



East Suffolk House, Riduna Park, Station Road,
Melton, Woodbridge, Suffolk, IP12 1RT

Scrutiny Committee

Members:

Councillor Stuart Bird (Chairman)
Councillor Mike Deacon (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Edward Back
Councillor David Beavan
Councillor Judy Cloke
Councillor Linda Coulam
Councillor Andree Gee
Councillor Louise Gooch
Councillor Tracey Green
Councillor Colin Hedgley
Councillor Geoff Lynch
Councillor Keith Robinson
Councillor Caroline Topping

Members are invited to a **Meeting of the Scrutiny Committee** to be held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton on **Thursday 17 June 2021 at 6:30 pm**

This Meeting is being held in person in order to comply with the Local Government Act 1972. In order to comply with coronavirus regulations and guidance, the number of people at this Meeting will have to be restricted to only those whose attendance is reasonably necessary.

Ordinarily, East Suffolk Council encourages members of the public to attend its Meetings but, on this occasion, would encourage the public to please watch the livestream, via the East Suffolk Council YouTube channel instead at <https://youtu.be/UD0jhm5j1Pg>

If you do believe it is necessary for you to be in attendance we encourage you to notify Democratic Services, by email to democraticservices@eastsoffolk.gov.uk, of your intention to do so no later than 12 noon on the working day before the

Meeting so that attendees can be managed in a COVID secure way and the Team can endeavour to accommodate you and advise of the necessary health and safety precautions.

However, we are not able to guarantee you a space/seat and you are advised that it may be that, regrettably, we are not able to admit you to the conference room.

An Agenda is set out below.

Part One – Open to the Public

Pages

- | | | |
|----------|---|---------------|
| 1 | Apologies for Absence and Substitutions | |
| 2 | Declarations of Interest
Members and Officers are invited to make any declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary or Local Non-Pecuniary Interests that they may have in relation to items on the Agenda and are also reminded to make any declarations at any stage during the Meeting if it becomes apparent that this may be required when a particular item or issue is considered. | |
| 3 | Minutes | |
| | To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held on 18 February 2021 | 1 - 6 |
| 4 | Review of waste management (Part 2) ES/0785
Part 2 of a review of all aspects of waste management in the district, to include litter, fly-tipping, recycling, waste education, penalty impositions etc. | 7 - 32 |
| 5 | Scrutiny Committee's Forward Work Programme
To consider the Committee's Forward Work Programme | |

Part Two – Exempt/Confidential

Pages

Close



Stephen Baker, Chief Executive

Filming, Videoing, Photography and Audio Recording at Council Meetings

The Council, members of the public and press may record / film / photograph or broadcast this meeting when the public and press are not lawfully excluded. Any member of the public

who attends a meeting and objects to being filmed should advise the Committee Clerk (in advance), who will instruct that they are not included in any filming.

If you require this document in large print, audio or Braille or in a different language, please contact the Democratic Services Team on 01502 523521 or email: democraticservices@eastsoffolk.gov.uk



The national Charter and Charter Plus Awards for Elected Member Development
East Suffolk Council is committed to achieving excellence in elected member development
www.local.gov.uk/Community-Leadership

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Scrutiny Committee** held in the Remote Meeting via Zoom, on **Thursday, 18 February 2021 at 6:30 pm**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Edward Back, Councillor David Beavan, Councillor Stuart Bird, Councillor Judy Cloke, Councillor Linda Coulam, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor Andree Gee, Councillor Louise Gooch, Councillor Tracey Green, Councillor Geoff Lynch, Councillor Mark Newton, Councillor Keith Robinson, Councillor Caroline Topping

Other Members present:

Councillor Peter Byatt, Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Craig Rivett, Councillor Rachel Smith-Lyte, Councillor Steve Wiles

Officers present: Katherine Abbott (Democratic Services Officer), Sarah Carter (Democratic Services Officer), Andrew Jarvis (Strategic Director), Sue Meeken (Political Group Support Officer (Labour)), Paul Wood (Head of Economic Development and Regeneration)

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

There were no apologies for Absence.

2 Declarations of Interest

There were no Declarations of Interest.

3 Review of the Economic Recovery and Regeneration of the District post Covid-19

The Scrutiny Committee received report **ES/0676** by the Cabinet Member for Economic Development. The report presented the extent to which the pandemic had impacted on the local economy, the Council's immediate response to this threat and the long-term, strategic economic growth plans to help ensure a strong recovery. In introducing the report, the Cabinet Member stated that the health of the economy was vital to ensure it could enable jobs and livelihoods, vibrant places and funding for vital services. 2020 and the beginning of 2021 had been, he said, like no other and this had had a major negative impact on the national and local economy. The Cabinet Member added that, as the lockdowns continued, it challenged the resilience of so many aspects of the economy. However, he was confident the Committee would see that the Council was well placed to recover strongly, and to build back better and greener from the downturn. As Economic Development, together with support from Cabinet, strong long term economic development and regeneration programmes based around existing strengths such as low carbon energy, ICT, port and logistics sectors, had been put in

place. The Cabinet Member introduced, Councillor Steve Wiles, Assistant Cabinet Member, and Paul Wood, the Head of Economic Development who provided a presentation in support of the written report.

The Chairman invited questions.

Councillor Deacon asked if the Council had considered making a case to the Government to permit a reduction in Business Rates. The Assistant Cabinet Member said that a possible opportunity to approach the Chancellor in this regard might be the modification of grant payments to those who pay Business Rates. Councillor Deacon referred to paragraph 3.3 of the report regarding the total of £84m of grant funding paid to the district's businesses since the beginning of the pandemic, and asked what information was available on the percentage return of such funds. The Cabinet Member said the Council had been prompt and efficient in getting mandatory and discretionary grant funds to as many eligible local businesses as possible, and had adopted a flexible approach so the vast majority of businesses qualified for this funding. The Head of Economic Development said that, from the original grant funds allocated, around 90% was anticipated to be paid to businesses. There had been, he said, miscalculation by the Government over the size of the district's business base, meaning that in reality, the percentage of funds allocated would be much higher than 90%. The Council compared favourably to neighbouring local authorities and, indeed, nationally in this regard. Councillor Deacon referred to paragraph 4.8 of the report which detailed the Towns Fund bid which, if successful, would enable significant economic growth in Lowestoft, and asked if an alternative source of funding had been identified in the event the bid was not successful. The Cabinet Member replied that if the bid was not successful the ambitions for Lowestoft would be retained and alternative sources of funding would be sought, as well as any other options which might arise. The Head of Economic Development added that other major funding opportunities were about to be launched but the Council had been invited to make a bid to the Towns Fund and so this had been the first route. Councillor Deacon asked if the Jubilee Terrace project was on schedule and the Cabinet Member said it was progressing well. Councillor Deacon asked what work had been undertaken to look at the Energy Bill proposed by Peter Aldous MP. The Head of Economic Development said the Council was committed to exploring and enabling all forms of clean energy growth in the district and, with regard to the Bill, east Suffolk was probably the only region in the UK that could meet its requirements and focus on low or zero carbon mainly. The Cabinet Member said a careful eye was being maintained on developments.

Councillor Robinson wished to state that he had heard nothing but praise from local businesses for the speed and efficiency of the allocation of grant funding. Councillor Robinson asked about the Council's aspirations for a Marine Science Park, issues with broadband in and around Lowestoft and when residents might be re-connected, and the perception of fishermen that they were being 'ignored' in preference for support of wind farms. The Cabinet Member thanked Councillor Robinson for his opening remarks and agreed that the team did fantastic work. In response to the questions, the Cabinet Member said that plans for the Marine Science Park were still being pursued with keenness; residential high speed broadband would be made available very shortly but more work was required on the broadband offer for larger businesses; and, lastly, the need for the fishing sector to see the potential benefits from the offshore industry were expected within the Master Plan.

