

# **Merton Council**

## **Overview and Scrutiny Commission**

**30 January 2018**

### **Supplementary agenda**

- 3      Call-in of the Residual Waste Container Size – officer response      1 - 30  
and advice from the Deputy Monitoring Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix B

### Officer Response to the call-in

**Note** – the officer response is in italics

#### **4. Evidence which demonstrates the alleged breach(es) indicated in 2 above (required)**

Required by part 4E Section 16(c)(a)(ii) of the constitution:

We – the signatories – welcome the fact that the council has at last recognised the concern among a significant number of residents in Merton about the size of wheeled bins in relation to their properties, as per paragraph 2.4 of the report. This is particularly an issue in our own ward of Dundonald as well as various other wards which form part of Merton’s town centres, given the prevalence of terraced housing there with less space for the storage of bins.

However, for the reasons outlined below, we do not believe that full and proper consideration has been given by the council to all other options with regard to the size(s) of waste container proposed to be introduced.

#### **(a) proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);**

It is simply unclear from the report whether the decision taken by Cabinet is proportionate to the desired outcome. The stated objectives of the new service due to be introduced in Merton in October 2018 are outlined at paragraph 1.1, namely encouraging greater recycling; keeping Merton’s streets cleaner; being safer for residents and operatives; and being cost-effective.

Whilst recycling rates and cost are both referred to in the report and appendix, there is no evidence provided on how the Cabinet’s decision on waste container size will impact on street cleanliness. Dan Goode, founder of the Merton Matters group (which was established locally specifically to campaign for a cleaner borough) has made clear previously that wheeled bins will not solve the “intrinsic littering culture” in Merton. At 2.8 the report talks about this in relation to bins smaller than 180l but we are not provided with any comparable empirical evidence on street cleanliness levels using 240l bins, 180l bins, a smaller sized bin or a different type of container.

*Response: Officers are not suggesting that a smaller wheeled bin will have an impact on attitudes towards littering. Wheeled bins themselves reduce the problem of waste being blown or spread by animals across the road. There is a judgement to be made about the most suitable size of bin to ensure residents have sufficient storage for their general waste to avoid them resorting to illegal forms of waste disposal, whilst also encouraging recycling by not providing more storage than is necessary. Based on experience in other boroughs, this suggests that 180l for general waste, together with a range of recycling options, does provide sufficient storage capacity.*

-----

With regard to safety, it is impossible to glean from the information provided as part of this decision how the safety of residents and operatives would be impacted by it as there is also no comparable data provided on levels of safety using 240l bins, 180l bins, a smaller sized bin or a different type of container.

*Response: Officers are not suggesting that a smaller wheeled bin will have significantly greater benefits for health and safety than a larger bin. Wheeled bins themselves make the operation safer for residents and collection crews.*

-----  
Furthermore, there are serious questions over whether it is proportionate with regard to the effect on the street scene and on convenience for residents given the significant increase in the number of containers that residents will be obliged to store under the new system and the size of those containers.

*Response: There is no effect on the number of containers as a result of reducing the size of the wheeled bins.*

-----  
**(b) due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;**

There has been no formal consultation with residents about the size of the residual waste containers with which they are due to be issued. This is stated explicitly at 2.10. Yet this decision clearly constitutes a radical change to the waste collection service and one that will affect almost all residents across the borough.

*Response: Based on officer's professional advice, consideration has been made for the needs of different households. This is addressed by giving residents the choice of bin size once they have established their needs by trialling the 180l bin.*

*Through informal feedback regarding the service change, residents have indicated their concern about the size of wheeled bins in relation to their properties. These views have influenced the decision to recommend a 180l wheeled bin over a larger one. By listening and responding to residents, it is hoped their concerns will be alleviated to some degree.*

-----  
Nor is there any evidence provided to demonstrate that the Lavender Fields pilot conducted in 2015 can be relied upon to demonstrate the opinion of residents right across the borough. The area of Lavender Fields that formed the pilot is not representative of the borough as a whole in terms of the mix of different types of housing stock.

Moreover the pilot itself used a different waste collection system from that which is now proposed. There was a weekly – rather than fortnightly – rubbish collection during the trial period and recyclables were collected together rather than being separated out into paper and card and then

plastic, glass and cans as is now planned under the current proposals. Nor were any size bins other than 240l ones used in the pilot.

*Response: This results of the pilot were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission in August 2016.*

-----  
**(c) respect for human rights and equalities;**

There is no analysis provided in the report on the specific impact for disabled and elderly residents living in Merton of the size of wheeled bins. One might have expected information on the merits or otherwise for disabled and elderly residents of using 240l bins, 180l bins, a smaller sized bin or a different type of container.

*Response: It can reasonably be assumed that a smaller bin will be easier for some people to handle rather than a larger bin. Furthermore, the Council's offer of an assisted collection for those who are unable to present their waste for collection will continue regardless of the size of the wheeled bin.*

-----  
No updated Equality Impact Assessment has been published alongside the report to enable Cabinet members to give this due consideration when making their decision on the size of container.

*Response: The size of the bin does not alter the original Equality Impact Assessment which was based on the consideration of a wheeled bin, regardless of size.*

-----  
Improved safety for operatives is a stated objective of this decision. Yet there is also no breakdown of the demographics of those operatives who will be impacted e.g. age, ethnicity, gender.

