

July 2004

THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF KENSINGTON & CHELSEA
WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Municipal Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan 2004-2009



THE ROYAL
BOROUGH OF



KENSINGTON
AND CHELSEA

love the streets you live in

**Municipal Waste
Management Strategy
and Action Plan
2004-2009**

INTRODUCTION TO THE STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN

1. The Royal Borough's waste management services are shaped by exceptional local conditions and exceptionally high local expectations. In response, those services themselves must be exceptionally good.
2. This Strategy describes how the Council will sustain and improve its performance on waste reduction, recycling, waste collection, and street cleansing. The Strategy sets out the Council's aims, and specifies four priority objectives for these services, each backed by targets to measure success.
3. The Action Plan supporting the Strategy describes in some detail the exceptional measures the Council is taking to achieve success. These include ambitious plans to increase recycling rates, to improve already very high standards of street cleansing, and to communicate with local people in a new and fresh way about civic pride and responsibility for the local environment.
4. **In short, the Council's ambition is to provide the best waste management services in London.**
5. The Strategy follows from work done during the Royal Borough Review¹ of the Service completed in 2003. It takes account of recommendations made by the Audit Commission in their inspection report on the service written in December 2003.
6. The Strategy takes its place in a hierarchy of other waste management strategies including European, national, and the Mayor of London's strategies. It has been particularly strongly influenced by the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) prepared by the Western Riverside Partnership². The Royal Borough's Strategy does not repeat the extensive technical and descriptive information set out in these strategies. Instead it sets out what the Council is doing and is going to do locally to meet the Council's own objectives and to meet the objectives of these other strategies.
7. The Strategy has been prepared concurrently with work on the contract documents and specification associated with the re-tendering of the Council's recycling, waste collection and street cleansing services. The new contract will come into effect in April 2005. Many important features of this Strategy will be delivered through the successful implementation of the new service specification after that date.

¹ A glossary of municipal terms is provided in Appendix D.

² The Riverside Waste Partnership consists of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, the London Borough of Lambeth, and Wandsworth Borough Council together with the Western Riverside Waste Authority. The production of a joint strategy by these partners is required by the Waste and Emissions Trading Act 2003.

LOCAL WASTE MANAGEMENT IN 2004

8. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea is a waste collection authority. The Council sends most of its waste to the Western Riverside Waste Authority (WRWA) for post-collection treatment. The Council's waste collection methods must therefore be consistent with the JMWMS and the WRWA's waste management services contract with Cory Environmental Limited. WRWA uses the river Thames to transfer the majority of the Royal Borough's waste. This environmentally sound transportation method saves many thousands of lorry movements across London each year.
9. The Council's waste collection contractor collects around 90,000 tonnes of municipal waste each year. Around 60,000 tonnes of this waste is household waste. The remainder is commercial waste. The Council recycled 16.5% of household waste in 2003/04, and around 11% of municipal commercial waste. A significant quantity of commercial waste is currently collected by other contractors and is not disposed of by WRWA.
10. The Council is one of the very few local authorities to collect household recyclables and other waste twice a week from the kerbside. The Council's commercial waste franchise provides the opportunity for businesses to have up to three recycling and waste collections a day, seven days a week.
11. The Royal Borough's streets are among the very cleanest in London, and residents attach very high priority to keeping them that way.

LOCAL WASTE MANAGEMENT IN CONTEXT

A tradition of high quality service delivery to meet local needs

12. The Council's Borough Aims set out the policy framework for all the Council's services. One Aim is to maintain the Royal Borough as a highly valued place in which to live and do business. Another Aim is to protect the public. A third is to ensure quality and value for money. Underpinning all of these Borough Aims is the Council's determination to foster a "Better City Life" in the Royal Borough.
13. These Aims imply that the Council should deliver the best possible and most cost-effective waste management and street cleansing services, and combat economic and environmental wastefulness. But the Aims imply a demand on local residents, visitors, and businesses too. Residents and others are entitled to expect the Council to deliver high quality waste management, recycling, and cleansing services at a reasonable price. Equally the Council looks to residents, visitors, and businesses to behave in a socially and environmentally responsible manner.
14. For many years now the Council has invested in "gold standard" services: twice a week kerbside recycling and waste collection, and an exceptionally high output specification for street cleansing. The Council has provided an infrastructure through which residents and businesses can manage their waste responsibly. The Council has also taken the view that the public realm should be as "owned" and respected as any private space. The Royal Borough's streets should delight everyone who uses them rather than being spattered with gum, grease, and dog faeces, or an obstacle course of dumped waste bags, fly-tips, illegal trading, and advertising boards.

15. The counterpart to the Council's investment has been intolerance of wastefulness and of abuses of the public realm. The great majority of local residents and businesses share this intolerance. They have very high expectations about how the Royal Borough should look. There has been strong local support for waste recycling and for the maintenance of clean uncluttered streets. The Council has been driven by these local aspirations, and – in its role as community leader - wants to promote them wherever they might not be shared.
16. These local aspirations have been given voice through the hierarchy of Council strategies: the Borough Aims as discussed above; the Unitary Development Plan; the Environmental Policy Statement; the annual Cabinet Business Plans; the annual Environmental Services Business Group Service Delivery Plans; and the Royal Borough Review of Waste Management. This new Municipal Waste Management Strategy and Action Plan describes a set of actions designed to meet these broad and long-standing aspirations over the next five years. In addition, these actions will contribute to meeting the goals set out in the Council's Air Quality Action Plan and in the not-yet published Local Implementation Plan dealing with transport. The Municipal Waste Management Strategy's emphasis on ensuring clean streets also contributes to the aims and objectives of the Community Safety Strategy.

Equalities

17. The work to produce this Strategy and Action Plan has included an Equalities Impact Assessment of the document. A short report of this Assessment is available as a 'daughter document' on the Council's website (www.rbkc.gov.uk).

The wider strategic framework

18. This Strategy must also take full account of international and UK waste strategies.
19. The Government has incorporated into UK legislation the **EU Landfill Directive**. This requires the Government to reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste that is sent to landfill in the UK in 2010 to 75% of the amount sent in 1995.
20. The **UK Government** has set the Council very ambitious recycling targets. The Government requires the Council to recycle or compost a third of the Royal Borough's household waste by 2005/6. This target is extremely challenging because it is based on tripling what was already a relatively strong achievement by the Council in 1998/99.
21. The Council's performance is also judged against other national indicators, including measures of waste reduction, and street cleanliness. The Government expects all Councils by 2005/06 to achieve 15% improvements in street cleanliness against a baseline of 2003/04. The Council wants to go much further than that.
22. The **Mayor of London** has prepared a Municipal Waste Management Strategy, and the Council has paid careful regard to his policies and proposals in developing this Strategy. In particular the Council supports the Mayor's policy that all waste management proposals should be judged against the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) for any given waste stream. The Council also supports the Mayor's policy to improve the standard of cleanliness on London streets and to combat environmental crime. The Council has already anticipated many of the Mayor's proposals designed to meet his ambitious waste recovery targets, for example by collecting at least three materials for recycling from the kerbside.

The Council and the Mayor's office have worked together in developing the documents relating to the Council's next recycling and waste management contract, and the Mayor has confirmed that these documents are in conformity with his Strategy.

23. Finally the Council, as part of the Riverside Waste Partnership, has helped develop the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy – on which there has been wide local consultation. The JMWMS envisages an intensive waste recovery effort through the kerbside collection of mixed dry recyclables, with materials separation taking place at a proposed new Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) at Smugglers Way in Wandsworth.
24. It is proposed that residual wastes should be taken from Smugglers Way down river by barge to a new Energy from Waste (EfW) plant at Belvedere in Kent. If – and this is not assured – the EfW plant is operational by 2010, the Government's requirements on the Western Riverside Waste Authority for the diversion of biodegradable waste from landfill should be met on time. However if it becomes clear that the EfW plant will not be ready on time, the Riverside Waste Partnership will need to consider alternative proposals for the diversion of biodegradable wastes from landfill. The Council has set out below proposals for the diversion of its waste during the next five years.

THE COUNCIL'S MUNICIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

High-level aims

25. Taking account of the policy and strategic frameworks described above, the Council has adopted two high-level aims that will determine the objectives of this Strategy:
1. The promotion of the **Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) for managing all types of waste.**
 2. The creation and maintenance of the **highest quality street scene.**
26. The first aim means that the Council:
- takes full account of the waste hierarchy that places waste minimisation above recycling, and recycling above energy from waste and landfill as methods of disposal;
 - supports and invests in waste transport options that minimise emissions and congestion; and
 - has regard to costs in deciding its policies and actions, and tries to find the right balance between investment in waste management and investment in other public services.
27. The second aim reflects the Council's strongly held view that well-designed, well-maintained, clean, and uncluttered streets are essential if urban environments are to be sustainable and attractive places in which to live and work. But in a borough where many residents and businesses lack external storage for waste, the street is an essential staging post for waste awaiting collection. Consequently the Council's ambitions for effective waste management and effective street cleansing are closely linked.