Councillor Newton referred to the number of businesses who had maintained services because their staff could work from home; he asked how the Council was supporting this and enabling people to continue working from home. The Cabinet Member replied that digital transformation would be a key element in this regard as well as diversification of skills perhaps through grant funding; he added that a report on the roll-out of broadband would be received by Cabinet in March. The Head of Economic Development said that this ambition was implicit, if not explicit, within the written report.

Councillor Gooch wished to record her thanks for a detailed report, for the written responses to her advance questions and to the Council's Officers for their support to local businesses which, she said, had been hugely impressive. Councillor Gooch referred to the presentation of Lowestoft and the tidying of derelict shop fronts etc. in order to install civic pride and asked how this might be addressed. The Cabinet Member said Lowestoft had two Heritage Action Zones (HAZ). He agreed that some shop fronts did need to be addressed and that, within the northern HAZ some progress had been made in encouraging people to apply for funds to assist with renovations, if the property was historically appropriate. The Committee was informed that a regular line of communication with those in both the north and south HAZs was maintained. Councillor Gooch asked if the Council had the power to compel action. The Cabinet Member said compulsory purchase orders and planning enforcement measures were possible, but these were not the first step and cooperation would also be the preferred route. Councillor Gooch referred to the tourism offer in and around Lowestoft and, specifically, struggling large and small scale charities, and what actions were underway in this regard. The Cabinet Member said this was included within the grant funding that was available, including the discretionary scheme which the Council had implemented. He referred to strong relationships with museums and charities including routes for assistance. The Head of Economic Development said charities had received some funds to sustain them at a certain level. He added that the Council worked with a wide and diverse range of charities and the voluntary sector around direct delivery, that the Council lobbied in support of these bodies as well as offering practical advice about available funding streams. Councillor Gooch asked if there was more the Council could do with local media companies to showcase the district further and proactively. The Cabinet Member said that it was the aim to promote the district as much as possible; he referred to current initiatives such as the Lowestoft Place Board, Screen Suffolk's *The Dig*, the Burberry advertisement etc. He added that the Cabinet Member for Communities, Leisure and Tourism would be bringing a report to Cabinet on the Destination Management Organisation. Councillor Gooch asked if the Council's *Eat Out Eat Well* initiative could promote a vegan/vegetarian accreditation scheme and said this linked to the declared climate emergency and the Council's strategic themes. The Head of Economic Development said that artisan food and drink was promoted as part of the visitor economy offer of the district, but agreed that it would be good to include vegan/vegetarian food and drink; he undertook to look into this.

Councillor Lynch referred to paragraph 4.18 of the report which described the offshore wind energy sector's growth, he said this would create a lot of jobs locally, but asked if it was possible to negotiate more of the related manufacturing contracts to be local too. The Cabinet Member replied that the scale of the operation was enormous and there was a need to maximise the district's profile to attract investors. The Head of

Economic Development stated that it was important to ensure the district had the commercial space such companies would require through investment in assets, for example. He added that there were opportunities and these would be pursued.

Councillor Topping referred to paragraph 3.4 of the report which outlined the Reopening High Streets Safely Fund allocated to the Council (£222,000); she asked how successful this had been and how that success had been measured. Councillor Wiles, as Assistant Cabinet Member, replied that the Council had worked with the town councils of the district's principal towns and much of the funds had been used for signage, sanitisers, barriers etc. He added that whilst this had not been 100% successful in all locations, in total the allocation had been used in delivering measures to support trading in the towns in the difficult and unusual circumstances of the time. Councillor Topping referred to paragraph 3.7 of the report which outlined the £71,000 Business Association Development Fund and asked how the allocation of this support had been tracked and its success measured. The Head of Economic Development said the total allocation had not been spent and that tracking was achieved via promotion, digital support and the ability to have safe re-openings. He added that whilst the Business Association's membership may not have increased its engagement had and the funding had enabled it to better establish local networks. Councillor Topping asked how the Council could work to engage with the widest number of stakeholders possible. The Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Regeneration said that it was necessary to ensure sufficient people were involved, that the right support was in place, including digital support and to learn from the Smart Towns pilots. He added that, ultimately, the Council was only able to facilitate revitalisation and not impose it. The Strategic Director stated that towns with aspirations for improvement could work alongside the Council and private sector entrepreneurial businesses.

The Chairman welcomed the positivity of the report. He referred to the need for improved road connections and asked what lobbying or representations had been made regarding the upgrading of the A12. The Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Regeneration said the A12 was not of the standard needed for the modern age and that the Council's ambition, within its Strategic Plan, included the building of the right environment; in addition, representations had been made to the Government regarding a large scale investment and the commensurate level of infrastructure which was now required. The Strategic Director added that it was also crucial to push for ultra fast broadband in order to protect the Council's carbon neutrality ambitions.

There being no further questions or matters raised for debate, the Chairman proposed a recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Topping. It was

RESOLVED

That, having received and questioned the report, the Scrutiny Committee welcomed the wide-ranging and focussed economic growth programmes and endorsed plans to ensure economic recovery by enabling growth opportunities

Cabinet Member update

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Regeneration was invited to

provide his verbal update. In terms of his key priorities, the Cabinet Member said that it was imperative to create the right environment to encourage business start-ups and, in that regard, the Covid-19 pandemic had been both a catalyst and an obstruction. He added that the Council, through hope, positivity, great vision and aspirations, together with an inclusive approach it was felt that the ambitions would be achieved.

Councillor Deacon asked what the Cabinet Member hoped, in time, to be able to describe as his greatest achievement in the role. The Cabinet Member replied that if he had the opportunity he hoped to fully implement successful smart towns.

Councillor Gooch asked about the inclusion of a town park in the Lowestoft masterplan and if the compulsory purchase of uncolonized retail outlets might be being considered. The Cabinet Member said a pocket park was underway through seed funding. He added that the Council would not compulsorily purchase everything but would work with others to achieve success for Lowestoft. Councillor Gooch suggested that Lowestoft would benefit from a luxury hotel in the town centre and asked if this had been explored. The Cabinet Member agreed that such a facility would be a great addition to Lowestoft as well as other areas within the district; he added that the challenge was where to place it and if there was a landlord or freehold owner willing to facilitate it. He emphasised that the team worked hard to identify potential opportunities as they emerged.

Councillor Topping asked if it might be possible to have a University sited in Lowestoft. The Cabinet Member replied that, to attract such a facility to the district, it would be necessary to provide skills-based jobs and environment, inviting and dynamic high streets, as well as quality of life.

Councillor Deacon asked if there was positivity that high streets would recover from their current malaise. The Cabinet Member said recovery was possible but they would need to transform themselves to counter the impact of internet shopping. Therefore, he said, it would be necessary to create an offering that worked for the customer and attracted them to the high street as a convenient, transformed experience.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member and the Head of Service.

4 Scrutiny Committee's Forward Work Programme

The Scrutiny Committee received and reviewed its current Work Programme.

The Chairman thanked the Task and Finish Group on Integrated Care for its work so far. He added that the report of the Group's findings was not yet suitable for submission to and consideration by the Committee. The Chairman said that there was a wish not to lose the Group's work and asked those present (Cllr Beavan having left the meeting earlier) if they wished to have more time to undertake additional work to ensure the proposed recommendations were evidence based and data led. He stressed that, nevertheless, this work would need to be completed within the time limits specified in the protocol. This was agreed.

Two future items for review were suggested: long term empty properties and the standardising/consistency of leisure provision. It was agreed that draft scoping forms

would be provided.

