

Meeting:	Cabinet
Date:	14 th April 2005
Subject:	Waste Management Service
Responsible Officer:	Area Director (Urban Living)
Contact Officer:	Andrew Baker
Portfolio Holder:	Environment and Transport
Key Decision:	Yes
Status:	Part 1

Section 1: Summary

Decision Required

For decision

To agree the recommendations and timetable set out in Section 3.

Reason for report

To report on the results of the kitchen waste trial and recommend options for the future development of the waste management service, including: - the development of the Brown Bin, Green Box schemes and the CA Site; the introduction of a kerbside recycling service for plastics, a recycling scheme for flats and a comprehensive public education programme.

To ensure the safety of the workforce.

To provide a response to recommendations from the Scrutiny Review of Waste Management.

Benefits

The council will increase its recycling rate, achieve its statutory target for 2005/6 and reduce its future liabilities under the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme.

Cost of Proposals

All revenue costs are contained within the agreed revenue budget for 2005/6 and future costs are being managed within the projections of the MTBS.

There is a requirement for some additional capital funding to set up some of the proposed new services. This will be found within the current approved Urban Living capital programme.

Risks

Failure to meet the Landfill Directive targets, for the diversion of biodegradable waste from landfill, will expose the council to significant financial liabilities under the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme.

Failure to win the hearts and minds of customers leading to failure to achieve the statutory recycling targets and control the budget, and reduced public satisfaction

with the service.

Staff do not buy in to the proposals and do not present a positive image to the public – reinforcing the risks outlined above.

Implications if recommendations rejected

The risks identified above will occur

Section 2: Executive Summary

This report sets out proposals for moving forward in relation to the Waste Management service. The experience of the kitchen waste trial, the recommendations of the Best Value Inspection and the findings of the Scrutiny Review of the service are incorporated into the options and recommendations.

2.1 What Are We Trying to Achieve?

The council's waste management service has the following objectives: -

- To achieve the statutory recycling targets for 2005/6 of 25.2%. (This will result in the payment of performance reward grants under the LPSA).
- To reduce the amount of biodegradable waste going to landfill. (Thereby reducing liabilities in relation to the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme - LATS)
- To improve public satisfaction in the service being delivered
- To deliver an easy to understand, high quality and reliable service to residents
- To deliver a cost-effective service in partnership with the workforce.
- To ensure the Health and Safety of the workforce
- To work in partnership with the West London Waste Authority.

2.2 Where Are We Now?

- Our recycling rate for 2004/5 will be 18.5%. This represents a significant improvement on 2003/4 when we achieved a rate of 13.2%. The proposals contained within this report should result in the 2005/6 target of 25.2% being achieved.
- The LATS scheme commences in April 2005. The government has just published the allocations for the scheme. WLWA's allocation in 2005/6 is 505,370 tonnes. The allocation for 2009/10, the first target year, is 329,450. This represents a reduction of 175,920 tonnes. The potential cost of purchasing landfill credits in 2009/10 is up to £26.388m. This would have a significant financial impact on the constituent authorities. Harrow's share of this cost, under the current levy arrangements would be approx. £4m.
- BVPI 90b, published last year showed that 68% of the public were satisfied with the council's recycling service.
- As the council increases the range of materials collected for recycling and composting, the complexity of the service increases. A common comment is that people do not remember which bin is being collected on any particular day. The council currently collects all waste in a given area on the same day. Waste bins are collected weekly and Green Boxes and Brown Bins are collected on alternate weeks. In the recent trial this pattern was varied in 11,000 households. This change (to weekly Brown Bin and alternate week Green Box and Waste Bin) represented a major change. One of the lessons of the trial is that this change was not accompanied by sufficient publicity and information

At present flats are not included in the council's recycling schemes. This represents just under 20% of residents.

- BVPI 86 measures the cost per household of refuse collection. Although there are concerns with the method of calculation set out by the Audit Commission, this PI indicates that Harrow operates one of the most expensive services in London. Previous reports on the Brown Bin

scheme indicated that during the introduction of the scheme there were some unavoidable inefficiencies in both the Brown Bin and the Waste Bin service. Once the scheme has been fully introduced these inefficiencies can be addressed. As part of the recent workforce agreement, the need to reallocate and equalise workloads was agreed. This will be subject to a separate protocol setting out an agreed way of reallocating workloads between crews.

- The trial of the revised frequency of the waste (green wheelie) bin has proved to be unpopular to a significant minority of the public. There have been a number of potentially very serious incidents involving physical attacks on staff in addition to a high level of verbal abuse.
- WLWA and the six constituent authorities are required, under the Waste and Emissions (WET) Act to prepare a joint waste strategy. This work started in Jan 2004 with the appointment of consultants on behalf of the seven authorities. This work has been funded centrally by the WLWA. Intensive work and consultation is currently being undertaken and a final draft is expected to be agreed later this year. The changes agreed by Cabinet as a result of this report will feed into the joint Strategy.
- Elsewhere on the Agenda is the report of the Scrutiny Review Group on "Household Waste Management".

2.3 Successes

- The trial was delivered on time
- And within budget
- It clearly demonstrated a difference in diversion rates between the different collection frequencies
- The tick sheet that was distributed in November 2004 was well received and understood by the public
- Public response to the survey was good with approx. 20% (4,500 people) returning the questionnaire
- The customer survey showed a clear majority in favour of the borough-wide implementation of the Brown Bin scheme. This was shown in both trial areas.
- Both sets showed improved satisfaction compared to the BVPI survey in 2003/4

2.4 Areas for Improvement

- Publicity for the launch of the scheme was not adequate.
- Ongoing publicity needs to be part of an overall programme
- Abuse of staff on the fortnightly refuse collection round was unacceptable
- Excess waste on the fortnightly refuse round was also a problem, though this was due in large part to people not using/understanding the new arrangements
- The volume of plastic in the fortnightly refuse bin, particularly plastic bottles, was significant and a major contributor to the excess waste problem
- Provision of an additional, separate, weekly collection service for disposable nappies

2.5 Summary

- The trial demonstrated that adding kitchen waste and cardboard to the waste stream increased the amount of organic waste diverted from landfill.
- Diversion of waste was greatest in areas where residual waste was collected on alternate weeks. However there were issues in these areas with excess waste and abuse towards collection staff.
- The potential savings in future disposal costs, of adopting alternate week collections for residual waste, mean that this should be adopted as the council's medium to long-term policy.
- Public support for the trial was better in both trial areas than the general position in last year's BV survey. However support was significantly stronger in areas where the waste bin was collected weekly.

