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## Summary

1 This report summarises the Recycling Project and updates members on its progress and performance. It notes the work of the member/officer Waste Project Team.

## Recommendations

2 That the progress report on the recycling scheme is noted.

## Background Papers

3 The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report.
(i) Uttlesford Waste Strategy.
(ii) Indecon Waste Consultants presentation to Members 21 July 2005
(iii) Report to Extraordinary Strategy Environment Committee - 28 November 2005

## Impact

4

| Communication/Consultation | A customer survey was completed in April, the <br> results are attached. <br> Further development of the web page is <br> ongoing. <br> An updated Guide to Recycling is anticipated <br> for the end of year. <br> Recycling promotion in schools, local <br> organisations and at road shows is ongoing. <br> A recycling workshop/training session will be <br> delivered for new Members and those that <br> would like a refresher. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Community Safety | No impact resulting from this update report. |
| Equalities | No impact resulting from this update report. |
| Finance | No impact resulting from this update report. |


| Human Rights | No impact resulting from this update report. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Legal implications | No impact resulting from this update report. |
| Ward-specific impacts | No impact resulting from this update report. |
| Workforce/Workplace | No impact resulting from this update report. |

## Situation

5 The Waste Strategy was approved by Council on 13 December 2005. A key part of this strategy was to introduce a three bin recycling scheme to meet 4 aims; to improve recycling performance, to minimise waste sent to landfill, to minimise landfill penalties and maximise recycling credits.

6 The above approach is targeted to deliver best environmental and economic solution currently available.

7 Completion of the rollout to most domestic properties was concluded in October 2006. The work with flats, community premises and schools continues through 2007.

8 The Member/officer Waste Project Team advise, oversee and challenge the implementation of Uttlesford's Recycling Strategy and the Essex Waste Partnership. They will also undertake the review of Street Cleansing.

9 A customer survey of 3000 households was completed in April 2007. 1244 surveys were returned by the appointed date. The survey was completed prior to the extended range of material being added to the dry recycling bin which many of the respondents ask to be collected.
10 To summarise the survey, $69 \%$ say they are very satisfied or fairly satisfied with the service overall. $13 \%$ say they are very dissatisfied or fairly dissatisfied. $60 \%$ say they recycle more since the introduction of the system and $45 \%$ say they send less to landfill.

## Targets

11 The model that this scheme is based upon predicted an annual $48 \%$ recycling rate, the data tracking progress towards this aim is attached. The published figures for Essex are also attached for 2006/7, along with the table that ranks the 12 district councils. $42.82 \%$ recycling rate was achieved in the year of rollout, we expect the full year effect to be in excess of $50 \%$.

12 Members have been provided with monthly updates of performance since the rollout commenced, graphical data is attached to this report tracking that performance.

## Pay-Offs/Penalties

13 Modelling of the scheme shows a diversion from the council tax payer incurring $£ 3,500,000$ of Landfill Allowance Tax penalties by 2010.

14 The scheme is not only the best economic solution it is also the best environmental solution currently available. The diversion of bio-degradable waste from landfill will make a significant reduction in production of methane.

15 The new scheme will allows more households in the district to participate in recycling and allow a greater volume of our waste to be recycled. The diversion from landfill will extend the life of the landfill sites.

16 The costs of the service are still subject to final checks during closedown of 2006/7 accounts

|  | Budget $£ 000$ | Actuals $£ 000$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direct Budgets | 1,457 | 1,490 |
| Internal Charges | 816 | 705 |
| Total cost of service | 2,273 | 2,195 |

## Risk Analysis

17 The are no risks associated with this update report.

# Uttlesford District Council Three Bin recycling feedback survey. 

## April 2007

## Background

Uttlesford District Council introduced a three bin waste and recycling system in 2006/07.

| Waste <br> Type | Size <br> of Bin | Colour | Collection <br> frequency | Materials | Policy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dry <br> recycling <br> litres | Green <br> Lid | Fortnightly | Plastics, <br> Paper, Card, <br> Cans, Foil | Excess waste <br> collected from beside <br> bin in carrier bags or <br> boxes. Extra bin <br> provided on request. |  |
| Non- <br> recyclables | 180 <br> litres | Black <br> lid | Fortnightly | Residual <br> waste | No excess waste <br> collected from beside <br> bin. Extra bin can be <br> applied for but only <br> granted to those who <br> meet criteria. |
| Wet <br> recycling | 140 <br> litres | Brown <br> Lid | Weekly | All kitchen <br> waste <br> including <br> meat, cooked <br> food and dairy <br> products. | Paper, card or <br> vegetable starch bags <br> can be used to wrap <br> food. Separated food <br> waste not in the bin is <br> not collected. |

The district was split into six separate phases for the purpose of rolling out the scheme. By the first week of November 2006 the whole of the district was served by the new system.