The meeting concluded at 9:16 pm

.....
Chairman



SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 17 June 2021

Subject	REVIEW OF WASTE MANAGEMENT – PART 2
Report by	Councillor James Mallinder, Cabinet Member for The Environment
Supporting Officer	Kerry Blair Head of Operations Kerry.Blair@eastsoffolk.gov.uk 01502 523007

Is the report Open or Exempt?	OPEN
-------------------------------	------

	Click or tap here to enter text.
Wards Affected:	All Wards

Purpose and high-level overview

Purpose of Report:

Scrutiny Committee requested a review of all aspects of Waste Management within the District, to include litter, fly tipping, recycling, waste reduction and penalty impositions.

This is the second of two reports in response to the review and this report covers the following items

- Contamination – in particular of blue bin contents, and the impact on East Suffolk Council.
- Littering and public realm – including the use of litter bins.
- PPE / Covid impacts on the refuse collection system

Click or tap here to enter text.

Recommendation/s:

That the Scrutiny Committee considers this progress report on Waste Management in East Suffolk, with a view to making recommendations to Cabinet for service changes or improvements, as necessary.

Corporate Impact Assessment

Governance:

This report has been prepared for the Scrutiny Committee. The Council is required by Law to discharge certain overview and scrutiny functions.

These functions are an essential component of local democracy. Scrutiny Committees can contribute to the development of Council policies and also hold the Cabinet to account for its decisions

ESC policies and strategies that directly apply to the proposal:

None.

Environmental:

The work covered in this report covers several important environmental issues for East Suffolk Council.

- Refuse collection helps the council deliver on its sustainability and recycling obligations. This will be increasingly important beyond 2023 with the introduction of changes under the government's Resource and Waste Strategy.
- In addition, the council's work to collect litter and ensure that bins are available in public spaces are important in order to provide a clean environment in which to live and work.

Equalities and Diversity:

None.

Financial:

The current budget for refuse collection across East Suffolk is in the region of £6m. In addition to this, around £1m is spent per annum on street cleansing.

Therefore, the issues covered in this report have a significant impact on the council's finances.

This is likely to become more acute from 2023, when the government's new Resource and Waste Strategy is likely to require local authorities to collect and process additional materials.

Human Resources:

None

ICT:

None.

Legal:

None.

Risk:

The main areas of risk for the issues summarised in this report are:

Financial: in particular, the potential for cost inflation in the waste collection service linked to the introduction of the new Resource and Waste Strategy

Reputational: Waste collection and littering are issues of key importance to local residents. Changes to this service are highly visible, and have an impact across all of the council's communities.

External Consultees:

Scrutiny Committee
Ward councillors
Suffolk County Council
Norse Commercial Services

Strategic Plan Priorities

Select the priorities of the Strategic Plan which are supported by this proposal: <i>(Select only one primary and as many secondary as appropriate)</i>		Primary priority	Secondary priorities
T01	Growing our Economy		
P01	Build the right environment for East Suffolk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P02	Attract and stimulate inward investment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P03	Maximise and grow the unique selling points of East Suffolk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P04	Business partnerships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P05	Support and deliver infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
T02	Enabling our Communities		
P06	Community Partnerships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P07	Taking positive action on what matters most	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P08	Maximising health, well-being and safety in our District	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P09	Community Pride	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
T03	Maintaining Financial Sustainability		
P10	Organisational design and streamlining services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P11	Making best use of and investing in our assets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P12	Being commercially astute	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P13	Optimising our financial investments and grant opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P14	Review service delivery with partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T04	Delivering Digital Transformation		
P15	Digital by default	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P16	Lean and efficient streamlined services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P17	Effective use of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P18	Skills and training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P19	District-wide digital infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
T05	Caring for our Environment		
P20	Lead by example	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
P21	Minimise waste, reuse materials, increase recycling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P22	Renewable energy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P23	Protection, education and influence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XXX	Governance		
XXX	How ESC governs itself as an authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>How does this proposal support the priorities selected?</p> <p>Cleaner streets and well managed waste collection ensure the environment in East Suffolk is one that people feel proud to live, work and invest in.</p> <p>Working with residents to ensure that they understand the ways in which they can recycle materials is an important part of our drive to increase recycling rates</p>			

Background and Justification for Recommendation

1 Background facts	
1.1	<p>Scrutiny Committee asked for recycling bin contamination, labelling and educational programme to be addressed within this report. This is covered in points 2.1 to 2.12 below. Specifically, this has been examined under the following sub-sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contamination of blue bins and educating users about all types of waste. See 2.1 – 2.7. • Research the possibility of private housing developers choosing to include central waste-recycling points on estates so that only black bins are kept at homes. See 2.8 – 2.9. • Seek ways to improve community waste collection points (e.g.: bottle banks, waste-paper collection, clothing banks etc.) all of which would ease household waste disposal needs. See 2.10 – 2.12.
1.2	<p>Scrutiny Committee asked how we can engender civic pride in areas of Hidden Needs and high deprivation. This is covered in 2.13 below. Specifically, this has been further examined under the following sub-section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate the possibility of acknowledging the difficulties of some residents in HMOs in managing their refuse collection bins.
1.3	<p>Scrutiny Committee asked for a review of Public spaces litter storage and collection. This is covered in the sections below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the timetable in place for the pro-active checking of on-street litter bins. See 2.14 – 2.15. • Address whether litter collected from mixed-waste bins in public spaces is sorted into recyclables and non-recyclables. See 2.16. • Review all existing public waste-bins – size, location and changing to ‘gull-proof’ lids. See 2.17. • Consider installing general waste public bins that have solar-powered internal crusher. See 2.18. • Address difficulties of who monitors litter on Retail Parks to ensure that by-laws etc. are adhered to. See 2.21.
1.4	<p>Scrutiny Committee asked that we consider the impact of Covid 19 specifically in relation to production of PPE waste, restricted hours of recycling centres and impact on beach cleans. This is covered in the sections below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not related to ESC, but consider what happens to the mixed waste collected from commercial premises, for example, Gisleham Industrial Estate - is it sorted by Biffa and other companies? They are operating in ES so, surely, we should have an interest in their operating procedures and their effect on the ES environment. See 2.20. • Review, perhaps, the impact of China refusing to take recyclables and the implications on material destination. See 2.20. • Investigate the education of takeaway outlets during these two lockdown periods where eating in has been impossible; address the new national

Litter Strategy and how this has affected the number of penalty notices issued for offences of throwing litter from cars. See 2.21 and 2.22.

- Impact of Covid-19 on community beach cleans and litter picks and HWRCs. See 2.23.

2 Current position

2.1 Contamination levels are recorded as a percentage of the total recycling household waste rejected for processing. This is expressed as a percentage of the total recycling tonnages collected in the district.

There are a number of elements to this. Each load that arrives at the MRF is sampled. Highly contaminated loads can be rejected at this stage. These loads are identified as 'gate rejects'.

In addition to gate rejects, the level of contamination of each load is determined. This is known as the 'contamination level'. Stats for both of these are shown below.

Total recycling collected for the period (the 12 months ending March 2021) was 18,180 tonnes. This doesn't include materials rejected either as a whole load (gate reject) or during the sorting stage.

Gate Rejects

The gate rejects are split between the 2 regions, with each having deposited initially into its own Transfer Station.

The Northern part of the district has shown a level of gate rejects at 10.5% and for the Southern part of the district this is 0.3%. The weights of the rejected whole recycling loads were:

- North – for the 12 months ending March 2021, resulted in 918 tons rejected.
- South – for the 12 months ending March 2021, resulted in 30 tons rejected.

The prime reason for gate rejects loads to be initially rejected is excessive moisture, typically due to rain or fluids, such as drinks / food etc.

The financial impact of gate rejects

This contamination of whole loads translates in lost Recycling Performance Payments equating to £1,639 for the South region, and £50,308 for the North region, totalling £51,947.