- The council needs to ensure that the public understand and support the changes to the waste management system that are required to increase the amount of waste that is recycled, reduce the amount of biodegradable waste being sent to landfill and control future increase in costs associated with the Landfill Directive and LATS.
- Significant factors in reducing the volume of residual waste are to increase participation in the Green Box Scheme and to introduce a scheme for the collection of plastic bottles.

3. Recommendations to ensure the medium and long term success of the waste management service

No.	Description	Ref. Para. Appendix A
1	As an interim measure green wheelie bins to be collected weekly for a period of 18 months.	1, 3
2	Similarly, as an interim measure, collect the Brown Bin on an alternate-week basis.	1,2,3
3	Continue to collect the Green Box on an alternate-week basis – alternating with the Brown Bin.	1
4	Confirm that it is the council's medium term aim to change the frequency of collection of the Brown Bin (to weekly) and the green wheelie bin (alternate weeks). The changeover would need be dependent on the successful completion of items 7 to 12, coupled with the extensive publicity and re-education campaign (item 6). The change to be introduced in the autumn of 2006 or early 2007, subject to confirmation by Cabinet.	2
5	Confirm that the number of green wheelie bins is to be limited to one per household for all new developments. Households with more than 5 people will be allowed one additional bin subject to payment of the appropriate charge.	4E
6	Introduce a sustained 18-month campaign to ensure that the public fully understands the issues involved in changing the waste management system in Harrow.	10, 4C
7	Confirm materials to be collected in Brown Bin to be garden waste, kitchen waste and cardboard. Garden waste no longer accepted in the Waste (green wheelie) Bin.	1
8	Note that the Area Director (Urban Living) is to sign a contract for the deposit of waste, collected by the Brown Bin scheme, for in-vessel composting – as agreed in May 2004.	13
9	Complete introduction of Brown Bin across the Borough. Scheduled for completion by the end of June 2005	2
10	Increase participation in the Green Box scheme across the Borough to encourage households not currently using the scheme to do so (from October 2005) – as identified in the Scrutiny Review.	4G
11	Launch a service for the collection of plastic bottles from households (from October 2005) to encourage recycling and free capacity within the waste bin.	4G
12	Introduce electronic identification technology (e.g. bar-coding or similar) on Green Boxes to improve monitoring of participation.	7

13	Re-brand existing green wheelie bins as TRASH Bins to avoid confusion with the green colour and “green issues” and confirm that dark grey bins will be used, in the future, for new and replacement bins.	10
14	Introduce a recycling service for flats for three materials – paper, glass and cans/plastic bottles (From September 2005)	5
15	Improve the recycling centre service (bring banks) by replacing the current igloo based bank service with collections based on wheeled bins. Include the collection of plastic bottles (within cans) – From September 2005.	6
16	Complete the alterations to the Civic Amenity Site – including the purchasing of two small parcels of land to the rear of 73 and 75 Cullington Close (by agreement with the owners) and alteration works to the site exit.	11
17	Note that all new wheeled bins are to be fitted with chips to enable the future introduction of automatic bin reading when the bin is emptied.	7
18	Confirm the current policy of providing financial support for people using reusable nappies (i.e. home laundered or laundry service) and increase the payment to (up to) £100 per family.	4D
19	Confirm existing two strikes and out policy for dealing with contaminated Brown Bins	4B
20	Note the moves to develop closer links with People First to encourage understanding and participation of children through the education system.	14
21	Review Risk assessments on the operation of alternate week collections of residual waste to ensure that the Health and Safety of the workforce is protected by appropriate measures, including training.	4C
22	Provide financial incentives in the form of prize draws for households participating in the Green Box and Brown Bin schemes.	7
23	In partnership with the WLWA and the development of their joint Waste Strategy consider the options for the provision of a MRF (Materials Recycling Facility) to process mixed recyclable materials. This will allow a wider range of materials to be collected and possibly allow the use of compaction vehicles for their collection.	12
24	Quarterly progress reports to be submitted to Cabinet during the 18 month roll-out period including monitoring the public response. Monthly performance reports, at ward level, to also be developed	
25	Cabinet to receive a follow-up report on the use and financial implications of providing free composting units	
26	Cabinet to receive a report on a strategy to encourage local businesses to reduce non-recyclable packaging	

4 **Financial Implications**

The financial implications of adopting the recommendations set out in Section 3 are as follows: -

	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8
Agreed MTBS revenue	305	234	936
Revised growth/savings			
• Organic waste round 3	250	0	
• Organic waste rounds 4 to 6	450	67	
• LPSA revenue support	0	-213	
• Performance Reward Grant	-178	-415	
• WLWA Levy	187	300	
• Reduced section 52(9) payments (rounds 4-6)	-450	50	
• Reduced section 52(9) payments (kitchen waste etc.)	-40	-40	
• Reduced section 52(9) payments (revised frequency)	0	-80	
• Add. Trade waste income	-100	0	
• Additional recycling income/recycling credits	-59	-60	
• Additional Green Box rounds (plastic bottles)	125	425	
• Publicity programme	60	30	
• Replacement Green Box vehicles	60	20	
• Flats recycling	0	150	
TOTAL	305	234	TO BE DETERMINED

NOTES:

The above calculations assume that: - the targets will be achieved; the diversion of waste (into the Brown Bin) seen to date, is repeated in the rest of the borough; and, that participation, by the public (in the Green Box scheme) improves. There is a risk that if these do not happen as predicted, there would be reduced savings. Close monitoring will be required to ensure that any shortfall is identified at an early stage and the necessary corrective action taken to ensure that the approved revenue budget is not adversely affected.

The above calculation does not include potential LATS payments. The budget for 2007/8 is expected to be below the MTBS total but significant changes are anticipated in the way payments are made and received from WLWA. At this stage it is not possible to provide an accurate estimate.

CAPITAL

	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8
Agreed Capital Programme	680	0	0
Revised Programme			
• Brown Bin	580	0	0
• Green Box	100	0	0
• Green Bag	80	0	0
• Recycling Banks	75	0	0
• Flats recycling	70	70	0
• Project Management (staff)	50	25	0
TOTAL	955	95	0
Additional Capital requirement	275	95	0

NOTE: The additional capital requirement will be contained within the approved Urban Living capital programme.

5 **Legal Implications**

None at this stage

6 **Equalities Impact**

The proposal to roll out the Brown Bin service across the borough will ensure equality of access to all people living in traditional terrace, semi and detached housing. Residents living in flats would not be covered by this service at present.

The provision of recycling facilities to residents living in flats will ensure that all residents have access to kerbside or near-front-door recycling services.

The provision of incentives to recycle using the Green box or Brown Bin will only affect people who are able to receive the service. People living in flats or those that use other methods to recycle will not have access to this.

All other proposals in the report would have equal impact across the borough.

7 **Consultation**

In addition to the public consultation in the trial area, the following organisations have been consulted:-

WLWA. Draft report was circulated to WLWA for comment. No adverse comments have been received.

