ng formal enforcement actio ffective and efficient to focus	/ provide the required Ities associated with n for low level	

	removing graffiti as soon as practicable.		
21.	Up to 10,000m ² of graffiti is removed and approximately 12,000 fly-tipped items are removed across the City each year. The priority areas for complaints about fly tipping and bins on the street tend to be where there are the greatest number of Houses in Multiple Occupation, linked to the poor management of these properties. Closer working with the HMO Wardens funded through the HMO Additional Licensing Scheme has increased education and enforcement capacity and activities in these areas.		
22.	The street cleansing and waste teams continue to look for opportunities to work in partnership with other agencies, communities and residents groups to target specific areas or issues of concern using a combination of advice, operational activities and targeted enforcement where required.		
RESO	URCE IMPLICATIONS		
Capita	I/Revenue		
23.	There are no additional capital and revenue implications associated with this report.		
Prope	rty/Other		
24.	None.		
LEGA			
<u>Statut</u>	ory power to undertake proposals in the report:		
25.	None.		
Other	Legal Implications:		
26.	None		
POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS			
POLIC	Y FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS		

KEY DECISION?	No	
WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:		

	SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION				
Appene	Appendices				
1.	Waste performance data				
2.	Complaints and Service requests summary				
Docum	Documents In Members' Rooms				
1.	1. None				
Equalit	y Impact Assessment				
	Do the implications/subject of the report require an Equality and Safety Impact Assessments (ESIA) to be carried out.				
Privacy Impact Assessment					
Do the	Do the implications/subject of the report require a Privacy Impact No				
Assess	Assessment (PIA) to be carried out.				
Other E	Background Documents				
Equality Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:					
Title of Background Paper(s)Relevant Paragraph of the Access Information Procedure Rules / Sche 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)			ules / Schedule b be		
1.	None				