*Response: There is no claim in the report that a smaller bin is safer for the operatives. Wheeled bins themselves make the operation safer for the collection crews. Therefore, the demographics of the operatives are not a consideration for the size of the wheeled bin. The role is demanding regardless of the size of the wheeled bin and the operatives' ability to carry out their role is for the contractor to consider and address.*

-----  
**(d) a presumption in favour of openness;**

There is a lack of openness in the report and appendix as illustrated by their brevity (just 10 pages in total). For example, it is stated at 2.21 that there are no crime and disorder implications as a result of this report. Yet, there have been high profile cases in recent months of wheeled bins being purposefully set on fire here in south London and so one would expect that that would at least have been taken into consideration when looking at container size. The same is true of theft levels of different sizes and types of container.

*Response: Officers are not aware of any link between the size of a wheeled container and the likelihood of it being vandalised or set on fire.*

-----  
Particularly concerning has been the general lack of engagement with residents on this issue. A petition was presented to Full Council on behalf of over 1100 residents asking the council to consider the residents' own proposal for the waste containers which they would like to see introduced in October 2018 and yet this was met with only a brief standard response from the council.

*Response: The petition was not in relation to the size of the wheeled bins. However, the signatories did raise concern about the size of the standard wheeled bin. By reducing the size of the wheeled bin to 180l from 240l, and offering residents the opportunity to choose a smaller bin (140l) after the roll out, the decision is intended to help to reduce these concerns.*

-----  
Also, as per (b) above, the 2015 pilot was not conducted using a fortnightly collection or multiple 180l wheeled bins as is now being proposed.

*Response: This results of the pilot were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission in August 2016.*

-----  
**(e) clarity of aims and desired outcomes;**

There appear to be contradictions within the report when it comes to the desired outcomes of this decision.

For example, 2.23 states there are no health and safety implications as a result of this report. Yet earlier the report states that the safety of residents and operatives is one of the stated objectives of the decision.

*Response: The size of the bin does not have significant health and safety implications for residents or operatives. The smaller bins may be easier for some residents to handle but this is not considered to have significant consequences for the health and safety of residents. The report states that wheeled bins themselves make the operation safer for residents and collection crews.*

-----  
Then in paragraph 2.5, the report outlines how residents in larger households will be able to request a 240l wheeled bin for residual waste and those who prefer will be able to request a 140l bin. Yet this is only 'once the new service has been introduced'. This does not seem to tally with the stated objective for this scheme to be cost effective. It does not seem clear why the council is proposing to issue these new bins to everyone in the first instance and then potentially replace some of them with bins of a different size. Residents are questioning whether it might not be more cost effective to engage in advance with households about the size of bin that would be most appropriate for them, particularly given the fact that officers stated in their response to a residents' petition on wheeled bins handed in at Full Council in September 2017 that:

*'Acceptable criteria to vary from the "norm" should be agreed in advance of any service being rolled out.'*

*Response: Taking and delivering individual orders to each household will*

*increase the administrative and delivery cost of the service. It will also increase the risk of households receiving the incorrect bin. Furthermore, without having used the standard wheeled bin, residents will be unaware of whether the size is appropriate for them. Therefore, it is considered best value and the most feasible option to provide all households with a standard sized bin and allow them to make a choice after they have used and experienced the new service.*

*The intention is to agree the acceptable criteria to vary from the norm before the advance of the service roll out. These will be confirmed before the service roll out.*

-----

There is clearly also an environmental aspect to this which appears nit to have been addressed by the Cabinet. In light of the recent press coverage of the damage being done by plastics to the global environment and publication of the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan, it seems that an unnecessary amount of additional plastic is being produced in order to accommodate the Cabinet's decision when the impact of this could potentially be lessened. Concerns have equally been raised by residents about the impact on the environment of the replacement of a large number of perfectly good bins.

*Response: Any wheeled bins that were previously delivered as part of the standard roll-out and are then swapped with a different sized bin will be re-used within the South London Waste Partnership area, assuming they are still fit for use.*

*Currently, some residents have chosen to purchase their own bin for storing their waste. These items are the property of residents and therefore there is no intention to remove them when the new bins are delivered. These bins vary in size, style and quality; this variation means they cannot be used as part of the new service. Residents will be encouraged to reuse their bins for other uses, for example, storage of other items but if they do want to get rid of them, they can be taken to the Household Reuse and Recycling Centre for disposal and where appropriate, recycling.*

-----

There is also a lack of clarity around the comparative data provided on potential savings in Appendix A. There are 4 options outlined showing the comparative impact on recycling rates and on savings to be delivered. Yet only the 240l bin is tested with a weekly collection. There is no comparative data provided showing the impact of a weekly collection with a smaller bin e.g. 180l or 140l. This does not appear to have been tested.

*Response: The table on slide 5 of the presentation (provided again here in Appendix D) includes theoretical calculations of the possible increases of recycling rates and the related financial savings by restricting the volume of general waste provided to residents. The weekly 240l option provides a baseline for comparison purposes. The frequency of collections is not part of this decision and therefore it is not necessary to provide figures based on a weekly collection service for each bin size as this variable will not*

change.

-----  
Finally, as the 2017 Annual Residents' Survey showed, street cleaning remains the top priority for Merton's residents with falling levels of satisfaction with how the council tackles litter and dirt in the streets. Clearly all councillors and residents wish to see cleaner streets in Merton. Yet, as at a) above, there is no convincing empirical evidence provided in the report as to how the decision will deliver improvements with regard to this shared aim and what level of improvements can be expected.