The balance of the rejected materials are the 'processed rejects' i.e. sifted during the sorting stage.

Once being 'sorted' the rejected materials are combined together with other LA's materials from across the County, therefore an exact weight for ES rejected material is not available, albeit total tonnages sent to the Incinerator are recorded. Therefore, to determine the main contaminants for ESC and to obtain a

contamination % a sample is assessed.

Contamination rates – ESC

The sampling process includes capturing between 5 and 8 ESC material bundles, each weighing 60kg.

The sampling data shows the average over the 12 month period:

	Acceptable	Objectionable	Prohibitive
South	81.547%	4.18%	14.27%
North	76.066%	4.75%	19.19%

South

North

The average contamination rate across Suffolk for this period based on the sampling data was 15.9%.

This compares with the targeted materials recycling for the MRF based on a contracted input specification of 95% Acceptable with 5% allowed for objectionable materials. It has been agreed by SCC with Viridor to reduce this to 90% Acceptable and with a permitted 10% Objectionable.

It should be noted that higher levels of contamination are associated with two rounds in Lowestoft. Section 2.2 of this report, details are given of the work that is taking place to address the issues presented by these two rounds.

2.2 ESC has been working with FCC, the operators of the Transfer Station in Lowestoft – which has the most significant issues with contamination - to try to reduce the impact of contamination, and this is being performed in three stages:

- 1) Each load tipped at the Lowestoft Transfer Station (see above figures detailing the levels of contamination) is checked by both the Driver and a member of staff from FCC (Transfer Station). The reason for a focus on Lowestoft is because the issues of contamination are so acute in Lowestoft – driven by two rounds where there are particularly high rates of contamination.
- 2) The load is in then categorised as Good, Fair or Bad. In conjunction with this any loads classed as Bad are located in a separate bay, to avoid contaminating the whole bulked load, albeit all waste is sent to Viridor for processing.
- 3) The round number is also recorded allowing us to focus on these collection areas to provide additional support. Particular rounds where contamination is an issue further educational material will be issued.

It should be noted that dealing with contamination at the transfer station is only one approach to dealing with the issue. Resident education and – if necessary – enforcement is also needed, and our approach to this is detailed later in this paper.

2.3	<p>Main contaminants</p> <p>The MRF 'gate fee' includes the additional cost of depositing rejects at the Energy from Waste Facility in Great Blakenham (EFW) for incineration. Whole rejected loads cost £102 / ton. This is the fee that ESC is charged at the gate of the EFW facility. SCC currently fund this – therefore the cost is to the 'whole system' rather than ESC specifically. However, this is currently being reviewed.</p> <p>The contaminants that can spoil a load are classed as either Objectionable or Prohibitive. Objectionable includes metals and hard plastics (where there is some value, minimal, to be gained if processed). Prohibitive items are those items that cannot be recycled – or that damage other materials (for example, soil, garden waste or wet material)</p> <p>The sample analysis performed at the MRF shows a similar pattern across East Suffolk. The main contaminants in ranked order are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Glass • 2nd Black Plastic waste sacks • 3rd former Waveney area - Food • 3rd former Coastal area - Foil / Tetrapaks • 4th former Waveney area – Foil / Tetrapaks • 4th former Coastal area - Food
2.4	<p>Work has been carried out to try to address poor recycling behaviours amongst residents.</p> <p>A number of initiatives have been employed, focusing on education, accountability and enforcement, with the focus being to help and educate residents as to which materials can be recycled, and to provide some key messages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, an updated recycling leaflet – 'Together we can get our recycling right' was posted to all householders in January 2021 (produced by the Suffolk Waste Partnership). This was complemented by various social media campaigns (via ESC, SCC / SWP). • Secondly A5 and A3 recycling stickers (the same design as the above) have been produced for crews to place on bins, where required. For example, the A3 sticker can be placed onto communal waste bins. • Thirdly, RCV Banners are being produced (following on from the Food Savvy campaign consisting of vehicle banners and a social media release) to highlight certain key contaminants - glass, food, plastic bags and nappies - that should not be placed into your recycling bin.
2.5	<p>As well as the actions above - supplementary support from such bodies as the Greenprint Plastic Action Champions who communicate / recommend how best to reduce overall consumption, resulting in less waste.</p> <p>In addition, the Suffolk Waste Partnership carry out information campaigns that aim to educate residents on which items go in which bin – for example, the Christmas 'bin hanger' campaign, which is carried out every year.</p>
2.6	<p>Persistent poor recycling and contamination</p> <p>In the event of repeated 'non-compliance' – there are a number of options for East</p>

	<p>Suffolk Council.</p> <p>First amongst these has to be education. This can include distributing leaflets to the householder, or engagement with residents on the doorstep to educate what material can be disposed of in each bin.</p> <p>There are enforcement options available to ESC if education does not work - however these are complex, and should be used only where all other options have failed.</p>
2.7	<p>For point 1 (mentioned in 2.2) a daily record is also sent to both Norse and the Council. Overall recycling statistics are provided for by Viridor / SCC.</p>
2.8	<p>A requirement that private housing developers to provide centralised recycling facilities would be a consideration for Planning and from an operational perspective agreed with the waste contractor.</p> <p>Importantly the Council's Environmental-Guidance-Note.pdf (eastsoffolk.gov.uk) states (on page 11, Materials and Waste) that "New development should have enough space to store sufficient wheelie bins for each individual dwelling".</p> <p>However, in larger developments, there is an opportunity to review this approach – as set out in point 2.9.</p>
2.9	<p>ESC is also reviewing the potential use of central collection points in our own developments such as Deben High School. Where East Suffolk Council is developing housing schemes, the viability of central refuse collection points will be explored as part of the feasibility study.</p> <p>This <i>could</i> include centralising all collection points (for example, black and blue bin collections) Or – and more likely – the provision of additional recycling points for non-standard items within the housing development.</p> <p>The advantages of a central collection point are twofold – firstly to increase the efficiency of collection, by reducing the number of points that crews need to visit in order to collect refuse. And secondly to reduce the visual impact of large numbers of wheeled bins at each property.</p> <p>It should be noted, however, that whilst collection points are generally accepted in, say, blocks of flats, there is still an expectation amongst UK house owners that they will have a dedicated bin and separate collection for their property.</p>
2.10	<p>Within East Suffolk, there are two providers of glass recycling – Indigo as part of a contract covering all of Suffolk except the former Suffolk Coastal area, and Norse in the south of the district.</p> <p>Norse glass recycling allows for greater flexibility in placement over the standard fixed container as the collection 'banks' are 1100litre wheelie bins lifted by an RCV equipped with a tail lift.</p> <p>This enables containers to be situated in places that would otherwise be inaccessible to the machinery that is required to empty the standard bell-style containers, such as those operated by Indigo, which are lifted by a crane and cannot be sited close to overhanging obstacles such as power lines and trees.</p>

