

**WASTE STRATEGY PROJECT TEAM held at COUNCIL OFFICES
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 10 am on 11 JUNE 2009**

Present: Councillor S Barker (Chairman).
Councillors J Cheetham, C Down, and E Godwin.

Also present: Councillor A J Ketteridge.

Officers: D Burrige (Director of Operations), R Clark (Waste and Recycling Officer), C Demmer (Departmental Co-ordinator – Operations), C Nicholson (Solicitor), R Pridham (Head of Street Services), R Procter (Democratic Services Officer), M Thomason (Health and Safety Officer).

Also present: Andrew Brown, Essex County Council.

WS1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C Cant and C Dean.

WS2 MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2009 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

WS3 BUSINESS ARISING

(i) Minute WS30 – Inter Authorities Agreement

Andrew Brown gave an update on the planning application for a civic amenity site at Dunmow. He said the planning application was now at the consultation stage. The timescale would depend to a great extent on whether a Compulsory Purchase Order would be required. If negotiations with the landowner concluded in a deal, it was possible the site could be open by May 2011, but in the case of a CPO it would not open before January 2012.

Councillor Barker asked for reassurance that negotiations would be dealt with early in the process. Andrew Brown said he hoped the fact that the planning application had now been validated would add momentum to the negotiations.

The current planning application differed from the previous application in that there had been a boundary change, and a flood risk assessment had been carried out. The flood risk assessment had concluded there was no flood risk, but recommended that drainage work be undertaken at a likely cost of £70K – £100K.

Members were keen to ensure that a condition of planning permission should be imposed to restrict the noise of vehicles reversing. Regarding access, Members expressed a preference for a traffic light solution. Councillor Barker said Development Control Committee Members were concerned to ensure

junction improvements were implemented, as these had yet to be put in, despite the construction of the police station and hotel. Andrew Brown said a Grampian condition was anticipated. Members were also concerned that lighting at the site and along access routes should not be unnecessarily obtrusive.

Councillor Barker said the Saffron Walden civic amenity site was excellent, and she hoped the Dunmow site would be just as good. She thanked Andrew Brown for joining the meeting.

Action:

- 1 Andrew Brown of Essex County Council to be invited to give a presentation at the next South Area Forum on 8 September 2009.
- 2 Essex County Council to be asked for a presentation to the Waste Strategy Project Team on the Crumps Farm application.

It was noted that the decision to delegate signing off the IAA was for Full Council, and that a recommendation would be made by Environment Committee.

WS4

CADDY TRIAL

A draft report to Environment Committee was considered, setting out data from the caddy trial which had been ongoing since January 2009. There were six criteria for success which were not met by the trial but learning from the trial had suggested a new way forward which did meet the criteria for success. Recommendations were suggested based on trial outcomes, which indicated caddies would not be the solution for the majority of households. Rather than caddies for all households, the scheme should be implemented only for flats and those properties which had, to date, been exempt from the separate kitchen waste scheme.

The Director of Operations explained that average figures for kitchen waste related to the whole community and therefore included many properties that did not participate in the scheme. These figures indicated the potential kitchen waste which could be diverted from landfill.

The possibility of opting in to the kitchen caddy scheme was discussed. The Head of Street Services said supply of caddies to households could not be a matter of individual preference. Rounds involving constant changes would have health and safety implications. Figures for sickness and injury were currently showing an improving trend.

Councillor Barker asked that when the scheme was implemented it was highlighted that no garden waste could be included in kitchen bins. Councillor Cheetham agreed that the inability to put garden waste in kitchen waste was an issue, and suggested there should be greater publicity regarding green skips. Members also raised the possibility that additional green skips could be provided. The Director of Operations said a long term view on this issue

was necessary, as in due course green waste would be excluded from waste figures. Whilst an extended service might be popular, it would be that much more difficult to remove such a service when it became necessary to do so.