*Response: The report does not attempt to suggest that a smaller wheeled bin will have an impact on attitudes towards littering. The impact of a smaller bin is expected to affect recycling rates rather than littering. Wheeled bins themselves reduce the problem of waste being blown or spread by animals across the road and thus improve street cleanliness.*

-----  
**(f) consideration and evaluation of alternatives;**

The residents' petition handed in to Full Council in September 2017 set out clear alternatives in terms of waste container size. Yet, despite a huge amount of time and research being spent by the residents' group on this, it does not appear to have been given consideration by Cabinet when reaching their decision.

*Response: The options presented by the petition did not relate to a wheeled bin service. However, it did propose a smaller bin than the 240l option. Therefore, the decision to have a smaller bin may be preferable to some signatories.*

-----  
The residents' 5 point proposal included the supply of two 80l lidded 'Bell-Orb' bins for recycling, both in brown with self-coloured, embossed symbols. Unfortunately nowhere in the report is there evidence that this clear alternative has been tested by council officers for its impact on the stated objectives of the decision even though these brown 80l bins would clearly be beneficial in terms of the street scene appearance.

There is also no reference to the 'slave-bin' collection method and the impact of this on container size even though Merton officers themselves have conceded that the 'to-&-fro' collection process proposed will take considerably longer for operatives to complete than the existing 'slave-bin' system. Yet, this has clear environmental and cost implications for the council and so would seem crucial to the decision making process. .

*Response: The suitability of wheeled bins was not part of this decision; this was previously debated by Overview and Scrutiny Commission in August 2016.*

-----  
The Cabinet has only considered either 240l or 180l bins i.e. the same size for both residual/general waste and for paper and card. There is not even any mention of 80l or 120l bins or a variation of these. The council has repeatedly stated in public that 'one size does not necessarily fit all' and so



many residents understandably feel that the council should opt for at least two sizes, and give residents the choice, particularly given that the 180l bins may be thinner but are not smaller in height. For example one other option could be the issuing of one 120l bin and one 180l one.

*Response: The decision will provide residents with the choice of three different sizes (240l, 180l and 140l) of wheeled bin depending on their circumstances. Introducing a further size increases costs in terms of administering orders, storage at the depot and carrying out orders. Smaller bins (140l or smaller) as the standard bin are considered too small to ensure residents have sufficient capacity for their general waste. This is noted in paragraph 2.5 of the report (see Appendix C)*

-----  
The *No Wheelies Please, Merton* group has pointed out that 42% of Merton council taxpayers are claiming 'single-adult-occupier' discount. There will also be a considerable percentage of households comprising couples (many of whom may be elderly). They therefore argue that as many as 60-70% of households may have a relatively low waste output and as such the issuing of 120l bins to them should be considered. Yet this alternative is not referred to in the Cabinet report.

There doesn't seem to have been any proper consideration by the Cabinet of modifications to existing container types used in Merton and their impact on street cleanliness e.g. the provision of lids for recycling boxes. It is therefore impossible to judge the merits and comparable cost of these further options.

*Response: The No Wheelies Please group proposed a method that does not consist of wheeled bins but considered alternative types of bin, which have not been trialled anywhere in the country. The decision by Cabinet does not relate to the type of bin, which has been previously decided by Cabinet on 4 July 2016 and debated by Overview and Scrutiny Commission in August 2016.*

-----  
There is also no evidence that, in reaching this decision, the Cabinet has given any consideration to the cross-party Sustainable Communities scrutiny task group review of efficient household waste management and the environment which published its report and recommendations in May 2011. This task group looked at this issue in extensive detail.

In November 2015 a report was presented to Cabinet by the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel setting out four key considerations that the Panel would wish to be addressed in advance of any roll out of wheeled bins across the borough. These included the following:

- That should the scheme be rolled out, Cabinet considers **choice for residents in the size of wheeled bins** and if they wish to participate in the scheme;
- That Cabinet considers the impact of wheeled bins outside homes on the street scene;
- That Cabinet consider the impact on disabled users if wheeled bins

are used in terms of accessing pavements and homes.

Yet, there is not clear evidence from the report that Cabinet has given these points detailed consideration, particularly around choice being given to residents BEFORE the scheme is rolled out.

*Response: Through this decision-making process, the Cabinet has given the Sustainable Communities Scrutiny Panel the opportunity to consider the choice of size of the wheeled bin.*

-----  
There are concerns among some residents (and not dispelled by the Cabinet report) that the council is being shoehorned into the proposed system of waste collection by its contractor. Rather than looking at what alternatives may be most appropriate for Merton and its residents in terms of container size, they feel the council is being dictated to by the contractor and what works best for them across all of the four boroughs forming the South London Waste Partnership.

*Response: The change to the size of the wheeled bin is an example of how the SLWP, LBM and Veolia are working together to ensure the new service reflects as best as possible: residents' preferences; operational feasibility; financial implications; environmental benefits; and, street cleanliness. Officers themselves are ensuring that any considerations reflect the interests of Merton's residents.*

-----  
With regard to this, it is noteworthy that the following motion has been carried at the most recent meetings of both the Wimbledon and the Raynes Park Community Forum for presentation at the next full Council Meeting:

*We, the attendees of the {Wimbledon/Raynes Park} Community Forum, request that Merton Council's Cabinet make time to discuss the following proposal with Veolia's Merton manager:*

**"ALL MERTON'S FUTURE BIN AND RECYCLING BOX PURCHASES SHOULD BE BROWN IN COLOUR (to match the food & garden waste bins), FREE FROM PRINTED LBM LOGOS, WITH A SIMPLE SYMBOL FOR WASTE OR RECYCLING ON THE LID IN BLACK (less conspicuous than white) IN ORDER TO MAXIMISE UNOBTRUSIVENESS."**

Yet, this decision seeks to disregard resident concerns about colour and wider design of the waste containers proposed for introduction in October 2018.

