



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

Jacki Ager (MCIWM)
Waste and External Contracts Manager

Neighbourhoods

London Borough of Havering
Town Hall
Main Road
Romford
RM1 3BD

recycling@defra.gsi.gov.uk

t 01708 433363
e jacki.ager@havering.gov.uk
text relay 18001 01708 433363
Date 10th May 2019

www.havering.gov.uk

Dear Sir / Madam,

**Consultation on consistency in household and business recycling
collections in England**

I enclose forthwith The London Borough of Havering's responses to the above consultation from DEFRA.

Yours sincerely,

Jacki Ager
Waste and External Contracts Manager
The London Borough of Havering

Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together

About you

1. What is your name?

Jacki Ager, The London Borough of Havering

2. What is your email address?

jacki.ager@haverling.gov.uk

3. Which best describes you?

Local Authority

4. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, what is its name?

The London Borough of Havering

5. Would you like your response to be confidential?

No

Part 1 - Measures to improve the quantity and quality of household recycling collected by local authorities

Proposal 1 - core set of dry recyclable materials collected

Q5 Setting aside the details of how it would be achieved, do you agree or disagree with the proposal that local authorities should be required to collect a set of core materials for recycling?

- Agree – local authorities should be required, to collect a core set of materials
- Disagree – local authorities should not be required, to collect a core set of materials
- Not sure/don't have an opinion

Agree, as standardised collections should help to reduce confusion among householders, and hopefully assist in encouraging producers to standardise some packaging into more sustainable / recyclable varieties. The variety of materials collected should be maximised if the UK is to meet a 65% recycling target. However, factors such as contract lengths need to be considered, and where consistent collections are mandated then appropriate compensation based on the Government's New Burdens Doctrine, particularly around contract transition costs, must be applied.

Q6 We think it should be possible for all local authorities to collect the core set of materials. Do you agree with this?

- Agree
- Disagree – If you disagree please provide further information and evidence as to what circumstances it is not practicable to collect the full set of materials

Agree. In reality, this will work where current contracts allow, otherwise a substantial amount of work will be required to ensure consistent infrastructure, and transition costs would need to be factored in, potentially funded through EPR. Housing stock may be a key influence, for example inner-city boroughs with flats = less space for residents to recycle. So collection systems need to be tailored for different housing types.

Q7 What special considerations or challenges might local authorities face in implementing this requirement for existing flats and houses in multiple occupancy?

Flats / HMOs traditionally have less available space for internal recycling bins. Communal bins are often contaminated, and no action can be taken against individual households because it is often not possible to identify a culprit. Bins with apertures for different materials can often lead to fly-tipped bags of material, where people do not have/make time to empty them accordingly. Would making landlords responsible be a potential solution? If so, how would this be regulated?

Also consider flats above shops, where waste is often placed on the highway in sacks, and where bins are not suitable. Would multiple sacks be required? This Borough's current collection method is highly suited to flats above shops, with one split-bodied vehicle able to collect both recycling and residual waste at

Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together

once. Additional material streams may lead to a requirement for differently equipped vehicles, which may have an impact on fleet provision and maintenance. It may also have an impact on general street scene if additional sacks are being presented and collected at different times.

Q8 What other special considerations should be given to how this proposal could apply to flats? Please provide additional information on your answer.

No further comments.

Q9 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 1? Please use this space to briefly explain your responses to questions above, e.g. why you agree/disagree with proposals.

The recyclability and market stability of some materials needs to be considered, e.g. Pots, tubs and trays. It is only worth collecting if there is infrastructure to recycle and a reliable market for that material. Chicken and egg perhaps, as clean, abundant material may stimulate the market.

Transporting materials a long way has other carbon impacts, so possible investment in local infrastructure needs to be considered. Carbon impacts of other forms of treatment (e.g. EfW) versus recycling may be useful, particularly where transport distances are considered.

Proposal 2 - which materials should be included in the core set

Q10 Do you believe that all of these core materials should be included or any excluded?

Glass bottles and containers - included

Paper and card - included

Plastic bottles - included

Plastic pots tubs and trays - excluded

Steel and aluminium cans – included

Q11 What, if any, other products or materials do you believe should be included in the core set that all local authorities will be required to collect?

Food and drinks cartons - included and phased in over time.

Plastic bags and film - included and phased in over time.

Q12 If you think any of these or other items should or should not be included in the core set immediately please use the box below to briefly explain your view.

Glass bottles and containers - included in theory. However, this Borough's current collection contract (comingled sacks) does not allow for the co-collection of glass and the paper industry has expressed concern around co-collection, therefore source segregation or twin streams would need to be introduced in some boroughs, potentially through new contracts.

