

**CABINET**

**28 January 2004**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Campbell (Chairman) (P)

Beveridge (P)

Cook (P)

Evans (P)

Hiscock (P)

Learney (P)

Nelmes (P)

Wagner (P)

Others in attendance and speaking:

Councillors Davies, Hutton and Lipscomb

Others in attendance and not speaking:

Councillors Mitchell and Porter

---

1007. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 7 January and 14 January 2004 (less exempt minute) be approved and adopted.

1008. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr J Brecknell spoke on the subject of Meeting Statutory Recycling Targets – A Way Forward. His comments are outlined under the consideration of Report CAB755 below.

1009. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Leader welcomed to the meeting Professor R Johns and Mr P Gwynn, who were independent members of the Standards Committee who were assisting the Council in monitoring the performance of its Committee meetings.

The Leader also reported that the Council had been judged to be a fair authority under the recent Comprehensive Performance Assessment. A seminar on this subject would be held for all Members on the evening of 28 January 2004.

The Portfolio Holder for Transport and Access reported that the Traffic and Transport Team within the Development Services Department had recently been independently assessed by the British Standards Institute and had been accredited with the highest standard in terms of its performance for the customer. Cabinet passed its congratulations to the officers involved.

The Portfolio Holder for Community Services reported that on 2 March 2004 the Council would be providing a training event on the Disability Discrimination Act to raise awareness of disability issues and compliance with disability legislation.

1010. **PLAYGROUND FIVE YEAR REFURBISHMENT PLAN**  
(Reports WTF24 and CAB792 refer)

The Director of Development Services stated that, following the meeting of the Winchester Town Forum held on 13 January 2004, the play area schemes at North Walls and the Home Nursery Green, Nursery Gardens, Fulflood, needed to be added to the list of schemes set out at Appendix 1 to Report WTF24 as part of the proposed 5 year plan. The minutes referring to the Town Forum meeting were set out in Report CAB792.

In reply to a Member's question, it was clarified that play area schemes, together with any commuted sums that related to them from the Public Open Space Scheme, could be passed to Parish Councils on request. Of the schemes mentioned within the 5 year plan, all had been offered to their respective Parish Councils, but the Parish Councils had declined to take over responsibility for them.

RESOLVED:

1. That the principles set out at paragraph 7.1 of Report WTF24, which defined the decisions taken in respect of the provision and maintenance of children's play areas, be approved.

2. That, subject to the inclusion of the play areas at North Walls and the Home Nursery Green, Nursery Gardens, Fulflood, the implementation of the 5 year refurbishment and maintenance programme as set out in the report be agreed.

3. That subject to annual reviews of the programme as part of the Community Services Department business planning process, the expenditure of any approved funds from the Open Space Fund or Play Area Capital budget on these schemes over the next 5 years be approved.

1011. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Council's Forward Plan for February 2004, be noted.

1012. **MEETING STATUTORY RECYCLING TARGETS – A WAY FORWARD**  
(Reports CAB755 and CAB796 refer)

Report CAB796 – Extracts from Minutes of Health Performance Improvement Committee held on 21 January 2004 was submitted at the meeting. Members noted that this report had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item as a matter requiring urgent consideration due to the need to consider the recommendations from the Health Performance Improvement Committee held on 21 January 2004, in conjunction with Report CAB775 – Meeting Statutory Recycling Targets – A Way Forward.

Cabinet considered under this item the comments made in the public participation part of the meeting by Mr J Brecknell.

In summary, Mr Brecknell referred to the experiences of a number of other local authorities that had varied their frequencies of waste collection. Their conclusion was that a weekly collection of waste material was the best option. Mr Brecknell also made reference to a number of reported respiratory health concerns to refuse operators caused by the collection of organic matter. He also requested that a full 12 month trial period be carried out before an evaluation of its effectiveness be assessed, and that any trial period should include the summer months. He also asked that, if a change in the bins provided did take place, the largest bin should be for recyclable materials with residual waste to be in smaller bins. In conclusion, he requested that, due to problems of odour, flies and pests, residual waste collection should continue on a weekly basis.

Under Council Procedure Rule 35, the Chairman stated that Councillors Davies and Lipscomb had requested to speak under this item.

In summary, Councillor Lipscomb referred to the extract of minutes within Report CAB796 from the meeting of the Health Performance Improvement Committee held on 21 January 2004. He stated that, under the report of the Waste Management Policy Review Informal Group, it was stated that part of Wonston and Micheldever was included as one of the preferred areas for the pilot of alternate weekly collections. In fact, the whole Ward was included in the proposed pilot area.