Before the bins were delivered all households were sent a questionnaire asking if they would have a problem with the new system. Those that returned the questionnaire were contacted or visited by the recycling team to agree a solution.

Households not able to accommodate the bins have an alternate weekly collection of dry recycling in boxes and non-recyclables in black bags. Disabled residents are offered an assisted collection.

Approximately 26,000 households out of the 30,600 in the district have all three bins. Other households include those exempt, those who only have one or two of the bins and those that share bins with neighbours.

## Methodology

The survey was designed to gain a capture of residents' views on the new system. The questions related to the implementation process, the bin delivery, the information provided and their overall view of the scheme. The questions were multiple choice with space for comments.

The survey consisted of 14 questions related to the three bin survey and then optional questions about the householder's situation.

The survey was posted to 3000 residents. 500 addresses were selected at random from each phase area using a database of all properties. Exempt properties and those with assisted collections were included in the list.

A business reply envelope was provided for residents to send the questionnaire back free of charge. A prize of a cotton shopping bag was offered to the first 100 surveys returned to encourage a good response. Residents were requested to return the questionnaire by $15^{\text {th }}$ April 2007.

Approximately 1200 surveys were returned giving a response rate of about $40 \%$.
The responses, including comments were recorded in an Access database. The results for each question were then transferred into an Excel spreadsheet for analysis.

## Results

Full results of the three bin survey are shown in table 1 below. The table provides a breakdown of all the relevant questions and the various responses. Question 10 is not included as it was only needed for people to request information about assisted collections. A list of those who wanted this will be produced and individuals contacted separately to make arrangements.

To summarise, 69\% say they are very satisfied or fairly satisfied with the service overall. 13\% say they are very dissatisfied or fairly dissatisfied. $60 \%$ say they recycle more since the introduction of the system and $45 \%$ say they send less to landfill.

The total number of surveys returned was 1244 .
Table 1 - Summary of results from three bin survey April 2007

| Survey Questions | Answer Choices | Result | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section One - Before |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you recycle before the three bin scheme was introduced? | Yes | 1065 | 85.6\% |
|  | No | 153 | 12.3\% |
|  | NA | 17 | 1.4\% |
|  | No Response | 9 | 0.7\% |
| 2. Did you apply for an exemption or assisted collection before the introduction of three bin recycling? | Yes | 118 | 9.5\% |
|  | No | 1025 | 82.4\% |
|  | NA | 85 | 6.8\% |
|  | No Response | 16 | 1.3\% |
| 3. If you applied for exemption or assisted collection from three bin recycling how satisfied were you with the way your application was handled? | Very satisfied | 56 | 4.5\% |
|  | Fairly satisfied | 40 | 3.2\% |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 15 | 1.2\% |
|  | Fairly dissatisfied | 13 | 1.0\% |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 26 | 2.1\% |
|  | Don't know/not applicable | 639 | 51.4\% |
|  | No Response | 455 | 36.6\% |
| 4. If you received a visit from our recycling team how satisfied were you with the solution that they suggested to you? | Very satisfied | 47 | 3.8\% |
|  | Fairly satisfied | 33 | 2.7\% |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 22 | 1.8\% |
|  | Fairly dissatisfied | 11 | 0.9\% |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 17 | 1.4\% |
|  | Don't know/not applicable | 697 | 56.0\% |
|  | No Response | 417 | 33.5\% |