	<p>Locations of sites available on our website Recycling » East Suffolk Council and SWP Recycling bring banks - Suffolk Recycling. It should be noted that these locations are under review.</p> <p>It is almost certain that these arrangements will have to change in line with the new Resource and Waste Strategy. Whilst this strategy – which represents a major shift in how local authorities collect waste – is yet to be finalised, it is likely that glass will need to be collected by councils at the kerbside, as part of people’s domestic collection.</p>
2.11	<p>Currently East Suffolk Council provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South of the District – 193 Bottle Banks, 75 Bring Banks for textiles, clothing, shoes and books. • North of the District – 81 Bottle Banks, 8 Bring Banks for textiles <p>These are the banks operated by East Suffolk Council – although some of these banks (particularly textile banks) might be owned by charities. Ward members can request - if there is space – that a bring bank is added to a location.</p> <p>In addition, bring banks can be requested by any landowner – for example, a supermarket chain - and as a result, the provision of bring banks are often outside of ESC’s control. The commercial arrangements between bring banks (often charities) and the landowner again can vary from site to site.</p> <p>Collection Bring Bank weights (12 months) are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glass c. 6300 tons (3800 – South, 2400 North) • All others c. 43 tons (37 South, 6 North) <p>Often textile banks are completely independent from the council, as many 3rd party sites make their own arrangements directly with a charity or commercial bank provider to have a textile bank situated on their premises and make it accessible to public.</p>
2.12	<p>Due to fewer numbers of banks provided in the North of the District, it could be considered that it should be a priority to increase the number of bring sites in the North. Suggestions have been made in the scoping document that sites could be installed offering increased paper collection, for example.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that ESC offers a wide-ranging kerbside recycling service, which collects wastepaper effectively through the blue bin. In fact, paper and card are the most commonly collected items through the blue bin. There is a risk that if ESC funded bring banks for paper, these would attract the wastepaper of commercial businesses – who are currently paying for a trade waste service. Therefore the implications of increasing facilities need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>It should be noted that some materials – for example, paper – have a negative value in terms of the market for resale. So, operating an additional paper bank means additional cost for East Suffolk Council – with no benefit to the</p>

	<p>householder, who can use their blue bin to dispose of paper.</p> <p>Across the District residents can also access the Household Waste Recycling Centres (as provided for in the links above) for materials such as Tetrapaks that cannot be recycled through the blue bin.</p>
2.13	<p>The Scrutiny scoping document seeks thoughts on addressing and helping support residents in HMO's and engender civic pride in areas of Hidden Needs and high deprivation.</p> <p>In parts of our more urban areas, this is a significant issue. We know that some rounds in parts of Lowestoft see contamination rates greater than 25% - which is significantly higher than the average across the district.</p> <p>This is thought to be driven by the difficulties of encouraging good recycling behaviour in areas where there is a more transient population – for example in buildings that have been converted to Homes of Multiple Occupation (HMOs)</p> <p>There are a number of potential approaches to improving this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Labelling all communal bins to clearly show what material should go into each bin. This may help those people who are new to the area – and who may have had different disposal rules in their previous area of residence. 2) Contacting households where persistent issues continue with additional information, including the outcomes of recycling i.e. reasons why and global / environmental benefits. 3) Providing residents who have confirmed they wish to participate with separate receptacles, following on from point 2 above, essentially a bagged waste service already provided for by Norse in cases where bins cannot be safely emptied. 4) ESC also seek to work directly with landlords and housing associations to promote and educate residents / occupiers to recycle. In some parts of the district, a single property management company may be responsible for a large number of HMOs – and we can engage with these companies through our Private Sector Housing team. We need to ensure that the refuse collection arrangements of housing providers are fit for purpose. <p>However – it is clear that given the impact of high levels of contamination in some areas, further enforcement options are explored, and consideration given to the collection policy at those HMOs where all other options have been explored.</p>
2.14	<p>Norse prepare a schedule for emptying litter bins based on expected and actual use.</p> <p>At our Coastal locations, such as Felixstowe, Southwold, Aldeburgh and Lowestoft additional resource is provided to ensure the bins are emptied when full on a daily basis – or more frequently in the summer period.</p> <p>The emptying regime is reviewed by Norse in consultation with the Town Council and ESC. ESC and Norse aim to take a flexible and responsive approach to litter collection – adding resources where issues arise or are anticipated to arise. For example, ESC has added several additional bins and collection points in coastal</p>

	<p>locations for the summer of 2021, in anticipation of increased visitor numbers.</p> <p>ESC is also trialling the use of new technology to improve with collection – for example the use of sensors which alert Norse when a bin is full, triggering a collection. More detail in section 2.15.</p>
2.15	<p>ESC is commencing a trial with Suffolk County Council and University of Suffolk and other partners where bin level sensors are installed to monitor when a bin requires collection. Norse would only arrive to empty the bin when it is at a certain fill level, for example 3 quarters full.</p> <p>This trial is for 6 months ending September 2021. The results of this could determine a wider roll out of this smart bin technology. This delivers service efficiencies and environmental benefits, ensuring the bin is only visited when required. Anticipated benefits include reduced carbon emissions as a result of unnecessary visits to empty the bin.</p>
2.16	<p>We have installed mixed litter and recycling bins in Aldeburgh, Southwold and Felixstowe. The contents are sent for recycling (and monitored on an ad-hoc basis).</p> <p>If successful, the intent is to continue deploying these elsewhere. Existing older style mixed bins (we have identified 33 across the District) are being reviewed if they can be recommissioned for use and assessing the operational practicalities of collecting.</p> <p>ESC has increased the visibility of recycling information at these bin sites – to encourage members of the public to use the right bin to recycle material.</p> <p>It is more difficult to get people to use the correct bin in ‘on the go’ locations, compared with a domestic bin – but ESC has been working with Town Councils and with Norse to try to address this issue.</p>
2.17	<p>In reviewing the provision of litter bins we have successfully, and are continuing to, locate standard 240lt lidded general public litter bins of the same colour and design as household bins.</p> <p>This provides a consistent message for litter disposal (and will include the same labelling) and avoids the multi-colour bins (green, blue, open top etc.) that were there previously for the collection of litter.</p>
2.18	<p>Solar power compactor bins cost approximately £5000 each. The balance between benefit and cost needs to be considered when deciding whether this is a good investment. The business case for this would need to be based on an assessment that a compacting bin requires less frequent emptying than a conventional bin.</p>
2.19	<p>Viridor – PPE</p> <p>There has been minimal impact at the MRF for bulked recycled loads – if in the load they tend to appear in clusters / in bags and ‘are easily captured in the pre-sort areas of the plant before they can get mixed into any recovered commodities. The public have been sensible and must have been placing them into their residual waste bins. It does go to show that when the public understand, they can do a good job in placing the right items in the right bins’.</p>
2.20	<p>The Kerbside Bin End Use Register would provide such data Where recycling goes - Suffolk Recycling This provides annual data for each recyclate collected at the kerbside and the destination country, as summarised below for the period 1 April</p>

2019 to 31 March 2020 (please note these figures are for all of Suffolk):

Metals (steel and aluminium cans) – 3605 tonnes (6.9%)

- UK 96.3%
- Germany 3.4%
- Greece 0.4%

Card – 6856 tonnes (13.1%)

- Vietnam 25.6%
- India 23.4%
- China 17.7%
- Indonesia 15.1%
- Taiwan 9.2%
- Thailand 3.4%
- Pakistan 2.7%
- Turkey 2.2%
- UK 0.7%

Paper – 24530 tonnes (46.7%)

- UK 28.5%
- India 26.5%
- Indonesia 17.4%
- China 8.7%
- Vietnam 7.8%
- Germany 5.9%
- Thailand 3.9%
- Netherlands 1%
- Turkey, South Korea, Malaysia, Belgium each <1%

Plastics (tubs, trays, bottles) – 8635 tonnes (16.4%)

- UK 65.2%
- Turkey 15.1%
- Romania 5.9%
- Netherlands 5%
- Germany 3.2%
- Spain 1.7%
- France 1.3%
- Ukraine, Italy, Thailand, Russia, Portugal, Taiwan, Slovenia, Greece, Slovakia each <1%

Contaminants – 8921 tonnes (17%)

With reference to collection of material from commercial sites – for example, Gisleham Industrial Estate – each business will have their own commercial collection arrangements. These may be with companies such as Biffa, or Veolia. These companies in turn will have their own processing and disposal contracts, and disposal will need to comply with UK legislation.