Main objectives

28. The Council has prioritised four main objectives for its waste management and cleansing services to ensure that it delivers these aims:

Objective 1: The Council will promote the reduction and reuse of waste; the Council will aim to decrease the average amount of waste produced by each household and to slow the overall growth in waste produced within the Royal Borough.

Objective 2: The Council will maximise the amount of municipal waste that is recycled.

Objective 3: The Council will collect waste efficiently, reliably, and with the least nuisance to residents and harm to the street scene and environment.

Objective 4: The Council will keep the Royal Borough's streets exceptionally clean and uncluttered.

Targets and timescales

29. The Council has set itself targets so it can measure progress towards these objectives.

Objective 1: Reduction and re-use targets.

30. **Household waste.** The Council seeks a 5% reduction in the average tonnage of waste produced by each Council tax-paying household by 2008/09, measured against a 2003/04 baseline.
31. **Commercial waste.** Target setting in relation to this waste stream is complex, as the Council has franchised out the collection of municipal commercial waste, and significant quantities of commercial waste are not collected by the Council or its contractor, but by other private companies.
32. As a matter of policy the Council has decided to take back the management of its commercial waste portfolio in April 2005. This decision was taken in order to improve the street-scene, and to maximise the amount of commercial waste that is recycled and disposed of in an environmentally sound manner through WRWA. The Council's decision, which is driven by environmental imperatives, will reduce the amount of commercial waste that is managed in less sustainable ways, even though it may have the misleading effect of appearing to increase the total municipal waste stream.
33. Commercial waste reduction targets for 2006/07 and beyond can only be set once the portfolio has been returned and fully evaluated, and the scope for waste reduction has been determined.

Objective 2: Recycling targets

34. **Household waste.** The Council aims to meet its statutory target of recycling 33% of household waste by 2005/06, as measured by national Best Value Performance Indicator 82. The Council will engage in discussions with DEFRA and other agencies about local target setting for 2008/09 and beyond.
35. **Commercial waste.** The Council aims to double the percentage of commercial waste recycled from 11% in 2003/04 to 22% in 2008/09.
36. **Participation.** The Council will deliver its Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) target to increase participation in recycling from 44% to at least 55% by the end of 2005/06. (The implementation of this Strategy should mean that participation will be significantly higher than this target and participants will be putting out significantly more recyclables.)

Objective 3: Efficiency, reliability, and "least harm" targets

37. By 2008/09 the Council will achieve a 20% reduction in justified complaints about waste collection services, measured against the 2005/06 baseline.

Objective 4: Clean and uncluttered streets

38. By 2005/06 the Council will have delivered its LPSA targets relating to the street-scene. These require a 30% improvement in street cleanliness in the North of the Borough, and

a 20% improvement in the South. The improvement will be measured in terms of the national Best Value Performance Indicator for street cleanliness (BVPI 199) against a 2003/04 baseline. Once the LPSA funded programme is over, the Council will sustain this “stretched” performance by equalling or bettering these targets over the three following years.

Delivering these aims, objectives, and targets in the Royal Borough

39. The Action Plan supporting this Strategy sets out detailed proposals to ensure the delivery of these aims, objectives, and targets. Delivery must take place in the unusual environment of the Royal Borough. The 2001 Census found that the Royal Borough is a quite exceptional place. The Royal Borough:
- is the most densely populated Borough in England and Wales, at 131 persons per hectare
 - has the third smallest average household size (1.96 persons)
 - has the third highest percentage of one-person households (49%)
 - has the fourth highest score nationally on the indicator of overcrowding
 - has the fifth highest percentage of households living in flats (83%)
 - has the eighth highest percentage of residents who are recent migrants into the Borough (19%)
 - has the ninth lowest percentage of households with a car or van (50%)
40. The accumulated weight of these statistics sets the Royal Borough apart from its comparators, and the facts they reflect have shaped and constrained the Council’s Royal Borough Review and this latest Strategy for recycling and waste management. Within Kensington and Chelsea there is relatively little public space available for new waste management facilities, including mini recycling centres. There is limited space within residents’ often overcrowded homes for the storage of waste. The great preponderance of flats means that home composting is only viable in a small minority of homes, and there is little space for waste storage or separation in front gardens or cellars. Very high population turnover makes it unusually difficult to ensure the whole population knows how to manage waste responsibly. The low level of car ownership means that many residents cannot use their own private transport to recycle materials or dispose of bulky waste at a Civic Amenity site. Finally, recent studies have shown that a key factor in increasing participation in recycling is the establishment of a settled pattern of family life – but half the Royal Borough’s households comprise single people not living in a conventional family structure.

ACTION PLAN

WASTE REDUCTION AND RE-USE (OBJECTIVE 1)

Introduction

41. The Council has an obligation to collect household waste presented for collection. It must clear dumped waste from the highway. And as discussed above the Council wants to increase the amount of commercial waste it collects to ensure it is handled in an environmentally satisfactory manner. Within the context of these obligations and policy decisions, the Council is determined to reduce the amount of waste produced and collected within the Royal Borough, and it has enlisted the support of Rethink Rubbish Western Riverside (RRWR) in many of the initiatives described below.

What the Council will do to minimise waste

A major assault on junk mail

42. The Council will step up its efforts to show residents how they can reduce the flow of junk mail, on the basis that most of it is a nuisance to residents, and it is better not to have to deal with it at all than to recycle it.
43. First, the Council will intensify its promotion of the Mailing Preference Service (MPS), which enables householders to request that unsolicited direct mail should not be sent to their homes. The MPS have about 4,500 registrations³ in the Royal Borough. We will aim to double this figure by 2006 and to treble it by 2009. This would have a significant impact on the weight of paper collected as waste.
44. Second, we will attempt to reduce the amount of other junk mail. This includes fast-food home delivery menus, and advertising flyers. Again, these can be a source of irritation for many householders, and we expect that many people would welcome practical help in stemming this tide of wasted paper. Our recycling wardens are distributing high-visibility orange stickers with the message 'No Junk Mail' to be stuck on letterboxes. Early evidence suggests that these stickers can be highly effective.
45. The Council needs to develop robust estimates of the amount of junk mail taken out of the waste stream as a result of these initiatives. This will be one of the Recycling Wardens' projects in 2005/06.

Promotion of composting at home

46. Very few households in the Royal Borough have large private gardens, so home composting will be a minority activity. We have supplied just over 1,500 households with a subsidised home composting bin (approaching 2% of all households). The Council has commissioned RRWR to investigate barriers to the take-up of home composting in the Royal Borough, and to advise on the best practicable composting technologies to meet local needs. The Council will develop a new home composting campaign in the light of the research and advice offered by RRWR.

³ Two people with different surnames at the same address would be counted by the MPS as two registrations.

47. The campaign is likely to include, as a minimum, the circulation of persuasive publicity to households with gardens, and articles in local newspapers offering composters to residents at cost price. Our target is to have supplied at least 2,500 composting bins to residents by 2008/09. During 2005/06 we will develop a robust methodology for estimating the amount of waste being diverted from the municipal waste stream by composting.

Promotion of re-useable nappies

48. The Council recognises the contribution that 'real' (re-useable) nappies can make in reducing the weight of a family's waste. Disposable nappies can amount to as much as 20% by weight of the household waste produced by a family with just one baby⁴.
49. The Council is already publicising nappy-laundering services and modern washable nappies through its website, through articles in local media, and through promotional events aimed at local parents. The Council will improve its data on the weight of disposable nappies in the waste stream, and develop estimates of the diversion of waste as a result of the use of real nappies.

Bulky waste schemes

50. The Council has greatly enhanced the service specification on bulky waste in its contract documents. The specification requires the next contractor to take every practicable step to maximise the recovery and re-use of materials collected during special collections, and it specifies the provision of additional resources to deal with waste electrical and electronic equipment.
51. In addition the Council will seek a partnership with one or more charities to provide a furniture re-use scheme, building on previous work with local registered social landlords. It will also support 'give or take days' (essentially cashless jumble sales).

How the Council would like others to minimise waste

52. Other organisations and individuals are well placed to reduce the amount of waste entering the waste stream. The paragraphs below set out the Council's expectations of others, which it will promote by lobbying and persuasion.

⁴ Babies typically use over 5000 disposable nappies before being toilet-trained.

Government

53. The Council will lobby the Government through the local government associations, seeking legislative or other pressure on manufacturers to modify the way they package goods at the point of production. For example the Council would argue against the excessive or unnecessary use of packaging materials such as expanded polystyrene.
54. The Council has opened an informal dialogue with DEFRA to explore issues such as the promotion of voluntary agreements with retailers to abide by a waste-reduction code of practice, a levy on carrier bags (which has been successful in Ireland), and compulsory deposits on glass bottles.
55. The Council wants the Government to introduce as soon as possible a “tonnage formula” for calculating waste disposal costs. This would help make more transparent the savings arising from waste reduction measures.

Retailers

56. The Council will work with our partners in RRWR to encourage their contacts in the retail sector to:
 - provide incentives to reduce the consumption of single-use carrier bags;
 - encourage their customers to select products and packaging that can be recycled;
 - inform them of opportunities within the community to reduce waste and increase recycling;
 - increase the recycling of packaging, products and process wastes generated on their own premises;
 - promote low-waste brands; and,
 - develop practical ideas to increase the re-use of bottles and containers.