HA21 – Waste Group. Draft report presented to HA21 - Waste Group on Wednesday 30th March. Broad support for the recommendations was expressed. No formal comments have been received.

Unison. Draft report distributed to Unison on 18th March for comment. A follow-up meeting was held on 4th April. Unison asked that the following issues were noted: -

- The proposed 18 month timetable (for implementing the service improvements - leading up to the change of collection frequency - was not long enough. They would prefer a timetable of 30 months particularly in difficult areas.
- The timing of any move to restricting the number of waste bins would be crucial. Restrictions should only apply once the 18 month roll-out programme has been completed.
- The completion of the Brown Bin roll-out, by the end of June, was also considered to be too short - the end of July was preferred.
- They would prefer recommendation 7 to say “Garden waste and cardboard no longer accepted in the wheeled bin.”
- They are strongly in favour of moving away from the Green Box scheme to a collection system based on the provision of a MRF and a possible change to wheeled bins. Recommendations 10 and 11 are therefore viewed to be interim changes pending the introduction of a MRF.
- They would support stronger action in support of the council’s recycling initiatives by the introduction of a stricter policy based on enforcement action in preference to the two strikes and out policy in recommendation 19.
- They would support the introduction of “compulsory recycling” as practised by L B Barnet.
- Recommendation 23. They support the provision of a local MRF either by WLWA or by Harrow and believe this should be provided sooner rather than later.

8 Supporting Information/ Background Documents

Appendix A - Summary of Trial/options

Appendix B - Future Development Options for the collection of Recyclable Waste

Appendix C - Waste Minimisation and Customer Care

Appendix D - Kitchen Waste Trial – Summary of results

Appendix E - Comparison of Recommendations in Main Report and the Scrutiny Review

Top Ten Recycling Performance 2003/4

London Recycling Performance 2003/4

1. **Kitchen Waste.** The trial was comprised of two elements: - The addition of kitchen waste and card to the Brown Bin, which has not been controversial; and, the change of frequency of collections in one of the rounds, which has proved more difficult. The council should confirm, as an interim measure, that it will collect the green wheelie bin weekly and the Brown Bin fortnightly, alternating with the Green Box.
2. **Change in collection frequency.** The addition of kitchen waste and card has led to an increase in the amount of waste being collected for composting in both rounds. If the frequency of collection is not changed, and the results were replicated across the whole of the borough, they would result in the diversion of an additional 1700 tonnes pa from landfill. This represents an immediate saving of £80k pa in Section 52(9) payments to WLWA and a potential saving of £250k pa in LATS liabilities. In a full year this change would mean that the council would achieve its statutory recycling target of 25.2% (in 2005/6). However the delay in rolling out the Brown Bin scheme across the whole borough, which should be completed by the end of June, means that (by itself) this change may not be sufficient to achieve the target in 2005/6.

The change of frequency has had the most impact on people and has produced higher levels of waste diversion into the Brown Bin. This was anticipated at the beginning of the trial. The revised frequency effectively restricts capacity for the disposal of un-sorted waste and encourages people to divert organic waste into the Brown Bin (which is collected weekly). If these results were replicated across the whole borough they would result in the diversion of an additional 6400 tonnes per annum from landfill. This represents an immediate saving of £160k pa in Section 52(9) payments to WLWA and a potential saving of £1m pa in LATS liabilities.

3. **Public Opinion/ survey.** The survey of public opinion shows that both the options produced an overall improvement in satisfaction with the service compared to the opinions expressed in BVPI 90(b). However satisfaction levels in Round 2 (unchanged frequency) were significantly higher and had a very high approval rating.

	% very satisfied or satisfied
Round 2	89
Round 1	71
BVPI 2003/4	68

4. **The change of frequency has produced a number of problems: -**
 - A. **Contamination.** Incidents of contamination have largely been confined to these areas. This is either due to deliberate acts by residents (to bypass the restrictions on the capacity of the green wheelie bin) or by inadvertent acts (indicating a need for more information/education by residents). Some of these problems have occurred where the population is not settled and there is no apparent continuity from week to week.
 - B. **Enforcement.** The original intention at the start of the trial was to operate a “two strikes and out” policy where residents had used the bins incorrectly. (I.e. After the council has returned on two separate occasions to clear a contaminated bin, future problems would be the responsibility of the resident to resolve). This has not been a significant issue in Round 2. In Round 1 most residents have been able to use

Appendix A – Results of Trial/Options

the system correctly, after initial problems, but there remains a hardcore of people who have continued to abuse the system and bins have been emptied on a repeated basis. Staff have worked extremely hard to resolve problems experienced by residents. This level of support would not be sustainable if applied across the whole of the borough. If the changed frequency is adopted across the borough the council would need to operate the two strikes policy more effectively.

C. Abuse. It is unfortunately the case that abuse of the council's workforce by the public has been a feature of the trial in Round 1 – on the alternate week collection of residual waste. Managers and Unison have worked closely together to try to address the problem but the problem persists. Verbal abuse and threats are seen as routine by the waste collectors on this round. Physical abuse was a major problem at the beginning of the trial and there continue to be incidents of this nature – some of these are potentially very serious. The problem arises from excess waste, which the crews do not collect. If the change of frequency is adopted, the council will need to ensure that residents are aware of the changes (via a comprehensive publicity campaign). The council would also need to ensure that the system was flexible enough to allow people to adapt to the revised scheme.

The council will need to carry out a risk assessment and review its procedures for dealing with aggression by the public to ensure that appropriate action is taken where this does occur. Training of the collection crews, in methods of defusing aggression, will also be undertaken to ensure that they are equipped to deal with this type of problem where it does arise. It is anticipated that this will have knock-on benefits in other areas where abuse is a feature of the working environment (e.g. parking attendants). As part of the risk assessment the possibility of installing CCTV on the collection vehicles or using street wardens to act as independent witnesses to assist the prosecution of residents who abuse or assault our staff, will be investigated.

The council will also investigate what scope there is for co-operating with the Safer Neighbourhoods Policing Initiative where there is an identified hotspot of abuse.

D. Disposable Nappies. It was envisaged that the revised frequency would result in families using disposable nappies experiencing some difficulties with storage capacity. This has proved to be the case. Approximately 60 families have been provided with an additional nappy bin, which has been emptied weekly. There has been no charge for this service during the trial. All the people who have contacted us with this problem have been made aware of the £60 grant for the use of reusable nappies. Take up has been low but some progress has been made in this area. The increase in disposal costs as a result of LATS, means that this subsidy could be increased to (up to) £100 per family and this is recommended.

Other “unpleasant” items in the waste stream (e.g. cat litter, sanitary towels, etc.) do not appear to have caused problems during the trial – probably due to the smaller volumes involved.