2.21 **In respect of Takeaways and Retail Parks:**

	<p>Powers exist under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 to address the problems caused by litter from takeaway outlets which, for example, do not provide street bins commensurate with their contribution to the problem of street litter.</p> <p>Those powers can be used to require establishments to provide and maintain a sufficient number of bins and adequate frequency of emptying. These powers have not been used, because the same objective has been achieved informally by negotiation, without recourse to legal powers.</p> <p>We record complaints of litter on our complaint recording system (UNIform), so that any recurrence of incidents arising from the same premises can be identified and addressed with the appropriate graduated response, beginning with education and persuasion, leading to enforcement and appropriate sanctions where these fail to achieve improvements.</p> <p>We received 220 litter complaints in East Suffolk for the whole of 2019 (78 during the first 4 months). This fell to 144 during 2020 (48 during the first 4 months). During the first 4 months of 2021 we have received 80 litter complaints.</p> <p>In respect of retail parks, we do have access to legal powers to tackle ‘defacement of land by litter’ under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014, which repealed and replaced the previous powers under the EPA1990. The first part of the process is to document the existence of an actual problem which is persistent or likely to recur, detrimental to the community and unreasonable. (The three tests for a community protection notice).</p>
2.22	<p>In respect of Littering from Vehicles:</p> <p>East Suffolk Council has an agreement with the DVLA which allows us to interrogate their computer records remotely to discover the registered keeper details of a vehicle used in connection with certain offences, including littering and fly-tipping.</p> <p>We have always pursued reports of littering from vehicles by issuing a Fixed Penalty Notice where the evidence is sufficient to sustain prosecution. In 2019, we investigated 37 complaints of littering from vehicles, 77 in 2019, 41 in 2020 and 5 during the first 4 months of 2021.</p> <p>The amount of a Fixed Penalty for littering is £80 and must be paid within 14 days. This amount is reduced to £60 if paid within 10 days.</p> <p>We issued 29 FPNS for littering in 2018, 69 in 2019, 38 in 2020 and 7 for the first 4 months of 2021. The way our data on these FPNs and the incidents from which they arise is stored makes it difficult to provide detail about how many littering FPNs were issued in respect of litter thrown from vehicles, however, anecdotally it is possible to say that the majority of littering FPNs do indeed arise from incidents of this nature.</p>
2.23	<p>Impact of Covid-19 on community beach cleans and litter picks and HWRCs</p>

Due to Covid-19 the provision of returnable equipment (litter pick sticks, hoops and tabards) to community volunteer groups was suspended due to concerns over the possibility of facilitating the spread of Covid-19 on infected surfaces. The incentive scheme Love East Suffolk which had been due to run through March, April and May 2020 was also cancelled.

In terms of groups supported with loans of equipment, the numbers are as follows:

- In 2019 ESC supported 146 groups
- In 2020 ESC only supported 23 groups
- In 2021 so far, ESC have supported 5 groups.

- In 2020, 12 litter picking sets have been sent to individuals who wanted to litter pick during lockdown.
- In 2021, 5 litter picking sets have so far been sent to individuals who want to litter pick on an ongoing basis.

The numbers above do not include support given in the form of collection of the bagged litter only, to those groups and individuals who have their own equipment (such as Litter Free Felixstowe and the Beccles Bombs whose members pick litter on an ongoing and repeated basis throughout the year).

Due to the easing of restrictions, Norse are again supporting community litter collections, and parish councils and community groups can request support in the normal manner for equipment, collection and disposal.

3 Reason/s for recommendation

3.1	To enable Scrutiny Committee, having reviewed the two parts of the report on waste management, to make recommendations to Cabinet as it sees fit.
-----	---

Appendices

Appendices:	
Appendix A	Questions from Scrutiny

Background reference papers:	
None.	

A review of all aspects of waste management in the district (Part 2)

Councillor Louise Gooch

Q1: How does ESC expenditure on waste management compare with our neighbouring counties of Norfolk, Cambridgeshire, and Essex?

A1: The authorities listed above are not collection authorities. County councils have responsibility for *disposal* of material – not collection. Collection is a district responsibility. In terms of finding comparable figures for collection costs – these are not publicly available, because they often relate to contractual arrangements between district councils and their operators.

In addition, the overall costs of collection are a function of the number of households in an area, and the proportion of urban versus rural rounds. Therefore – even if available – the overall figure would not be a useful one in terms of understanding the cost of collection per household.

Q2: To what does the team attribute the marked difference in recycling contamination and ‘gate’ rejections in the north and south of the district? Does the identification of two ‘rounds’ in Lowestoft largely cover this?

A2: The quality of materials collected initially for recycling, as identified by the rejection statistics is far better in the South, albeit in the North, more so Lowestoft, due to possibly being a more densely populated area, with higher levels of homes in multiple occupation

We have identified certain rounds in Lowestoft, due to the pre-sorting exercise, that collect excessive contaminated materials and will be addressing that through further engagement and education.

An ESC Recycling Campaign and Questionnaire is planned to be issued very soon, which may help us further to understand the locational variances with an financial incentive to take part.

Q3: Please could we have a map of the glass recycling points? Given the discrepancy in the numbers of banks in the north and south of the district, would it not make sense to even up this provision?

A3: Locations of sites available on our website [Recycling » East Suffolk Council](#) and SWP [Recycling bring banks - Suffolk Recycling](#). It should be noted that this tool is location based, i.e. it will show recycling points in the vicinity of the location entered, and that the

accuracy of these locations is under review. We currently do not have a map of the district showing those recycling points for which ESC is responsible, though we could investigate adding these as an additional overlay on our GGP/GIS mapping system available on our website.

Q4: What educational programmes are in place in our schools (particularly in areas of high deprivation and hidden needs) to help students and parents understand the financial costs of littering and fly-tipping?

A4: There are programmes that the Suffolk Waste Partnership run – which include organising visits to the MRF – including outreach in schools. These programmes focus on the environmental and social impacts of recycling and littering – rather than the financial impacts, which may not speak to the target audience. The council no longer have resources to run education programmes directly.

Q5: Should we not, as a district, consider promoting communication that quantifies the waste of money on waste to residents? This might make people think twice. (For example, what percentage of the council tax is spent on this clear-up?)

A5: It is considered that environmental messaging - focusing on the social and environmental impacts of littering - are more likely to change resident behaviour, than messages about cost to the council. Littering is not considered to be a result of people not understanding the financial impact – but not caring about the environmental cost of their action.

Q6: What follow through mechanism is there to ensure that waste materials shipped overseas for recycling are not simply dumped as contaminants as has been seen recently on broadcast reports on Turkey?

A6: It is Suffolk County Council's responsibility to ensure that their contractor – Viridor – have the necessary controls around the end destination of waste material once it leaves the MRF.

Suffolk's Local Authorities send the mixed recyclables they collect from households to a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) at Great Blakenham. The MRF is operated by Viridor, one of the UK's largest waste management companies.

Once at the MRF, these mixed recyclables are sorted into their individual material types (e.g. paper, plastics, steel cans etc) before being sent to reprocessors both in the UK and overseas.

Viridor only works with appropriately licensed facilities which satisfy its strict environmental procedures. Material is sold with the understanding that it is to become an "end of waste product". In addition, Viridor carries out compliance checks in all destinations to

ensure materials are being sent to an approved supplier.

Q7: Could we consider posting road signs on the gateway roads to the district, and the main towns, to remind drivers of the possibility of fixed penalty notices?

A7:

Around 2013/14 Highways permitted the SWP to display anti-litter messages on the Variable Messaging Signs situated along the A14 however in subsequent years Highways tightened their policy to only permit messages directly related to road traffic safety. This has been explored and any main roadside signage would have to be approved by Highways England, and in cases Suffolk Highways. Permitted signage is for safety and motoring directions / information. We have though succeeded in agreeing with Highways England to employ the use of the A road Variable Messaging signs to remind drivers not to litter.