| Section Two - During |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5. Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the three bin recycling bins were introduced? | Very satisfied | 279 | 22.4\% |
|  | Fairly satisfied | 438 | 35.2\% |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 246 | 19.8\% |
|  | Fairly dissatisfied | 96 | 7.7\% |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 102 | 8.2\% |
|  | Don't know/not applicable | 51 | 4.1\% |
|  | No Response | 32 | 2.6\% |
| 6. Overall, how satisfied were you with the information provided when the bins were delivered to your home? | Very satisfied | 362 | 29.1\% |
|  | Fairly satisfied | 504 | 40.5\% |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 138 | 11.1\% |
|  | Fairly dissatisfied | 68 | 5.5\% |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 78 | 6.3\% |
|  | Don't know/not applicable | 59 | 4.7\% |
|  | No Response | 35 | 2.8\% |
| Section Three - After |  |  |  |
| 7. How does the amount you recycle now compare to before three bin recycling was introduced? | More | 745 | 59.9\% |
|  | Same | 400 | 32.2\% |
|  | Less | 52 | 4.2\% |
|  | Don't Know | 24 | 1.9\% |
|  | No Response | 23 | 1.8\% |
| 8. How does the amount of non-recyclable waste (black bin) you throw away now compare to before three bin recycling was introduced? | More | 92 | 7.4\% |
|  | Same | 532 | 42.8\% |
|  | Less | 554 | 44.5\% |
|  | Don't Know | 39 | 3.1\% |
|  | No Response | 27 | 2.2\% |
| 9. How easy do you find three bin recycling to use? | Very easy | 369 | 29.7\% |
|  | Easy | 437 | 35.1\% |
|  | Neither easy nor hard | 245 | 19.7\% |
|  | Hard | 81 | 6.5\% |
|  | Very Hard | 33 | 2.7\% |
|  | Don't Know | 37 | 3.0\% |
|  | No Response | 42 | 3.4\% |
| 11. Overall how satisfied are you with the three bin recycling system? | Very satisfied | 314 | 25.2\% |
|  | Fairly satisfied | 541 | 43.5\% |
|  | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 134 | 10.8\% |
|  | Fairly dissatisfied | 98 | 7.9\% |
|  | Very dissatisfied | 65 | 5.2\% |
|  | Don't know/not applicable | 37 | 3.0\% |
|  | No Response | 55 | 4.4\% |


| Section Four - About Your Household |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12. Do you compost at home? | Yes | 593 | 47.7\% |
|  | No/No response | 651 | 52.3\% |
| 13. Do you recycle glass? | Always | 1052 | 84.6\% |
|  | Sometimes | 135 | 10.9\% |
|  | Never | 39 | 3.1\% |
|  | No Response | 18 | 1.4\% |
| 14. Do you recycle textiles? | Always | 463 | 37.2\% |
|  | Sometimes | 588 | 47.3\% |
|  | Never | 173 | 13.9\% |
|  | No Response | 20 | 1.6\% |
| 15. How many people are there in your household (including children)? | One | 209 | 16.8\% |
|  | Two | 503 | 40.4\% |
|  | Three | 175 | 14.1\% |
|  | Four | 228 | 18.3\% |
|  | Five | 77 | 6.2\% |
|  | Six | 15 | 1.2\% |
|  | More | 1 | 0.1\% |
|  | No Response | 36 | 2.9\% |
| Supplementary Information - About yourself (optional) |  |  |  |
| S1. Are you male or female? | Male | 569 | 45.7\% |
|  | Female | 411 | 33.0\% |
|  | No Response | 264 | 21.2\% |
| S2. What was your age on your last birthday? | Under 30 | 30 | 2.4\% |
|  | 30-39 | 142 | 11.4\% |
|  | 40-49 | 215 | 17.3\% |
|  | 50-59 | 176 | 14.1\% |
|  | 60-69 | 173 | 13.9\% |
|  | 70+ | 193 | 15.5\% |
|  | No Response | 315 | 25.3\% |
| S3. How long have you/your household been living at your current address? | Under 1 year | 71 | 5.7\% |
|  | 1-2 years | 83 | 6.7\% |
|  | 3-5 years | 146 | 11.7\% |
|  | 6-10 years | 164 | 13.2\% |
|  | 11-20 years | 221 | 17.8\% |
|  | 21+ years | 294 | 23.6\% |
|  | Don't know/can't remember | 3 | 0.2\% |
|  | No Response | 262 | 21.1\% |
| S4. How long have you/your household been living in Uttlesford? | Under 1 year | 46 | 3.7\% |
|  | 1-2 years | 45 | 3.6\% |
|  | 3-5 years | 86 | 6.9\% |
|  | 6-10 years | 128 | 10.3\% |
|  | 11-20 years | 204 | 16.4\% |
|  | 21+ years | 470 | 37.8\% |
|  | Don't know/can't remember | 2 | 0.2\% |
|  | No Response | 263 | 21.1\% |


