



Subject:	Kerbside Glass Collection Options
Date:	3 December 2019
Reporting Officer:	Nigel Grimshaw – Director City & Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer:	John McConnell – City Services Manager (Resources & Fleet)

Restricted Reports	
Is this report restricted?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, when will the report become unrestricted?	
After Committee Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
After Council Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sometime in the future	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>

Call-in	
Is the decision eligible for Call-in?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

1.0	Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues
1.1	To respond to the motion raised at the Council meeting of 1st November 2018 and re-iterated at the Committee meeting of 6 August 2019, namely;
1.2	<i>“This Council is committed to increasing household recycling across the city of Belfast; notes the colossal impact waste is having on our oceans, cities and countrysides; welcomes the recent waste consultation; and will commit to introducing glass recycling in households across the city of Belfast as soon as possible.”</i>
2.0	Recommendations
2.1	The Committee is asked to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Note the report.

3.0	Main report
	<p data-bbox="248 228 408 259"><u>Key Issues</u></p> <p data-bbox="165 327 1455 609">3.1 The provision of a kerbside glass collection scheme is a matter frequently raised by Members on behalf of their constituents. This report examines the various collection options and in particular the desire by Members to explore the possibility of expediting such a scheme, in light of the indicative time frame associated with the implementation of a Wheelie-box scheme throughout the city, as noted in the committee meeting of 6th August 2019.</p> <p data-bbox="165 676 1442 913">3.2 Currently, around 80,000 households (54%) within Belfast have access to a kerbside collection of glass. The total volume of glass captured through kerbside schemes is approximately 3,800 tonnes per annum, contributing 2.5% per annum to the city's recycling rate. It is estimated that there is around 6,100 tonnes of glass per annum which remains in the residual bins and which is destined for landfill.</p> <p data-bbox="165 981 1449 1361">3.3 Members will be aware that the Council conducted an options appraisal on recycling collection schemes in 2017. This piece of work examined a number of options for the collection of dry recyclables, including glass, from an environmental, financial and legal compliance perspectives. The results were presented to the November 2018 committee. In summary, after consideration of the factors outlined above, the preferred approach which was agreed and carried forward into the public consultation exercise conducted in Summer 2018, was that based on the Wheelie-box approach with proposed restrictions to residual waste.</p> <p data-bbox="165 1429 1461 1872">3.4 Notwithstanding the results of the collections options appraisal, the following sections examine the various kerbside glass collection schemes deployed by Local Authorities with commentary on their pros and cons and indicative timeframes for deployment. The timeframes for deployment include key issues such as; governance processes, procurement exercises, lead times for vehicles and containers, Communications and then the delivery of the scheme on the ground. In all instances the roll-out is on a phased basis which, while slower, allows for assessment, bedding-in and corrective action if required. This is a realistic and reduced risk approach to deployment. Further information on the individual schemes is contained in Appendix 1.</p>

3.5	<p>A kerbside sort scheme (Wheelie-box or Bryson Recycling scheme) collects a range of dry recyclables including glass in separate boxes and these are stored in separate stillage compartments on a Resource Recovery vehicle (RRV).</p> <p>The focus of this scheme is on the collection of higher quality materials to deliver higher income yield and support local re-processors rather than relying upon the export of these resources. The RRVs are designed to capture a wide range of materials (dry recyclables including glass and food waste) on a single pass rather than the requirement to have a specific vehicle allocated for the collection of glass only. The Indicative timeline for implementation of this scheme which seeks to deliver, as far as reasonably practicable, a standardised scheme across the city, is around 4-5 years. This is the scheme which is being tested in around 5,000 households in the Castle DEA.</p>
3.6	<p>A twin stream collection of glass would involve the provision of an additional wheeled bin to householders in the outer city (88,000 hh). New split bodied vehicles would be required to take the current blue bin materials in one compartment and the glass and tins/cans/plastics in the other compartment. This type of scheme maintains the integrity of the key materials and in particular paper as this remains separate from the glass during the collection process. This scheme would retain and re-enforce the two distinct dry recyclables collection schemes in the city as inner city households currently on the box scheme will not have the storage space for two bins. The indicative timeline for implementation is around 5-6 years, the additional year over the kerbside sort scheme, being the internal governance and public consultation considerations.</p>
3.7	<p>A caddy insert scheme involves the provision of a caddy/box which sits inside the existing dry recycling bin. Similar to the twin stream approach this scheme would require new split body vehicles along with the procurement and delivery of the caddy boxes. The insertion of the caddy also impacts upon the capacity of the bin and additional bins would need to be provided in such cases. This type of scheme would also result in the maintenance of two distinct schemes throughout the city; inner city kerbside sort and outer city 3 bin scheme. The indicative time line for implementation is 5-6 years.</p>
3.8	<p>There are approximately 22,000 households which have a fortnightly collection of glass only via the purple box scheme. The extension of this scheme to the remaining households which do not have kerbside collections of glass is relatively uncomplicated at an operational level however the environmental benefit of capturing the additional glass tonnage versus the carbon created by the collection service may be questionable. In addition, such schemes</p>

	<p>tend to be expensive on a cost per tonne basis with limited opportunity to mitigate the cost through the income stream as glass is a low yielding material, typically £10 per tonne compared with £70 per tonne for paper. Based on the existing purple box scheme, the net revenue cost of adopting this approach would be in the region of £650k per annum. The indicative time line for implementation is around 5 years.</p>
3.9	<p>A fully co-mingled scheme, involves the inclusion of glass within the dry recyclables bin. Members will be aware that at the committee meeting of 6 August this approach was discussed and it was the recommendation of officers not to progress this type of scheme for various reasons outlined in the report. In addition, the existing Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) contract precludes this system for the Council during the course of the contract (3 years plus option to extend 2 years).</p>
3.10	<p>Based on the outcome of the options appraisal of future kerbside collection arrangements, the public consultation feedback, and progress to date in terms of the Capital Programme and taking into consideration that the most expeditious of schemes may not necessarily deliver the desired environmental, economic or social benefits, the approach adopted by committee at its meeting on 6 August 2019, remains the most judicious option.</p>
	<p><u>Financial & Resource Implications</u></p>
3.11	<p>There are no financial or resource implications associated with this report.</p>
	<p><u>Equality or Good Relations Implications/Rural Needs Assessment</u></p>
3.12	<p>There are no equality, good relations or rural needs issues associated with this report.</p>
4.0	Appendices – Documents Attached
	Appendix 1 – Glass collection schemes