He continued that the issue of recycling required cross political party agreement and that Parish Councils and Ward Councillors should be consulted as part of any exercise. The Council needed to take with it the momentum of public opinion and should appeal to the responsibilities of its citizens through education, but should not appear patronising. He also questioned the appropriateness of Wonston and Micheldever as being the best trial area for such an initiative. He asked that the Health Performance Improvement Committee should reconsider its recommendations.

He added that Option 7 of Appendix 8 to Report CAB755, that is the present arrangements with compulsory bin swap and free fortnightly garden waste collection service did have some merit but he would promote a voluntary bin swap rather than a compulsory bin swap. The resultant 29 – 31% estimated recycling composting rate would be near to the Government's target figure and could be reached with a vigorous education programme to encourage recycling across the whole district.

Councillor Davies stated in summary that he had deputised on Project Integra at past meetings and he was a strong supporter of the project. He questioned the procedure that a press release and press conference had been held prior to the generality of Members of the City Council knowing of the Waste Management Policy Review Informal Member/Officers Group's recommendations. Although the Informal Member/Officer Group tasked to undertake the review had a cross party membership, it would have been preferable if the release of its conclusions had been more properly handled. The issues raised should have been placed before a formal Member body prior to the press being informed.

The Chairman responded that the conclusions of the Waste Management Policy Review Informal Group had been submitted to the Health Performance Improvement Committee on 21 January 2004 by means of Report HE21. As this report and Report CAB755 were to be published into the public domain, it was thought appropriate that a press conference be held prior to the meeting of the Health Performance Improvement Committee.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hutton, the Chairman of both the Waste Management Policy Review Informal Group and the Health Performance Improvement Committee, addressed the meeting. In summary, he stated that the Informal Group had carried out an in-depth investigation into the 13 options set out in Appendix 8 to Report CAB755. Evidence had been taken from a number of authorities including East Hampshire District Council and Eastleigh Borough Council and this had provided considerable information to reach a decision. The Informal Group and the Health Performance Improvement Committee had concluded that the decision reached was the best way forward and would be most acceptable to the general public. In addition, the provision of kerbside glass collection would be popular, as it would reduce the number of trips to the recycling centre. The experience of other local authorities would be monitored, including those of East Hampshire and Rushmoor Councils in glass collection.

On behalf of Cabinet, the Chairman thanked Councillor Hutton for leading the study into recycling. She added that Southampton City Council had been progressive in introducing recycling schemes and in a recent MORI poll of 13,000 households, 90% had responded in favour of the new scheme. In addition, the collection figures for recyclables had tripled from 11% to 35%, which gave Councils further encouragement in rolling out recycling schemes.

The Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing spoke of the need to address the issues of waste generation. There were health and cost implications of not taking action, for example, the Government would be increasing its Landfill Tax from £14/£15 per ton to £34 per ton in the near future, which would lead to a significant extra cost to Hampshire County Council and this in turn would be passed on through the Council Tax. Therefore, the need to reduce the amount of landfill was paramount. The Council's objective was to double the amount of recycling that took place to meet Government and European community objectives and the proposals before Cabinet should be supported.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources commented that recycling was a clear Corporate Objective of the Council with cross party support. The proposals before Cabinet provided the best opportunity for the recycling targets to be met at the lowest cost to the authority and, therefore, provided best value. There was also the opportunity for possible external finance towards a trial pilot project. However, although adding kerbside collection of glass would bring the Council closer to meeting its recycling objective targets, the cost of £500,000, together with £125,000 capital costs did present a problem and did not present good value at the present time.

In the discussion that arose, it was stated that there were 4 streams to recycling: the collection of glass, green materials, dry recyclables and residual material (that required landfill). Should the Council be unable to afford all 4 streams, an option was to pilot 3 and add a fourth stream should it become affordable.

An option was not to pursue the kerbside collection of glass at the present time, as this represented only a small proportion of recyclable material and did require additional assessment in terms of its impact on noise during collection, possibilities for vandalism and breakages, particularly in the more urban areas. It was noted that trials of glass collection were taking part in some neighbouring authorities, including Rushmoor, and their experiences could be gained before the Council took a final decision on glass recycling. Cabinet supported this approach.