| S5. Is your property? | Owned outright | 415 | 33.4\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bought on a mortgage | 394 | 31.7\% |
|  | Rented from council | 74 | 5.9\% |
|  | Rented from an Housing Association/Trust | 20 | 1.6\% |
|  | Rented from a private landlord | 50 | 4.0\% |
|  | Other | 14 | 1.1\% |
|  | No Response | 277 | 22.3\% |
| S6. How many adults aged 18 or over are living here including yourself? | One | 209 | 16.8\% |
|  | Two | 606 | 48.7\% |
|  | Three | 97 | 7.8\% |
|  | Four | 33 | 2.7\% |
|  | Five | 5 | 0.4\% |
|  | More | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | No Response | 294 | 23.6\% |
| S7. Which of these activities best describes what you are doing at present? | Employee in full time job | 309 | 24.8\% |
|  | Employee in part time job | 156 | 12.5\% |
|  | Self employed | 76 | 6.1\% |
|  | Full time education | 5 | 0.4\% |
|  | Unemployed and available for work | 3 | 0.2\% |
|  | Permanently sick/disabled | 22 | 1.8\% |
|  | Wholly retired from work | 280 | 22.5\% |
|  | Looking after the home | 100 | 8.0\% |
|  | Other | 4 | 0.3\% |
|  | No Response | 289 | 23.2\% |
| S8. Do you have any longstanding illness, disability or infirmity? | Yes | 200 | 16.1\% |
|  | No/No response | 1044 | 83.9\% |
| S9. Does this illness or disability limit your activities in any way? | Yes | 182 | 14.6\% |
|  | No/No response | 1062 | 85.4\% |
| S10. To which of these groups do you consider you belong to? | White British | 917 | 73.7\% |
|  | White Irish | 7 | 0.6\% |
|  | Other White | 16 | 1.3\% |
|  | Bangladeshi | 1 | 0.1\% |
|  | Other Asian | 1 | 0.1\% |
|  | Mixed White and Asian | 2 | 0.2\% |
|  | Chinese | 1 | 0.1\% |
|  | No Response | 299 | 24.0\% |

There were also several comments that were made by more than one respondent. The most common was that the brown bins were too big, this was said on 111 separate surveys ( $9 \%$ ). Other popular comments were requests for a collection of glass and garden waste. 56 people (5\%) gave positive comments about how good or easy to use they think the system is.

Many people also said that they would like more plastics to be recycled. Since sending out the survey Uttlesford District Council have started taking the majority of plastics for recycling which has been a very popular development.

The following bar charts show some of the information from table one in clearer form for comparisons.


180 people said that they had applied for an exemption to the scheme or an assisted collection. 150 responded to question 3 with an answer other than "Don't know/not applicable". Of these 150, $64 \%$ said they were either "very satisfied" or "fairly satisfied" with the way the application had been handled.


130 people gave and answer to question 4 other than "don't know/not applicable". $62 \%$ of these said they were either "very satisfied" or "fairly satisfied" with the visit that they received.

$58 \%$ of people expressed satisfaction with the way the three bin system was introduced. 16\% were dissatisfied. 27 commented that the bins had not been delivered when they should have been and that they had had to contact the council. 19 said that there had been a problem with collection immediately following the roll out.

$70 \%$ said that they were satisfied with the information provided with the bins. Common comments from those who were not satisfied were that there was not enough information, the information was confusing or that no information was provided. 7 people said that too much information was provided.


745 out of the 1244 people who returned the survey ( $60 \%$ ) said that they felt they recycled more with the new system than they had before. Only 52 (4\%) said they though they recycled less than before. Some of these stated that they had mistakenly thought all plastics could be accepted on the green box system and therefore felt they were recycling less.

$554(45 \%)$ people said that they sent less waste to landfill since the introduction of three bin recycling. This was very close to the number that said they threw away the same amount, which was 532 ( $43 \%$ ). Only 92 people (7\%) said that they threw away more.

