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1 - INTRODUCTION

Croydon has approximately 9,000 companies, 90% of which are small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs). Croydon is also home to the head offices of a number of large international companies. The main business sectors in Croydon are:- Financial services (29%) - Public Services (20%) - Retail, hotels and catering (19%) - Manufacturing (12%).

Businesses account for a significant proportion of the waste produced within Greater London. Individually a small or medium size enterprise (SME) may feel that its environmental impact is negligible, but 88 per cent of London’s 300,000 businesses (a very similar percentage to that of Croydon) have 10 or fewer employees, which makes their cumulative environmental impact significant.

Both existing literature and research conducted in the course of this review point to the fact that trade waste recycling is still in its infancy. According to guidance published in 2005 by the GLA on trade waste recycling (GLA Best Practice Guidance: Trade Waste Recycling - A Report by Enviros Consulting LTD - March 2005), the research on existing guidance shows that support for collection authorities in the UK is focused towards household recycling collection schemes rather than developing trade waste recycling schemes. Up till 2007, little guidance has been offered to encourage the development of recycling schemes for businesses.

A large number of private firms such as Biffa and Grundon currently provide both trade waste disposal and recycling services to businesses in Croydon, and so does the Council, unlike many other boroughs. While the Council’s share of these markets is not very large, it has an important role to play in leading by example locally and in answering general queries and providing support to businesses in the borough. In addition, the Council needs to be ready to react positively to changes in regulations which may lead to an increase in demand for recycling services.

2 - AIMS OF THE REVIEW

On 28th November 2006, the Members of the Scrutiny Working Group leading on this review, comprising Councillors Maria Garcia (Chair), Pat Clouder, Simon Hall and Luke Clancy, agreed the following aims of the review:

- To ascertain the scale of trade waste recycling in the borough, particularly among small businesses, and the amount of trade waste currently going to landfill
- To ascertain what good practice, and what future opportunities there are for increasing the rate of trade waste recycling in Croydon
- To make recommendations for service improvement and expansion

The terms of reference of the review are set out in Appendix A, and the list of research activities undertaken is shown in Appendix B.

Members of the Working Group would like to express their warm thanks to the officers and local businesses listed on page 22 who took time to share information, guidance and views regarding trade waste recycling.

3 - BACKGROUND
Legislation and Policies

Whilst, nationally, it may appear that the legislative focus is on household waste, as this is currently the only stream with statutory targets for recycling and composting, there are a wide range of legislative controls on the production and management of various streams of business waste, such as:

- The Environmental Protection (Duty of Care) Regulations (1991)
- The Animal By-Products Regulation (2005)

Drivers in terms of policy include the Mayor’s Business Waste Management Strategy, the draft of which was published in May 2007 and is currently under consultation. A key element of its implementation plan involves negotiating with the Government to ensure that statutory recycling and composting targets for municipal waste should be set, in order to stimulate sustainable waste management as in the case of household recycling.

As this review was nearing its end, the Government published its Waste Strategy for England 2007. The key objectives of this strategy are:

1. To put more emphasis on waste prevention and re-use
2. To meet and exceed the Landfill Directive diversion targets for biodegradable municipal waste in 2010, 2013 and 2020
3. To increase diversion from landfill of non-municipal waste and secure better integration of treatment for municipal and non-municipal waste
4. To secure the investment in infrastructure needed to divert waste from landfill and for the management of hazardous waste
5. To get the most environmental benefit from that investment, through increased recycling of resources and recovery of energy from residual waste using a mix of technologies

While the Members’ Working Group did not have access to this strategy in the course of the review, a number of findings and recommendations echo the above aims, particularly the integration of treatment of household and trade waste streams, the need for investment in infrastructure, and the recovery of energy from biodegradable waste such as food.

Financial Drivers

The two major drivers fuelling the need for more recycling in future are the Landfill tax, and the Landfill Allowance Trade Scheme (LATS).

The Landfill Tax, which is charged to landfill operators and passed on to users as higher costs, currently stands at £24 per tonne for active waste (substances that either decay or contaminate land - which includes household waste). From April 2008, however, this rate will increase by £8 per tonne per year until 2010-11, when it will reach £48 per tonne. This will impact very heavily on all waste producers and collectors (both councils and private firms) and should make other methods of dealing with waste (including recycling and waste to energy) much more attractive.
Another key driver for the development of organic waste recycling is the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS) which sets challenging targets for reducing the tonnage of biodegradable municipal waste which is sent to landfill, and heavy fines for not meeting these. The Waste and Emissions Trading Act 2003 provided the framework for landfill allowance trading schemes, designed to implement Article 5(2) of the Landfill Directive.

Trade Waste collected by local councils count against their LATS targets and thus presents an incentive to recycle or compost the biodegradable element of trade waste such as paper, green waste and food waste.

LATS targets for Croydon’s Biodegradable Municipal Waste (BMW) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MSW* Arisings (tonnes)</th>
<th>BMW** Arisings (tonnes)</th>
<th>LATS – BMW** Permitted to go to Landfill (tonnes)</th>
<th>Diversion Required (tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>191,401</td>
<td>130,153</td>
<td>118,839</td>
<td>11,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>199,926</td>
<td>135,949</td>
<td>75,700</td>
<td>60,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>211,668</td>
<td>143,934</td>
<td>50,421</td>
<td>93,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>237,978</td>
<td>161,825</td>
<td>35,282</td>
<td>126,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Strategic Waste Plan for Croydon - 2007)

If Croydon Council does not meet its increasingly stringent targets, it will be fined £150 for every tonne landfilled beyond the limit set by the allowances it holds.

Private waste collection firms, however, are not bound by the terms of the LATS, and therefore have far less incentive to divert waste from landfill and to offer recycling services to their customers. However, new regulations coming into force on 30th October 2007 mean that this situation could change. These will include compulsory treatment of all non-hazardous waste going to landfill - a condition which had hitherto only applied to hazardous waste. The new rules are a result of a European-wide requirement in the Landfill Directive, applied by the Landfill (England and Wales) Regulations 2002.