This Borough has previously carried out an options appraisal on the inclusion of glass and food waste in its kerbside collections. Whilst disposal costs would potentially be reduced due to the addition of containment limitations for residual waste, collection costs would increase by over £800k PA, resulting in a nett cost of £74,000 PA, a figure which is likely to have inflated in the 5 years since the appraisal was carried out. This gives some indication of the possible financial impact of additional materials being collected at kerbside.

As an alternative, this Borough's network of glass recycling bring banks boasts capture rates comparable to boroughs with a kerbside collection. Therefore, it may be useful to utilise a TEEP-type evaluation tool to decide if alternative cheap, effective options such as this are appropriate in some circumstances.

Cartons and films should be included and phased in over time, as they are common items that residents wish to recycle, and many already assume these can be recycled. However, recycling infrastructure for these materials is still poor, and new collection and separation methods may be required, particularly around films which can get caught in MRF machinery. Therefore, further investment is needed.

Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together

Stable markets do not exist for pots, tubs and trays, and some (e.g. black plastic trays) are difficult to recycle. Even if LAs receive a nett cost recovery, how do we expect to stimulate the markets for these to ensure the collected material gets recycled? EPR may help, but it is likely to take a little time for infrastructure to develop. Has energy from waste been considered as a viable and useful alternative? Carbon impacts need to be considered, with alternative options taken into account.

Q13 If you think these or other items should be considered for inclusion at a later stage, what changes would be needed to support their inclusion?

If it is deemed desirable to collect glass as a separate / partially source-segregated material, some boroughs will a suitable require lead-in period for service changes to occur at a local level, particularly where contracts may be limiting progress.

Comments on cartons and films included in Q12 response.

Q14 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 2?

No further comments.

Proposal 3

Q15 Do you agree that the core set should be regularly reviewed and, provided certain conditions are met, expanded?

Yes, wherever economically or technically practicable to do so.

Q16 Do you believe that the proposed conditions a) b) c) and d) above are needed in order to add a core material?

Yes – but I would also add some (please specify which conditions you believe should be added ...)

No – some/all should be removed (if some please specify below)

No – some should be added and some should be removed (please specify which ...)

Not sure/don't have an opinion

Yes – but I would also add some (please specify which conditions you believe should be added ...)

1. That this is on the proviso that more sustainable alternative materials do not exist and have not been trialled for viability, which would enable this material to effectively be banned (e.g. paper instead of plastic straws)
2. That a life cycle analysis has been carried out to determine the carbon footprint of the material through different outlets, e.g. recycling vs energy from waste, and that recycling has subsequently been found to be the environmentally best available option.
3. That appropriate time and financial investment are given in order to: upgrade existing facilities, and introduce new ones where required; update fleet and containment; allow for the development of viable markets.

Q17 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 3?

No further comments.

Proposal 4 - separate food waste collection

Q18 Which aspects of the proposal do you agree and disagree with?

i) at least a weekly collection of food waste

ii) a separate collection of food waste (i.e. Not mixed with garden waste)

iii) services to be changed only as and when contracts allows

iv) providing free caddy liners to householders

Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together

- i) at least a weekly collection of food waste - Agree
- ii) a separate collection of food waste (i.e. Not mixed with garden waste) - Not sure
- iii) services to be changed only as and when contracts allows - agree
- iv) providing free caddy liners to householders - Not sure

Q19 Are there circumstances where it would not be practical to provide a separate food waste collection to kerbside properties or flats.

Yes. Blocks of flats are notoriously difficult areas to successfully capture viable quantities of food waste. Often bins either go unused, or become contaminated with other items. Considerable effort goes into policing these, and communicating with residents, yet many continue to fail for a variety of reasons. Unless landlords are held responsible (and even then, regulation may prove difficult) local authorities may struggle to cope with the issues associated with communal food waste facilities, and struggle to encourage participation.

Flats above shops often have no storage facilities therefore food waste collections would be problematic, for example bags left out would be subject to animal attack, and food waste boxes would detract from the street scene and potentially pose a trip hazard. Therefore, there may be circumstances where separate collections of food waste are not suitable and may pose more problems than benefits.

Q20 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 4 including on circumstances where it may not be practical to provide a separate food waste collection?

The structure of the current ELWA PFI contract with Renewi means there is no financial saving to ELWA or the four constituent councils through increasing recycling rates, so any investment in new services comes at an additional cost without any subsequent reductions in overall disposal costs. As such, the costs to the four ELWA constituent councils of introducing food waste collections would be higher than for most urban local authorities.