$65 \%$ of people said that they find three bin recycling "easy" or "very easy", $9 \%$ said they find it "hard" or "very hard".


855 people (69\%) said they were "very or fairly satisfied" with three bin recycling overall. This is $10 \%$ more than those satisfied with the way the bins were introduced, showing that some of the problems that were encountered initially have been solved. However 27 people did comment that they were still having problems with their collections. 163 people (13\%) said that they were "very or fairly dissatisfied" with three bin recycling overall.

In question 12, $48 \%$ of those returning surveys said that they compost at home, 18 commented that they do not use the brown lidded bin at all because they compost all of their food waste.


Only $3 \%$ said that they never recycle glass, $85 \%$ said that they always do. 90 people commented that they would like a kerbside glass collection introduced. Some said that it would only need to be a monthly collection.

$37 \%$ said that they always recycle textiles, this is $48 \%$ less than glass. $13.9 \%$ never recycle textiles.

## BASE DATA



|  | landfill rate 05/06 | landfill rate $06 / 07$ | dry recycling rate 05/06 | dry recycling rate 06/07 | Composting rate 05/06 | Compsting rate 06/07 | Total recycling rate 05/06 | Total recycling rate 06/07 |  |  | ndfill per <br> ad 05/06 | Landfill per head 06/07 | dry recycling <br> per head <br> 05/06 | dry recycling per head 06/07 | composting per head 05/06 | compostin <br> g per <br> head <br> 06/07 | Total recycling per head 05/06 | Total recycling per head 06/07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basildon | 77.24\% | 72.59\% | 15.77\% | 19.88\% | 6.99\% | 7.53\% | 22.76\% | 27.41\% |  |  | 357.09 | 337.40 | 72.91 | 92.41 | 32.31 | 35.01 | 105.21 | 127.42 |
| Braintree | 69.45\% | 64.61\% | 20.84\% | 23.38\% | 9.70\% | 12.01\% | 30.55\% | 35.39\% |  |  | 288.10 | 263.51 | 86.46 | 95.34 | 40.24 | 48.99 | 126.70 | 144.33 |
| Brentwood | 73.41\% | 68.82\% | 16.90\% | 19.82\% | 9.69\% | 11.37\% | 26.59\% | 31.18\% |  |  | 320.35 | 280.21 | 73.77 | 80.69 | 42.28 | 46.29 | 116.05 | 126.97 |
| Castle Point | 75.98\% | 74.27\% | 15.62\% | 16.62\% | 8.39\% | 9.11\% | 24.02\% | 25.73\% |  |  | 313.06 | 304.61 | 64.37 | 68.17 | 34.57 | 37.35 | 98.94 | 105.52 |
| Chelmsford | 71.35\% | 67.71\% | 14.83\% | 16.38\% | 13.82\% | 15.91\% | 28.65\% | 32.29\% |  |  | 353.42 | 330.16 | 73.43 | 79.88 | 68.46 | 77.56 | 141.88 | 157.44 |
| Colchester | 69.94\% | 69.10\% | 18.78\% | 18.46\% | 11.28\% | 12.43\% | 30.06\% | 30.90\% |  |  | 273.04 | 264.10 | 73.34 | 70.55 | 44.03 | 47.52 | 117.36 | 118.08 |
| Epping | 76.10\% | 62.91\% | 16.40\% | 25.31\% | 7.50\% | 11.78\% | 23.90\% | 37.09\% |  |  | 308.13 | 258.09 | 66.42 | 103.81 | 30.35 | 48.33 | 96.77 | 152.14 |
| Harlow | 80.12\% | 78.71\% | 18.49\% | 19.49\% | 1.39\% | 1.79\% | 19.88\% | 21.29\% |  |  | 297.32 | 298.14 | 68.62 | 73.83 | 5.16 | 6.80 | 73.78 | 80.63 |
| Maldon | 70.77\% | 67.14\% | 17.71\% | 19.77\% | 11.52\% | 13.10\% | 29.23\% | 32.86\% |  |  | 278.19 | 263.39 | 69.62 | 77.55 | 45.29 | 51.38 | 114.91 | 128.93 |
| Rochford | 85.46\% | 82.82\% | 14.01\% | 15.40\% | 0.54\% | 1.78\% | 14.54\% | 17.18\% |  |  | 361.31 | 345.53 | 59.23 | 64.26 | 2.26 | 7.42 | 61.49 | 71.68 |
| Tendring | 78.45\% | 77.04\% | 21.55\% | 22.96\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 21.55\% | 22.96\% | Page |  | 268.71 | 262.00 | 73.79 | 78.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 73.79 | 78.09 |
| Uttlesford | 74.41\% | 57.18\% | 22.19\% | 30.15\% | 3.40\% | 12.67\% | 25.59\% | 42.82\% |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 338.95 \\ 37 \end{array}$ | $7 \quad 231.97$ | 101.06 | 122.29 | 15.49 | 51.41 | 116.55 | 173.70 |
| Essex CC | 39.56\% | 40.20\% | 34.63\% | 34.16\% | 25.81\% | 25.64\% | 60.44\% | 59.80\% |  |  | 39.13 | 42.91 | 34.25 | 36.46 | 25.54 | 27.37 | 59.79 | 63.83 |