It is not yet known how these regulations will impact on waste management in the commercial sector: some private waste collection firms may take on the responsibility of treating waste and thus raise waste disposal charges. Others may opt to put the onus on their customers to pre-treat their own waste.

However, it is very likely that the Council will be faced with an increased number of enquiries from private businesses, which could represent a good opportunity to raise awareness of recycling, both as an environmentally preferable option, and as a cost-effective option, as recycling services are generally cheaper than waste disposal costs.

* MSW: Municipal Solid Waste
**BMW: Biodegradable Municipal Waste
How can councils finance trade waste recycling?

Councils offering recycling to businesses can obtain savings in terms of averted landfill costs and LATS fines. However, recycling services have their own costs in terms of equipment, transport administration and staffing.

Under the Controlled Waste Collections, authorities can charge for trade waste collections, although the extent to which authorities choose to charge their customers for recyclables collections depends on individual circumstances.

The approach to pricing varies from council to council (see examples from the 2005 GLA trade waste survey in Appendix C).

Some councils offer a trade waste recycling service free, particularly at pilot stage, to raise awareness and encourage businesses to take up this service. While they are not legally permitted to fund trade waste recycling from Council Tax, they can finance it through revenue funding e.g. income from trade waste disposal services. Other councils offer this service free as they finance it from a funding stream such as business rates set aside in a Business Improvement District (e.g. the Paddington B.I.D.).

However, most councils offer the service at a lower cost than waste disposal to landfill. For instance, Croydon Council’s recycling pick-ups cost less than a quarter of its waste disposal collections.

Sources of funding for trade waste recycling include the following:
- Revenue funding
- Various funding streams from BREW (Business Resource Efficiency and Waste), NISP (National Industrial Symbiosis Programme), WRAP (Waste and Resource Action Programme), etc., particularly for pilot schemes
- Income from recyclables - the higher the quality of and demand for the recyclates, the higher the price

Economies of scale and financial savings can also be obtained if a council combines collections of household and trade recyclables, an opportunity acknowledged by DEFRA, and already implemented by a number of councils including the London Borough of Bexley, which record total tonnages collected for both household and trade waste. Members are keen to see this practice being applied in Croydon (for more details, see page 18).

However, the challenge for many councils - and for Croydon Council in particular - is to offer a good value “one-stop shop” to businesses in competition with private firms. While trade waste recycling services in Croydon are considerably cheaper than disposal services, getting both services from the Council will cost a business considerably more than a private firm is likely to charge. For instance, a firm producing two bags of residual waste a week (at a cost of £5.00 per bag per week if taken by the Council) and one bag of paper recyclables (at a cost of £1.05 per week if recycled through the Council), could simply pay £6 for the disposal of all its rubbish, and save itself the need to sort its waste.

It remains to be seen what impact the new requirements to pre-treat waste prior to disposal will have on private waste management firms.

How much trade waste is currently being recycled?
Only a small number of London Boroughs currently offer trade waste recycling collections to businesses in their borough (Croydon, Westminster, Southwark, Hammersmith and Fulham, Bexley, Hillingdon). Others make recycling facilities at specified civic amenity sites available to traders (e.g. LB Havering and Richmond). A number of boroughs are currently setting up or running pilot trade waste recycling projects with a view to gradually expanding these, and building on lessons learnt in the course of the pilot schemes. In most other boroughs, however, trade waste recycling is carried out by private firms.

Countrywide, trade waste recycling services are offered by a number of councils such as Oxfordshire and Devon County Councils, although many councils provide contact details for private firms or other organisations providing such services.

Appendix C provides a UK-wide list of councils providing trade waste services which were surveyed by Greater London Authority in 2005. A few observations might be made on these figures:

- Many councils opted to charge reduced prices for trade waste recycling, while a few offered recycling free, at the risk of finding it difficult to handle increased demand (see the case of the Moray Council Scotland)
- A number of councils prioritised existing trade waste customers, particularly in the face of very high demand
- A few councils offered some form of recycling to traders at Civic Amenity sites

Recyclables most often collected by councils are paper, cardboard and glass. A small number of councils (e.g. London boroughs of Hammersmith and Fulham, Hillingdon and Bexley) also offer recycling services for materials such as plastics and metal.

During this review, Members took a particular interest in food recycling. Thanks to funding from WRAP, a number of councils e.g. London Borough of Bexley and West Devon Borough Council have carried out trials with local businesses. The area of food recycling is discussed in further detail on pages 14-15.

**Recycling in the local street market**
A sector of the local economy which produces significant amounts of biodegradable waste is the local market, e.g. the Surrey Street market in Croydon. The waste consists mainly of green waste and paper/cardboard.

BREW, GLA and NISP are currently funding pilot schemes on recycling for markets. Braintree District Council have recently conducted such a trial.

The greatest challenge of the trial was to prepare the stallholders to take an effective part in the trial. 100 businesses were trained as part of the trial and the Oxfordshire County Council training pack for businesses proved to be very popular. Officers aim to increase recycling at the market to 50%, and hope to extend this service to the Saturday market in Braintree, and to Witham and Halstead Districts.

Croydon Council too made a bid in 2006 for a composting and cardboard recycling trial for the Surrey Street market. Towards the end of this review, officers were pleased to hear that this bid had been successful. As a result, the Council aims to set up such a service in the second half of 2007.

4 - AN OVERVIEW OF TRADE WASTE RECYCLING IN CROYDON
The Council’s Trade Waste Recycling Service

The Council currently provides a range of trade waste disposal services using bags, bundles, wheelee bins, skips and compactors to approximately 2450 customers with a varying frequency of collections to meet customer needs.

In the last 3 years the Council has introduced trade waste recycling for glass, paper and cardboard with approximately 110 and 450 customers respectively. The service is provided using bags, bundles and wheelee bins with varying frequency of collections to meet customer needs. Trade waste recycling is actively promoted through ENVIBE (see Appendix F) and the Council actively encourages its customers to think positively about waste minimisation and recycling, emphasising the environmental and financial benefits to their business.

Contractual arrangements are arranged by the Environmental, Culture and Public Protection Department through their Waste Management Section and supported by 2 Marketing Officers and 4 Administrative Officers.