Renewi makes use of mechanical-biological treatment (MBT) for the region's residual waste. The treatment reduces the weight of the waste by about 30%, and makes it possible for refinement of the material to take place so that glass, stones and metal can be extracted for recycling. A compost-like output is also extracted, primarily constituting the dried residues of food waste, and this material is sent for a non-PAS100 composting process. The remaining residual waste is then sorted into two grades of refuse derived fuel (RDF), for which there are currently strong markets.

It may be appropriate for further technical studies to be carried out on the impacts of any such collections on the MBT process and the quality of the compost-like output. Any changes in collections would be dependent on the application of full nett cost recovery (FNCR), including any transitional costs through new additional burdens associated with introducing a separate collection of food waste. Regardless, whilst technologies continue to advance and may move away from MBT, services should be changed only as and when contracts allow, unless transition costs are appropriately covered. There may be grounds for introducing separate food waste collections prior to the end of the PFI contract in order to encourage behavioural change amongst residents, or if the separation of food waste, upon further investigation, is deemed more environmentally and / or economically viable once additional fleet etc. is taken into account.

The provision of free caddy liners to householders is an additional financial burden to Local Authorities, although it does encourage responsible use of containers.

Lastly, sufficient infrastructure must be available (most likely Anaerobic Digestion) in order to receive additional tonnage of food waste in order to avoid sudden price fluctuations based on market capacity.

Proposal 5

Q21 If you are responding on behalf of a local authority, what kind of support would be helpful to support food waste collection? (tick as many as apply)

o I am not responding on behalf of a local authority

o Specific financial support (please specify)

o Procurement support, (e.g. free advice on renegotiating contracts; centralised purchasing of containers)

o Communications support, (e.g. free collateral that can be adapted and used locally)

o Technical support, (e.g. free advice from a consultant about round re-profiling)

o Other (please specify ...)

Specific financial support - As a new burden this would require funding in order to introduce a new separate collection, including operational items such as additional vehicles (including running costs), staff (operational, contract management and customer-facing), containment (purchase and delivery) and communications.

Procurement support - Where re-negotiation of contracts is required, appropriate support should be offered. Should a blanket approach to legislation be adopted, a procurement framework may be useful, either at a national or regional level. A phased approach may be required to manage market demands.

Communications support - Sustained communications are required to ensure a cultural shift, and national materials (such as the WRAP campaigns) would be useful, and be a way to create a recognisable brand. However, financial support would be needed to sustain momentum, and some face-to-face communications may be required in some (but not all) localities, which are both time-consuming and costly.

Technical support - this may be required if rounds require re-profiling, for example, but will be dependent upon any options listed within individual contracts.

Q22 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 5?

An introduction of separate collections of food waste would have particular ramifications for this Borough's existing respective waste collection and disposal contracts. Therefore a phased approach based on contract lengths would be required, or alternatively financial compensation for local authorities where contract renegotiations (either directly or through WDAs) have led to financial penalties being imposed.

Proposal 6 - separation of food waste and garden waste

We believe it would be desirable for local authorities that have contractual commitments with IVC facilities, which needs mixed garden and food waste, to require separate presentation of food waste but then be able to mix it with garden waste for treatment purposes. This is because our evidence shows that separate presentation of food waste leads to higher yields.

Q23 What are your views on this proposal?

If evidence points to this being the case then the proposal is supported in principal. However this is likely to generate negative press (residents taking the time to separate materials only to find out they are being mixed together later down the line). There are also cost implications for local authorities currently co-collecting these materials, if new containers and vehicle rounds are required.

Proposal 7 - free garden waste collections

Q24 Which aspects of the proposal do you agree or disagree with?

i) free GW collection for all households with gardens - Disagree.

ii) Capacity to 240L (either bin or other container e.g. Sack) - N/A

iii) fortnightly collection frequency at least during growing season - Agree

iv) ability to charge for additional capacity over set minimum requirement - N/A - charging should be a local decision.

Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together

v) new requirement to start from 2023 - Disagree

Q25 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 7?

It is common sense to only charge those customers that use a particular service such as this, and the introduction of such a scheme would effectively mean those without gardens subsidising those that have them, which may become an equalities issue. This is not just related to flats vs houses; householders currently composting at home may feel that they are missing out on a Council service. This may subsequently encourage higher usage amongst those that do not necessarily need the service, and thus bring waste back into the Borough's control when it could have avoided entering the waste stream altogether. There are other outlets for this waste, such as home composting, and Reuse and Recycling Centres. Therefore, householders already have a number of options to choose from.