The WLWA is currently in the process of developing its joint waste strategy. The council should seek to ensure that within the Strategy WLWA provides a comprehensive campaign to promote reusable nappies within the Health Service and other baby care service providers.

E. Capacity of the waste bin. The restriction on the waste bin has resulted in a significant number of people having problems with excess waste (which the council does not collect) This has occurred even where people recycle correctly using the Green Box and the Brown Bin to maximum effect. The main problem appears to arise from plastic bottles. This issue is discussed below. A small number of residents have

Appendix A – Results of Trial/Options

purchased a second bin to provide the capacity or because they do not wish to recycle. This is in accordance with existing council policy but runs counter to the need to minimise waste. It is recommended that, from now, people are restricted to one 240 litre wheeled bin. Additional bins could be allowed on the basis that households with five or more people are allowed one additional bin - subject to payment of a one-off charge (i.e. current policy)

During the introduction of the Brown Bin people are offered free exchanges of green wheelie bins for Brown Bins. This will continue.

F. Smaller Brown Bins. A small number of comments have been received concerning the provision of a smaller bin. When wheeled bins were first introduced the council provided people with the option of a 120 litre bin. These are no longer provided as an option as they are difficult for collectors to manoeuvre onto the bin lift. The point at issue arises in a small number of properties where residents have restricted side access (and wish to store the bin to the rear of their property) or where storage space in front gardens is very restricted. In these circumstances it is suggested that the council provides a 180 litre bin. This is marginally narrower but not as awkward for the collection crews as the 120 litre bin. The 180 litre bin is more expensive than the standard 240 litre bin. For this reason it should only be provided to residents with access or restricted front gardens.

G. Plastics. As indicated above, plastics, particularly plastic bottles, have created problems for people on the fortnightly waste bin collection. The Scrutiny Review identified that the public saw this as a major omission and feedback from people on the trial reinforces this (20 to 23% of people stated that they wished to see plastics recycled). The addition of plastic bottles to the Green Box scheme would affect the current efficiency of the scheme due to the high volumes/ low weight involved. However it now appears that the addition of plastics would be the catalyst for increased use of the Green Box scheme and is a pre-requisite for any change to the frequency of collection. It is recommended that the Green Box scheme be re-launched with the addition of plastic bottles to the existing materials.

The collection of plastics will add significant volume to the existing collection scheme resulting in additional costs. The exact method to be employed has yet to be agreed with the workforce. The options are set out in greater detail in Appendix A. In the short term introducing a reusable Bag for the collection of plastic bottles and cans would appear to be the most cost effective method. The additional collection costs could be contained within the existing budget as a result of increased savings in Section 52(9) charges resulting from the Brown Bin scheme. Purchasing reusable Green Bags would cost approx. £80k, which could be funded by a minor reallocation of the existing Urban Living capital budget. The West London Waste Authority has agreed to fund the transportation of mixed plastic bottles and cans to a local MRF for processing.

See also items 5 and 6, which envisage the collection of plastic bottles from flats and bring sites.

5. Flats

Flats represent approx. 20% of the borough's housing stock and, to date, the majority of these properties do not have access to kerbside recycling facilities. This is a major omission and has been commented on by the Best Value Inspectors, the Scrutiny Panel Review and residents. Officers have studied a number of other local authorities that operate systems for flats and have concluded that the scheme should be based on the collection of three material streams, newspapers and magazines, glass bottles and jars, and cans and plastic bottles, using wheeled bins. Collections would be made using a dedicated three-compartment vehicle, once a week. Officers believe that a reorganisation of the current refuse fleet, following the introduction of the Brown Bin would allow one of the existing refuse vehicles to be replaced. Thus

Appendix A – Results of Trial/Options

collections from flats could be started within the existing revenue budget. There is likely to be a need for one or two additional vehicles as the scheme is expanded. These would require growth in revenue in 2006/7, which is currently not identified in the MTBS.

6. Bring Sites

The borough currently uses a combination of igloo and wheeled bin banks for the collection of glass bottles, cans and paper. There are 30 public sites and approx. 100 private sites (usually shops and offices). This requires a dedicated vehicle that can empty both types of bank. Usage of the existing sites has fallen over the past seven years as a result of the introduction of the Green Box scheme. The Audit Commission inspection noted that the sites presented a poor image for recycling and also noted that there was potential for increasing recycling through the bank system. It is recommended that the use of igloo banks is discontinued and the council invests in wheeled bin banks to replace them. As with flats, three material streams should be concentrated on (i.e. newspapers and magazines, glass bottles and jars, and cans and plastic bottles). The existing vehicle would be replaced with an identical vehicle to that serving the flats enabling more flexible working and a degree of redundancy to cover vehicle breakdowns. Standardisation on wheeled bins will also allow the provision of smaller sites across the borough to fill in some of the current gaps in provision.

This more flexible approach and enhanced capacity would enable recycling to be expanded into schools on a more pro-active basis.

7. Improving Monitoring

One of the major weaknesses in the provision of the current refuse and recycling services is the monitoring of the service. This includes monitoring of participation in recycling schemes and monitoring of service delivery for refuse collection. The delivery of a modern customer-centred service requires a step change in the way service problems are recorded and used. At present, drivers fill out forms identifying problems and these are used by the call centre to respond to residents' queries. As part of the UNISYS project it is intended to move towards recording this data electronically. This will improve customer service on the refuse service.

It is recommended that the Green Boxes be bar-coded to allow collectors to actively record those boxes that have been collected. This will allow improved monitoring of participation and the introduction of incentive schemes for those people who are using the scheme. Incentives could take the form of a weekly prize draw of £50 for people who have set out the bin and a quarterly and/or annual draw open to the most regular recyclers

It is also recommended that all future wheeled bins are purchased with Rfid (Radio frequency identity) chips already installed. This will start immediately with the new Brown Bin purchases. At some point in the future, the council could adopt Rfid (radio frequency id) technology to allow positive recording of bin collections. Future collection vehicles will be specified with chip readers. Provision of chips in Brown Bins will allow the introduction of similar incentives as for the Green Box scheme.

8. Compulsory Recycling.

The introduction of "compulsory recycling" is strongly supported by the workforce, and was one of the recommendations from the Scrutiny Review.

The London Borough of Barnet is the first council in England to introduce compulsory recycling. This was introduced on a trial basis in four wards and has resulted in a 17% increase in the use of Barnet's recycling box scheme. The scheme is currently being extended across the

remainder of Barnet. Enforcement has mainly been achieved by close monitoring of the system and sending letters and making visits to people who are not using their boxes.

The proposed publicity/education campaign and service improvements, outlined in this report, are intended to increase participation and the amount of waste being recycled, by education and persuasion. The introduction of compulsory recycling is therefore not recommended.