Annual revenue for 05/06 for trade waste and trade recycling was £3.1 million and £45 K respectively. It should be noted that prices were increased by 40% for trade waste disposal and 10% for trade recycling in December 2006. It is difficult to predict the effect on the level of business resulting from the increases.

The work is carried on behalf of the Council by Veolia Environmental Services as part of the refuse/street cleansing/recycling Contract which began in August 2003 for a period of 7 years.

Tonnages of trade waste and recyclables collected by Croydon Council in 2005/6 and 2006-7 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TRADE WASTE DISPOSAL (tonnes)</th>
<th>PAPER RECYCLING (tonnes)</th>
<th>GLASS RECYCLING (tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005/6</td>
<td>30,228</td>
<td>Total: 668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(not weighed separately)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/7</td>
<td>28,646</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 1370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These tonnages show a decrease in trade waste disposed of by the Council, probably as a result of the above-mentioned price increases, as well as a promising doubling in recycled tonnages from one year to the next. The tonnage recycled in 2005/6 came to 2.2% of the tonnage taken to landfill, and grew to 4.8% in 2006/7. However, this still lags far behind recycling rates for household waste, which was 16% in 2006/7.

While these figures are very low, we need to remember that most trade waste in Croydon is handled by private firms. Of the 80 businesses surveyed as part of this review, 23 had a waste disposal with the Council, and another 13 had recently chosen to cancel their trade waste disposal contract with the Council. 1 out of the 80 businesses stated it had a recycling contract with the Council.

How much do Croydon Council officers recycle?
Members of the Working Group felt that the Council should lead by example on recycling practice, and therefore requested recycling figures for its own departments. A summary of collection rates for different council sites and department provided by Veolia is set out in Appendix D. It shows very wide variations between different sites and departments. Members are keen to encourage the relevant departments to ascertain the causes of these areas of good and poor performance, and for relevant officers to focus awareness-raising and additional support on particular areas where recycling rates are very low, and waste disposal costs particularly high.

Local businesses’ views of trade waste recycling

A survey was carried out as part of this review to ascertain local businesses’ views regarding trade waste recycling. Respondents were asked to provide information on the following:
- The average weekly volume and main components of their waste
- Whether they recycle their waste
- What factors prevent them from recycling more waste
- What would encourage them to recycle more
- Whether they are aware of the Council’s recycling and business support services available to them, and whether they would like to find out more about these

80 businesses responded to this review, the results of which are shown in Appendix E.

Comments on the findings

77% of respondents were from very small businesses employing less than 10 staff and producing relatively little waste: 46% stated that they produced 5 bags or less a week. To make recycling worthwhile for those who produce significant quantities of paper/glass waste, they would have to use a very small bin for residual waste, and recycle paper/cardboard in bundles. With the Council’s recycling service, they would also be able to apply for a six-monthly refund on any unused collections, which would benefit businesses producing particularly small amounts of waste.

Of the 52 businesses interviewed by the Scrutiny officer, only 14 said they did some form of recycling. This included taking recyclables to civic amenity sites in the borough where their homes were located, which are strictly speaking dedicated to household recycling, paid for through residents’ Council Tax.

Many stated they were keen to recycle although they did not know what services were available to them: 16 stated that lack of knowledge was the main reason why they didn’t recycle, and 19 stated that they would appreciate getting more information on trade waste recycling. Only one respondent stated that he could not see the point of recycling. While it is always easier to express enthusiasm than to act on it, it seems as if there is an understanding among local businesses of the environmental need to recycle, and a willingness to do something about it.

Other surveys carried out around the country seem to support the view that businesses view recycling in a positive light: For instance, 93% of traders responding to a survey in a West Oxfordshire District Council survey stated they wished to recycle, and, in a later survey, 91% of the same group stated they had started recycling at a newly opened facility for businesses. In another survey conducted by Mansfield District Council, 70.25% of businesses also expressed interest in recycling but expressed great reluctance to paying for the service.
Responses revealed a surprisingly high demand (37 respondents) for cardboard and paper recycling, even from businesses selling food, petcare products, etc. These two materials certainly form a significant percentage of potentially recyclable materials within the retail and office sector waste streams in London, as quoted in the Mayor’s Business Waste Management Strategy (see table on page 10).

19 Respondents to the Scrutiny survey felt that the key obstacles to recycling waste were the lack of space to store recyclables, which might be mitigated with support on what containers to choose, how often to collect recyclables, and how best to organise easy waste management customs within the business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offices (%)</th>
<th>Retail (%)</th>
<th>Hospitality (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic kitchen waste</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of potentially recyclable elements of retail, hospitality and office-sector waste streams

6 respondents expressed the view that recycling was too expensive, despite the fact that recycling prices are usually far lower than waste disposal costs, and 6 stated that they would recycle more if the service were cheaper (only one stated that it was too costly and that a cheaper recycling service would encourage him to recycle more). As stated previously, the collection of recyclables in Croydon costs less than a quarter of the price of waste disposal collections. However, these responses suggest that some form of awareness-raising would be needed to ensure that a “critical mass” of businesses are aware that recycling is considerably more cost-effective than disposal to landfill.

Although staff compliance - or lack of it - was not listed on the survey form as a possible issue, this was flagged up by 3 respondents. There may well be many others which would have ticked such an answer had it been listed. This issue may be of particular concern in the context of food recycling, as many staff in cafes, pubs and restaurants tend to be on short contracts, may well receive very little training, and in some cases - particularly noticeable during visits to Thornton Heath and Portland Road South Norwood - language issues may hamper effective training. This matter is discussed more fully on page 14.
5 - MEMBERS’ RECOMMENDATIONS

This section sets out the recommendations of the Members’ Working Group which carried out this review, and the arguments in support of these.

A - Increasing Trade Waste Recycling Rates

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

That the Council should bring about a significant increase in its trade waste recycling rates, starting with existing trade waste collection customers.

As stated above, despite costs in landfill tax and potential LATS fines, trade waste recycling is not currently a very high priority in Croydon or other boroughs, hence the low recycling rates shown on page 8.