Street Markets

57. The Royal Borough has street markets on Portobello Road and Golborne Road, both of which house a large number of antiques and second-hand goods stalls, side by side with fruit and vegetable stalls selling unpackaged produce. The Council is working towards a new strategic partnership with the markets Management Committee, which will include finding new ways of promoting the markets. The Council will urge traders to consider promoting their environmental credentials as part of the “low waste” economy and to provide opportunities for shoppers to recycle waste while visiting the market.

Residents

58. The Council will encourage its residents to put consumer pressure on retailers to minimise unnecessary packaging, to decline the offer of carrier bags when they are not needed, and to promote the use of reusable shopping bags. The Council will endeavour to harness residents’ charitable instincts by encouraging donations of unwanted goods to the many charity shops throughout the borough.

GREATLY INCREASED RECYCLING (OBJECTIVE 2)

Introduction

59. Waste collection authorities are better able to influence recycling than any other level of the waste hierarchy. The Royal Borough was one of the first local authorities to build its own materials reclamation facility, and the first to introduce universal kerbside recycling collections – initially once a week, and now twice a week. The Council recycles most dry materials, including card, and has developed a wide portfolio of recycling options in response to the diversity of the Royal Borough’s residents and housing. For over a year the Council has employed a team of ten Recycling Wardens whose target is to visit every household at least once to promote recycling face-to-face.
60. This effort and investment has delivered a household recycling rate of 16.5% in 2003/04; a fraction short of the national target of 17%, but significantly short of the Royal Borough’s statutory target of 22% for 2003/04. This Strategy sets out how the Council plans to achieve a step change in its recycling rate so that it can achieve its statutory target of 33% household recycling for 2005/06, and then improve on that.
61. Appendix A sets out estimates of the weight and composition of the household waste stream, and of the current and required patterns of residents’ participation in recycling. The conclusions that the Council has drawn from these estimates are summarised below.

Conclusions from analysis of waste and recycling data

62. The Council concludes that it must achieve the following in order to meet its statutory recycling target:
- The LPSA target on participation seems to have been delivered early, but participating residents need to be pushed up “the recycling ladder”: “medium” recyclers need to become “high” recyclers; “low” recyclers need to become “medium” recyclers.
 - All participating residents must be persuaded to intensify their recycling effort; all categories of recycler need to put out even more material.
 - It is essential to improve the rate of recycling from mansion and tower blocks, as this is where recycling rates are lowest.
 - The capture of recyclables at the kerbside must be significantly increased, and the contamination of recycling loads must be significantly reduced.
 - Significantly more recycling material must be captured from “non-dustbin” sources such as street litter and schools waste.
 - Significant quantities of kitchen and other organic wastes must be diverted from the household waste stream.

Actions in response to the analysis

63. The Council plans the following actions in response to its conclusions from the data about recycling.

i) A brand new Recycling Campaign.

64. The Council's Media and Communications Office has commissioned an advertising agency to produce a fundamentally new publicity programme to promote the theme of responsible waste management within the Royal Borough. The campaign – which will be consistent with the RRWR campaign - will be launched in early Autumn 2004. It will highlight recycling, and aim to increase participation and to push participants up the recycling ladder. In addition to complementing the RRWR campaign, we will look for synergies with the forthcoming campaigns by the GLA and the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP). The campaign programme will be appended to this Strategy as a daughter document once it is complete.

ii) A permanent team of Recycling Wardens.

65. The Council obtained funding from the London Recycling Fund (LRF) for a team of Recycling Wardens to promote recycling during 2003/04, but was disappointed to have a bid for funding for a further year rejected. The Council has asked bidders for its next recycling and waste contract to set out operational plans and costs for a permanent team of five Wardens to be employed from April 2005 onwards. With training support from RRWR, this will provide the Council with the long-term capacity to deliver its recycling campaign messages, to increase participation, and to develop special projects in areas of poor recycling performance.

iii) Mansion block recycling.

66. The Council has agreed with its partners in RRWR to launch a new approach to recycling in private mansion blocks, mobilising residents' associations and managing agents in the biggest blocks to use orange recycling bags. Preparatory work is underway and the launch will take place in the Autumn of 2004.

iv) Tower block recycling.

67. The Council has commissioned a trial of doorstep collections in a housing estate of 600 households. The trial is being conducted by Kensington and Chelsea Community Recycling Ltd. It is not proving to be at all cost-effective using KCCR's standard business model, but in Autumn 2004 the Council will take over, sustain, and extend the scheme using much cheaper collection methods. The Council will take full account of the forthcoming guide to best practice being drafted by RRWR.

v) "Blue bin" recycling.

68. The Council has installed many local "bring" facilities for residents in flats served by communal waste collection points. The current network comprises 305 blue recycling bins on just over 200 sites. The Council has set itself the target of providing blue recycling bins for mixed recyclables, or single stream paper bins where noise problems prevent the collection of glass, at an additional 100 blocks of flats by the end of 2005/06. To "close the loop" the Council will specify the use of recycled materials in the manufacture of new recycling bins.

vi) More bring sites.

69. The Council already has 24 mini-recycling centres on the highway collecting a wide range of materials. Growth in this network has been constrained by the difficulty of finding new sites that do not obstruct the borough's busy highways or cause nuisance to nearby residents. It is a priority for the Council to overcome barriers to growth by testing the acceptability of new, more attractive designs and new methods of sound reduction. The Council aims to introduce many more single stream paper bins on the highway, with a target that no resident should be more than 175 metres from a paper recycling facility by 2008/09.
70. One feature of the job description of the Council's North Kensington Environment Manager – a new post backed by the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund – is to upgrade recycling facilities to make them more attractive.

vii) Promoting the use of orange recycling sacks.

71. All four Boroughs in the Western Riverside Partnership are committed to using and promoting semi-transparent orange sacks to collect dry recyclables. The Council will greatly expand the accessibility and use of orange sacks in order to help residents collect larger quantities of recyclables, to help the recycling crews recognise recyclable waste, and to encourage a form of neighbourly peer pressure on residents who are not recycling.
72. The Council does not support the universal free distribution of orange sacks on the grounds that this is inefficient and wasteful and that it encourages their abuse. However the Council will always sell orange sacks to residents and local businesses at a cheaper rate than black refuse sacks.
73. By the Autumn of 2004 the Council aims to have increased four-fold the number of sale points for orange sacks, and will expand the network even further during 2005/06. The Council will test the feasibility of incentivising local retailers to act as points of sale from April 2005 onwards. We have asked RRWR to help us with this and other ideas to expand the efficient distribution of orange sacks. We would like to see orange sacks available in supermarkets too; we will approach their Directors and ask them for their practical support.
74. The Council recognises that many residents have very limited space inside their homes, and that this can make it difficult to keep their recyclables and non-recyclables separate. The Council's UDP policy PU11 requires the provision of storage space for waste collection and recycling in all appropriate developments. We will work with the Planning and Conservation Business Group to ensure the optimum practical implementation of this policy. We will also aim to apply this principle to refurbishments and refits where Planning controls do not apply. In particular, we will work with the Tenant Management Organisation and RSLs to ensure that their tenants can store their recyclables easily outside their homes.

viii) Improving performance by the recycling crews.

75. The Council seeks two types of improvement in the performance of its contractor's recycling crews. The first is a higher rate of capture of recyclable material at the kerbside. The second is a lower rate of contamination of the collected recyclables.
76. To achieve this the Council has included the following requirements in its specification for recycling services from April 2005 on: the contractor to employ a Waste Reduction and Recycling Co-ordinator; the contractor to deploy a recycling charge hand on each collection round with promotional and supervisory responsibilities; collection crews to be properly trained in recycling methods; the contractor to develop incentive schemes to encourage the crews to optimise recycling performance; a requirement for the separation of recyclable from non-recyclable waste when "pulling up"; a requirement that each recorded "tip" of non-recyclable waste from a split-back vehicle should be matched by a recorded tip of recyclable waste (this is to avoid over-filling the recycling compartment), and disciplinary sanctions against crews persistently failing to collect recyclables properly.
77. WRWA reported that around 8% of the material in the collected recyclable waste stream in 2003/04 could not in fact be recycled. The Council's target is to reduce this figure to below 5%, thus saving around 700 tonnes of material that would otherwise be wasted.

ix) Increasing the capture of "non dustbin" recyclable waste.