9. Christmas/New Year Break

Over the past few years the council has suspended the refuse collection and the Green Box service for the period between Christmas and the New Year. This has produced a three-week gap in services for the Green Box scheme (and latterly for the Brown Bin scheme). During the trial additional collections were inserted in the fortnightly refuse collection, on round 1, to ensure that collections did not get stretched to three weeks as this was considered to be unacceptable. By Christmas 2005 the Brown Bin scheme will be fully introduced and the current policy will need to be revised. It is recommended that fortnightly services continue through the holiday period using the available non-public holiday days. Weekly services would be suspended as at present. This would allow some staff to take leave during this important family period whilst ensuring that residents continued to receive fortnightly collections. The details of this proposal would need to be negotiated with the workforce.

10. Publicity

The publicity associated with the launch of the kitchen waste trial was not adequate and this caused problems with the implementation of the scheme. There is a clear need for a step change in the council's publicity and information in this area. It is recommended that the council employ a specialist public relations firm to oversee a major public education and publicity drive explaining the changes and the reasons behind them clearly. The programme of change set out in the recommendations is significant and will take a year to eighteen months to deliver.

In the preparation of this proposal, officers have spoken to specialist PR firms and invited them to present proposals for this important element in the change process. It is recommended that TaylorSyms, a PR consultant with experience in both the public and private sector of managing difficult portfolios be engaged to oversee the publicity programme. The cost of this proposal is contained within the existing revenue budget.

As part of this campaign the green wheelie bin should be re-branded as a WASTE or TRASH bin to avoid any possible confusion between its colour and "green" issues and to reinforce the message that the contents are a wasted resource. New WASTE or TRASH bins will be dark grey in the future to allow a gradual changeover in colour.

11. Civic Amenity Site

Over the last eighteen months there has been a significant amount of work undertaken at the site to increase the amount of waste being recycled. Funding has been provided by the London Recycling Fund, LPSA and from capital. Approx. 40% of the waste delivered to the site is now recycled. The next phase of work will involve the purchase of small areas of land to the rear of 73 and 75 Cullington Close to allow a small expansion of the site and a realignment of the access road into the depot. This will allow the provision of additional tipping space (allowing increased throughput at the weekends), provision for the sale of compost from the Brown Bin scheme, and improved sight-lines for people using the access road and the site's exits.

12. MRF (Materials Recycling Facility)

The council's current kerbside system is largely determined by the availability of local tipping facilities – i.e. the Civic Amenity Site. Sorting at the kerbside is relatively slow but has the advantage of providing high quality materials, which can then be deposited into the recycling bays at the site. This system restricts the range of materials that can be collected. A MRF, where materials can be sorted after collection would allow a wider range of materials to be collected and would also mean that collections could be carried out more efficiently. Provision of a MRF would probably need to be carried out in partnership with the WLWA as part of the joint waste strategy that is currently being developed. A local, operational MRF is unlikely to be available for use by the Borough for at least two to three years.

13. Composting Facility

The report to Cabinet in July 2004 gave authority for the Area Director – Urban Living to “enter into a temporary contract with Grundon, for the duration of the pilot, to accept collected organic waste for reprocessing, with the costs of the reprocessing being met by WLWA; and, to procure through a competitive procurement process a permanent facility for operation from April 2005 (subject to confirmation by the council whether to continue with the collection of kitchen waste following the pilot).”

A permanent facility has been procured through competitive Tender. If the council confirms that it is to continue to collect kitchen waste in the Brown Bin, the contract will be signed and become operational. The gate fee for the facility will be met directly by WLWA.

14. Working with Schools

Working with schools will be an important element in changing the public's perception on waste management issues. It is intended to work closely with People First to develop programmes and the curriculum. Details of this new programme and how it fits in to the publicity programme will be reported back to Members once it has been developed.

As part of the changes to the recycling bank service, schools will be offered facilities to recycle a wider range of materials. The recycling officers will work closely with schools to help to deliver this message.

15. Vehicles

Pending the decision on the kitchen waste trial, the council has deferred a decision on replacing six refuse vehicles that are being hired on a temporary basis. The council currently specifies Rotopress vehicles for organic waste collections and compaction vehicles for refuse collection. The number of vehicles depends on the frequency of collection. Rotopress vehicles are specified for organic waste as it mixes and aerates the waste and absorbs any excess moisture within the load, whereas a compaction vehicle, squeezes the load, excludes air and excess moisture leaks out of the vehicle. Rotopress vehicles have been used for over thirty years as refuse collection vehicles and are therefore dual purpose. The main disadvantage is that the rotation of the drum produces additional noise particularly where glass bottles are still present in the waste stream. It is recommended that the six temporary vehicles are replaced with Rotopress vehicles if it is decided to adopt the alternate week collection for residual waste as a future aim.

Appendix B – Future Development Options for the collection of recyclable waste

The council has the following options for the development of its kerbside collection scheme for dry recyclables :-

Option	Description	Collection Freq.	MRF?	Lead-in time	Vehicles	Tonnage	Revenue	Capital
1	Green Box (existing)	Alternate week	No	N/a	6 Kerbsiders	6600	N/a	N/a
2	GB + Green Bag	Alternate week	No	3	9 Kerbsiders	11000	540k	80k
3	GB + second Box	Alternate week	No	3	9 Kerbsiders	11000	540k	240k
4	GB + Green Bag	Weekly	No	3	12 Kerbsiders (minimum)	18000	1080k	80k
5	GB + second Box	Weekly	No	3	12 Kerbsiders (minimum)	18000	1080k	240k
6	Wheeled Bin (+ GB for glass?)	Weekly	YES	24	12 (hybrid) compaction vehicles	25000	990k	1200k

Conclusions:

Provision of a Green Bag would be less expensive than other options in terms of capital expenditure.

The Green Bag would offer greater capacity than second box

Options 2 to 5 envisage the addition of plastic bottles only to the materials being collected.

Option 6 requires a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) to enable materials to be sorted after collection. This has the following disadvantages: -

- At present the nearest MRF is 18 miles away. This is too far to allow direct delivery by collection vehicles because of excessive travelling times
- The nearest MRF does not accept glass for sorting. At present this would mean retaining a separate collection stream for glass. In turn this means that collection vehicles would need a separate compartment for glass
- Development of a local MRF will be dependent on the joint Waste Strategy being developed by WLWA and the six boroughs. A draft of this strategy will be published this summer. The lead-in time for a local MRF is therefore a minimum of two years away.

Option 6 would be less expensive than Box and Bag options when collection frequency is weekly

Option 6 offers capture of a wider range of materials than Box and Bag options. In particular all plastics could be collected not just bottles.