However, many local businesses are interested in making use of such services, some for environmental reasons, and many for financial reasons - particularly in Croydon, where the cost of the Council’s disposal services went up by 40% in December 2006, and recycling costs are considerably cheaper.

Recommendation 1 is echoed in the Mayor’s draft Business Waste Strategy, which calls for achieving recycling or composting levels in commercial and industrial waste of at least 70 per cent by 2020 (see Policy 1), and proposes national reuse, composting and recycling targets for both municipal and non-municipal business waste (Proposal 1 of the Implementation Plan).

The Council’s officers have indicated that they wish to focus on increasing recycling rates among existing trade waste collection customers. As the Council currently has about 2,450 trade refuse customers, and 450 customers for paper/card recycling and 110 customers for glass recycling, bringing about significant increases in the number of recycling customers so that it represents the majority of refuse customers will represent an important first step. The task would be made easier by the fact that paper and cardboard appear to constitute a large proportion of business waste among small businesses.

The Council and its business customers would both benefit from the switch to recycling as the cost would be lower to both parties (lower waste management costs for businesses, and lower landfill tax for the Council).

Such an approach to improving the Council’s performance in respect of trade waste recycling would also represent a measured approach to service expansion, and would enable a progressive increase in transport facilities, waste containers and staff support, and an opportunity to adapt gradually to a growth in customers. A best practice guide on trade waste recycling produced by Enviros Consulting LTD (March 2005) for the Greater London Authority acknowledges the risk of increased demand and quotes the example of councils such as Caerphilly which offered such a popular recycling service, that it became unable to cope with the unexpected demand from businesses, thus disappointing prospective customers and jeopardising trust in the service.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

That the Environment and Sustainability Team (EaST) should ascertain the reasons why a number of Council sites and departments have a very low recycling rate, and that the Environment Forum should identify and implement the necessary steps to produce a sizeable increase in recycling rates in these sites and departments.
Members were keen to ensure that the Council should lead by example on trade waste recycling. The 2005-2006 statistics set out in Appendix D show areas of very high performance, and others where recycling is very poor or non-existent.

Members therefore recommend that the Council should:

- ascertain the reasons why certain sites and departments recycle so little
- provide the necessary leadership from senior officers and the Environment Forum as well as support through the Environment Action Network to produce a sizeable increase in recycling rates in these sites and departments
- work with Veolia to produce timely statistics at least twice a year on recycling performance, so that relevant officers can monitor progress on recycling and take necessary and timely remedial action to improve this where necessary
- consequently attain savings in the Council’s waste disposal costs and improve the Council’s carbon footprint

B - Effective Advertising

**RECOMMENDATION 3:**

That the Council should significantly increase advertising of its trade waste recycling service, and focus efforts on making the service more business-friendly

The Scrutiny survey of local businesses has revealed a lot of interest in recycling but ignorance on the availability of recycling services. These discussions suggest that the Council would be “pushing at an open door” to advertise its low-cost recycling service.

Another driver for additional publicity is that many businesses, particularly SMEs, still have low awareness of their environmental obligations and are failing to take steps required to reduce their environmental impact. The Mayor’s Business Waste Management Strategy mentions a City and Guilds survey of 600 employees in small manufacturing businesses, which found that 46 per cent of those in management roles were unaware of the environmental laws affecting their business, with one in seven of these not knowing that the company could be fined for failing to comply with environmental regulations.

Officers in Croydon’s Envibe team, which provides support on environmental matters to businesses in Croydon, have worked to improve businesses awareness and compliance with emerging legislation and rules. In addition, every waste disposal invoice and waste transfer note sent to businesses includes a message encouraging them to contact the Council to explore ways of decreasing their waste costs. Yet, the survey carried out in connection with this review shows that opportunities for trade recycling among small businesses remain little known.

The ignorance of traders on possibilities for recycling may also suggest that private firms are not currently advertising heavily with this sector of the local economy - possibly as the small amounts of recycling produced by SMEs do not offer private firms the economies of scale and the profits that accounts with larger firms may represent.

Private trade waste disposal firms will be facing a number of new regulations from October 2007, which may impact on services to local businesses, and perhaps on prices (see page 5). As a result, some businesses may turn to the Council for advice and possibly for waste
management services. The Council must be ready to take up this opportunity to encourage businesses to recycle, and where appropriate, to encourage the take-up of the Council’s own recycling service.

The Council is invited to explore possibilities for publicising its trade waste recycling service, the regulations which call for effective waste management, and Croydon’s low recycling costs in comparison with its waste disposal costs, with a view to showing the advantages of this approach and achieving a significant increase in the take-up of its recycling service and saving money on waste disposal. A number of approaches could be taken to achieve this:

- Sending relevant trade waste disposal customers full details of trade waste recycling prices along with Water Transfer Notes and invoices, thus saving them the need to phone for a price list, and providing them with an opportunity for a direct comparison between the options open to them

- Carrying out an advertising campaign through telephone promotion. This has already been done successfully in various councils e.g. the City of Subiaco, Perth, Western Australia

- Providing opportunities for businesses to discuss the pros and cons of various recycling options face to face with Trade Waste Marketing Officers and gain a clear view of how this service might benefit them and work for them, either on a one-to-one basis, or through meetings of local business associations or awareness raising events organised by the Council

- Disseminating and making use of information on waste management and recycling such as the Oxfordshire CC Commercial Waste Reduction Pack, which has proved very popular and helpful in a number of councils

- A combination of all the above

C - Food Recycling

RECOMMENDATION 4

That officers should provide an update on the household food recycling project towards the end of 2007, and findings on problems experienced and solutions found, with a view to exploring the possibility of setting up future trade food recycling schemes

Members were very interested in exploring the recycling of food waste, as Croydon has a thriving catering sector. Indeed, it has been estimated that the food sector accounts for over a third of the waste produced in the UK (an estimated 17 million tonnes of waste). In addition, it has already been said that diverting biodegradable waste from landfill has become a very high priority in view of stringent LATS targets and fines.