Free collections will place more vehicles on the road, and in Havering's case may incur higher ELWA levy tonnage charges as more garden waste is collected at the kerbside. As well as more vehicles to carry out the collections, greater capacity would be required at local waste transfer and composting facilities, potentially requiring new site licenses. There may also be space implications in fleet yards. Therefore, full nett cost recovery may need to include space rental and O-licence renewals, as well as the actual purchasing / hire of vehicles, running costs, etc.

Whilst some garden waste enters the residual waste stream, this is a localised problem encountered at varying degrees between local authorities, and is therefore not a consistent issue that needs addressing at a national level. Charging should be a local decision based on knowledge of local demographics and housing stock, as well as local waste treatments available and disposal contracts.

A fortnightly collection during the growing season is sensible, however this should not necessarily be free.

If free garden waste collections are to be mandated then the additional collection and disposal costs must be met by Government through the New Burdens Doctrine. However, it should be recognised that in more urban areas these collections are likely to be inefficient compared to targeted, subscription-based collections.

Proposal 8 - separate collection to improve quality

Q26 Do you agree the proposed approach to arrangements for separate collection of dry materials for recycling to ensure quality?

No - this is a local issue dependent not just on cost, but on housing stock and demographics. More evidence is required, for example on how the multi-stream collection model been proven to be cheaper than twin stream. Where EPR helps to fund collections, DRS may allow for greater separation of some packaging materials outside of kerbside collections, providing a stable and viable stream of clean material. Quality cannot be solely driven by the source segregation of materials; communications play a key part.

More clarification needs to be provided around:

1. "Disproportionate costs", including if value should be placed on higher recycling rates or better quality material, and if there will be criteria attached based on costs being met by producers through EPR.
2. "Technical feasibility" and whether this will be considered at a Borough level (e.g. where it may be feasible for one Borough, but not another)
3. Whether the environmental costs will be weighed up, e.g. additional materials recycled, but with a higher carbon impact due to the associated additional vehicle movements.

Q27 What circumstances may prevent separate collection of paper, card, glass, metals and plastics? Please be as specific as possible and provide evidence.

There will be some dependency upon waste collection and disposal contract lengths, or otherwise appropriate compensation would be required based on the new associated burdens, particularly around contract transition costs.

HMOs/flats where space is at a premium, particularly in conversions or older properties that do not have enough space in bin stores for separate bins for different materials. Communal recycling bins are also highly susceptible to contamination / cross-mixing of items, even where capacity is not an issue. Planning legislation can ensure that adequate space is provided going forward, but retrofitting may be problematic. Space can also be problematic for properties with small / no front gardens. Furthermore, the segregation of material can put householders off of fully participating, where they deem there to be too many containers / too complex a scheme. DEFRA should consider the audience segmentation work that was commissioned by WRAP (c.2015), which demonstrated the differing attitudes towards recycling depending on a number of personality traits. The population was divided into six categories, with two being particularly challenging for encouraging recycling. It should be noted that WRAP found that these two categories are most prevalent in dense, urban areas, like East London. Whilst Havering Council benefits from its proximity from both London and Essex, it experiences many problems associated with urban recycling and refuse collections.

Consider the extra vehicle passes required to collect segregated materials - more analysis is required to assess the carbon impact, particularly in London where emissions are at the forefront of political concerns.

Q28 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 8?

No further comments.

Proposal 9 - bin colour standardisation

Q29 Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

o Agree – bin colours should be standardised for all waste streams

o Agree in part – bin colours should be standardised for some waste streams but not all (specify which ...)

o Disagree – bin colours should not be standardised for any waste streams

o Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

Agree in part. Whilst this is not an imperative issue, it may help avoid confusion, particularly where there are more transient populations, or perhaps at least within regions (e.g. London). However, Havering suggests that more work be done to establish whether this is a genuine problem. Furthermore, if implemented, this should be phased in to avoid premature waste (e.g. wait for a contract change so containers do not need to be disposed of prematurely), as well as avoiding sudden market pressures.

Q30 There would be potential for significant costs from introducing standardised bins colours from a specific date. What views do you have on a phased approach or alternative ways to standardising the colours of containers for different materials?

o Phased approach 1 – as and when waste contracts are renewed

o Phased approach 2 – as and when old/unserviceable bins are replaced

o Other ways please specify...

Phase approach 1 - as and when waste contracts are renewed. This often involves a service change, so is a prime opportunity to undertake an overhaul of container designs. This also avoids the problems associated with Phased Approach 2, whereby residents throughout a Borough end up with a multitude of different coloured bins, which has the potential to create confusion.

Q31 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 9?