In the short term the addition of the Green Bag to the existing Green Box system offers increased tonnage at minimum capital costs and allows the collection of plastic bottles to address the issues raised in the kitchen waste trial.

In the medium to long-term provision of a third wheeled bin and access to a local MRF would allow the collection of a wider range of materials. However this is dependent on the development of the WLWA joint Waste Strategy. Another issue that would need to be addressed would be the public's acceptance of a third wheeled bin.

Appendix C – Waste Minimisation and Customer Service

In providing its refuse and recycling services the council needs to balance the following demands:-

- The need to introduce a service which increases recycling
- the need to minimise waste, and
- the need to provide a degree of flexibility for residents for whom the basic service does not meet their needs

By the end of December 2005 all households (except flats) would have the following service.

Basic Service – provided free of charge

Container	Number	Frequency	Waste
Brown Bin – 240 litre	1	Alternate week*	Garden waste, kitchen waste and cardboard
Green Box – 55 litres	No limit	Alternate week	Paper, glass, textiles, WEEE, cans and PLASTIC BOTTLES (from summer 2005).
Waste (green wheelie) bin – 240 litres	1	Weekly*	Other plastics and residual waste. NO GARDEN WASTE

* Collection frequency of Brown Bin and waste bin to be swapped at later date.

The basic service meets the first of the above demands and should provide the majority of households with a service that meets their needs. At present residents can have additional waste bins on payment of a one-off, £75 charge. It is recommended that the one-off payment be replaced with an annual hire charge to provide an incentive for people to minimise their waste. The council would no longer empty additional waste bins, which residents had purchased independently. The following charges for extra services are suggested.

Optional Extras

	Charge	Frequency	Comments
Additional Brown Bin	£25 one-off	Alternate week	Current Policy
Additional Waste (green wheelie) bin	£75 one-off	Weekly	Current Policy
Clinical waste bin	Free	Weekly	As requested by patient's clinic/hospital

Appendix D – Summary or Results

Kitchen Waste Trial – Summary of results

		Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
No. of households		11,000	11,000	11,000
Materials collected		Garden, kitchen, cardboard	Garden, kitchen, cardboard	Garden
Brown Bin frequency		Weekly	Fortnightly	Fortnightly
Green wheelie bin frequency		Fortnightly	Weekly	Weekly
Total weight collected (% in B.Bin)	October	758 (30%)	711 (20%)	689 (17%)
	November	596 (40%)	792 (20%)	762 (17%)
	December	475 (31%)	586 (14%)	577 (12%)
	January	582 (28%)	707 (11%)	695 (8%)
	February			
	March			
Kg of organic waste per hhld per week		4.13	2.47	1.99
Excess over garden waste		2.14	0.48	0
Tonnes/ 10,000 hhlds/year		1113	234	0
Tonnage across 73,000 hhlds		8100	1700	0
% increase in recycling rate		8%	2%	0
Total predicted recycling rate across the borough when fully implemented.		32%	26%	24%

Appendix D – Summary or Results

Kitchen Waste Trial – Results of Customer Survey

Question	Category	Round 1	Round 2	Comments
Total number of responses (%)		3016 (27.4%)	2205 (20.0%)	
How well are you coping with the trial?	Very well Well Neither Quite badly Very badly	36 34 121 9 9	51 35 9 3 3	Both rounds show an overall positive rating. Round 2 is significantly better than Round 1.
How well are you coping with the fortnightly green bin?	Very well Well Neither Quite badly Very badly	24 24 10 17 24	N/a	A significant proportion of the respondents found the fortnightly collection difficult to cope with.
Have you experienced any problems with excess waste?	Yes No Don't know	49 48 2	N/a	Half of the respondents reported difficulty with excess waste.
What would be your preferred frequency of collection?	BB weekly BB fortnightly	46 54	30 70	There is a small majority in Round 1 and in Round 2 there is a clear majority in favour of the unchanged frequency.
Are you recycling more?	Yes No Don't know	77 17 5	87 8 5	Both sets report increased recycling
If so, how?	Use GB More materials Banks	17 79 4	15 81 3	No difference between response rates
Should we restrict each house to one wheelie bin for waste?	Yes No Don't know	43 38 19	57 24 19	There is a clear difference between the two sets, which reflects the frequency of collection of the green wheelie bin. However both sets showed a majority for the restriction.
Should we charge for nappies?	Yes No Don't know	30 44 26	35 38 27	The reduced frequency of collection in Round 1 has clearly had an effect on the result. The results from Round 2 probably represent the general public's view.

Appendix D – Summary or Results

Did the kitchen caddy help?	Yes No Don't know	57 39 4	59 36 5	For a significant minority in both rounds the kitchen caddy was not helpful.	
Should the scheme be introduced across the Borough?	Yes No Don't know	75 14 11	85 6 9	There is a clear majority view from both rounds that the scheme should be introduced across the borough.	
In general how satisfied are you with the recycling service?	Very satisfied Quite satisfied Neither Fairly dissatf'd Very dissatf'd	31 40 11 8 10	48 41 7 3 2	BVPI 03/04 22 46 18 8 6	These questions replicate the BVPI survey and show a clear improvement over these base figures for BOTH rounds. Round 2 has a clearly better response than Round 1

Comments

This is a random sample of 100 responses from each round. The grouping of responses is to a degree subjective. Analysis of a different sample might produce slightly different figures but the general thrust of the comments would appear to be broadly representative of all the comments made by participants in the trial.

Which aspect of the trial did you find most satisfactory?

Round 1

Able to recycle cardboard	10
Introduction of 2 bins/brown bin	9
Able to recycle kitchen waste	8
Recycling Garden waste	7
Encouraged to recycle more	7
Kitchen caddy	3
Collection weekly	2
Doing more for the environment	2
Regular/prompt collections	2
The Green Box	2
The information provided	2

Round 2

Introduction of the brown bin	20
Kitchen Caddy	10
Able to recycle cardboard	8
Able to recycle kitchen waste	5
Recycling garden waste	3
Convenience	3
Encouraged to recycle more	2
Doing something for the environment	2
Green B ox	2

Appendix D – Summary or Results

Which aspect of the trial did you find most unsatisfactory?