Members were particularly pleased to hear that a food waste recycling trial had commenced in May 2007 in the Coulsdon West ward, involving about 2000 households. They look forward to hearing of the results of the trial, and hope that lessons learnt will encourage the Council to initiate a similar trial with local businesses. Such trials have been set up by a number of other councils e.g. Bexley and North Dorset District Council.
However, while lessons may be learnt from trials with residents in the Coulsdon West ward on the process of providing food waste recycling, differences may emerge on the type of support that may be needed by the users of this service.

A number of trials with residents, e.g. in West Devon Borough Council, have met with a good response.

In food recycling trials with businesses, however, councils encountered a number of problems working with restaurants which may be related to the fact that a lot of kitchen staff have temporary contracts, limited training, and occasionally some language problems. North Dorset District Council found that progress with the food recycling trial was hampered by communication problems.

Another council, Wealden District Council, worked with small restaurants and cafes and other establishments on a pilot project which involved recycling paper, glass and cans - not food. Officers found that the main problem with contamination related to small restaurants and cafes who have a high staff turnover and often employ staff for whom English was not their first language. This resulted in a lack of understanding about what could go in the bins, despite support provided by the scheme operatives.

RECOMMENDATION 5

That the South London Waste Partnership should work with chosen contractors to explore the recycling of food waste to the full, and to develop extensive anaerobic digestion and in-vessel composting facilities to make effective use of organic waste from the Hospitality Industry within the partnership in the long term.

One additional challenge for Croydon and other councils to face is the need to process food waste in line with the Animal By-Products Regulations (2005), which set strict conditions for the composting or processing of food waste that contains meat or animal by-products. To protect human health, the Regulations restrict the composting of food waste to specialist facilities and plant require State Veterinary Service approval to be complaint with the Regulations.

The animal by-products are defined within three categories according to risk, which determines the disposal routes for each. Catering waste, former foodstuffs and raw meat and fish from food manufacturers and food retailers will usually be category 3 materials (the lowest risk). These can be processed at in-vessel facilities into high-grade compost (qualifying, if of a high enough grade, for Best Value Performance indicator 82B credits), or be converted into biogas through anaerobic digestion (thus gaining credits under Best Value Performance Indicator 86b). This can be used as a renewable source of hydrogen, suitable for very high efficiency transport. Food waste can thus be considered to be a valuable resource rather than matter to be discarded, an opportunity highlighted in the Mayor’s draft Business Waste Management Strategy.

Croydon has already started processing household waste with a high organic content at the “Danodrum” run by contractors SITA at their Beddington Lane site (London Borough of Sutton), which Members visited in the course of this review. However, Croydon and its partners will need to invest in more extensive facilities to in order to meet increasingly stringent targets and process ever larger amounts of organic waste, and minimise the need to transport the waste to facilities some distance away, as is currently the case with many councils.
In view of the growing need to divert food from landfill to meet LATS targets, and of the potential for transforming organic waste into a valuable energy resource, it is hoped that the South London Waste Partnership will work with chosen contractors to explore the recycling of food waste to the full, and to develop extensive anaerobic digestion and in-vessel composting facilities to make effective use of organic waste from restaurants, take-aways and pubs within the partnership in the long term.

D- Reusable and Biodegradable Packaging

**RECOMMENDATION 6**

That Envibe officers work with local traders to encourage the use of recycled, reusable or biodegradable carrier bags and use this opportunity to improve the environmental credentials and the image of the borough

According to Defra, packaging waste arisings in the UK now total over 10 million tonnes per annum and are predicted to rise further, in line with the recent trend. It is estimated that about 20% of all rubbish put out by households is retail packaging.

A number of regulations have been set to control the amount and quality of packaging being produced, the latest of which, the new Producer Responsibility Obligations (Packaging Waste) Regulations 2007 came into force on 16th March 2007. The 2007 Packaging Regulations consolidate the original 1997 Regulations with all of the subsequent amending Statutory Instruments and they also incorporate the changes made to the Regulations in 2007 as a result of a major public consultation exercise.

Various large companies are responding to the need for reduced packaging, including Marks and Spencer's which has launched its "Plan A - because there is no Plan B" to make significant environmental improvements to its processes.

The small businesses responding to the Scrutiny survey have little control over the type and amount of packaging used on their goods. In the Scrutiny survey of trade waste recycling, 21 out of 80 respondents said packaging was a key element of their waste, with 14 stating that it made up one of the three greatest elements of their waste stream. 60 stated that paper and cardboard made up a very important element of their waste, with many small shops stating that cardboard boxes were a key element of their waste, and that they were keen to start recycling this.

**Plastic Bags**

One type of packaging which has featured in the media recently is the plastic carrier bag, which cannot currently be recycled in civic amenity sites, can take 1,000 years to decompose compared to paper bags which take about a month to decompose, and involves both large and small businesses. As a very light-weight material, it cannot feature significantly in waste tonnages, but is a very visible waste stream in the local environment.

Various supermarkets chains are coming forward with a range of strategies for discouraging the use of carrier bags, e.g. the one-day moratorium on plastic bags held by Sainsbury's in April 2007, Waitrose's fortnight-long ban ink Saffron Walden, and Tesco's offer of club-card points for customers reusing old bags.

However, none of these schemes has been as ambitious as the six-month long complete ban in the Devon town of Modbury, which started on 1st May 2007 and was brought about through the campaigning of a local resident and the co-ordination work of a local trader,
The ban is being observed by all local traders, ranging from small family businesses to the local Co-op. They have started providing shoppers with 100% biodegradable cornstarch bags, recyclable paper bags or reusable cotton and jute bags, supplied by a company from Cornwall.

Today, fully biodegradable cornstarch bags are increasingly widely used (e.g. in food recycling). Shoppers can also be encouraged to use cotton or jute bags, similar to those distributed by Envibe officers in a recent publicity campaign in Surrey Street market to raise awareness of the environmental damage caused by plastic carrier bags.

As council officers start working with traders to increase recycling, some work may be done to phase out the use of plastic bags in Surrey Street Market and replace these with practical alternatives. Envibe officers may also assist local traders borough-wide in providing them with practical information, to encourage them to identify suppliers of low-cost, environmentally-friendly bags and replace plastic bags with less damaging alternatives.