UTTLESFORD POSITION

| Authority | Reduction in Landfill per head <br>  <br>  <br> Landfill <br> per head <br> $05 / 06(\mathrm{~kg})$ <br> Landfill per <br> head 06/07 <br> $(\mathrm{kg})$Percentage <br> reduction |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 338.95 | 231.97 | $31.56 \%$ |
|  | 308.13 | 258.09 | $16.24 \%$ |
|  | 320.35 | 280.21 | $12.53 \%$ |
| Braintree | 288.10 | 263.51 | $8.53 \%$ |
| Chelmsford | 353.42 | 330.16 | $6.58 \%$ |
| Basildon | 357.09 | 337.40 | $5.51 \%$ |
| Maldon | 278.19 | 263.39 | $5.32 \%$ |
| Rochford | 361.31 | 345.53 | $4.37 \%$ |
| Colchester | 273.04 | 264.10 | $3.27 \%$ |
| Castle Point | 313.06 | 304.61 | $2.70 \%$ |
| Tendring | 268.71 | 262.00 | $2.49 \%$ |
| Harlow | 297.32 | 298.14 | $-0.27 \%$ |


| Authority | Increase in recycling per head |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Recycling <br> per head <br> 05/06 $(\mathrm{kg})$ | Recycling <br> per head <br> 06/07 $(\mathrm{kg})$ | Percentage <br> increase |
|  | 96.77 | 152.14 | $57.22 \%$ |
|  | 116.55 | 173.70 | $49.04 \%$ |
| Basildon | 105.21 | 127.42 | $21.11 \%$ |
| Rochford | 61.49 | 71.68 | $16.57 \%$ |
| Braintree | 126.70 | 144.33 | $13.91 \%$ |
| Maldon | 114.91 | 128.93 | $12.20 \%$ |
| Chelmsford | 141.88 | 157.44 | $10.96 \%$ |
| Brentwood | 116.05 | 126.97 | $9.41 \%$ |
| Harlow | 73.78 | 80.63 | $9.28 \%$ |
| Castle Point | 98.94 | 105.52 | $6.65 \%$ |
| Tendring | 73.79 | 78.09 | $5.82 \%$ |
| Colchester | 117.36 | 118.08 | $0.61 \%$ |


| Authority | Total waste arisings per head |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wasste arisings 05/06 (kg) | Wasste arisings 06/07 (kg) | Percentage reduction |
| Uttlesford | 455.5 | 405.67 | 10.94\% |
| Brentwood | 436.4 | 407.18 | 6.70\% |
| Colchester | 390.4 | 382.18 | 2.11\% |
| Braintree | 414.8 | 407.84 | 1.68\% |
| Chelmsford | 495.3 | 487.60 | 1.56\% |
| Rochford | 422.8 | 417.21 | 1.32\% |
| Tendring | 342.5 | 340.10 | 0.70\% |
| Castle Point | 412 | 410.13 | 0.45\% |
| Maldon | 393.1 | 392.31 | 0.20\% |
| Basildon | 462.3 | 464.82 | -0.55\% |
| Epping | 404.9 | 410.23 | -1.32\% |
| Harlow | 371.1 | 378.76 | -2.06\% |

## Recycling performance

The tablebelowshons ar recyding performanœe for April 2006 throughto March 2007and compares it to the previou year. The new scherre wes rodled aut across the distrid starting in the sath in Juneand cormpleting in the nath in Noverber. 2007/8 will be the first full year in the newscheme, we will continue to provideMenbers with provisional monthly figures as the year unfdds. Final figuresfor any year are formally amounoed from Essex County Coundil after auditing (normally June).