*Response: The colour of the bin is not part of this decision. Options were not presented in the report regarding the colour of the bin. The bin colour has been chosen to be inconspicuous.*

-----  
Finally, the Cabinet appears not to have considered the impact of the EU Referendum result when reaching its decision, particularly in regard to the size of containers in which waste is to be collected. There is no reference to whether EU Directive 2008/98/EC will still apply by the time of the roll out of this new waste collection system. Were it not to be applicable any longer in the UK then this would clearly have an impact on the size of container

choice as it may be that co-mingling of recyclables could in fact continue here in Merton.

*Response: There is sufficient flexibility in the service offering to adapt to possible changes in legislation, all of which is very uncertain.*

-----

## 5. Documents requested

All papers provided to the Director of Environment and Regeneration/Director of Corporate Services and relevant Cabinet Members prior to, during and subsequent to the decision making process on residual waste container size.

*Response: The slides presented to the relevant Cabinet Member in relation to the wheeled bin size have already been published as part of the cabinet report, 15 January, included as Appendix C in the main agenda pack for the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 30 January 2018.*

-----

All emails, reports and associated documentation relating to the decision on residual waste container size provided to the relevant Cabinet Members, Leader of the Council, Chief Executive, Director of Environment and Regeneration, Director of Corporate Services and other council officers.

*Response: Provided in Appendix B1 attached.*

-----

The detailed financial analysis of the projected costs of implementing the decision on residual waste container size.

*Response: The analysis is presented in the presentation (Appendix C in main agenda pack) already circulated to Members and published publicly.*

-----

The detailed financial analysis of the projected savings to be delivered through implementation of the decision on residual waste container size.

*Response: The analysis is presented in the presentation (Appendix C in main pack) already circulated to Members and published publicly.*

-----

Minutes of all the SLWP meetings when residual waste container size was discussed.

*Response: The SLWP have been asked to provide these, if any.*

-----

The detailed risk analysis in relation to the implementation of the decision on residual waste container size, including both financial and reputational risks.

*Response: The financial implications are presented in the presentation already circulated. There was no further risk analysis relating to finance or*

reputation.

-----  
The detailed analysis of the impact of the decision on residual waste container size on the cleanliness of Merton's streets.

*Response: The analysis is presented in the presentation (Appendix C in the main pack) already circulated to Members and published publicly.*

-----  
The detailed analysis of the impact of the decision on residual waste container size on recycling rates in Merton.

*Response: The analysis is presented in the presentation (Appendix C in the main pack) already circulated to Members and published publicly.*

-----  
The detailed analysis of the impact of the decision on residual waste container size on the health and safety of both residents and operatives.

*Response: The size of the wheeled bin is not considered to have any significant impact on health and safety considerations. No detailed analysis was considered necessary.*

-----  
The detailed analysis of the impact of the decision on residual waste container size on crime and disorder in Merton.

*Response: The size of the wheeled bin is not considered to have any significant impact on crime and disorder. No detailed analysis was considered necessary.*

-----  
The Equality Impact Assessment (or any other equalities analysis carried out) in relation to the decision on residual waste container size.

*Response: The size of the wheeled bin is not considered to have any significant impact on equality and diversity. The original EqIA remains appropriate (see appendix B2).*

-----  
A copy of the detailed 'analysis of operations in other local authorities' referred to at paragraph 2.3 of the report.

*Response: The waste collection services in London boroughs and their recycling rates are presented in Appendix B1.*

-----  
A copy of the detailed 'review of best practice' referred to at paragraph 2.3 of the report.

*Response: The top performing authorities for recycling rates is presented in Appendix B1*

-----  
A copy of the detailed 'guidance from WRAP' referred to at paragraph 2.3 of the report.

*Response: A link to the WRAP report is included in the presentation*

*provided in Appendix C to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission report:*

[http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/priv\\_download/Analysis\\_of\\_recycling\\_performance\\_and\\_waste\\_arisings%20in%20the%20UK%202012%2013.pdf](http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/priv_download/Analysis_of_recycling_performance_and_waste_arisings%20in%20the%20UK%202012%2013.pdf)

-----  
All correspondence between the relevant Cabinet Members, Leader of the Council, Chief Executive, Director of Environment and Regeneration, Director of Corporate Services, other council officers and Veolia on residual waste container size.

*Response: Correspondence has been provided in Appendix B3 of this report.*

-----  
All correspondence between the relevant Cabinet Members, Leader of the Council, Chief Executive, Director of Environment and Regeneration, Director of Corporate Services, other council officers and WRAP on residual waste container size.

*Response: There was no correspondence with WRAP. The evidence and guidance is available publicly.*

-----  
All correspondence between the relevant Cabinet Members, Leader of the Council, Chief Executive, Director of Environment and Regeneration, Director of Corporate Services, other council officers and the SLWP on residual waste container size.

*Response: As attached in Appendix B3 (Annie Baker is the SLWP Manager and she was cc'd to an email to Veolia.)*

-----  
All correspondence between the relevant Cabinet Members, Leader of the Council, Chief Executive, Director of Environment and Regeneration, Director of Corporate Services, other council officers and the *No Wheelies Please, Merton* residents' group on residual waste container size, including all evidence provided to the council by this group.