Q8: Might we be able to add further guidance in planning consent in relation to the management of waste on private retail and commercial park developments?

A8: Provision for the storage of solid waste in new or converted buildings is already covered in broad terms by part H of the Building Regulations. Beyond ensuring the physical space is allocated for bin stores etc, planning controls (presumably by attaching conditions to planning consents pertaining to the frequency of bin-emptying and street sweeping/litter picking) would be an inappropriate and unnecessarily cumbersome way of seeking to control litter and waste management on private retail and commercial park developments when there are other, more specific legal provisions applicable to the problem.

Q9: Do we have regular litter-picker routes for Norse? If so, what is the location and frequency, and how is this managed?

A9: Schedule at the bottom of this document.

Q10: Would we consider paying beach wardens to monitor our beaches in the summer and issue on-the-spot fines to those who fail to observe our litter-free rules? (I am aware of a new advertising campaign on this, thanks to Cllr James Mallinder).

A10: Enforcing littering legislation on all land, including beaches, is part of the role of the 3 waste management enforcement officers who do schedule periodic visits to beaches during the summer season for this and other enforcement purposes.

Cllr David Beavan

Q11: What is the reason that glass is not allowed in recycling bins?

A11: Blue bin contents are sorted using a variety of equipment which separate out paper, plastics and metals. The automated handling to which the waste is subjected during these sorting processes would be liable to cause any glass in the waste to break, presenting a serious hazard to operatives and contaminating the end product, hence glass for recycling has to be processed entirely separately from the blue-bin stream. Glass collections are dealt with by a closed recycling mechanism and therefore it is important that this a separate collection.

Q12: How can we ensure that the capacity of glass recycling points correlates with the variable demand in our tourist hotspots, by number and regularity of emptying?

A12: Glass bottle banks can be requested by Town and Parish councils if there is a capacity or location specific requirement. The potential quantity of glass to be collected would also need to be assessed for economic viability. Added to this our collection partners – Norse and Indigo – can also suggest additional capacity, or additional collections that may be required. ESC work with town and parish councils to identify the frequency of collection, including in summer months.

Q13: Beach wardens - do we need environmental wardens for dog fouling as well as littering? Are we confident the beach wardens are fully effective?

A13: Enforcing the controls on dogs, including cleaning up, dog ban areas and dogs on leads areas, is part of the role of the 3 waste management enforcement officers who do schedule periodic visits to beaches during the summer season for this and other enforcement purposes.

Q14: With reference to paragraph 2.1 “The prime reason for gate rejects loads to be initially rejected is excessive moisture, typically due to rain or fluids, such as drinks / food etc.” Would it help to have a drain hole in the bottom of recycling bins to discourage/reduce moisture content?

A14: Larger capacity wheeled skips are sometimes equipped with drain holes. However, these create convenient access and attractive harbourage for rats. We have asked for these to be bunged in the past, to help deal with rat infestations. Excluding water by proper management and keeping the lid closed is far more effective and desirable.

Q15: Paragraph 2.3 – (a) Is foil allowed or not? (b) Are there Tetrapak local collection points? (c) Are there Local Composting sites or anaerobic digesters for food waste? (d) How clean does recycled material need to be?

A15: (a) The specific items permitted in the recycling bin are provided on our website (see link) [guide_to_recycling_2020_\(with_translation_box\).pdf \(suffolkrecycling.org.uk\)](https://www.suffolkrecycling.org.uk/guide_to_recycling_2020_(with_translation_box).pdf)

This includes foil, but not foil lined items, for example Pringles packaging which can't be processed.

(b) There are no local Tetrapak collection points, although the Household Waste Recycling Centres will accept them. The prime reason for not having local collection points is the processing cost and associated environmental considerations. The only recommended processing plant is in Halifax, and tetrapaks by their nature are light but take up a disproportionate amount of space meaning the tonnages transported to Halifax, in relation to the vehicle are low. The solution to these hard to recycle materials is to compel the producers of packaging – and food companies – to take responsibility for the costs of their recycling. This is a major feature of the new Resource and Waste Strategy – and is expected to see both funding for the recycling costs of tetrapaks being passed to local authorities, as well as an incentive for food producers to use materials that are more easy to recycle.

(c) We don't provide local composting / AD for food although we have promoted campaigns, through the SWP designed around reducing food waste, called Food Savvy (see link)

[Food waste - Suffolk Recycling](#)

Coupled with this there have been RCV banners highlighting reducing food waste

(d) The key messaging for Recycling materials are to be Clean, Loose and Dry, as provided for on our website and promoted accordingly.

Cllr Caroline Topping

Q16: Strategic Plan Priorities table: P03 Maximise and grow the unique selling points of East Suffolk. Should we not be ticking the Secondary Priority box? A place which has civic pride should be encouraged as a unique selling point in ES?

A16: Yes – we can add tick this box on the report.

Q17: P08 Maximising health, well-being, and safety in our District. In my opinion, this should have been a Primary priority? Health and well-being whilst we enjoy our open spaces, our towns, our cemeteries, etc free from litter which allows the wildflowers to grow and be seen without being choked and obscured. Safety as in my experience the most picked up single item has changed from dog poo bags and takeaway packaging, to face masks. Surely a health hazard?

A17: The report writing guidelines stipulate that only one 'Primary priority' should be ticked. The breadth of the subject matter covered by the initial request for this scrutiny report means it is not possible to reflect all the corporate priorities it encompasses by reference to just one.

Q18: T03 Maintaining Financial Sustainability.

With this currently unknown cost for the new waste plan, we have to start being 'smarter'. If we can have grass cutting and litter picking schedules from Norse this would help with

- (a) The unfortunate side effect of our cutting teams not being able to litter pick an area before the cutters going in, hence the cutters then cut the litter that is in place up into smaller pieces causing more of a problem. I know the cutters do not want to leave the place in more of a littered mess than when they arrived, but what other choice do they have – can we schedule the litter pick before the cut?
- (b) Litter picking schedules would help as there is no sense in community litter picking groups going out and targeting the same areas as the Norse pickers. If we know where the Norse pickers are and on what days, we can do other areas and increase coverage?

A18: Kerry/ Daniel

- a) East Suffolk Council is aware that in the past, issues have been created by lack of coordination between litter and cutting teams – who are sometimes working for different councils. However since 2019, efforts have been made to improve communication between the ESC teams who are picking litter on verges and central reservations, and the teams working for Suffolk Highways who are cutting verges. This seems to have improved the coordination and reduced the number of incidents of 'strimming' litter on the roadside.
- b) The work of community groups and individual volunteers complements rather than replaces the work of the Norse teams – we do not see one at excluding the other. In many places, community volunteers are picking the same areas as Norse do, just more often. Litter removal is an ongoing battle – as soon as some is removed, more is added. Many community volunteers completely get this and some would prefer to pick something up now rather than wait even if they know Norse will be picking it next week. In addition, some volunteers particularly those who regularly pick the streets in their own neighbourhood may have the time and inclination to carry out more thorough litter picking removing very small items such as cigarette ends and fragments of plastic whereas the Norse crews may in some areas be under more pressure to remove the larger more visible items to cover more ground more quickly.

Q19: Hangers on bins. Is there another way? A temporary sticky label perhaps? As many hangers get blown off the bins before the homeowner sees them.

A19: We have used hangers to publicise collection timetables and recycling guidance for at least the past 15 years, and generally there are few issues with these. We have discussed phasing out hangers, and just running digital comms – however it is considered that the bin hanger, or a letter through the door (which is more time consuming) are the only way to reach all households. Depending on the timing of the release, we could also include the information in the new East Suffolk magazine.

We have also explored recyclable bin tags (as against Hangers) to inform the resident of a contaminated bin, although all materials reviewed have been confirmed as 'objectionable' for recycling by Viridor.