**E - Providing Recycling Services Geared To The Needs Of SMEs**

It is widely recognised that SMEs have special needs. Individually an SME may feel that its environmental impact is negligible, but, as stated above, 88 per cent of London’s 300,000 businesses have 10 or fewer employees, a very similar percentage to Croydon’s business profile, which makes their cumulative environmental impact significant.

In addition, research undertaken for Defra found evidence to suggest that the smaller the firm the more insignificant the economic benefit of implementing an environmental management system.

Croydon’s trade waste services offer a number of features which are of particular benefit to small businesses:

- Those wishing to recycle paper and cardboard can recycle as little as a bundle of paper/cardboard per week at a cost of £1.05 per week per pick-up *(disposal of a bag of waste would cost £5.00 - nearly five times more)*
- If businesses do not recycle as much as a bundle per week, they can receive a refund for unused recycling “labels” on a six-monthly basis
- The Council have recently introduced a 240 litre bin to enable businesses to recycle small quantities, and use this relatively small size as a standard for glass recycling

In addition, officers are exploring various ways of encouraging as many businesses as possible to recycle more. In particular, Envibe officers staged an event on 14th February 2007, “Love your Business”, to raise awareness of regulations relating to trade waste.

In addition, Trade Waste Marketing officers are working with the District Centre Manager for New Addington and local businesses to set up shared recycling facilities, and hope to extend this in future in locations where these systems are likely to work well.

However, alternative incentives have to be in place where such systems cannot so easily be put into place. The following two recommendations are intended for small businesses which have to rely on their own resources to recycle their relatively limited amounts of waste.
RECOMMENDATIONS 7

7 - That the Council should use the opportunities available through the new waste disposal contract to develop Civic Amenity Site facilities for traders, and particularly SMEs, to encourage each of them to recycle more extensively, even if the businesses concerned produce very low quantities of waste.

So far, a lot of work has been carried out to prevent businesses from making inappropriate use of Civic Amenity sites in various councils. In addition, it is unlikely that provision could be made for businesses to make use of all sites in Croydon as their waste would have to be weighed and costed - which, at the present moment, can only be done at the Stubbs Mead transfer station.

However, making a recycling centre available to businesses would encourage them to divert waste from landfill. This would be particularly important for small businesses which produce little waste, and for which current trade waste recycling arrangements do not represent value for money. Although there is no statutory duty to allow trade waste at reuse and recycling sites, there is potential for this approach to assist with increasing diversion of biodegradable waste from landfill and generate income.

In the course of the trade waste recycling survey conducted as part of this Scrutiny review, many respondents spoke of civic amenity sites and stated that they would welcome access to these for the small amounts of recyclables that they produced.

Civic Amenity sites present the advantages that:

- Users usually are able to recycle a far wider range of materials than can be offered through a kerbsite collection
- Users can recycle as little or as much as they wish within reasonable limits, a particular attraction for SMEs which are many in number but often produce little waste and have to pay comparatively high fees for disposal
- Users themselves take the waste to the site and sort it

A number of authorities e.g. Bexley, Richmond and Havering do allow businesses to bring recyclables to certain civic amenity sites. Charging regimes vary, going from one-off payments for permits (linked to the vehicle, not the driver), to charges by weight.

One example in particular, the recent establishment of a dedicated disposal and recycling facility for trade waste by Oxfordshire County Council may be of interest in exploring the establishment of any such facilities within the South London Waste Partnership.

The new Redbridge facility, providing both waste disposal and recycling services, was not very expensive to establish, as it used existing infrastructure. Fairly small containers and compacting equipment were selected in view of the size of the site. A dual charging system was introduced, with recycling costing 50% of waste disposal. The service was initially made available to the county council’s existing trade waste customers, and preparation included a survey, which showed that 92% of users would like to be able to recycle some of their business waste at the site. A further survey in February 2007 showed that 91% of site users were actually recycling some of their waste at this new Redbridge Waste Recycling Centre.

Project Outcomes were as follows:

- 2,813 tonnes of trade waste brought to the site so far
- 406 tonnes (14.4%) diverted from and sent for recycling, offering savings of £14,210
Two key lessons have been learnt in the six months this facility has been open:

• It is advisable to limit the number of people that you offer the service to initially. Redbridge trade waste service had an initial customer base of 150 regular business users, the new trade recycling service was only offered to these businesses. This allowed the site staff to work through any issues that had arisen with the new service.

• Other Local Authorities had moved to recycling only trade waste facilities. Initial surveying of existing customers showed that some customers used Redbridge because they needed a quick turnaround time and would only occasionally be able to recycle their waste. It was essential that these customers were given the choice of still land-filling their waste, but paying an increased price for it.

As the Council is shortly to conclude a waste disposal contract in partnership with London Boroughs of Kingston, Merton and Sutton (the South London Waste Partnership), this present clear opportunities to increase recycling opportunities for traders, and achieve economies of scale in terms of marketing and sales of recyclables.

RECOMMENDATION 8

That the Council should explore the possibility of providing the same green box recycling service within areas which comprise a mix of small businesses and homes, thus achieving economies of scale on transport and use of recycling containers.

As stated before, many small businesses produce small quantities of waste per week, which are not dissimilar from the volume produced by a household, containing similar waste to households, particularly paper, glass, green/food waste (except for restaurants etc which would need different arrangements in view of volume of food waste produced).

Within certain areas e.g. small parades with residential accommodation as well as small businesses, using the same recycling containers and transport would lead to a more efficient provision of recycling services.

In their work on trade waste recycling, DEFRA have recognised the fact that collecting both household and trade waste could provide Councils with the opportunity to create economies of scale.