Depending on the scheme this could work via varying the colour of the lid only. This would allow boroughs to retain their existing bin stock, where, for example, a contract is not due to be renewed for some years. It would also allow Councils to utilise their own unique colour schemes on the body of the bin, in instances where this is deemed important. Lastly, it would allow for bulk purchase of the cheapest colour option (e.g. green or black) for the body whilst varying the colour of the lid only, which could then be fitted

Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together

separately. This would also allow for easier rotation of spare stock.

Proposal 10 - service standards

Q32 Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to publish statutory guidance?

Disagree. As consistency in collections appears to rely solely on funding through EPR, this is likely to cause disregard to any obligation under the doctrine of statutory burdens to properly fund additional / revised collection methods. Thus, Boroughs may be worse off if forced to apply these changes without the necessary funding. Notwithstanding the above, any statutory guidance would need to be evidence-based and acknowledge the challenges faced within different demographics, housing stock, contracts and existing infrastructures which may limit the ability to enact change without substantial investment. There must also be a degree of discretion based on local factors. For example, more urban collections are likely to require more frequent collections, but may still be able to restrict residual waste container size in order to encourage waste reduction and increased recycling.

Q33 We propose reviewing the guidance every few years, revising it as required and then allowing sufficient lead-in time to accommodate the changes. Do you agree or disagree with this timescale?

o Agree

o Disagree – it should be more often

o Disagree – it should be less often

o Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

Not sure, although the above objection remains. However, more specifics required around the definition of "every few years" and it is recommended that this align with contract lengths, e.g. 7-8 years, or at least recognise that collection and disposal contract lengths may limit the ability to change on a more frequent basis without substantial operational and financial issues. There should be opportunities for further consultation upon each review, or regular feedback from local authorities regarding their service changes - lessons learned opportunities. The reviews should be prescriptive and consistent in their approach each time to ensure fairness, and if methods change, backed up with robust data / rationales.

Q34 Subject to further analysis and consultation we propose to use the guidance to set a minimum service standard for residual waste collection of at least every alternative week Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

o Agree

o Disagree – it should be more often

o Disagree – it should be less often

o Not sure/no opinion/not applicable

Disagree; it is acknowledged that a separate collection of food waste would reduce the requirement for a weekly residual waste collection. Proper containment of other smelly waste types should prevent odours from escaping. However, as long as a robust recycling service is in operation, residual waste collection frequencies should be a local decision based on demographics, housing stock, etc. For example, more urban collections are likely to require more frequent collections, but may still be able to restrict residual waste container size in order to encourage waste reduction and increased recycling.

Q35 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 10?

If the government decides to mandate collection frequencies, it will need to provide local authorities with the tools to encourage recycling, both through communications and more easily accessible enforcement powers - particularly given that local authorities are unable to enforce issues such as contamination through Section 46 of the EPA.

Proposal 11 - communicating about recycling

Q36 Do you have any comments to make about Proposal 11?

Whilst the WRAP iconography is easily recognisable, it may need a considerable overhaul to draw peoples' attention back in as it has been around for some years. The iconography has been useful over the years,

Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together

and has certainly benefited this Borough. The other visual materials, whilst attractive, have not proven to be particularly diverse, particularly for London-based communications work. This needs revisiting and diversifying, in line with groups with protected characteristics. This will allow it to appeal to a greater audience. A national campaign will help to create a recognisable brand, however local authorities must still have the freedom to create local communication campaigns to help engage with their residents who may have specific needs or concerns.

Q37 What information do householders and members of the public need to help them recycle better?

Householders require information and iconography they can relate to (see response to Q36) in order to make them feel a part of the community. This in turn will help to motivate. It should be recognised that different motivations exist for different households (e.g. money, environment, community concerns) therefore information needs to be flexible and targeted as much as possible. It also needs to reflect different types of housing stock. Pictorial information wherever possible will allow it to transcend language barriers. Information ideally also needs to be as consistent as possible (geographically) where populations are transient, and encouraging in its approach. It should also be recognised that service changes can lead to information overload and confusion for customers. Therefore, drip feeding may be appropriate in some circumstances. Finally, householders require reassurance that the waste they separate for recycling ends up where it should be. Whilst the technical aspects may be of little interest, some assurances around enforcement of wasteflows should be transparent and promoted to the population.

Proposal 12 - transparency of information

Q38 Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

- o Agree – government should work with local authorities and other stakeholders on this**
- o Disagree – government should not work with local authorities and other stakeholders on this**
- o Not sure/no opinion/not applicable**

Agree, however this is a complex issue. Further comments in Q39.

Q39 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 12?