Futher belowthe table is a graphthat tradk ou improving recyding pefformenœethrough the rollout and the reduring tornage being sent tolandill.

## Recydingfigures2006/07

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 / 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6} 07$ | Difference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total recyding <br> Tornage | 8113 | 12262 | +4149ames |
| Weste tolandill | 23910 | 16522 | -7388 tornes |
| Total weste arisings | 32023 | 28784 | -3239 tornes |
| Recyding rate | $25.3 \%$ | $426 \%$ | $+17.3 \%$ |
| KerbsideDry <br> Recyding(domestic) | 4321 | 5653 | +1332tomes |
| Ktchenweste | - | 2588 | - |
| Gass Recyding | 1464 | 1942 | +478tomes |

MONTHLY COMPARISONS

| Month | Household Waste to Landfill (t) |  |  | Household Waste Recycled |  |  | Total Household Waste (t) |  |  | Recycling Rate (\%) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2005/06 | 2006/07 | Difference | 2005/06 | 2006/07 | Difference | 2005/06 | 2006/07 | Difference | 2005/06 | 2006/07 | Difference |
| April | 2012.68 | 1784.05 | -228.63 | 689.29 | 636.65 | -52.64 | 2701.97 | 2420.7 | -281.27 | 25.51\% | 26.30\% | 0.79\% |
| May | 1986.8 | 2070.2 | 83.4 | 732.93 | 756.42 | 23.49 | 2719.73 | 2826.62 | 106.89 | 26.95\% | 26.76\% | -0.19\% |
| June | 2064.04 | 2040.74 | -23.3 | 721.5 | 791.67 | 70.17 | 2785.54 | 2832.41 | 46.87 | 25.90\% | 27.95\% | 2.05\% |
| July | 2008 | 1488.76 | -519.24 | 658.19 | 887.26 | 229.07 | 2666.19 | 2376.02 | -290.17 | 24.69\% | 37.34\% | 12.66\% |
| August | 1973.2 | 1399.32 | -573.88 | 701.23 | 962.31 | 261.08 | 2674.43 | 2361.63 | -312.8 | 26.22\% | 40.75\% | 14.53\% |
| September | 2208.06 | 1233.45 | -974.61 | 810.69 | 1100.85 | 290.16 | 3018.75 | 2334.3 | -684.45 | 26.86\% | 47.16\% | 20.30\% |
| October | 2065.76 | 1256.93 | -808.83 | 744.52 | 1159.98 | 415.46 | 2810.28 | 2416.91 | -393.37 | 26.49\% | 47.99\% | 21.50\% |
| November | 2039.74 | 1086.94 | -952.8 | 668.79 | 1201.61 | 532.82 | 2708.53 | 2288.55 | -419.98 | 24.69\% | 52.51\% | 27.81\% |
| December | 1664.16 | 1026.67 | -637.49 | 553.04 | 987.45 | 434.41 | 2217.2 | 2014.12 | -203.08 | 24.94\% | 49.03\% | 24.08\% |
| January | 2240.84 | 1120.59 | -1120.25 | 651.04 | 1473.59 | 822.55 | 2891.88 | 2594.18 | -297.7 | 22.51\% | 56.80\% | 34.29\% |
| February | 1664.16 | 938.23 | -725.93 | 526.07 | 1077.76 | 551.69 | 2190.23 | 2015.99 | -174.24 | 24.02\% | 53.46\% | 29.44\% |
| March | 1982.38 | 1075.81 | -906.57 | 655.26 | 1226.6 | 571.34 | 2637.64 | 2302.41 | -335.23 | 24.84\% | 53.27\% | 28.43\% |


| Total | 23909.82 | 16521.69 | -7388.13 | 8112.55 | 12262.15 | 4149.6 | 32022.37 | 28783.84 | -3238.53 | $25.30 \%$ | $42.60 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