78. A significant amount of "household" waste does not come from households putting out waste in dustbins, containers, or bags. Street litter, schools waste, bulky waste, hospital waste, and clinical waste are all defined as "household" waste for the purposes of setting recycling targets, and it will be important to recycle as much of this difficult set of wastes as possible if the statutory target is to be met.
79. The Council has specified in its contract documents that as from April 2005 street sweepers will be required to separate all clean and dry recyclable material from other litter, and to collect it in orange sacks for recycling.
80. The Council has set a target for 2005/06 of installing at least 10 paper-only recycling litterbins near Underground stations to encourage the recycling of commuters' and visitors' newspapers. The Council has set a target for 2005/06 of installing a further 20 single stream bins in parks, aiming to capture materials such as paper and drinks cans.
81. The Council's proposals for service improvement in the collection of bulky waste for re-use have been detailed in the section on waste reduction.
82. Waste produced by schools is the third largest source of non-dustbin household waste in the Royal Borough. The RRWR campaign has already done work in eight schools in the Borough, and our recycling team has visited many more to offer a range of information and practical support on improving the recycling of schools waste. Currently 21 of the 72 maintained and private schools in the borough have blue bin collections. The Council has set a target of doubling this during 2005/06, looking to both the maintained and private sectors for growth. The Council will continue to work closely with RRWR on this issue.
83. RRWR is working with the National Health Service to increase the proportion of its waste that is recycled. If this work is successful we will ask RRWR to extend it to NHS buildings in the Royal Borough.

x) Removing organic waste from the household waste stream.

Promotion of green waste collection

84. Home composting is preferable to municipal collection of green waste for composting. However, the Council recognises that some of our residents do not want to produce their own compost, or are unable to compost all of the green waste that they produce. A green waste collection service for composting has therefore been made available to all residents who want it. The service runs for six months a year from Easter onwards. From April 2005 the Council will make permanent and seek to extend its garden waste collection scheme. The Council's target is to capture an additional 600 tonnes of garden waste for composting by 2005/06 and an additional 1000 tonnes by 2008/09.

Diversion of kitchen waste

85. Other organic waste removed from the household waste stream cannot always be counted as "recycling". However policies to divert this waste are important to ensure compliance with the EU Landfill Directive and will reduce the total household waste stream – the denominator in the calculation of the Council's recycling rate.
86. The Western Riverside Partnership's Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS) was conceived within the very heavy constraints placed on the processing of food waste before and since the publication of the Animal By-Products Regulations 2003. The JMWMS focuses on dry recyclables and there is currently no processing capacity through Western Riverside for any "wet" food waste that the Council could separate from its waste stream.
87. One of the Council's partner authorities within the Western Riverside Partnership – the London Borough of Lambeth - has been running a pilot food-composting scheme in 500 households for several months, and reports that it seems feasible to divert an average of 120kg of such waste per household per year – figures consistent with findings in Bexley, and with the Council's own waste analysis in Appendix A.
88. The great difficulty faced within the Royal Borough is the lack of front garden spaces to store this very problematic waste stream in hard containers that are resistant to rats, mice, and other vermin. The Council is working in partnership with RRWR to develop a feasibility study for a trial separation and collection of residents' food waste in the north-west of the borough – an area where over 70% of properties do have front gardens, and which is close to land that could house an in-vessel composter. The Council will seek external funding, possibly in conjunction with another borough, for an in-vessel composter that could render this waste safe.
89. In principle food waste could be disposed of through the sewerage system - macerators fitted under kitchen sinks are standard in the City of London's Barbican flats. This system would reduce the weight of waste that the Council must collect. However the Council must take account of the environmental implications of the treatment of this waste through the sewage processing system. If this waste could be composted, this might be a sustainable means of dealing with a significant and difficult fraction of the waste stream. The Council will seek technical advice on whether the balance of environmental advantages and disadvantages would warrant developing a scheme to subsidise the installation of food waste macerators.

Recycling tonnage to be obtained from each initiative

90. Appendix B sets out in summary form the predicted increase in recycling tonnage to be obtained from each initiative. The total increase in recycling required and expected from all the initiatives set out above is just over 10,000 tonnes.

Other “non-targeted” waste

91. Although the Council's statutory recycling target is concerned only with household waste, we want to maximise the proportion of commercial waste that is recycled. Currently, the Council's commercial waste customers are offered a significant financial incentive to separate as many of their recyclables as possible for collection. Sacks for ordinary commercial waste cost £1.20 each. This is nearly four times more expensive than orange sacks for recyclable commercial waste, currently charged at 34 pence. However take-up is poor, and misuse of the recycling bags is prevalent, in part because the Council's present franchisee has wound down the local sales team that could have delivered the strong messages and advice needed alongside the financial incentive.
92. From April 2005 the Council will take back the management of its commercial waste portfolio, and recreate a new sales team, with a brief to encourage commercial customers to recycle as much of their waste as possible. The North Kensington Environment Manager will be expected to help with this in his patch.

Internal waste minimisation programme

93. Working closely with RRWR, the Council is increasing the recycled proportion of its own waste by taking its “desk recycling system” to all of its major office buildings. Under this system, the usual roles of ordinary bins and recycling bins are reversed, so that staff can place recyclables in a recycling bin at their desk, but must get up to place non-recyclables in ordinary bins. This scheme has recently been expanded with assistance from RRWR.
94. The Council has also launched a new toner recycling scheme linked to charities – donations go to various charities for each toner recycled. A new CD recycling scheme has been introduced within Council offices to provide a better disposal route for the increasing number of “junk” or unsolicited CDs; if this is a success the Council will explore ways of extending the scheme to residents and local businesses. The programme will also include paper and cup reduction campaigns to be rolled out from Summer 2004.

EFFICIENT AND RELIABLE WASTE COLLECTION (OBJECTIVE 3)

Introduction

95. This Strategy and Action Plan was produced concurrently with the specification for the new recycling and waste collection contract that will begin in April 2005. This followed the extensive consultation associated with the Royal Borough Review in 2003, consultation with Members and residents about what the next contract should specify, and in depth consultation with the waste industry about what service improvements could be delivered at a realistic price. Details of our consultation and research activity are shown in Appendix C.
96. The consultation showed that hardly any residents were prepared to accept a reduction in the frequency of recycling and waste collections. Nor was there much enthusiasm for increasing the number of waste collections at night. The overall message from consultation was that we should maintain the core characteristics of the existing service.
97. For many Royal Borough residents, perhaps the most important objective for local waste management is to provide as unobtrusive a refuse collection service as possible. Notwithstanding the Council's efforts to encourage residents to think about and reduce their waste, our ambition is to ensure that day-to-day waste collection services operate effectively without causing harm to the environment or residential amenity.
98. This means that:
- residents should not be disturbed unduly by noise from collections, or by collections made during anti-social hours;
 - residents should find no spillages of waste after a collection;
 - residents' waste should be collected when they expect it to be;
 - the time that bagged waste is left on the highway should be kept to the absolute minimum necessary;
 - harmful emissions from refuse vehicles should be minimised.

Delivering an unobtrusive collection service

99. The Council receives relatively few complaints about messy crews or missed collections. We believe that this is due to the quality of our contract monitoring and of the collection crews themselves. It also demonstrates the benefit of running an integrated refuse collection and street cleansing service: if crews fail or are unable to deal with any spillages after a collection, it is down to their managers and colleagues to sort it out, not down to staff in another company.
100. The specification for the next integrated waste contract places a great emphasis on training and motivation of crews to ensure that they minimise noise and disruption to residents: we want collection crews and street sweepers alike to take pride in the fact that they are 'ambassadors' for the whole Council. The specification sets high standards for responding to any complaints about missed collections and spillages. It requires that pulled up waste should on average sit on the highway for no more than 30 minutes before collection. It requires integrated complaint management, with the contractor sharing the Council's information system and making provision for secondments to any future contact

centre the Council may set up. It warns the contractor that – in addition to routine contract monitoring - the Council will conduct sample surveys from time to time to test compliance with all these requirements.

101. The Council will redesign and improve its local performance indicators on complaints, setting new standards from April 2005 on. The Council aims to achieve continuous improvement thereafter, seeking at least a 20% reduction in justified complaints about waste collection services in 2008/09, measured against the 2005/06 baseline.

Refuse collection vehicles and air quality

102. Working in partnership with WRWA to transport waste by river is probably the Council's single most significant contribution to improving London's air quality. However the environmental performance of the contractor's refuse fleet is of particular local importance.
103. The whole of the Royal Borough has been designated an Air Quality Management Area. The specification for the next contract includes a lengthy extract from the Council's Air Quality Management Plan, setting out a series of onerous expectations on the contractor. These requirements will reduce the immediate nuisance of smoky emissions, and the less obvious risks to health associated with small particulates.

The environmental benefits of improved commercial waste collection

104. The Council wants commercial waste collection in the Borough to be as sustainable as possible and to further its aspirations for a better street environment. The Council's resumption of its direct management of the commercial waste portfolio will greatly increase our influence over the manner and timing of commercial waste presentation and help reduce its impact on the streetscene. It will also help reduce late-night noise nuisance to residents living near commercial premises. To achieve these environmental objectives the Council must provide a first-class service business that is the natural first port of call for any local enterprise wanting to have its waste collected.
105. Expanding the Council's share of the local commercial waste market will have benefits in terms of reducing the number of non-municipal refuse vehicle movements. It is significantly more sustainable environmentally to have one truck collecting recyclables and waste from all businesses in a street than to have many vehicles servicing individual businesses scattered throughout the borough.