Whilst a considerable amount of data exists through current reporting methods, in WasteDataFlow, this information is not particularly user-friendly to the layperson. However, regular Freedom of Information requests have shown that this is information of interest to the public. Considerations should therefore include the following:

- Whilst WasteDataFlow shows the route of materials, it is unlikely to include the very final destination, rather just a series of brokers within the UK. This is therefore not a complete life cycle of the material, and would therefore not be appropriate to promote to the public.
- EPR may assist in the above, by providing greater transparency on end destinations.
- The actual user interface of WasteDataFlow is not particularly intuitive. If any information within is to be utilised by Local Authorities (e.g. by linking from their websites), then it needs to have a clear purpose and be more user-friendly. For example, it could display a clear set of statistics for each borough such as recycling rates, tonnes of waste per head, and a list of end destinations for recycle.
- The onus should be placed on producers (and recycling companies) to show greater transparency in their own material flows.

Proposal 13 - end markets

Q40 Please use this space to briefly explain any comments you have on the issues discussed in this section.

Whilst most of the proposed items in this consultation are already collected by the majority of local authorities, there are still some limitations, particularly around plastic pots, tubs and trays. Commencing collection of these items prematurely is unlikely to stimulate the market in a positive way, and may instead lead to either stockpiling, incineration or landfilling. More market engagement needs to be carried out to assess the viability of separating these items (particularly PTT of different colours, and composites), and a

Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together

plan or roadmap produced with an aim to stimulate the market prior to legislating for collection. The volatility of international markets means that the domestic market needs to be developed accordingly, particularly around adequate separation of these materials to create a clean and marketable product. Only partial source segregation is likely to be achieved, therefore some standardisation of materials may need to be investigated, or significant investment in sorting facilities - both in technological development, and sheer size to accommodate increased volumes of materials. This is particularly crucial in London where space is at a premium.

Proposal 14 - non-binding performance indicators

Q41 Do you agree or disagree that introducing non-binding performance indicators for waste management and recycling is a good idea?

Not sure. Havering welcomes the recognition Defra has made towards the factors influencing performance, as well as the acknowledgement of the part waste prevention plays. A baseline figure should be taken into account, as well as a common set of factors that would likely influence performance and should be subject to further consultation and research (e.g. rurality, deprivation, % of home ownership). This would allow each Borough to more accurately benchmark against its "nearest neighbour" and track progress accordingly. However, it is questioned what the main aim of these indicators would be, outside of individual borough benchmarking. Many boroughs would be unlikely to see their place in any league table change dramatically, and therefore could encourage poor assumptions by the press, residents and even Members. It would also fail to encourage existing high performing boroughs to make further improvements. Lastly, as the indicators are non-binding, there is some concern that this effectively absolves any responsibility of Government to adequately fund schemes through the New Burdens Doctrine.

Q42 Do you agree or disagree that the proposed indicators are appropriate?

Agree, however as per Q41 response, they should be accompanied by a set of factors that are likely to influence performance, in order to fairly benchmark. The proposed indicators would allow boroughs to track key areas of performance. However, there should also be optional reports that can be drawn off of WasteDataFlow in order for Boroughs to dig down deeper into trends for individual materials, which would then allow for more targeted communications campaigns where appropriate.

Q43 Do you have any comments to make about Proposal 14 or examples of indicators currently in use that may be of assistance?

More emphasis still needs to be placed on waste reduction, therefore indicators showing overall and residual waste per household / per head would allow boroughs to track progress accordingly, and benchmark against other authorities.

Proposal 15 - alternatives to weight-based metrics

Q44 Do you agree that alternatives to weight-based metrics should be developed to understand recycling performance?

Yes, however these should be easy to calculate and understand to ensure transparency towards the general public.

Q45 Do you agree that these alternatives should sit alongside current weight-based metrics

Yes

Q46 What environmental, economic or social metrics should we consider developing as alternatives to weight-based metrics?

A carbon-based metric would help to identify the most carbon-efficient materials to focus efforts on. However, this should go a step further and also measure carbon performance relating to other waste treatment technologies (e.g. Mechanical Biological Treatment, Anaerobic Digestion, Energy from Waste, etc.), as well as the carbon impact of waste reduction. It should be acknowledged that carbon metrics can

Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together

change over time, based on technological developments / efficiencies. This change may be outside of a local authority's control, causing performance to suddenly alter without an actual change in council operations.

Collections also play a large part in carbon impact, so this may need to be another area of investigation. The GLA has recently produced an Emissions Performance Standard tool that goes some way (but not entirely) towards measuring the carbon impact of waste collection activities. On a wider scale, this would need to consider the continued journey of the materials once they leave the jurisdiction of the Local Authority.