This same recognition is echoed in the Mayor’s Business Waste Management Strategy:

‘There is an opportunity for waste authorities to provide recycling services to householders and local businesses, because the types of materials produced by each are closely similar, household services could be delivered to commercial businesses without change. This would give local businesses (particularly SMEs) that are not in a contractual obligation to a private sector waste management company already, access to services that are consistent with those they are receiving at home; ensuring individuals can bring their good habits from home into work. Furthermore, having a single vehicle collecting from every property on the street, rather than one for households and one (at least) for commercial properties, could reduce the associated transport impacts. By building a density into their contracts waste authorities may benefit from service efficiencies and profit from the sale of recycling the materials collected.’ (P. 37, Mayor’s Business Waste Management Strategy)

Members of the Working Group identified such opportunities for economies of scale in some parades such as Wayside and Central Parade in New Addington. They felt that there
was potential for offering households and small businesses situated within the same area a green box kerbside recycling service, with households paying out of their Council Tax, and businesses through invoices. Such a move could improve the recycling culture locally, reduce costs to businesses, and entail very minor changes for the Council, which would benefit from economies of scale in terms of transport and provision of containers.

Officers in many councils have previously opposed such an approach as it does not seem to allow officers to monitor separate tonnages for households and businesses. However, this issue has not presented a problem to councils such as Bexley, which collects from businesses and households in the same rounds. However, councils can estimate progress by monitoring numbers of customers, and evaluating approximate tonnages by multiplying average weights of boxes by the number of customers. In addition, the future use of bar codes on bins (which could be coded to show whether a box belongs to a business or a household) and of weighing equipment on vehicles will allow for the recording of precise information on tonnages recycled.

F - Partnership Work

RECOMMENDATION 9

That the Council’s Waste Management team and Envibe combine respective skills and work together to bring about significant increases in recycling amounts and types of materials in response to new strategies and targets, sharing joint accountability for performance.

Both the Waste Management team and Envibe have an important role to play in increasing recycling rates.

With its focus on environmental sustainability, EaST focuses on keeping abreast of broad environmental issues and good practice, and much of its work entails enshrining principles in planning regulations and activities, and promotion of these principles.

While its work is underpinned by the Council’s waste strategy and other national and regional plans, Waste Management has a more operational focus.

The Council’s recycling rates could but benefit from both teams sharing accountability on recycling performance as well as expertise at all levels in planning and implementing new strategies and procedures, and having regular liaison at operational and planning levels to monitor progress and fine-tune recycling services as new regulations and opportunities arise. Thus the Council can provide a more cohesive recycling service, incorporating planning, publicity, follow-up and problem-solving in a streamlined manner.

Such co-operation could also provide an opportunity to provide businesses with accessible channels of communication with the council on recycling matters e.g. legislation and opportunities to cut costs, and to improved support on getting started with recycling services.
REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1
That the Council should bring about a significant increase in its trade waste recycling rates, starting with existing trade waste collection customers.

RECOMMENDATION 2
That the Environment and Sustainability Team (EaST) should ascertain the reasons why a number of Council sites and departments have a very low recycling rate, and that the Environment Forum should identify and implement the necessary steps to produce a sizeable increase in recycling rates in these sites and departments.

RECOMMENDATION 3
That the Council should significantly increase advertising of its trade waste recycling service, and focus efforts on making the service more business-friendly.

RECOMMENDATION 4
That officers should provide an update on the household food recycling project towards the end of 2007, and findings on problems experienced and solutions found, with a view to exploring the possibility of setting up future trade food recycling schemes.

RECOMMENDATION 5
That the South London Waste Partnership should work with chosen contractors to explore the recycling of food waste to the full, and to develop extensive anaerobic digestion and in-vessel composting facilities to make effective use of organic waste from the Hospitality Industry within the partnership in the long term.

RECOMMENDATION 6
That Envibe officers work with local traders to encourage the use of recycled, reusable or biodegradable carrier bags and use this opportunity to improve the environmental credentials and the image of the borough.

RECOMMENDATION 7
That the Council should use the opportunities available through the new waste disposal contract to develop Civic Amenity Site facilities for traders, and particularly SMEs, to encourage each of them to recycle more extensively, even if the businesses concerned produce very low quantities of waste.

RECOMMENDATION 8
That the Council should explore the possibility of providing the same green box recycling service within areas which comprise a mix of small businesses and homes, thus achieving economies of scale on transport and use of recycling containers.

RECOMMENDATION 9
That the Council’s Waste Management team and Envibe combine respective skills and work together to bring about significant increases in recycling amounts and types of materials in response to new strategies and targets, sharing joint accountability for performance.
CONCLUSION

Members of the Working Group are very keen to see that recycling should increase not only in local households, but also among local businesses, to create a local culture of environmental sustainability. The survey conducted with local businesses shows that they do see the need for it, and would be interested in taking up such a practice.

However, businesses are hampered by lack of information on what they should do with their waste, what they can do, and how much it might cost them. In addition, it can be hard to change habits when day-to-day business presents a wide range of other high priorities and problems.

Members of the Working Group hope that this review has raised the profile of the needs of local businesses, and that future developments in the trade waste recycling service will provide more and more compelling incentives to recycle, ranging from an attractive pricing policy to practical support in getting used to new regulations and to new, simple and convenient recycling processes.
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APPENDIX A

TRADE WASTE RECYCLING
SCRUTINY REVIEW

TERMS OF REFERENCE AGREED ON TUESDAY 28TH NOVEMBER 2006

1 - OBJECTIVES

- To ascertain the scale of trade waste recycling in the borough, particularly among small businesses, and the amount of trade waste currently going to landfill
- To ascertain what good practice, and what future opportunities there are for increasing the rate of trade waste recycling in Croydon
- To make recommendations for service improvement and expansion

2 - INFORMATION TO OBTAIN

A - Statistics

- Tonnage and Percentage of trade waste recycled
- Tonnage and Percentage of trade waste to landfill
- Number of customers receiving a recycling service from the Council
- Cost of recycling trade waste - prices charged by the Council and other firms

B - Current Situation

- Legislation regarding trade waste recycling
- Finance issues - need to be self-funded, availability of different funding streams
- Managing different streams of trade waste:
  - Collection methods (e.g. collective recycling boxes for groups of businesses e.g. parades of shops)
  - How are recycled materials reused?
  - Issues relating to different types of waste
- Issues relating to use of landfill site
- Providers of recycling: is Croydon Council competitive?
- Other firms: fly-tipping issues
- Business case for various types of recycling
- Role of charities in providing recycling services
- Efforts to limit packaging (or make all packaging easily recycled)
- Getting businesses on board:
  - Incentives for getting more businesses involved in recycling
  - How well Envibe is working
  - Guardian Green Awards
- How is recycling being incorporated into planning process for businesses?