Continuous improvement in “customer” satisfaction

106. The Royal Borough Review of Waste Management included a benchmarking survey of customer care and customer satisfaction. The conclusions from that survey were that – although there was evidence of real strength in many areas - there was a need to refresh some aspects of the service, particularly in relation to the management of bulky waste. Since then the standardised customer satisfaction survey has been conducted for the 2003/04 round of Best Value Performance Indicators. The results are set out below, together with the Council's targets and timetable for improving customer satisfaction:

Indicator	Description	2003/04 result	2006/07 target
BVPI 89	Percentage of people satisfied with cleanliness in their area	68%	75%
BVPI 90a	Percentage of people expressing satisfaction with household waste collection	72%	78%
BVPI 90b	Percentage of people expressing satisfaction with waste recycling	45%	55%

107. The implementation of this Strategy, and the service enhancements planned in the next waste management and cleansing contract, provide real grounds for confidence that these targets for improvement in customer satisfaction can be met or exceeded. In addition, customers will benefit from our determination to increase the public accessibility of our services.

108. Customer satisfaction with waste management services is not measured only by the national performance indicators described above. Consultation with customers is part of the routine of the Waste Management Division. Every month we ring a sample of customers to test their satisfaction with the service. Courtesy (from Council and the contractor's staff), speed of response, and effectiveness are all tested. In the period August 2003 to May 2004 inclusive the results show that 39% of those sampled said the service they had received was "excellent"; 41% said it was good; 11% said it was average; and 9% said it was poor. The Council has set a local target that in 2005/06 at least 45% should find the service excellent, and fewer than 5% should find it poor.

EXCEPTIONALLY CLEAN AND UNCLUTTERED STREETS (OBJECTIVE 4)

Introduction

109. The Council is convinced that a high quality street environment is essential to ensure community safety and economic vitality. The Council wants residents and visitors to enjoy the Royal Borough's streets, and to feel safe in them. The Council does not want pedestrians to have to negotiate an obstacle course of litter, refuse sacks, dumped bulky waste, grease from commercial waste, dog faeces, A-boards, builders' materials, and unlicensed tables and chairs. The consultation reported in the Royal Borough Review found that residents identified litter, dumped bags, builders' waste, and dog fouling as very high priorities for action by the Council.
110. The Council is determined that its streets should be noticeably cleaner than the streets in other inner urban areas. Our aspiration is that any resident returning to their home from a trip outside the borough should immediately notice that the standard of cleanliness is higher here than in the place from which they have just come.
111. The new Best Value Performance Indicator 199 grades streets into four main categories of cleanliness. The national standard is that no more than 30% of streets should be below grade B, the second highest of these grades. We are pleased that we meet these standards comfortably - in 2003/04 only 18% of our streets fell below grade B – but we want to achieve still better results. We aim to keep our streets spotless by setting exceptionally high standards, and by funding the level of street cleansing needed to meet those standards. The Council will also develop imaginative ways of persuading – or requiring - residents, businesses and visitors to avoid creating street waste in the first place. The way the Council will achieve these goals is set out below.

Setting exceptionally high standards

112. The specification for street cleansing in the Council's integrated waste management contract is strictly output-based, and is exceptionally demanding.
113. The Council will require its contractor to cleanse all streets so that they are Grade A standard as defined by the National Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse – that is, 'No litter or refuse'. Any of the shopping streets that fall below this standard at any time must be restored to Grade A within one hour. In effect, this specification requires 24 hour sweeping of these streets.
114. Any residential street that falls below grade A standard during the daytime must be restored to grade A within a maximum of two hours, and normally within one hour.
115. These standards greatly exceed the requirements of the National Code, but they reflect the expectations of residents that their streets shall be very clean at all times. Meeting these expectations requires the Council to pay for a relatively large workforce of street sweepers, but we are proud that we give such a high priority to street cleansing.

LPSA target on the quality of public space

116. The Council set itself even more stretching targets for street cleansing in its Local Public Service Agreement with the Government (the LPSA). As part of the LPSA, the Council has a target by 2005/06 to improve levels of street cleanliness in the north of the Borough by 30% and by 20% in the rest of the Borough – 2003/04 is the baseline, and BVPI 199 results will be used as the method of measurement. The Council is spending an additional £500,000 per year to achieve this, deploying four additional sweeping teams, and a new street washing team.

Gum removal

117. Discarded chewing gum is spoiling the Royal Borough's high quality pavements, especially in shopping streets. But high-pressure washing is damaging the grouting and pavement surfaces, to the extent that new technologies may need to be found to remove gum. The Council has asked bidders for the next waste contract to make proposals to solve this problem. The Council will also lobby the Government hard to persuade gum manufacturers to produce gum that is either degradable or more easily removable.

Grease and stains from commercial premises

118. We know that residents and visitors alike are appalled by unsightly grease and liquid stains on shopping streets. We will redouble our efforts to encourage businesses to take responsibility for the cleanliness of their pavement frontage. We already include strict rules about cleansing regimes in licences for tables and chairs on the highway, and we want to promote a similar commitment to cleansing from the managers of all commercial premises.

Tackling the 'black bag' problem

119. Residents with no external waste storage, who have to place their refuse on the street for collection, are asked to do so by 7 o'clock on the morning of their collection day – not the night before.

120. The 'black bag problem' occurs because refuse bags are placed out at the wrong time: either after a collection has been made, or not on a collection day at all. In some cases, bags are dumped deliberately or recklessly. Enforcement officers have opened bags and found that names and addresses have been torn out of mail so as to avoid identification and prosecution. We believe that the cause of most domestic black bag dumping is probably ignorance of the local rules around waste presentation. But this ignorance may sometimes be a product of carelessness – the dumper may not know what was expected because he or she did not bother to find out.

121. Ignorance is perhaps more understandable among people who have just moved home, and the areas of the borough with the greatest dumping problems tend to be the areas with the greatest population turnover. But the scale of the problem indicates that in some areas more established residents are also placing out their refuse at the wrong times. In a few parts of the Borough there seems to be evidence of the 'broken window' effect. Some residents seem to take their cue from what they see on the street, and one bag out on the wrong day quickly leads to a profusion of bags. Some hotspot enforcement exercises have picked up as many as 1700 black bags dumped on the street over a two week period in a relatively small area.
122. The Council's response to the black bag problem is two-fold: education and enforcement. Until recently we have been significantly stronger on the latter than on the former. In future the Council will be clearer that responsibility for the street-scene is not just the Council's problem: residents must help.

Education and advice

123. The best way of improving the cleanliness of our streets is to stop them getting dirty in the first place. The Council can and does use enforcement action to deter certain kinds of behaviour that spoil the street-scene, but in many cases detection and enforcement is impractical. Often education and communication have greater potential to stop the problem at source.
124. Surveys conducted by third parties during the Royal Borough Review showed that the Council needed to refresh public awareness of enforcement and other waste services; the Audit Commission's inspection report repeated this message. The Council's new publicity programme, promoting the theme of responsible waste management within the Royal Borough, is being developed in response to these recommendations for change.
125. One of the priorities of the Council's new recycling and waste Communications Strategy is to develop more effective ways of explaining to residents how they should put out their waste. The Communications Strategy is likely to include:
- the creation of a new immediately recognisable waste management "brand" to aid marketing of our message
 - improved on-street signage, using high quality materials, advertising collection days and times for the street;
 - regular frequent communication with managing agents and landlords, aimed at helping them transmit the message about responsible recycling and waste management to their new tenants;
 - improved working with landlords, managing agents, residents' and tenants' associations to communicate messages about waste presentation;
 - suitable posters or signs about collection times inside the communal areas of flats;
 - a more imaginative use of non-textual communication methods, so that residents are not expected to read antiquated municipal prose in order to get the message ("The placing out of refuse sacks is strictly prohibited. By order...etc.").

126. The Communications Strategy will promote a theme of civic pride and personal responsibility, reminding all residents, visitors, and businesses to keep our streets clean. By way of example, this is likely to include:

- using the Metropolitan Police's 'Junior Citizen' programme to promote positive messages to children;
- 'Welcome to the Royal Borough' signs at major gateways into the Borough, which stress that this is a 'no-litter' zone;
- publicity that challenges popular excuses for dropping litter.

127. The Council's emphasis will be on developing a sustained message that everyone should respect and take pride in a beautiful area.

Enforcement

128. The Council's waste enforcement section includes a team that is dedicated to tackling black bags on the highway. Officers in this team operate all over the Borough, but each has a designated postcode area in which they spend most of their time. This approach allows them to build up local knowledge and to take a proactive approach to problems.

129. By mapping complaints on its Geographical Information System, the Council is able to identify particular hotspots in the borough where waste dumping is a frequent occurrence. These hotspot areas are targeted for enforcement action, and officers spend more time on their known problem areas than on one-off reports of a single dumped bag. However, officers do not limit their attention to the established problem areas; the Council wants to ensure that dumping in new areas is 'nipped in the bud' before they become hotspots.

130. The Council has recently adopted a revised Enforcement Policy for Waste Management and Highways offences. This sets out the purpose and style of the Council's enforcement, placing an emphasis on a robust common sense approach geared to local needs.

131. We will increase the 'reach' of our Enforcement operation by working more closely with the Parking Operations Division and by extending the hours of Enforcement activity.