Q20: Gate Rejects. North 918 tons £50,308 compared to South 30 tons £1,639 – do we have plans for work in this regard?

A20: The key reason for the variance in these cases is to do with the difference in demographics in each area. Areas such as the North of the district, with higher numbers of homes in multiple occupation (HMOs) typically have higher levels of contamination in the recycling stream. This is due, perhaps, to lack of awareness among newer residents of the recycling rules in the district. There is also a link between high levels of deprivation and associated social issues, and lower levels of compliance in recycling.

The focus is on engagement and education and by having the data from the Transfer Station which strongly indicates the affected rounds we can more specifically target those areas requiring our support.

Q21: MRF gate fee

I think SCC are in a contract with the incinerator so that we have an obligation to commit a certain amount of waste for incineration? The MRF 'gate fee'* is then on top of the contract the Waste Partnership are in? So, are we obligated to supply a certain amount of waste? Does Great Blakenham then charge a further whole rejected load cost? If we are so obligated, what happens if we underprovide the amount of waste?

**The MRF 'gate fee' includes the additional cost of depositing rejects at the Energy from Waste Facility in Great Blakenham (EFW) for incineration. Whole rejected loads cost £102 / ton. This is the fee that ESC is charged at the gate of the EFW facility. SCC currently fund this – therefore the cost is to the 'whole system' rather than ESC specifically. However, this is currently being reviewed.*

A21: The focus is to recycle, hence the reason we receive recycling performance credits. The prime reason for the incinerator is to burn household waste for energy, not to add to that from contaminated recycling loads, which could have had potential economic and social value if recycled. The CC currently fund the incineration of the rejected recycling loads. There is a minimum calorific requirement for the

incinerator to operate efficiently, which is dependent on the quality of the waste being burnt to generate steam, although the CC's focus is to promote recycling. Importantly the incinerator generates enough electricity to power 34,500 homes, and based on tonnages this equates to 6,450 homes in ES.

Q22: How successful was the campaign in Lowestoft which started in January 2021?

- Firstly, an updated recycling leaflet – ‘Together we can get our recycling right’ was posted to all householders in January 2021 (produced by the Suffolk Waste Partnership). This was complemented by various social media campaigns (via ESC, SCC / SWP).
- Secondly, A5 and A3 recycling stickers (the same design as the above) have been produced for crews to place on bins, where required. For example, the A3 sticker can be placed onto communal waste bins.

Would a door to door, or a few people standing in the street just engaging with the public in general in a public place be more effective? How were the leaflets posted - by Royal Mail, private delivery agency, within the Advertiser?

A22:

The campaign referred to was an SWP campaign carried out county wide and coordinated by SCC. We would need time to make enquiries of SCC as to the impact of the campaign.

“Roadshow” events where people engage in the streets and other public places can be visually prominent and an opportunity for PR but realistically the only people who engage will be those who have a reason to e.g. those who want to find out more and those who want to have a moan and these represent useful opportunities for open engagement, however those who don't care will cross the street.

Door knocking can bring additional opportunities for benefits, as where it has been possible to identify streets where an issue exists the effort can be targeted there, and it also enables literature to be posted through letterboxes where no one answers the door. It also enables return visits to the same households to measure impacts.

However both of these approaches would have resource implications in terms of officer time particularly door knocking exercises, and we are not currently resourced to be able to deliver either approach.

Q23: Paragraph 2.11 -

- South of the District – 193 Bottle Banks, 75 Bring Banks for textiles, clothing, shoes and books.
- North of the District – 81 Bottle Banks, 8 Bring Banks for textiles

Why are there so many more collection banks in the South compared to the North of the District?

A23: This issue goes back to the funding available to previous councils. Circa 2002/03 SCDC was awarded a large grant from Defra for recycling services and part of this was used to introduce the more flexible 1100l wheelie bins including at sites that couldn't accommodate the bell-style banks and resulted in a step change in the number of sites at which banks for glass, cans and paper were

<p>provided. When we stopped collecting cans and paper at bring sites, all the existing containers were repurposed as glass banks.</p>
<p>Q24: I am aware that some Councils state that if bins (in HMOs) are contaminated they might be removed by the council and the people living in the accommodation will have to take the waste to the waste centre – do we have something similar or have we considered it?</p>
<p>A24: HMOs can be a contributor – in some cases – to higher levels of contamination entering the recycling bins. Reasons for this include the fact that people living in HMOs may have come from other areas where recycling arrangements were different to those in operation in East Suffolk.</p> <p>For that reason, we do liaise with the private sector housing team to engage with larger landlords in areas such as Lowestoft to ensure that the messages about recycling are understood by residents.</p> <p>Where there are ongoing issues with contamination, we do offer the ability for individual residents in HMOs to place recyclable items in a separate bagged collection, and these will be collected by crews.</p> <p>The report accompanying this meeting also sets out proposals to pause recycling collections – in extreme circumstances – for properties where contamination is a significant and enduring issue.</p>
<p>Q25: Where is the trial for the sensor trigger bins taking place?</p>
<p>A25: There are 18 bin sensors installed across the District, in bins that are less used / or have irregular emptying patterns. The output from the data will determine how the existing collection frequency compares with the recommended frequency</p>
<p>Q26: Litter bins. Do I understand correctly that we are removing the open top bins, which I agree with as gulls and foxes, etc pull the litter out of the bins and cause a mess. Are we replacing them with wheelie bins the same as household wheelie bins? Do we consider wheelie bins to be the right style of bin to stand in our historic town centres and within our Conservation Areas? Why can we not replace the open top bins with attractive closed top bins?</p>
<p>A26: We're seeking a consistent litter strategy approach, more so that the litter bins reflect the litter materials that are deposited – Black for litter and Blue for recycling. In some locations various bin types and colours were being used such as Green and Blue for litter, causing confusion. The cost of bins is also a consideration. The ones as described are c.£300 plus, the wheelies are £30. Town Councils can review if they wish to purchase themselves.</p>
<p>Q27: Only .7% of our card stays in this country. Do we know what the travel carbon footprint is of the card being sent abroad?</p>

A27: East Suffolk Council is not the contract holder for the MRF – and therefore does not hold this data. The end destination of recycled card and the associated carbon output is the responsibility of Suffolk County Council, who hold the contract with Viridor.

Q28: The 80 litter complaints during the first 4 months of 2021 are, I suggest, a drop in the ocean of the actual issue. Should we be encouraging people to contact ESC to complain about litter to get a true record of the littering problem?

A28: Yes. Public feedback can only help. Complaint data which truly reflects the distribution of the problem can help target resources effectively. Incomplete complaint data can misdirect resources to the “squeakiest wheel”, whilst worse problems are ignored elsewhere.

Thank you for the recognition in the report of the Beccles Bombles. We have now been picking about 10 years and would like to thank Norse for their continued support and prompt collection (usually within 24 hours) of us reporting the collection site.

Norse litter picking schedule

North		South	
Lowestoft Town Centre	morning clean and permanent present 11-5 Mon – Sat	Felixstowe Town centre, seafronts	Daily, with permanent presents with 3 guys. 1 in town, two on seafront - Monday to Sunday
Lowestoft Daily	Daily	Woodbridge Town centre and river wall	Daily with permanent presence Monday to Sunday
Beccles Daily	Daily	Aldeburgh town centre and seafront	Daily and permanent presence Monday to Sunday
Bungay Daily	Daily		
Southwold	Daily and twice Daily June – Oct	Saxmundham town	6 days a week , few hours a day
Halesworth	Daily	Framlingham town	6 days a week few hours a day
Carlton Colville	Twice Weekly		
Blundeston / Lound / Somerleyton / Wrentham	Weekly		
Kessingland	Twice Weekly		