*Response: There was no correspondence regarding the size of the wheeled containers. The correspondence received referred to an alternative collection method, which is not part of this Cabinet decision.*

-----

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix B1 - Briefing paper on potential bin sizes: November 2017

### Link between bin capacity and recycling

A study by WRAP in 2012/13 identified the key determinates to higher recycling rates. They included:

- The affluence of the area (more affluent = higher recycling)
- The urban/rural nature of the authority (more rural = higher recycling)
- Whether the authority provided a food waste service (food waste = higher recycling overall)
- The capacity (in litres) of the general waste collection (lower capacity of general waste = higher recycling)

[http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/priv\\_download/Analysis\\_of\\_recycling\\_performance\\_and\\_waste\\_arisings%20in%20the%20UK%202012%2013.pdf](http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/priv_download/Analysis_of_recycling_performance_and_waste_arisings%20in%20the%20UK%202012%2013.pdf)

With regard to capacity, they found: “Each additional litre of **effective weekly residual containment capacity** was associated with a reduction in mean recycling rate of  $0.05\pm 0.02$  percentage points. This indicates that *authorities with higher effective weekly residual containment capacity were associated with lower recycling rates*. Comparing 240 litres effective weekly residual containment capacity (typical for a weekly residual collection) with a reference value of 120 litres a week (typically seen with a fortnightly residual collection), is therefore predicted to reduce recycling rate by  $6.3\pm 2.9$  percentage points. This predictor has the *highest level of certainty* within the dataset.”

Whilst WRAP have established a link between capacity and recycling rate, they do not conclude the optimum size of wheeled bin.

### The London collection regime

An analysis of collection arrangements across London illustrates the range and complexity of the collection regimes in operation. There is no obvious preference in the size of bin; it ranges from 240 litre to 140litre. Bearing in mind collection frequencies, this range increases from 240l capacity a week in some boroughs with weekly collections to 70litre/week in some who operate alternate weekly collection with a 140l bin.

Comparing recycling rates with the collection regime is also inconclusive; looking at one year's data, there is no obvious link between bin size and recycling rate. Given the many factors influencing recycling rates, this is not surprising. To establish a link would require much more detailed analysis looking at the change in recycling rate over time compared to changes in the collection regime and a deep analysis of the demographic nature of each borough.

### Veolia's bid:

The Veolia bid commits them to provide a 240l refuse bin and 240l paper and card bin (although Sutton retained a 140l bin for refuse, and Kingston their 180l bin).

Veolia calculated that on average, households required 187litres of storage for fortnightly collections of refuse, and 36litres for paper/ card. This data is not specific to Merton; they appear to be based on Veolia generated averages. The table below is extracted from their method statement:

Waste Stream	Property	Collection Frequency	Average Kg/hh presented each collection	Storage Required in L per collection	Container volume (l) per collection per property	Average Kg/hh presented in 4 weeks	Storage Required in L per 4 weeks	Container volume (l) per 4 weeks
Residual Waste	Kerbside	Fortnightly	15.49	187	240*	30.98	373	480
Paper /Card		Fortnightly	4.06	36	240/140	8.12	73	480/280
DMR		Fortnightly	4.11	34	110	8.22	68	220
Food Waste		Weekly	1.21	4	23	4.85	17	92
Garden Waste		Fortnightly	11.00	133	240	22.00	265	480

They acknowledge the need for larger bins in some circumstances and state their standard policies:

- Household of six or more people
- Certain medical conditions
- Families with two or more children in nappies

#### Sizes:

Sizes differ slightly from one manufacturer to another. For comparison, Spiderbins provide the following dimensions:

Volume - Litres	120	140	180	240	360
Height - mm	960	1070	1080	1080	1095
Width - mm	485	490	480	580	620
Depth - mm	550	550	725	730	850

#### Bin prices:

Average prices on the ESPO bin framework are as follows. It has not yet been agreed with Veolia what, if any, Merton's saving by opting for a smaller bin.

140l: £14.38

180l: £17.37

240l: £18.42

#### Logistics:

When introducing wheeled bins, all households will receive the same size bin. This is in order to maximise the efficiencies of delivering the bins and reducing the likelihood of mistakes which may occur if households state individual preferences.

In time, households could be offered the opportunity to swap their bins for a smaller or larger size. Providing a range of sizes increases complexity in the ordering, storing and delivery system, which will inevitably increase costs. In their method statement, Veolia have committed to offer a smaller refuse bin for those who request it, as well as larger bins under certain circumstances.



## **Policies:**

Certain policies are recommended to allow some households to use a larger bin. This is to account for larger households and certain circumstances relating to health and age. This flexibility helps to avoid discrimination.

Sutton operate the following policies, it is recommended that we adopt the same for consistency across the Partnership:

- Households with 5 or more permanent residents can obtain a larger bin.
- Households consisting of a resident with specific medical needs can obtain a larger bin e.g. incontinence pads

Sutton do not have a policy relating to children in nappies; given these households will produce more waste, it is recommended we do include one as follows:

- Households with one or more children under the age of 4 and in nappies can obtain a larger bin

(A 'larger bin' would be one size larger than the standard bin. i.e. 240l vs 180l or 180l vs 140l.)

It is recommended that these options can be requested on-line and are 'self-certified' i.e. no proof is required, however, the Council reserves the right to contact or visit the household to ascertain the reason for the request should there be cause for enquiry.