Proposal 16 - joint working between local authorities

Q47 Do you agree that greater partnership working between authorities could lead to improved waste management and higher levels of recycling?

Agree. London already has a series of networks and waste authorities / partnerships in operation, and these continue to develop. Depending on the type of partnership this can, at times, lead to a loss in autonomy for individual boroughs, and this therefore needs to be handled carefully.

Q48 What are the key barriers to greater partnership working?

We are in agreement with the barriers already been mentioned within the consultation, however to add to this

- Financial situations of individual authorities, which may influence areas of priority and willingness to invest in service transition costs. Resident consultations may also act as a key influencer.
- Different baseline performance which in turn may influence the choice of priorities
- Contract lengths and renewal dates, including the ability to apply extensions
- Demographical differences, variations in housing stock and levels of deprivation meaning different methods of collection and communication are necessary

Q49 How might government help overcome these barriers?

Consistency in collections (potentially funded through EPR), and the continuation of communications assistance from WRAP may help to increase the desirability of partnership working, as there may be fewer perceived barriers. Non-binding indicators may help boroughs identify nearest neighbours (both in make-up as well as geographically) with whom they might then see value in partnership working. This may then encourage more boroughs to bring contracts into alignment and realise economies of scale, e.g. when purchasing containers. Frameworks may also act as a way to encourage more partnership working, as they create a common method of procurement.

Q50 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 16?

No further comments

Part 2 - Measures to improve recycling by businesses and other organisations that produce municipal waste

Proposal 17 - legislate for businesses to segregate their recyclable waste from residual waste.

Q51 Do you agree or disagree that businesses, public bodies and other organisations that produce municipal waste should be required to separate dry recyclable material from residual waste so that it can be collected and recycled?

Agree

Q52 Which of the 3 options do you favour?

- o Option 1 mixed dry recycling and separate glass recycling; no food waste collected for recycling**
- o Option 2 mixed dry recycling and separate food recycling; no glass recycling**
- o Option 3 mixed dry recycling, separate glass recycling, separate food recycling**
- o Something else (please expand ...)**
- o Not sure/no opinion/not applicable**

Something else. Whilst Option 3 provides the widest variety of materials for recycling, other options such as multiple streams may need to be considered. This may be dependent on the type of business. For example, public houses and restaurants may produce larger amounts of glass which would benefit from being kept separately from other materials such as plastic and paper. Offices may produce large amounts of clean paper which would benefit from being presented separately from food containers. Without over-complicating things, it may be prudent to categorise businesses on the types of waste they produce, as well as the amounts of waste, and then stipulate the type of collection required. This would be of benefit to reprocessors who would be in receipt of purer material, and may work particularly well for higher waste producers.

Q53 We would expect businesses to be able to segregate waste for recycling in all circumstances but would be interested in views on where this may not be practicable for technical, environmental or economic reasons

- o Yes – it should be practicable to segregate waste for recycling in all circumstances**
- o No – some exceptions are needed for particular circumstances (please provide examples below)**
- o Not sure/no opinion/not applicable**

No - some micro businesses in particular may struggle to separate waste into more than two streams due to space constraints, or may not produce enough waste in separate streams to make separate collections financially viable. However, exceptions to this may be where a number of businesses in close proximity are able to share waste/recycling facilities, and businesses should be obligated to evidence that an appropriate options appraisal has taken place.

Q54 Should some businesses, public sector premises or other organisations be exempt from the requirement?

No, there should be a realistic minimum standard of service even for small / micro businesses. However, sufficient support should be provided in order for them to have realistic options (such as joint waste provision in BID areas).

Q55 Do you have any other comments to make about Proposal 17? For example, do you think that there are alternatives to legislative measures that would be effective in increasing business recycling?

Whilst financial savings may act as an incentive to medium or large businesses, smaller businesses may require additional incentives. This could either come as a carrot (i.e. tax breaks) or stick (legislative measures). One way would be to provide evidence under revised Duty of Care documentation, however, particularly during the transition period this would place additional onus on Local Authority enforcement teams to monitor and administrate. Any incentive would involve resource to administrate / enforce, and would therefore require additional funding under the Government's New Burdens Doctrine.

Proposal 18

Q56 Do you agree or disagree that businesses, public bodies or other organisations that produce sufficient quantities of food waste should be required to separate it from residual waste so that it can be collected and recycled?

Agree

Q57 Do you agree or disagree that there should be a minimum threshold, by weight, for businesses public bodies or other organisations to be required to separate food waste for collection?