Problem-solving

132. While tough enforcement is an important part of our response to dumped waste on the street, we also aim to help solve genuine problems. In some cases, we have found that residents are placing their refuse on the street instead of in designated waste storage areas because these storage areas have been poorly maintained, and become unattractive or infested.

133. The Council has started work with local housing associations, offering advice, persuasion, and some financial support to improve the physical condition and the 'feel' of their waste storage areas: rat-proofing, better lighting, and so on. As part of this, the Council has already improved signage explaining to people when and where to place their refuse. This approach appears to have been successful, and we see the early successes as a model of best practice for future work with private managing agents and landlords, and with Registered Social Landlords. In addition, the Waste Management Division will work more closely with colleagues in Environmental Health and Housing to take advantage of the links that they have built with local landlords.

Changes to refuse collection rounds

134. The point of twice weekly waste collection is to reduce the temptation or “need” to dump waste that cannot be stored for a full week inside the borough’s many flats. However, because domestic waste is collected only on weekdays, people with a collection on a Wednesday must have their other collection on a Monday or Friday, with the result that they still have a five-day gap between collections. If collections were made on Saturdays, no one would have more than a four-day gap, thus reducing the amount of waste indoors, and reducing the temptation to dump it on the street.
135. The Council has asked bidders for the next waste contract to offer alternative prices: one for weekday domestic collections as now, and one for a six-day service.

Preventing bulky waste dumping

136. In the Royal Borough, around half of all households do not have access to a car, and this restricts their access to WRWA’s civic amenity sites. Even fewer households have adequate outside space in which to store unwanted bulky waste. A responsive and reliable bulky waste collection service for our residents is therefore a vital tool in reducing dumping on the street.
137. The implications for the Council of the new WEEE Directive are not yet clear. They may mean that residents are better able to dispose of unwanted electrical items through retailers’ own schemes. In any event, the Council wants to reduce waiting times for its existing ‘Too big for the bin’ service. 55% of the Residents’ Panel said they would be prepared to pay more to reduce waiting times for this service, and the Council has asked bidders for the next waste contract to offer prices for significantly improved levels of service.

Abandoned vehicles

138. In the past the Royal Borough has had far fewer abandoned vehicles to deal with than most London boroughs, but the Council is still determined to reduce the problem to a minimum. The Council has joined the Association of London Government’s London-wide free take-back scheme for unwanted vehicles. An increasing number of residents are voluntarily surrendering their vehicles, and there is early evidence of a reduction in the number of vehicles being abandoned. The Council intends to sign a Service Level Agreement with the ALG to ensure that all abandoned vehicles are removed from the highway within 72 hours of being reported.

MONITORING THE STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN

139. The Council will monitor the progress of this Strategy and Action Plan.

140. First the Council will use the existing system of regular performance reporting to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Health, Leisure and Waste Management. This will include concurrent performance reporting to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Environmental Services, Environmental Health and Planning Policy. We will expand the scope of the existing reports to include new input measures – such as the increase in recycling infrastructure – as well as new outcome measures to monitor progress against the targets set out in this Strategy.

141. The Council will also conduct an annual review of the Strategy and Action Plan, updating the document so that it does not go stale.

FUNDING THE STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN

142. The initiatives set out in this Strategy and Action Plan will cost a significant amount of new money. Unfortunately – because the Council is in the middle of tendering for the next waste management contract – the Council's estimate of the prices of several initiatives cannot be disclosed in this Strategy as this could well distort the procurement process. The budget has instead been circulated as a confidential document to Members of the Council's Cabinet.
143. However it can be said here that the budget growth required to generate the required increase in recycling tonnage is of the order of £1 million a year for the next five years. This in turn implies an additional cost of around £100 a year for each tonne of recyclable material added to the current annual total. Broadly speaking, this would push the total cost of recycling in the Royal Borough up from just under £1 million a year to around £2 million.
144. This growth cannot be funded solely from internal resources without prejudicing other public service objectives. The Council must embark on an urgent and intensive effort to secure part-funding for this package of initiatives, seeking assistance from the EU, from national government, and from the RRWR campaign.
145. Between September and December 2004, the budget for the Strategy and Action Plan will be submitted to the Cabinet as part of the Council's overall budget-making process for 2005/06 and beyond.

APPENDIX A

1. How much of the Royal Borough's waste could be recycled?

The table below sets out the Council's best estimate of the weight and composition of the Royal Borough's household waste stream in 2003/04. The table is derived from a sample analysis of the typical Royal Borough dustbin conducted when the Recycling Strategy was prepared in 2000.

Table 1: Composition of household waste in RBKC (2003/04)

Dustbin, container and bag waste	%	Tonnes
Paper and card	42	22441
Plastics	7	3740
Textiles	2	1069
Glass	11	5878
Metals	2	1069
Organic matter	27	14427
Miscellaneous	9	4809
Total dustbin, container and bag waste	100	53432
Street sweepings less detritus		3004
Parks waste		495
Bulky collections		1437
School waste		580
Hospital waste		238
Clinical waste		4
TOTAL HOUSEHOLD WASTE STREAM		59190

The dry recyclable waste stream: "dustbin" waste and "non-dustbin" waste

WRWA's Joint Municipal Waste Strategy is premised on a "dry" recycling scheme, and does not provide at present for the collection and processing of kitchen wastes. The table below shows that the total accessible "dry" recyclable waste stream in the Royal Borough is made up of two distinct types of waste: "dustbin" waste, where the Council is dependent on residents to separate and present the recyclable material, and "non-dustbin" waste over which the Council or its contractors have more control.

An estimate of the weight of potentially recoverable dustbin waste is set out in Table 2a:

Table 2a: Composition of the recoverable, dry recyclable waste stream in RBKC 2003/04 (waste that must be separated by residents)

Material	
Dustbin/container/bag waste	Tonnes
Paper and card	22441
Plastics	3740
Textiles	1069
Glass	5878
Metals	1069
Sub-total	34197

An estimate of the weight of potentially recoverable non-dustbin waste is set out in Table 2b:

Table 2b: Composition of the recoverable, dry recyclable waste stream in RBKC 2003/04 (waste that could be extracted for recycling by the efforts of the Council or its contractors)

Material	
Non-dustbin waste	Tonnes
Litter and sweepings	750
Parks waste	200
Bulky waste	480
School waste	210
Sub-total	1640

Table 2b comprises a set of assumptions about what could be recovered from each of these “non-dustbin” household waste streams if a real effort was made by the Council to change collection systems to improve capture rates.

The estimated total of dry household waste that could be recovered for recycling is therefore **35,837 tonnes**. This comprises around 60% of the total household waste stream.

Assuming no growth in household waste by 2005/06, the Council needs to capture and process 33% of the total household waste stream – 19,533 tonnes. This is around 55% of the total dry waste stream that could potentially be recovered for recycling.

2. How many residents are recycling now? How many will need to recycle if the Council is to hit its target?

There have been seven recent pieces of research into participation in recycling in the Royal Borough. These have given participation figures ranging enormously from 43% to 73%.

Table 3: Claimed participation rates in RBKC surveys 2000 - 2004

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Recycling Roadshow – people who say they recycle	44%				73%
Residents' Panel - People who say they recycle at least once a month		55%			
MORI - people who recycle everything or a lot			43%	50%	
Residents' Panel - people who say they recycle				63%	69%

This variability must to some extent be a product of variability in the populations surveyed, and in the precise questions asked. Nevertheless the increase in the participation recorded by the Roadshow is very striking, since a determined effort was made in 2004 to reproduce the methodology used in 2000. The issue, though, is the real underlying meaning of the answer “Yes, I do recycle.” There is strong evidence that respondents to surveys systematically exaggerate the extent of their recycling – a phenomenon known as “over-claiming”.

The Brook Lyndhurst study (2004) into recycling behaviour in London classified claimed household recycling behaviour as follows:

Table 4: Claimed participation in recycling in London 2004

	% of households recycling
High recyclers	24
Medium recyclers	27
Low recyclers	27
Non recyclers	22
	100

This result is not too distant from the local participation surveys conducted by MORI in 2003, through RRWR. This identified the following distribution of recycling behaviours in the Royal Borough:

Table 5: Claimed participation in recycling in the Royal Borough 2003

	% of households
I recycle everything that can be recycled	19
I recycle a lot but not everything that can be recycled	31
I do not recycle much	32
I do not recycle anything	18
	100

There is a broad consistency here between the Brook Lyndhurst results for London, and the MORI 2003 and Roadshow results for Kensington and Chelsea. In all studies there must be real uncertainty about what “I do not recycle much” really means. Given the strong evidence of over-claiming, it has to be assumed that in reality it means “I recycle very little indeed”. Both studies found around 20% of people admitting to not recycling at all. If this finding is valid, it implies that achieving an increase in participation is not primarily about getting non-recyclers to recycle, but about greatly intensifying current recycling behaviour. This known as pushing people up “the recycling ladder”. This, then, is the theme of the analysis below, and it is accepted that there will always be an irreducible core of around 20% non-participants who cannot be induced to recycle anything at all.

The definitions behind the Brook Lyndhurst classification (high, medium, low) are virtually identical to the MORI 2003 categories used in the local study. The high, medium, low categorisation is therefore adopted in the analysis below for convenience, while the numbers from MORI 2003 (including the 18% non-participation rate) are used in preference to the Brook Lyndhurst figures because they are local.