Fortnightly collection of green bin	23
Wrapping kitchen waste in newspaper	6
Confusion about what goes where	4
Christmas	4
Lack of information	4
No bag for kitchen waste	4
Didn't get kitchen caddy	4
Overflowing green bins	3
Too much work/inconvenience	3
Hot weather smells	3
Green Box too small	3
Confusion over collection dates	2
Unhygienic	2
Too many bins (unsightly)	2
Unreliable collections	2

Kitchen Caddy	13
Fortnightly collection of brown bin	6
No caddy	4
Poor communications/info	4
Kitchen waste	3
Cleaning brown bin	2
Confusion about what goes in what bin	2
Infrequent collection	2
Green box heavy	2
No bin liners	2
Wrapping kitchen waste in newspaper	2

Suggested changes:

Collect plastics	20
Weekly collection both bins	11
Collect green bin weekly	9
Seasonal difference in Brown Bin	5
Regular/better communications/info	5
Collect milk/juice cartons	4
Provide/approve bin liners	4
Lids for Green Boxes	3
Manufacturer's/retailers packaging	3

Collect plastics	23
Better education/info	6
Weekly collection of both bins	5
Weekly green box	4
Provide/approve bin liners	4
Provide lids for green box	4
Council Tax rebate for recycling	3
Get shops to stop giving carrier bags	3

Appendix D – Summary or Results

Other comments:

More rubbish dumped/strewn in road	3
Excess bags encourage rats/foxes	3
Green Box heavy	3
Excess not collected	2

Returning of bins to property	4
Bad customer service	3
Good customer service	2
Mess left after collections	2
Others contaminating brown bin	2

Comparison of Recommendations in Main Report and the Scrutiny Review

No.	Recommendation in Report to Cabinet	Scrutiny Review recommendation
1	As an interim measure green wheelie bins to be collected weekly for a period of 18 months.	N/a
2	Similarly, as an interim measure, collect the Brown Bin on an alternate-week basis.	N/a
3	Continue to collect the Green Box on an alternate-week basis – alternating with the Brown Bin.	N/a
4	Confirm that it is the council's medium term aim to change the frequency of collection of the Brown Bin (to weekly) and the green wheelie bin (alternate weeks). The changeover would need be dependent on the successful completion of items 7 to 12, coupled with the extensive publicity and re-education campaign (item 6). The change to be introduced in the autumn of 2006 or early 2007 subject to confirmation by Cabinet.	<p>7. Consider implementing a new collection routine that more actively encourages recycling</p> <p>The Scrutiny Review has a collection frequency of weekly Brown Bin as its preferred option and as Alternative 1. (Alternative 2 envisages alternate week collections for the Brown Bin.).</p>
5	Confirm that the number of green wheelie bins is to be limited to one per household for all new developments. Households with more than 5 people will be allowed one additional bin subject to payment of the appropriate charge.	<p>5. Introduce a limit of one (1) wheelie bin per household, with the exception of households with more than five people who may obtain additional bins</p> <p>This should be viewed as a waste minimisation measure. The council will be offering a diverse range of collection systems for different materials.</p>
6	Introduce a sustained 18-month campaign to ensure that the public fully understands the issues involved in changing the waste management system in Harrow.	<p>19. Review communication strategy and develop promotional materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A leaflet giving clearer instructions about the recycling process and explaining collection days • Reinforce the message to “sort at the source” and the cost of not doing so • Develop notes for collectors to put in the bins saying “Thank you for recycling” once every six months • Leaflets informing the public it is their responsibility to recycle

Appendix E

		<p>and the benefits of doing so</p> <p>The cabinet report contains a proposal to introduce an expanded information /awareness raising campaign over the next 18 months/two years to ensure that the council's message is understood and accepted by the public.</p>
7	<p>Confirm materials to be collected in Brown Bin to be garden waste, kitchen waste and cardboard. Garden waste no longer accepted in the Waste (green wheelie) Bin.</p>	N/a
8	<p>Note that the Area Director (Urban Living) is to sign a contract for the deposit of waste, collected by the Brown Bin scheme, for in-vessel composting – as agreed in May 2004.</p>	<p>2. Consider building a composting facility in Harrow</p> <p>Such a site would also need to obtain a waste management licence from the Environment Agency. This would require a minimum 250m gap between the site and the nearest housing. This requirement means that obtaining Planning Permission for a composting facility is likely to be difficult within Harrow.</p> <p>The council has secured composting facilities in Harefield for the waste collected by the Brown Bin scheme. Therefore this recommendation has a relatively low priority.</p>
9	<p>Complete introduction of Brown Bin across the Borough. Scheduled by the end of June 2005</p>	N/a
10	<p>Increase participation in the Green Box scheme across the Borough to encourage households not currently using the scheme to do so (from October 2005) – as identified in the Scrutiny Review.</p>	See Recommendation 6 in Main report.
11	<p>Launch a service for the collection of plastic bottles from households (from October 2005) to encourage recycling and free capacity within the waste bin.</p>	<p>6. Further work is done to investigate the possibility of recycling plastics and if necessary introduce a "Green Bag" to ensure there is sufficient room for collection of recyclable materials.</p> <p>There is a clear public demand for the collection of plastics. The kitchen waste trial has demonstrated that those households that consume a number of plastic bottles cannot cope with the fortnightly collection of the WASTE bin. Report recommends the collection of plastic bottles via the Green Box system and from flats and Recycling Banks.</p>

Appendix E

12	Introduce electronic identification technology (e.g. bar-coding or similar) on Green Boxes to improve monitoring of participation.	<p>13. Develop a system for recording information about recycling patterns. This system should then be used to determine actions for particular areas.</p> <p>Bins fitted with chips would enable the council to introduce a some point in the future chip reading technology. This would allow participation rates to be accurately monitored and would allow a step change in quality control of the collection process.</p> <p>The introduction of bar-coding on Green Boxes will be introduced within existing budgets. Chip reading technology will be specified for all future collection vehicles.</p> <p>SEE ALSO RECOMMENDATION 17 TO CABINET</p>
13	Re-brand existing green wheelie bins as TRASH Bins to avoid confusion with the green colour and “green issues” and confirm that dark grey bins will be used, in the future, for new and replacement bins.	<p>20. Change recycling bin colours following the roll-out of the Brown Bin scheme across the borough.</p> <p>Swapping the green wheelie bin and the Brown Bin is not recommended as this will lead to considerable confusion for the public – particularly where people would not have the Brown Bin (e.g. flats). Brown bins are becoming established as a standard colour across a number of authorities for organic waste collections.</p> <p>Re-branding the green wheelie as the TRASH bin will ensure that people understand the difference between the different bin colours. New and replacement bins are recommended to be Dark Grey.</p>
14	Introduce a recycling service for flats for three materials – paper, glass and cans/plastic bottles (From September 2005)	<p>8. Give flats recycling scheme</p> <p>This is a major omission in the council’s current service.</p> <p>The BV Inspection also identified this as an area for improvement.</p> <p>The report proposes the establishment of a scheme for recycling from flats.</p>
15	Improve the recycling centre service (bring banks) by replacing the current igloo based bank service with collections based on wheeled bins. Include the collection of plastic bottles (within cans) – From September 2005.	<p>11. Review recycling banks collection to ensure that they are routinely emptied, consider possibility for re-naming banks and ensure that they are easily accessible to users.</p> <p>The report proposes to improve the existing bring bank system and phase</p>