LATS - WITH TRADE

| Row |  |  | 2005/06 <br> Actuals | 2006/07 Model for old system | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2006 / 07 \\ \text { Predicted } \\ \text { Actuals } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2007/08 Model for old system | 2007/08 <br> Predicted <br> Actuals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Projected MSW arisings (tonnes) |  | 35,779 | 38,777 | 32,286 | 39,941 | 29,250 |
| 2 | Predicted BMW in <br> waste (tonnes) using <br> Gov. 68\% <br> assumption | $\begin{gathered} =68 \% \text { of } \\ \text { row } 1 \end{gathered}$ | 24,330 | 26,368 | 21,954 | 27,160 | 19,890 |
| 3 | Paper/Card/Books recycled (tonnes) |  | 4,362 | 4,742 | 5,507 | 4,884 | 6,359 |
| 4 | Green waste, Kitchen Waste and Wood (tonnes) |  | 1228 | 747 | 3704 | 769 | 5294 |
| 5 | Textiles/Footware reused/recycled $(50 \%$ biodegradable) |  | 187 | 203 | 154 | 210 | 240 |
| 6 | Planned total BMW removal (tonnes) | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline=\text { total of } \\ \text { rows 3-5 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 5,684 | 5,591 | 9,288 | 5,758 | 11,773 |
| 7 | Calculated BMW in waste to landfill | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { = row } 2- \\ \text { row } 6 \end{gathered}$ | 18,646 | 20,778 | 12,666 | 21,402 | 8,117 |
| 8 | BMW permitted To landfill (tonnes) |  | 18,750 | 17,960 | 17,960 | 16,097 | 16,097 |
| 9 | Performance against target <br> (Figure in brackets is cumulative total) | $\begin{gathered} =\text { row } 7- \\ \text { row } 8 \end{gathered}$ | -104 | $\begin{gathered} 2,818 \\ (2,714) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-5,294 \\ -(5,397) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5,305 \\ (8,019) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-7,980 \\ -(13,377) \end{gathered}$ |
| 10 | Penalty with regard to performance against target <br> (Figure in brackets is cumulative total) | $\begin{gathered} =\text { row } 9 \mathrm{X} \\ £ 12 \end{gathered}$ | -£1,245 | $\begin{aligned} & £ 33,814 \\ & (£ 32,569) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -£ 63,522 \\ & -(£ 64,768) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline £ 63,659 \\ & (£ 96,228) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline-£ 95,760 \\ -(£ 160,528) \end{array}$ |

LATS - WITHOUT TRADE

| Row |  |  | 2005/06 <br> Actuals | 2006/07 <br> Predicted <br> Actuals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Projected MSW arisings (tonnes) |  | 32,067 | 28,567 |
| 2 | Predicted BMW in <br> waste (tonnes) using <br> Gov. $68 \%$ <br> assumption | $\begin{gathered} =68 \% \text { of } \\ \text { row } 1 \end{gathered}$ | 21,806 | 19,426 |
| 3 | Paper/Card/Books recycled (tonnes) |  | 4,362 | 5,507 |
| 4 | Green waste, Kitchen Waste and Wood (tonnes) |  | 1228 | 3704 |
| 5 | Textiles/Footware reused/recycled (50\% biodegradable) |  | 187 | 154 |
| 6 | Planned total BMW removal (tonnes) | = total of rows 3-5 | 5,684 | 9,288 |
| 7 | Calculated BMW in waste to landfill | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline=\text { row } 2- \\ \text { row } 6 \end{array}$ | 16,122 | 10,138 |
| 8 | BMW permitted To landfill (tonnes) |  | 18,750 | 17,960 |
| 9 | Performance against target <br> (Figure in brackets is cumulative total) | = row 7 - <br> row 8 | -2,628 | $\begin{gathered} \hline-7,822 \\ -(10,450) \end{gathered}$ |
| 10 | Penalty with regard to performance against target <br> (Figure in brackets is cumulative total) | $\begin{gathered} =\text { row } 9 \mathrm{X} \\ £ 12 \end{gathered}$ | -£31,535 | $\begin{aligned} & -£ 93,869 \\ & -(£ 125,405) \end{aligned}$ |

Recycling Rate by Month


Waste to Landfill by Month
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Recycling Tonnage by Month


Total waste split