Working back from the actual tonnage recycled in the Royal Borough in 2003/04, the MORI 2003 numbers provide a reasonably sound basis for estimating the likely participation and presentation rates among the Royal Borough’s recyclers in 2003/04. The total includes residues (just over 8% of recyclable waste presented), and excludes an estimated 105 tonnes a year of recyclable school waste (“non-dustbin waste”) that is already being captured:

Table 6: Model of current participation and presentation in RBKC 2003/04

Type of recycler	Number of each type	Estimated annual average recycling presented per household (kg)	Aggregate annual recycling tonnage from each type
High recyclers	16140 (19%)	300	4842
Medium recyclers	26333 (31%)	180	4740
Low recyclers	27184 (32%)	25	680
Non-participants	15291 (18%)		
TOTAL	84948 (100%)		10262*

* rounding of the estimated average recycling presented slightly understates the actual tonnage achieved, but this has no significant impact on the modelling

What will these numbers have to look like if 33% recycling is to be achieved?

Making an assumption that residues can be reduced to 5% of the recyclable waste presented for collection, a model of the local “recycling ladder” can be developed that would generate the tonnage of recyclables required for the Council to hit its statutory target for 2005/06. It is assumed that the full potential recovery rates for “non-dustbin” waste described in Table 2b have been achieved (750 tonnes of recycled litter; 200 tonnes of parks waste etc):

Table 7: Model of participation and presentation to achieve 33% recycling in RBKC by 2005/06

Type of recycler	Number of each type	Annual recycling presented per household (kg)	Aggregate annual recycling tonnage from each type
High recyclers	20388 (24%)	375	7645
Medium recyclers	29732 (35%)	280	8325
Low recyclers	19538 (23%)	150	2931
Non-participants	15291 (18%)		
TOTAL	84948 (100%)		18901

The challenge facing the Council can be expressed as follows. Assuming the models in tables 6 and 7 are reasonable approximations of current reality and the requirement in future, the Council needs to persuade the following numbers of households to climb the recycling ladder:

Table 8a: Ascending “the recycling ladder” by 2005/06 (a model)

Recycling status of household	Households in 2003/04	Households in 2005/06
High	16140	20388
Medium	26333	29732
Low	27184	19538
Non-participants	15291	15291
Total	84948	84948

The Council also needs to persuade each type of recycler to intensify their efforts. That is, not only does the Council need more households to become “high” and “medium” recyclers; it also needs to change the meaning of “high” “medium” and “low” recycling such that the tonnages each type of household are presenting for recycling are much greater than they are now.

Table 8b: Increasing presentation rates by 2005/06 (a model)

Recycling status of household	Average annual presentation in 2003/04 (kg)	Average annual presentation required in 2005/06 (kg)	Required increase in annual average presentation (kg)
High	300	375	75
Medium	180	280	100
Low	25	150	125

3. Sources of household waste and recycling in the Royal Borough

An analysis of the sources of household waste and recycling gives some indication of where this growth can be found.

Combining Census 2001 and 2004 Council tax data provides a good estimate of the distribution of households among different housing types:

Table 9: Housing types in the Royal Borough 2004

Household accommodation	%	Council tax payers 2003/04
Single dwelling houses	16.9	14356
Flats in purpose built blocks	44.8	38057
Flats in conversions; bedsits	35.7	30326
Other	2.5	2124
	100	84948

The best estimate of the distribution of the sources of household recycling in **2002/03** is as follows:

Table 10: Sources of household recyclables 2002/03

Collection methods	%	Total post residues household tonnage*
Kerbside in split-backs	72	5484
Blue bins	12	914
Mini centres	12	914
Other	4	305
	100	7616

* the kerbside figure is accurate; the accuracy of the estimated split between blue bins and mini-centres will be improved in 2004/05 once the vehicles completely specialise on each recycling stream

This estimate shows a marked difference in the quantity of recycling collected from the kerbside and that collected from bulk bins. These recycling figures need to be set against the total waste tonnage collected at the kerbside and that collected from mansion and tower blocks in bulk bins.

The weighbridge figures for both kerbside and bulk bin vehicles include co-mingled commercial and household waste, and estimates of the proportion of commercial waste in each type of vehicle have had to be applied to derive estimates of the total household tonnage collected. (The estimates used are consistent with WRWA data.)

Table 11: Estimates of recycling rates supplied by different sources 2002/03

Household waste type	Non-recycled (tonnes)	Recycled (tonnes)	Total (tonnes)	% recycled
Kerbside collections + non TMO bulky waste	25779	5484	31263	18
Bulk bin collections + TMO bulky waste	15539	914	16453	6

The conclusion must be that the biggest scope for growth in recycling lies in the bulk bin sector, ie in capturing recyclables from residents who use communal waste facilities and live in purpose built mansion blocks and tower blocks.

APPENDIX B

Estimating the additional recycling tonnage the Council will achieve

The following pages give the Council's best estimate of the additional recycling tonnage that we expect to achieve by implementing the actions described in the Strategy. To avoid double-counting, the additional tonnage attributed to the media campaign and the work of the wardens relates only to those households that will intensify their use of the existing recycling infrastructure. Estimates of the impact of the use of new infrastructure (for example, much more widely available orange recycling sacks or the additional paper bins) are set out separately.

The tonnage calculations are derived by measuring the likely increase in recycling participation intensity (high, medium, and low) that we expect to see as a result of each of the actions. The figures on current and required participation and presentation levels are taken from Appendix A. To recap, the Strategy aims both to move households up the recycling ladder (from low to medium, and medium to high) and to increase the average tonnage from each category of household as shown in the table below. The Strategy assumes that current participation intensity is higher than average in houses and converted flats, but lower in tower and mansion blocks.

	2003/04	2005/06
High	19% @ 300kg per h'hld	24% @ 375kg per h'hld
Medium	31% @ 180kg per h'hld	35% @ 280kg per h'hld
Low	32% @ 25kg per h'hld	23% @ 150kg per h'hld
Non-participants	18%	18%

In the following pages, calculations of predicted tonnage for each specific action or scheme are made to the nearest tonne. This implies a degree of precision that cannot be guaranteed. Recognising this, the figures carried forward to the total (those in the right hand column) are rounded up or down to the nearest 50.

- 1. Media campaign and wardens:** increased awareness and motivation of residents who are prompted to increase their use of existing collections, without taking advantage of any of the new recycling services included in this Strategy. There are 45000 households in houses and converted flats.

Assumptions:

That the media campaign will positively affect the recycling behaviour of a third of these households (15,000).

That participation intensity in these households is **above** average

We can achieve the following shift in participation intensity:

3% more high level participants	401 tonnes
2% more medium level participants	573 tonnes
5% fewer low level participants, putting out many more recyclables	408 tonnes
Total additional tonnage	1382 tonnes

1400

2. Mansion block scheme

Assumptions

That we will target 120 mansion blocks

That each block has an average of 70 households

This gives a target population of 8400 households

That participation intensity is **below** average

We can achieve the following shift in participation intensity:

19 % more high level participants	630 tonnes
20 % more medium level participants	596 tonnes
39 % fewer low level participants, putting out many more recyclables	160 tonnes
Total additional tonnage	1386 tonnes

1400

3. Tower block scheme

Assumptions:

That we will target 2000 households

That current participation intensity is below average

We can achieve the following shift in participation intensity:

24 % more high level participants	180 tonnes
25 % more medium level participants	160 tonnes
49 % fewer low level participants, putting out many more recyclables	33 tonnes
Total additional tonnage	373 tonnes

350

4. Orange sack scheme plus media support

We expect that the orange sack scheme will be most effective in moving low and medium recyclers up the recycling ladder. These will include households in all types of building stock, but these figures are in addition to those listed in Item 1 to 3.

Assumptions

That the orange sack scheme will affect 16,500 households

That current participation intensity is below average

That a small number of existing high recyclers will switch to orange sacks and increase their tonnage

We can achieve the following shift in participation intensity:

9% more high level participants	900 tonnes
4% more medium level participants	844 tonnes
13% fewer low level participants, putting out many more recyclables	510 tonnes
Total additional tonnage	2254 tonnes

2250

5. Additional blue bins in estates

Assumptions:

That we will have 200 additional blue bins

That on average, each blue bin collects around 5 tonnes pa

That we will achieve 5 tonnes in sites that are not currently served and in sites that have some bins already

This would mean an additional **1000 tonnes**

1000

6. Additional paper bins

To achieve our ambition that no resident should be more than 200 yards from a paper recycling facility, we would need to have around 200 paper banks in the Borough.

Assumption:

That a paper-only bring site, being smaller, would collect 5 tonnes pa

At 175 metres spacing, (approximately 200 yards) or 200 paper banks, we would achieve an additional **1000 tonnes**

1000

7. Improving crews' performance

Assumption:

That 5% of waste put out for recycling is not placed in the recycling compartment of the refuse trucks.