Appendix E

		<p>out the existing “igloo” bank system with wheeled bins.</p> <p>The change to wheeled bins will allow the integration of the existing bring bank and trade recycling service with flats recycling.</p>
16	Complete the alterations to the Civic Amenity Site – including the purchasing of two small parcels of land to the rear of 73 and 75 Cullington Close (by agreement with the owners) and alteration works to the site exit.	N/a
17	Note that all wheeled bins will in future be fitted with chips to enable the future introduction of automatic bin reading when the bin is emptied.	SEE RECOMMENDATION 12 TO CABINET
18	Confirm the current policy of providing financial support for people using reusable nappies (i.e. home laundered or laundry service) and increase the payment to (up to) £100 per family.	<p>4. Promote cloth nappy use more actively and increase the nappy subsidy.</p> <p>Minimising waste is a preferred option. The council already provides a £60 subsidy to people who use reusable nappies or a nappy laundering service. Disposing of reusable nappies represents a significant and growing cost to the council. Recommended to increase subsidy to (up to) £100.</p>
19	Confirm existing two strikes and out policy for dealing with contaminated Brown Bins	<p>14. Council investigates options for enforcement where there are repeat offenders.</p> <p>15. Recycling Officers work be expanded so that they are more proactive in deterrent/enforcement activities</p> <p>Better enforcement of the two strikes and out policy will encourage people to use the system correctly. Better recording of participation will allow improved targeting of households that are not recycling (See recommendations 12 and 17).</p>
20	Note the moves to develop closer links with People First to encourage understanding and participation of children through the education system.	<p>16. Target children through the education system by developing school based recycling programme</p> <p>17. Recycling Officers be supported in proactively creating links with schools.</p>

Appendix E

21	Review Risk assessments on the operation of alternate week collections of residual waste to ensure that the Health and Safety of the workforce is protected by appropriate measures, including training.	N/a
22	Provide financial incentives in the form of prize draws for households participating in the Green Box and Brown Bin schemes.	<p>18. Incentives are given to households to recycle</p> <p>Barcoding on Green Boxes would allow the introduction of incentive schemes for recycling (i.e. a weekly £50 prize draw for those people who put out their box).</p>
23	In partnership with the WLWA and the development of their joint Waste Strategy consider the options for the provision of a MRF (Materials Recycling Facility) to process mixed recyclable materials. This will allow a wider range of materials to be collected and possibly allow the use of compaction vehicles for their collection.	<p>9. Consider building a Materials Recycling Facility</p> <p>Construction of a local MRF would mean that the council could collect a wider range of materials, which would subsequently be sorted at the MRF. Collections would be more efficient allowing a reduction in costs.</p> <p>At present the nearest MRF is 18 miles away and travelling times would make collections of mixed waste inefficient. The medium term aim of the council and the joint WLWA strategy should be to try to secure a local MRF. Procuring such a facility would take a minimum of two years to complete. In practice lead in time is likely to be three to five years.</p> <p>In the short term, the current Green Box system provides the most cost-effective option.</p>
24	Quarterly progress reports to be submitted to Cabinet during the 18 month roll-out period including monitoring the public response. Monthly performance reports, at ward level, to also be developed.	N/a
25	Cabinet to receive a follow-up report on the use and financial implications of providing free compost units.	3. Consider providing composting units to suitable households free of charge
26	Cabinet to receive a report on a strategy to encourage local businesses to reduce non-recyclable packaging	1. Investigate beginning a plastic bag campaign/initiative with a local retailer

<p>Scrutiny Review</p> <p>(Other Recommendations – not incorporated into report to Cabinet)</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>10. Consider providing free lids for Green Boxes with stickers showing what to put in them</p>	<p>Increasing participation in the scheme is an essential element in improving recycling performance and a pre-requisite for changing the collection frequency of the Brown Bin and Waste Bins.</p> <p>The provision of free lids would cost £250k plus delivery to implement across the borough. Free lids and stickers are provided at shows etc. This will continue as a relatively low cost promotional tool.</p>
<p>12. Consider instituting compulsory recycling in Harrow once the Green Box and Brown Bin schemes have been implemented.</p>	<p>The proposed extensive publicity campaign and changes to the recycling services should lead to improved participation. The introduction of compulsory recycling is not recommended for action at present.</p> <p>Situation may be reviewed at a later date.</p>

Top Ten Recycling Performance 2003/04

Local Authority	Recycling and Composting Rate (%)	Refuse	Dry Recyclables	Organic
Lichfield District Council	46	Alternate week Black wheelie bin	Weekly Two boxes	Alternate week Brown Bin (Garden)
Daventry DC	42	Alternate week Grey wheelie bin	Weekly Two boxes	Alternate week Brown Bin (Garden)
East Hampshire DC	36	Alternate week Green wheelie bin	Alternate week Grey wheelie bin	Alternate week Woven Sack (Garden)
St Edmundsbury BC	35	Alternate week Black wheelie bin	Alternate week Box	Alternate week Brown Bin (Garden + card)
Isle of Wight Council	35	Weekly Sacks	Alternate week Box	Alternate week Green bucket (kitchen)
Forest Dean DC	33	Weekly Sacks	Alternate week Box	Alternate week Brown Bin (Garden)
Melton BC	31	Alternate week Black wheelie bin	Weekly Two boxes	Alternate week Brown Bin (Garden)
Eastleigh BC	31	Alternate week Black wheelie bin	Alternate week Box	Alternate week Black Bin (Garden)
Canterbury City Council	30	Weekly Grey lid wheelie bin	Alternate week Clear Sacks	Alternate week Green lid Bin (Garden)
Horsham DC	30	Weekly Green 140 l bin	Alternate week Box	Alternate week Brown Bin (Garden + card)

London Recycling Performance 2003/04 (Provisional)

Local Authority	Recycling and Composting Rate (%)	Refuse	Dry Recyclables	Organic
Sutton	25	Weekly Brown wheelie bin	Alternate week Green wheelie bin	
Bexley	21	Alternate week Sacks	Weekly Two boxes	Alternate week Brown Bin (Garden)
Brent	9	Weekly Grey wheelie bin	Weekly Box	Alternate week Green Bin (Garden)
Ealing	12	Weekly Sacks	Weekly Box	Weekly Sack (chargeable)
Hillingdon	24	Weekly Sacks	Weekly Clear sack	Alternate week Woven Sack (Garden)
Hounslow	16	Weekly Sacks	Weekly Box	Weekly Sack (chargeable)
Richmond	22	Weekly Sacks	Weekly Box	Weekly Sack (chargeable)