In terms of deciding on a suitable pilot area, the Director of Health and Housing explained that the pilot area had been chosen because it had previously been used for a trial exercise and that it had a good mix of factors and was well understood by the Council's contractor. A trial period of 12 months would be satisfactory with regular adjustments following periodic evaluation within this time frame. With respect to the question of the health of refuse operators, he was not aware of any issues, and none had been raised by the Health and Safety Executive, but he would investigate the comments made by Mr Brecknell.

The Director of Health and Housing added that, to date, 7 letters of objection to alternate collections had been received and one letter of support. In summary, the letters principally raised concerns on hygiene grounds.

In conclusion, Cabinet supported the initiative of using the pilot area to trial an alternative weekly collection scheme.

The Director of Health and Housing indicated that there was an error in Appendix 8 to report CAB755. Option 13 should read as follows: "Option 12 + fortnightly kerbside collection of glass".

This error had also been taken forward onto the draft minute of the Health Performance Improvement Committee in CAB 796. The option actually preferred by the Performance Improvement Committee should have been correctly described as Option 13 – as Option 12 (Alternate weekly collection + fortnightly garden waste collection service + fortnightly kerbside collection of glass).

Cabinet considered the additional costs of fortnightly kerbside collection of glass and decided not to proceed with this aspect of the pilot. However, further consideration would be given to kerbside glass collection in the future.

In addition, in Recommendation 4 of Report CAB755, it was agreed that the reference to 3(iii) of Report HE21 should be amended to delete the reference to "at a subsidised charge of £10" for the swapping over or exchange of 140 litre recycling bins for existing holders to a 240 litre recycling bin. This would just relate to the pilot area for the time being.

Cabinet also supported the commencement of the trial period at the earliest possible date, possibly from this autumn, and that seminars should be held for parish councils so that they were involved with and made aware of the process as soon as possible.

It was noted that the budget implications of the following recommendations would be considered by Cabinet at its next meeting on 11 February 2004.

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out above, and outlined in the various reports.

## RESOLVED:

1. That following consideration of the options for improving recycling/composting performance aimed at the Council achieving its 2005/2006 statutory target, Option 12 (Alternate weekly collection and free fortnightly garden waste collection service) be preferred for a pilot scheme to be supported by an educational and promotional programme.

2. That the Council's current waste collection policies, including those concerning the provision and emptying of refuse and recycling containers and the consideration thereof by the Waste Management Policy Review Informal Group be supported to support the twin aims of waste reduction and increased recycling/composting and that, for this purpose, householders within the pilot area be permitted to exchange 140 litre bins for 240 litre bins free of charge.

3. That the waste management policies as agreed by the Health Performance Improvement Committee be applied in the area of the pilot scheme from its commencement and that Policies 1(i), 3(i), 3(iii) – (as amended to state that existing holders with a 140 litre recycling bin be permitted to swap their bins over or exchange the 140 for a 240 litre recycling bin but that this be free of charge in the pilot area only), 3(iv), 6 and 8 be applied throughout the rest of the district subject to funding and following agreement over necessary variations to the contract with Serco.

4. That the commitment to achieving statutory recycling targets be confirmed and that a pilot kerbside collection service, and supporting policies, be approved as agreed by the Health Performance Improvement Committee and as amended by Cabinet in 1, 2 and 3 above, for implementation subject to necessary funding being available through the National Waste Minimisation and Recycling Fund.

5. That, in the event of insufficient funding being obtained to finance the approved pilot scheme, and waste management policies, then a further report be brought back to Cabinet for consideration.

6. That as early a start as practicable be made to the pilot trial, if possible from the autumn of this year and further consideration be given to the timetable for the project.

7. That a seminar be held for the Parish Councils that are involved in the scheme as soon as possible.

8. That further consideration be given to the possibility of introducing fortnightly collection of glass in the future, including the issues of noise and cost.

9. That the possibility of using the existing larger bins for recycling and the smaller ones for waste (with the use of appropriate labels on the bins) outside of the pilot area be considered and the Director of Health and Housing report back to Cabinet shortly.

10. That Cabinet's thanks be recorded for all those involved in the process.

1013. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
1014	Avalon House Reception Facilities – Design and Build Details	) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority). (Para 7 Schedule 12A refers). ) Any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services. (Para 9 to Schedule 12A refers).
1014	Barton Edge, Worthy Road, Winchester	

1014. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14 JANUARY 2004 (EXEMPT MINUTES)**

Cabinet considered the exempt minutes relating to Avalon House Reception Facilities – Design and Build Details and Barton Edge, Worthy Road, Winchester.

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minutes from the meeting held on 14 January 2004 be approved and adopted.

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 10.40am.

Chairman