That we can reduce this to 2%

3% of total current recycling is 300 tonnes

3% of projected future recycling is up to 600 tonnes; say **600 tonnes**

600

8. Food waste scheme

Assumption:

That we can emulate the 120kg per household achieved in Lambeth

That we can service 1000 households in K1 collection round

This would give **120 tonnes**

100

9. Composting scheme

We have set ourselves a target of **600 tonnes** per year

600

ADDITIONAL DUSTBIN WASTE RECYCLING = approx. 8700 tonnes

(8700)

10. "Non-dustbin" waste

- **Schools**

We aim to double the number of schools with blue bins from 21 to 42.

Assumption: each school blue bin produces 5 tonnes of recycling

Additional tonnage would be $21 \times 5 =$ **105 tonnes**

- **Street sweepings**

These amount to 3000 tonnes pa

Assumptions:

That a quarter of sweepings are recyclable

That we will capture 100% of this

Additional tonnage would be 1/4 of 3000 = **750 tonnes**

- **Bulky waste**

We aim to recycle a third of bulky waste.

33% of 1440 tonnes = **480 tonnes**

- **Parks waste**

There are 500 tonnes in total

Assumption:

That we can capture newspapers, cans and bottles

Additional tonnage likely to be around **200 tonnes**

ADDITIONAL NON-DUSTBIN RECYCLING IS 1535 TONNES

1550

ADDITIONAL TOTAL HOUSEHOLD RECYCLING

10,250

APPENDIX C

RECENT CONSULTATION ON RECYCLING AND WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

There have been many surveys, discussion groups and other events over the past few years that have helped shape waste management and recycling policy. These are listed below.

1. The Recycling Roadshow Promotional Campaigns and Research

2000 and 2004 – The Recycling Roadshow asked about the recycling behaviour and attitudes of residents, whilst raising public awareness of and participation in the kerbside recycling service offered by the Council. A team from Kingston University delivered the Roadshow on both occasions, and submitted full research reports to the Council on the results.

2. RBKC Residents' Panel

The Residents' Panel is a broadly representative sample of the Borough's population, selected at random. Members of the Panel agree to answer four questionnaires a year on a wide range of Council issues.

April 2001 – Questions on satisfaction with waste management services, attitudes towards recycling and recycling behaviour.

April 2002 – Questions on residents' views on waste enforcement in the Borough.

July 2003 – Questions on options for the new waste management contract.

October 2003 – Council Tax consultation, asking Panel members their priorities for spending Council tax income. The methods used included questionnaires, young people's focus groups and a deliberative workshop.

November 2003 – Focus group with Panel Members on service options for the new waste management contract.

January 2004 – Questions on recycling behaviour, use of markets and service standards.

3. Residents' Associations

July 2003 – A questionnaire was sent to over 300 Residents' Associations, asking their views on service options for the new waste management contract.

4. Waste Watch – Western Riverside Study

November 2002 and 2003 – MORI was commissioned to conduct a face-to-face survey of over 2000 residents in the WRWA area; 500 of those surveyed lived in the Royal Borough. Residents were questioned on their recycling behaviour and attitudes, as well as their experience of the recycling service. The survey was repeated in 2003.

5. MORI/ODPM BVPI survey

December 2003 – the standard BVPI questionnaire was circulated to a sample of residents including questions on satisfaction with waste and recycling services.

6. ENCAMS Survey

Spring 2002 – the OSC for Environmental Services, Environmental Health and Planning Policy commissioned ENCAMS (formerly the Tidy Britain Group) to do a survey of residents' attitudes to refuse collection and other services.

7. Study into marketing strategies on local recycling.

2002 – An academic research project for an MBA thesis was conducted on recycling behaviour in the Royal Borough.

8. “Listening Event” at the Muslim Cultural Heritage Centre.

October 2002 – The Markets Team set up a stall at the Business Group's Listening Event held at the Muslim Cultural Heritage Centre.

9. Routine in-house customer care surveys.

Every month the Business Support Unit rings a small sample of recent customers to test their satisfaction with the complaints service.

10. The Portobello Management Committee (PMC).

The Division runs the Portobello and Golborne Road Markets jointly with traders and frontagers who are represented on the PMC. The PMC is now an effective forum for continuous consultation between the Council and local traders on all matters affecting the two Markets.

APPENDIX D

GLOSSARY

AQMA	Air Quality Management Area. The Council has declared the whole of the Royal Borough an AQMA because we are likely to exceed national pollution targets. We have produced an Air Quality Action Plan containing several measures to reduce pollution.
Black bag problem	The generic term for the blight of refuse sacks (including supermarket carrier bags as well as binliners) placed on the pavement at the wrong time.
Blue bins	Communal recycling bins provided by the Council in estate and mansion blocks.
BPEO	Best Practicable Environmental Option
Bring sites	See mini-recycling centres and single stream bins
BVPI	Best Value Performance Indicator. The Council is obliged to report its performance to the Government on a number of BVPIs, including several relating to waste. Some of these are used in the Audit Commission's Comprehensive Performance Assessment of local authorities.
Commercial waste	Commercial waste is best defined as every other kind of waste produced in the Royal Borough that is not household waste.
Defra	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. It sets national policies on waste management.
Dustbin waste	A term used in this Strategy to mean the kind of household waste which most people would think of as household waste – ie waste put out by householders for regular collection by the authority, whether in a bin or a bag. Distinct from non-dustbin waste , which is household waste that would not be collected on a routine basis from households.
EfW	Energy from Waste. Sometimes known simply as 'incineration' the burning of waste to provide energy.
EU Landfill Directive	This requires member States to reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste going to landfill to 75 % of 1995 levels by 2010, with further targets thereafter. This has consequences for local waste disposal authorities, which must reduce their own contribution to the national landfill figures or buy 'landfill permits' from those that do.

Household waste	There is some inconsistency in the meaning of this term between different regulations, Acts and the Best Value performance monitoring regime. In this Strategy, household waste is taken as meaning all the waste produced in resident's homes and gardens, but also - perhaps surprisingly - street sweepings, and waste produced in schools, and hospitals. The Strategy also distinguishes between ' dustbin ' and ' non-dustbin ' waste
In-vessel composter	A container in which organic material can be composted at an accelerated rate
JMWMS	The Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy of the Riverside Waste Partnership
Junior Citizen	A Metropolitan Police initiative, supported by the Royal Borough and other partners, aimed at educating local schoolchildren about personal safety and responsibility.
LPSA	Local Public Service Agreement. The Council signed an agreement whereby the Government will provide financial rewards to the Council if it meets a given level of service improvements.
LRF	London Recycling Fund
Mini-recycling centres	Typically these include a number of large recycling bins on the highway or in other public areas, in which people can place items for recycling. They are a type of bring site , along with single stream bins .
MPS	Mailing Preference Service. A service operated on behalf of the direct mail industry. It allows people to reduce the amount of unwanted mail they receive by removing their names from mailing lists used by the industry.
MRF	Materials Recovery Facility – where materials collected as recycling are taken to be separated into waste streams (paper, glass, tin etc) for onward processing. Currently the Royal Borough's recyclables are taken to a MRF in South-East London but in future they are due to be taken to a new MRF in Wandsworth.
Municipal waste	Household and commercial waste that is collected by a waste authority
Non-dustbin waste	A category of household waste that includes street sweepings, clinical waste, schools and parks waste, and bulky waste.
Organic waste	In the Royal Borough, organic waste is predominantly kitchen (food) waste, which is a very difficult type of waste to process for recycling. It also includes garden waste (grass cuttings, leaves, twigs etc).

Pulling up	Collection crews often move refuse from front gardens and vaults to the kerbside before the refuse truck arrives. This is “pulling-up”.
Real nappies	Reuseable nappies. These are a more sustainable alternative to disposable nappies.
Recycling wardens	Officers who work in the local community to promote recycling and waste minimisation
Riverside Waste Partnership	A consortium of four waste collection authorities – LB Hammersmith and Fulham, LB Lambeth, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and Wandsworth Borough Council – and the disposal authority Western Riverside Waste Authority
Royal Borough Review	Formerly known as Best Value Reviews, these are thorough reviews of a service or service which challenge the existing operation and make recommendations for future service delivery. Whereas Best Value Reviews would be audited – leading to a ‘star’ rating – by the Audit Commission, Royal Borough reviews are usually not assessed by the Audit Commission.
RRWR	Rethink Rubbish Western Riverside. A five-year public awareness campaign initiative promoted by WRWA, which aims to increase recycling in the WRWA area.
Single stream recycling bins	Public recycling bins for one material only – typically paper. Being smaller, it is easier to find suitable locations for single stream bins than for mini-recycling centres .
Streetscene	A term used in this Strategy to denote the look of the physical street environment, including the design and quality of the roads and pavements as well as their cleanliness and orderliness.
Too big for the bin	The Council’s bulky waste collection service.
WEEE Directive	The European Union’s Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Directive, which requires retailers and manufacturers of electrical and electronic appliances to provide for their safe disposal.
WRAP	Waste and Resources Action Programme. A national initiative to secure markets for recyclables; it is also running a major new recycling awareness campaign.
WRWA	Western Riverside Waste Authority – the waste disposal authority that disposes of the Royal Borough’s waste.