WS5 CUBE PARTNERSHIP EXPLORATION

The Head of Street Services said discussions were taking place for potential partnership options for vehicle maintenance and kerbside collection. Initial discussions involved Braintree, Colchester and Harlow councils. It had been suggested that a high level review of potential shared arrangements be carried out. There were potential advantages for Uttlesford in terms of working with other authorities which already had vehicle maintenance workshops. A meeting was to be held later today to agree terms of reference for the review.

Action agreed:

The Head of Street Services to report on the outcome of discussions with other authorities on partnership arrangements, and to circulate terms of reference of such discussions to Members.

WS6 DOG BINS

A number of requests for additional dog waste bins had recently been received, and in view of increasing numbers of dog owners coming to live in new developments across the district, Members were asked to consider the Council's strategies on this issue.

Officers advised that currently there were 250 dog bins. The collection service was covered by street cleaning. Collection using a transit van took 1 to 2 days.

Members discussed the apparent increase in public perception that more dog waste bins were necessary. Some parish councils felt that more bins would serve to remind people to the need to dispose of dog waste. In general there was a need for greater publicity of how to deal with dog waste, and Members agreed that a publicity campaign would be helpful. Fouling was an enforceable issue, and prosecution of those failing to clear up after their dog could reinforce the message.

Officers explained that the Council's recommended means of disposal was to bag the waste, take it home and dispose of it in the black wheeled bin. Collecting from dog bins took away resources from litter picking.

Councillor Ketteridge said there was certainly a problem with dog waste, and this was particularly noticeable when doing a litter pick. One of the reasons for people failing to deal properly with dog waste was that they disliked taking it home.

The Head of Street Services said the need for dog bins was likely to be different in rural and town areas, and two strategies were therefore needed.

Councillor Barker suggested that 'Uttlesford Life' should publicise issues surrounding dog ownership, including proper disposal in black wheeled bins of bagged dog waste. Where requests for new bins on new estates had been received, she did not see any option other than to provide bins, although siting bins outside residential houses could pose difficulties.

Councillor Godwin suggested inviting parish councils to advise whether more dog bins were needed.

Councillor Cheetham said a publicity campaign should include contact details for the Animal Warden, in order to enable people to report those failing to clear up after their dog. There were health risks associated with dog waste.

Requests for new dog bins had been received from Little Hallingbury (x 2), Priors Green (x 2), Stebbing (x 1) and Woodlands Park (x 4). The Head of Street Services advised that usage of existing bins should be examined before agreeing to issue more bins. Other measures should also be considered in the first instance. For example, at Woodland Park, Officers planned to speak informally to people seen walking dogs, to encourage disposal of dog waste via domestic black bins. Members agreed this approach would be a useful starting point.

Councillor Barker said help from the County Council should be sought in order to conduct a survey. She said the Council should write to parish clerks to indicate that dog waste was a growing issue and to ask them to publicise the advice on dealing with it.

Action agreed:

- 1 Officers to speak informally to dog owners to inform them of the recommended means of disposing of dog waste;
- 2 Parish Clerks to be asked to publicise this information;
- 3 An article on dog ownership to be included in Uttlesford Life.

WS7

OTHER BUSINESS

(i) Civic amenity site at Crumps Farm, Great Dunmow

The planning application had been submitted, and was still at consultation stage. It would be dealt with by the County Council. There were issues regarding access roads and noise.

Action agreed as at WS3 (i) above, ie:

A representative from Essex County Council to be invited to give a presentation at the next Waste Strategy Project Team meeting.

(ii) Special collections strategy

Officers reported a situation where an individual, who was entitled to free collection of bulky waste items, was repeatedly requesting collections. Already this financial year 12 collections had been requested, for which no charge could be made. It was likely that the individual was running a business from his home. A proposal for addressing such incidents would be considered under "Items that the Chair considers urgent" at next weeks Environment Committee.

(iii) Trade Waste Review

As part of the Inter Authorities Agreement the County Council was planning to review trade waste across all districts. A review of the tonnage methodology used to calculate payment to the County Council for trade waste disposal was expected. The review could have costs implications, but until the outcome of the review was made known, no action could be taken.

WS8

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be Thursday 3 September at 10.00 am.