Whether we 'recall' the bins after a period of time can be determined later depending on how many households have requested the larger bin and the cost-benefit analysis of undertaking this work. We should at least record who has received a larger bin so we have a record of this.

**London Local Authorities - Waste collection services**

Accurate as possible based on information available

Ref No.	Local Authority - London	Residual			Dry Recycling				Recycling % (2015/16)
		AWC	Container	Volume (l)	Weekly	AWC	Container	Volume (l)	
24	Newham		Wheelie bin	240		Yes	Wheelie bin	240/360	14.7
32	Westminster		blk sack	N/A	Yes		box/sack	N/A	17.3
23	Lewisham		Wheelie bin		Yes		Wheelie bin		18
2	Barking and Dagenham		Wheeled bin	140	Yes	Yes	Wheeled bin	240	18.9
31	Wandsworth		blk sack	N/A	Yes		sack	N/A	21.1
13	Hammersmith and Fulham		blk sack	N/A	Yes			N/A	22.0
7	Camden		Wheeled bin		Yes		Boxes/bins/bags		24.8
12	Hackney		blk sack	N/A	Yes		green sacks	N/A	24.8
29	Tower Hamlets		Sack/communa	N/A	Yes		Wheelie bin/sack		26.7
25	Redbridge		Wheelie bin				2 x boxes		27.7
22	Lambeth		Wheelie bin	140/240	Yes		sacks		28.7
19	Islington	Yes	blk sack	N/A	Yes		reuseable sacks, boxes, wheeled bins	35-180	29.4
16	Havering		blk sack	N/A	Yes		sacks	N/A	31.8
18	Hounslow		blk sack & whe	140/180	Yes	Yes			33.8
30	Waltham Forest		Wheelie bin	140	Yes		Wheelie bin		34.6
28	Sutton	Yes	Wheeled bin	140/240		Yes	Wheeled bin	140/240	34.7
11	Greenwich		blk sack & whe	140/240	Yes		Wheeled bin or sacks	140/240	34.8
27	Southwark	Yes	Wheeled bin	240	Yes	Yes	Wheeled bin/boxes	240	35.0
10	Enfield		blk sack & whe	140	?		Boxes & wheeled bins	240	35.9
14	Haringey	Yes	Wheeled bin	180/240	Yes		Wheeled bin	180/240	36.2
3	Barnet		Wheeled bin	240	Yes		Wheeled bin	240	36.8
8	Croydon	Yes	Wheeled bin	180/240	Yes		Boxes	55	37.8
5	Brent	Yes	Wheeled bin	140/240	Yes		Wheeled bin	240	38.4
15	Harrow		Wheeled bin	180/240		Yes	wheeled bin	180-240	
9	Ealing		blk sack & whe	180/240	Yes		Boxes		43.0
17	Hillingdon		blk sack	N/A	Yes		sacks	N/A	44.1
6	Bromley	Yes	blk sack	N/A		Yes	Boxes	55	45.9
4	Bexley		blk sack & whe	60/240	Yes		Boxes		52.00
1	Merton		blk sack	75	Yes		boxes	55	
20	Kensington and Chelsea		multi	N/A	twice weekly		sacks	N/A	
21	Kingston	Yes	Wheeled bin	180/240	Yes		Boxes, reusable sacks	-	45.8
26	Richmond		blk sack	N/A	Yes		2 x boxes		

Top performing authorities for recycling														
Rank	Local Authority	Recycling, Reuse and Composting Rates	Residual				Dry Recycling				Other waste streams		paid for	
			Weekly	AWC	Container type	Size	Weekly	AWC	Co-ming	Contain	Size	Food waste		Garden
1	South Oxfordshire District Council	66.6%		Yes	Wheeled	180		Yes	Yes	Wheeled	240	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	East Riding of Yorkshire Council	66.1%		Yes	Wheeled	140/180		Yes	Yes	Wheeled	240	Yes	Yes	No (GW combined with FW)
3	Rochford District Council	66.0%		Yes	Wheeled	180		Yes	Yes	Wheeled	240	Yes	Yes	No (GW combined with FW)
4	Vale of White Horse District Council	64.8%		Yes	Wheeled	180		Yes	Yes	Wheeled	240	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Surrey Heath Borough Council	62.1%		Yes	Wheeled	180		Yes	Yes	Wheeled	240	Yes	Yes	Yes

This page is intentionally left blank

# Appendix B2 - Equality Analysis



Please refer to the guidance for carrying out an [Equality Analysis](#).  
Text in blue is intended to provide guidance – you can delete this from your final version.

What are the proposals being assessed?	Wheelie bin collection service
Which Department/ Division has the responsibility for this?	E&R – Public Space

Stage 1: Overview	
Name and job title of lead officer	Graeme Kane (AD Public Space)
1. What are the aims, objectives and desired outcomes of your proposal? (Also explain proposals e.g. reduction/removal of service, deletion of posts, changing criteria etc)	<a href="#">What are you proposing and what are they designed to deliver?</a> To implement a wheelie bin collection service borough wide for both General waste and recycling.
2. How does this contribute to the council's corporate priorities?	To increase the level of recycling and improve the image of the public realm
3. Who will be affected by this proposal? For example who are the external/internal customers, communities, partners, stakeholders, the workforce etc.	The service acknowledges not all properties will be suitable for bins and as such some areas will be offered alternatives including the use of bags. This will depend on the nature of their property and will be assessed by LBM officers or their contractors according to a criteria. This is expected to be a small proportion of the properties across the borough.  Elderly and or disabled residents who will struggle with a wheelie bin will be offered an assisted collection.
4. Is the responsibility shared with another department, authority or organisation? If so, who are the partners and who has overall responsibility?	This project is being managed by waste service who is working closely with both the South London Waste Partnership and our contractor, Veolia.

