

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> XX November 2003	<b>MEETING NAME</b> Executive
<b>Report title:</b>		Scrutiny Report on Waste Disposal in Southwark	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Environment & Community Support Scrutiny Sub-Committee	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Executive consider the comments of the Environment & Community Support Scrutiny Sub-Committee on Waste Disposal in Southwark, as set out below, and provide a written response by XXXXXX:
2. That the Executive recognises that the ability to recycle is central, both in terms of providing facilities and in providing sufficient information so that e.g. Southwark residents know what can be recycled;
3. That as wide a range of methods as possible are used to raise public awareness about waste and recycling;
4. That the possibility of asking people to separate refuse is explored (enabling a clean as opposed to a dirty Materials Reclamation Facility);
5. That incentive schemes to encourage recycling are considered; and
6. That the progressing of an integrated waste management contract is key and that the Executive gives priority to this in order to make the necessary links with private and other partners.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

7. The Environment & Community Support Scrutiny Sub-Committee received a presentation from the Head of Waste Management on proposals for Southwark's Waste Strategy. The Sub-Committee had also invited representatives from the Greater London Authority and the Community Recycling in Southwark Project to attend a meeting and have an input into the Sub-Committee's work and their final recommendations.

### Head of Waste Management

8. The Head of Waste Management introduced Southwark's waste strategy. The Council was considering a new waste management facility in the borough, working with private partners. A site had already been identified within the UDP. Private sector investment would be necessary as part of an integrated waste management contract, combining collection and disposal. With the limited waste facilities in London it would be possible to seek waste from other areas. Independent market research was being undertaken into what was to be recycled and options in technology. Reports would be submitted to the Executive in November and December providing a range of options.

9. A feasibility study had been done into providing a facility for organic waste at Chumleigh Gardens which would also be an education facility. A proposal for a separate collection using electric vehicles was being considered. This would be grant-funded as it would be the first bio-gas plant in London. In addition, the new refuse fleet would have a weighing facility and ways of “rewarding” estates for recycling were being looked at.
10. The Head of Waste Management explained that the Councils’ Consultation Unit had advised on how best to reach different groups in the borough and that a bespoke publicity campaign was planned for January 2004.

**Samantha Heath, Chair, GLA Environment Committee**

11. Samantha Heath outlined the Mayor of London’s Municipal Waste Management Strategy. London currently produced 4.4 million tonnes of municipal waste (waste collected by Councils, mostly from households and some businesses), out of a total of 17 million tonnes of waste per year. Last year London had been second to bottom of a league of European cities in terms of recycling.
12. As Chair of GLA’s Environment Committee, Samantha Heath took a London-wide approach to this, but emphasised that it was essential to consider reduction and re-use. She felt that the Strategy did not look enough at reduction, that it was important not to predicate on waste growth. She proposed 60% as a recycling target.
13. In the past, London Waste Action had provided Southwark with £790,000 of funding. As a member of the group, Samantha Heath understood that Southwark had put in a further bid in respect of kerb-side collection. She felt that, in addition to waste collection, it was important to analyse the content of dustbins and to find out why people did not recycle. Often people did not know what was recyclable and this affected their ability to recycle. Southwark needed to interface with the London-wide Participation Campaign to raise waste awareness. Samantha Heath hoped that each borough would receive funding of £10,000 in order to do this. It was necessary to go into the community via as many routes as possible.
14. Samantha Heath indicated the importance of London Remade across the capital. London Remade, a strategic partnership between the business sector, London boroughs and regional government, waste management companies and the not for profit sector, developed and promoted new markets and secondary industries based on the processing and re-use of London’s recycled materials. She understood that Southwark had signed up to the Green Procurement Code but questioned whether the borough was doing as well as it could be. Effective auditing was essential. Performance Indicators and the Audit Commission could play a part in the future. At the same time it was important to be confident that the goods were adequate – ultimately, British Standards might be necessary or the creation of a London-wide body on construction materials.
15. The GLA was in the process of looking at Waste Directives from Europe and the relationship to dumping of electrical goods. Councils would need to take a decision as to preferred relationships with retailers – as to who would collect and recycle but on the premise that retailers would fund.

**Dr Richard Anderson, Southwark Environment Forum and Community Recycling in Southwark Project**

16. Dr Andersen commented that it would be useful to take trade waste into account in the statistics for Municipal Solid Waste. Auditing and data collection were very important but currently did not take account of the commercial or voluntary sectors. In addition, such activity as the recycling of furniture was not reflected.
17. Dr Andersen stressed that although recycling was difficult to sell to people it provided jobs, work experience and training and economically was very useful to the local community. He also stressed the importance of the Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Directive in terms of the safe disposal of potentially hazardous material. The European directive proposed that the manufacturer held responsibility for recycling of goods. This presented an opportunity to the Council in terms of funding and remanufacture.
18. Dr Andersen indicated that composting should be encouraged and composting facilities provided as close as possible to the point where compost was generated. He also indicated that there was a relationship between crime and waste, that the attitude of looking after the environment linked to attitudes to crime. Dr Andersen stressed that a partnership between the Council and the voluntary sector was essential to encourage people to recycle and to provide appropriate services. With the population in the borough growing, limiting the growth of waste would be particularly difficult.
19. Dr Andersen informed the Sub-Committee that Southwark funded Community Recycling in Southwark, which in turn provided a recycling service to 295 businesses in the borough. The focus of the Project was businesses that could not afford commercial rates.

**KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

20. Paragraph 15.3 of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules requires the Executive to consider and provide a written response to a Scrutiny Sub-Committee's report within two months of receipt.

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Environment & Community Support Sub-Committee – Agenda and Minutes	Town Hall, Peckham Road, London. SE5 8UB	Peter Roberts Scrutiny Team 020 7525 7229

## APPENDIX A

### Audit Trail

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	
<b>Report Author</b>	Peter Roberts, Scrutiny Team	
<b>Version</b>	Draft	
<b>Dated</b>	22 October 2003	
<b>Key Decision?</b>		
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Chief Officer	No	
<b>Executive Member</b>	No	
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services</b>		