Agree

Q58 Do you have any views on how we should define 'sufficient' in terms of businesses producing 'sufficient' quantities of food waste to be deemed in scope of the regulations?

Businesses licenced to prepare and / or sell food (and subject to a FSA Hygiene rating) would likely meet a minimum threshold. Many non-food-related businesses would also likely hit a minimum threshold through food brought into work by employees then discarded. We suggest the threshold for non-food related businesses be based upon the number of employees on site. It should be noted that even relatively small businesses can produce viable quantities of food waste, and therefore further examination needs to take place to decide upon a suitable threshold.

Q59 Do you have any views on how we should define 'food-producing' businesses?

Businesses licenced to prepare and / or sell food, which are subject to an FSA Hygiene rating.

Q60 In addition to those businesses that produce below a threshold amount of food waste, should any other premises be exempt from the requirement?

Only where space realistically does not allow, and other options (such as shared facilities within high streets or BID areas) have been exhausted.

Q61 Do you have any other comments to make about proposal 18?

No further comments.

Proposal 19

If the proposals above are adopted, we would like to support businesses, public sector and other organisations to make the transition. In particular we would like to find ways to reduce the impact on small and micro businesses

Q62 What are your views on the options proposed to reduced costs??

Optimising / rationalising services - this would be a good place to start for many businesses, however small businesses would not necessarily benefit if they are only producing a small amount of waste to begin with. Collaborative procurement projects - this would be a viable way for small businesses to recycle their waste, and potentially have a secondary benefit of engaging more with the surrounding business community. However, it requires one party to administrate (e.g. landlord, BID manager) and therefore may not work in all circumstances.

Local franchising of waste services - this may break competition law, and therefore as stated in the consultation, may require legislative change. Operationally, it would be beneficial to the collection company(s) involved as it would create a compact, highly efficient service.

Combining household and business collections - Havering Council does not currently operate a business waste collection due to being unable to charge competitive rates to attract enough businesses to build a viable service. This is due to the current PFI contract that the East London Waste Authority currently operates, which applies high tonnage fees for both residual waste and recylate, and therefore only offers incentives to reduce overall waste. However, future disposal contracts may make this more financially viable, and many boroughs already successfully co-collect both household and commercial waste. Investing in more commercial waste drop off sites - These work well for small businesses with access to a car. However, any investment in further sites would need to be applied through the Doctrine of New Burdens.

Financial incentives to business - As stated within the consultation, differential pricing would work better if one collector has control over all of the services. It must be questioned how the collectors themselves would be incentivised - higher landfill taxes, for example, or recycling credits?

Phased introduction of services or exemptions - exemptions only in exceptional circumstances, as in Q60 response. A phased introduction would be a sensible method of ensuring that businesses had adequate support to make the transition.

Cleaner, Safer, Prouder Together

Q63 Are there other ways to reduce the cost burden that we have overlooked?

None that Havering is aware of.

Q64 Do you have any other views on how we can support businesses and other organisations to make the transition to improved recycling arrangements?

A phased approach, as mentioned in Q62, would allow a transition period for businesses, however with this, appropriate support needs to be given. Some businesses are not even aware of basic Duty of Care obligations, therefore considerable communications work will need to be done in order to engage and ensure compliance. Some of this may be done through routine Enforcement Duty of Care visits, however the extra onus on businesses would naturally lead to this work being more resource-intensive for local authorities, and any new burden will need to be financed accordingly. EPR should go some way to providing financial support for local authorities, or indeed organisations such as WRAP to engage with businesses to ensure they are aware of any new responsibilities being placed on them. There may be scope to revamp the Environment Agency website to allow for easier local searches of waste carriers or partnership initiatives - easy access to services will be key to ensuring the compliance of small businesses.

Proposal 20 - business waste data

Q65 Do you have any views on whether businesses and other organisations should be required to report data on their waste recycling performance?

Agree, however the infrastructure for this would need to come from the collectors that have the ability to weigh the waste. This could then be included on electronic waste transfer notes with very little onus on the businesses themselves. The current WasteDataFlow process places the onus on local authorities to provide data on the waste they send for treatment / reprocessing. There may therefore be an argument for placing a similar responsibility on commercial waste collectors. It seems clear that any EPR scheme should fund not just household waste, but business waste too, given that their products will be present in both homes and businesses. If producers are paying for the full nett cost recovery of waste they produce, this should apply to both local authority collected waste, and that collected by commercial companies. Therefore, any costs of updating systems / retrofitting on-board weighing equipment, etc. should be met through EPR.

Q66 Do you have any other comment on Proposal 20?

No further comments.