## Stage 2: Collecting evidence/ data

### 5. What evidence have you considered as part of this assessment?

Provide details of the information you have reviewed to determine the impact your proposal would have on the protected characteristics (equality groups).

The assessment is based on the experiences of other local authorities within and out with the SLWP, the extensive experience of our waste collection contractor and the wheeled bin pilot undertaken in Merton.

## Stage 3: Assessing impact and analysis

### 6. From the evidence you have considered, what areas of concern have you identified regarding the potential negative and positive impact on one or more protected characteristics (equality groups)?

Protected characteristic (equality group)	Tick which applies		Tick which applies		Reason Briefly explain what positive or negative impact has been identified
	Positive impact		Potential negative impact		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Age		✓	✓		Due to size / weight of bin – assisted collection offered
Disability		✓	✓		Due to size / weight of bin – assisted collection offered
Gender Reassignment		✓		✓	
Marriage and Civil Partnership		✓		✓	
Pregnancy and Maternity		✓		✓	
Race					
Religion/ belief		✓		✓	
Sex (Gender)		✓		✓	
Sexual orientation		✓		✓	
Socio-economic status		✓		✓	

**7. If you have identified a negative impact, how do you plan to mitigate it?**

1.  
The service currently provides assisted collection to the elderly and disabled residents. This service will continue.  
For properties considered unsuitable for a wheeled bin, an alternative collection method will be offered which may include a sack collection service.

**Stage 4: Conclusion of the Equality Analysis**

**8. Which of the following statements best describe the outcome of the EA (Tick one box only)**

Please refer to the guidance for carrying out Equality Impact Assessments is available on the intranet for further information about these outcomes and what they mean for your proposal

- Outcome 1** – The EA has not identified any potential for discrimination or negative impact and all opportunities to promote equality are being addressed. **No changes are required.**
- Outcome 2** – The EA has identified adjustments to remove negative impact or to better promote equality. **Actions you propose to take to do this should be included in the Action Plan.**
- Outcome 3** – The EA has identified some potential for negative impact or some missed opportunities to promote equality and it may not be possible to mitigate this fully. **If you propose to continue with proposals you must include the justification for this in Section 10 below, and include actions you propose to take to remove negative impact or to better promote equality in the Action Plan. You must ensure that your proposed action is in line with the PSED to have ‘due regard’ and you are advised to seek Legal Advice.**
- Outcome 4** – The EA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination. **Stop and rethink your proposals.**

Page 21

## Stage 5: Improvement Action Pan

### 9. Equality Analysis Improvement Action Plan template – Making adjustments for negative impact

This action plan should be completed after the analysis and should outline action(s) to be taken to mitigate the potential negative impact identified (expanding on information provided in Section 7 above).

Negative impact/ gap in information identified in the Equality Analysis	Action required to mitigate	How will you know this is achieved? e.g. performance measure/ target)	By when	Existing or additional resources?	Lead Officer	Action added to divisional/ team plan?
Property type	Individual property types assessed for suitability.	Feed back from Crew and residents and contractor	On going	N/A	Neighborhood Client Officers	
Elderly / Disabled	Provide assisted collection	All current assisted collections to be retained and all new requested monitored and assessed by Waste Operations	On Going	N/A	Neighborhood Client Officers	

Page 22

**Note that the full impact of the decision may only be known after the proposals have been implemented; therefore it is important the effective monitoring is in place to assess the impact.**

## Stage 6: Reporting outcomes

### 10. Summary of the equality analysis

This section can also be used in your decision making reports (CMT/Cabinet/etc) but you must also attach the assessment to the report, or provide a hyperlink

This Equality Analysis has resulted in an Outcome [add](#) Assessment

[Please include here a summary of the key findings of your assessment.](#)



**Stage 7: Sign off by Director/ Head of Service**

<b>Assessment completed by</b>	Charles Baker	<b>Signature:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Improvement action plan signed off by Director/ Head of Service</b>	Graeme Kane	<b>Signature:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Graeme Kane

---

**From:** Graeme Kane  
**Sent:** 25 November 2017 18:21  
**To:** Councillor Stephen Alambritis; Councillor Mark Allison; Councillor Caroline Cooper-Marbiah; Councillor Tobin Byers; Councillor Nick Draper; Councillor Edith Macauley; Councillor Katy Neep; Councillor Martin Whelton; Councillor Ross Garrod  
**Cc:** Chris Lee; Charles Baker  
**Subject:** LSG presentation: bin sizes and delivery options  
**Attachments:** LSG Bin Sizes 221117 v2.pptx.html

Dear Cabinet Members,

At the Leader's LSG meeting on Monday you are due to discuss some elements of the changes to the waste and recycling service due to be implemented next autumn. We have prepared a presentation to assist with this discussion and I wanted to provide this to you in advance in the hope it is helpful for you. Specifically, we will be discussing the options for the size of wheeled bin used for general waste, and the options we give residents to have a larger or smaller bin. These decisions have some important implications for recycling rates, waste disposal costs and the success of the service. I welcome your input to these decisions.

There are some final small amendments to be made to the presentation but attached is a draft should you wish to consider it ahead of the meeting. I shall provide copies of the final presentation when we meet.

Kind regards  
Graeme

Graeme Kane | Assistant Director of Public Space  
Environment and Regeneration

London Borough of Merton  
Direct: 020 8545 3190 | Switchboard: 020 8274 4901

Merton is bidding to become London Borough of Culture 2019; find out more at [Merton London Borough of Culture](#)  
Support us at [www.facebook.com/mertonculture](http://www.facebook.com/mertonculture)

**merton**

for London Borough  
of Culture **2019**

**#mertonculture**

## Graeme Kane

---

**Subject:** FW: Wheeled bin options

**From:** Graeme Kane

**Sent:** 15 December 2017 14:29

**To:** 'Will Graham' <will.graham@veolia.com>; Scott Edgell <scott.edgell@veolia.com>

**Cc:** Charles Baker <Charles.Baker@merton.gov.uk>; Annie Baker <Annie.Baker@merton.gov.uk>

**Subject:** Wheeled bin options

Dear Will and Scott,

In line with your timescales, please see our latest position on wheeled bin sizes.

It is likely we will go with Option 1, but we need to get this confirmed with a Cabinet decision in January. We will therefore be able to meet your final deadline of 5<sup>th</sup> February.

All containers can be grey/black bodies with lids as indicated.

(Please also note the need for Veolia to ensure they have a sufficient supply of plastic sacks for properties that are unable to accommodate the paper/card wheeled bin.)

I suggest the following:

	Landfill	Paper	Container Mix	Garden Waste	Food waste
Option 1	180L (grey/black lid)	180L* (blue lid)	'As is' boxes	240L (brown lid)	Caddy
Option 2	240L (grey/black lid)	240L (blue lid)	'As is' boxes	240L (brown lid)	Caddy

\*the decision to reduce the size of the Paper and Card bin is based on Veolia's proposal to do this, as indicated at the latest Service Change Board meeting. This is on the basis that LBM, or any other member of the SLWP, will not be liable for any perceived or actual reduction in the amount of paper and card collected, and/or any impact on the income from this material.

Graeme

Graeme Kane | Assistant Director of Public Space

Direct: 020 8545 3190

e council's e-mail disclaimer - <http://www.croydon.gov.uk/email-disclaimer>

## Graeme Kane

---

**From:** Graeme Kane  
**Sent:** 15 December 2017 16:37  
**To:** Councillor Ross Garrod  
**Cc:** Chris Lee; Charles Baker  
**Subject:**  
**Attachments:**

Hi Ross

Following our meeting this week, this is an update on the situation.

**Bin sizes:** We have provided Veolia with our two preferred options as per the table below and we have informed Veolia that it is likely we will go with Option 1, but we need to get this confirmed with a Cabinet decision in January. We will therefore be able to meet their final deadline of 5<sup>th</sup> February.

All containers to be grey/black bodies with lids as indicated.

	Landfill	Paper	Container Mix	Garden Waste	Food waste
Option 1	180L (grey/black lid)	180L* (blue lid)	'As is' boxes	240L (brown lid)	Caddy
Option 2	240L (grey/black lid)	240L (blue lid)	'As is' boxes	240L (brown lid)	Caddy

Regards  
Graeme

Graeme Kane | Assistant Director of Public Space  
Environment and Regeneration

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Appendix D**

### **Call In of the Residual Waste Container Size – Ruling from the Deputy Monitoring Officer on which parts of the call-in request are within scope for consideration at the call-in meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 30 January 2018**

#### **Background**

The Monitoring Officer has judged the call-in to be valid in part.

The Monitoring Officer has ruled that matters raised in the call in relating to the Cabinet decision made on 15 January 2018 as regards the size of the wheeled bins to be used are within scope and matters which refer to matters outside of the scope of this decision and which relate to previous decisions taken by Cabinet and/or were dealt with at the call in held on 2 August 2016 are not in scope.

#### **Further advice from the Deputy Monitoring Officer**

More specifically the following matters are **in** scope:

(a) Proportionality

- The impact on street cleanliness as specifically relates to the size of the bin and not generally as it relates to wheeled bins
- Safety of residents and operatives as it relates to the size of the bin.

(b) Consultation and taking professional advice

- Consultation with residents about the size of the bins with which they are due to be issued.

(c) Respect for human rights and equalities

- Impact for disabled and elderly residents in relation to the size of the bin
- Equality impact assessment
- Improved safety for operatives

(d) Openness

- Length and amount of detail in the report
- Public consultation on the size of bins

(e) Clarity of aims and desired outcomes

- All of the points raised in this section are in scope

(f) Consideration and evaluation of alternatives

- Consideration of the residents petition in relation to the size of bins
- Points raised in relation to alternative sized wheeled bins
- Residents choice as to the size of the bin
- Views of the contractor and impact on decision making

The following matters are not in scope to be called in as either they do not relate to the decision made at cabinet on 15 January and/or they refer to previous decisions of cabinet and/or have been subject to call in by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 2 August 2016:

(a) Proportionality

- The impact on street cleanliness generally as regards wheeled bins
- The effect on street scene and convenience for residents of wheeled bins in general as opposed to the size of the wheeled bin

(b) Consultation

- Reference to the Lavender Fields pilot in 2015

(d)presumption in favour of openness

- Crime and disorder implications as they relate to wheeled bins generally
- Engagement with residents on the issue of wheeled bins generally

(f) consideration and evaluation of alternatives

- Discussion of alternatives to wheeled bins. The decision to move to wheeled bins was decided at cabinet on 4 July 2016