C - Benchmarking With Other Councils

- Materials recycled elsewhere + tonnages
- Success rates (and how they were achieved in Bexley, Sutton, Hillingdon, Richmond and countrywide)
- Problems
- Recycling facilities across country and their financial viability
D - IDEAS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT TO EXPLORE DURING THE REVIEW

- Can Council collected household and trade waste be recycled using the same facilities, thus creating economies of scale?

- Recycling partnerships - Working with other councils to share costs

- Are there solutions that would allow Croydon, at acceptable cost, to
  - sort all rubbish and get it into the different categories at a sorting plant?
  - sort general rubbish to recover particular items e.g. use of magnetic fields for metal recovery
  - sort recyclables at a sorting plant (which would make the process for collection easier and cheaper) e.g. Grundon

- Opportunities for increasing the rate of recycling for biodegradable waste in view of the LATS scheme

- “Reuse” of food which is still fit for human consumption

- Simple effective ways of disposing of more demanding waste (e.g. chemicals) in a way that prevents contamination of adjacent waste

- Maximising co-operation from residents and traders
  - carrot / stick / mixture
  - Fines for non-recycling?
  - Reduction in Council Tax for “good” performers?

- Need for education programme
  - Need for clear communication programme
  - frequency of collection and alignment of general and recycling collection dates
APPENDIX B

SCRUTINY REVIEW OF TRADE WASTE RECYCLING - PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES

Working Group Scoping meeting ...........................................................28th November 2006

Working Party Meeting .................................................................8th January 2007
Discussion re design of survey and visits to be carried out

Attendance at “Love your business” local conference re trade waste ....14th February 2007

Survey.................................................................................................February-March 2007

Visit to Bexley trade waste recycling facilities and Mitcham MRF ........22nd February 2007

Working Group Meeting .................................................................6th March 2007
Feedback on visit to Bexley and Mitcham

Meeting with New Addington businesses..............................................20th March 2007

Visit to Danodrum, Transfer Station and Stubbs Mead ..................11th April 2007

Working Group Meeting with senior officers....................................19th April 2007

LGA Conference on Trade Waste Recycling ......................................26th April 2007

Consultation on recommendations......................................................May-June 2007

Present final report at Community Services Scrutiny Sub-Committee ..17th July 2007

Present final report at Scrutiny and Overview Committee .................24th July 2007
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>NAME OF AUTHORITY</th>
<th>SCHEME DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE SCHEME STARTED</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL COMMENT</th>
<th>COSTS &amp; BUDGETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bath and North-East Somerset Council</td>
<td>Paper cardboard (incl confidential)</td>
<td>NO ANSWER GIVEN</td>
<td>Service provided by DSO to existing customers</td>
<td>65p / sack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Birmingham CC</td>
<td>Scheme advertised through web, magazines, local press, trade magazines</td>
<td>Glass 1993 Paper 2000</td>
<td>CA sites do not accept trade waste, but are considering opening for one day for trade waste recycling</td>
<td>Funded through mainstream budgets. Used existing kerbside infrastructure so minimal additional costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BRADFORD MBC</td>
<td>Cardboard and paper Has to be large volumes</td>
<td>NO ANSWER GIVEN</td>
<td>No v. developed - Top priority is roll-out of kerbside recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Caerphilly CBC</td>
<td>Mixed glass, card and cans Limited to urban business concentrations. V. effective in terms of business participation Cannot accommodate all enquiries</td>
<td>NO ANSWER GIVEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>No cost to those it services. LA gats £35 /ton for glass, £20 for card, less for cans/tins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cardiff CC</td>
<td>Glass, card, cans plastic bottles Implemented as a result of customer enquiries Scheme running at full capacity-no new customers</td>
<td>Jan 2004</td>
<td>CA sites generally, don’t accept trade waste, although do accept large one-off volumes of green waste: one-off charge of £30, usually to landscapers.</td>
<td>£3 per collection for either 15 bags or 1100 litre bin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Carmarthenshire CC</td>
<td>Card, paper, glass Advertised through leaflets and local paper V. high demand, expecially for cardboard. Generally low contamination.</td>
<td>NO ANSWER GIVEN</td>
<td>Recently ordered 200 add. Bins to meet card demand</td>
<td>Free collection service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Moray Council Scotland</td>
<td>Paper, glass, cans &amp; cardboard</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Many CA sites accept trade waste</td>
<td>Used to be free but too expensive to keep going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nottingham CC</td>
<td>Paper card glass in separate containers Only for existing refuse customers Haven’t got infrastructure to accommodate new customers</td>
<td>NO ANSWER GIVEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Peterborough CC</td>
<td>Paper, junkmail, cardboard, tins, bottles, plastic, not glass</td>
<td>June/ July 2003</td>
<td>“3 strikes and you’re out” approach to contamination</td>
<td>There is a cost to users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf</td>
<td>Pilot focuses on business cluster areas Glass, paper</td>
<td>Pilot started 2003</td>
<td>Demand increasing, only using word of mouth</td>
<td>Pilot was free, new scheme will charge at a reduced rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>South Ayrshire</td>
<td>Card and glass</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Much demand for service.</td>
<td>Low cost to users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tameside MBC</td>
<td>Via word of mouth Advertising to existing council customers</td>
<td>About 2000</td>
<td>2 CA sites accept trade waste recyclables</td>
<td>Free collection to existing customers, one off charge to new customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wrexham County Borough Council</td>
<td>Glass Rely on word of mouth</td>
<td>NO ANSWER GIVEN</td>
<td>Scheme needs clearer guidance to reduce contamination</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>weight landfill / tonnes</td>
<td>weight recycled/ tonnes</td>
<td>Total waste</td>
<td>Recycling rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Community Centre</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taberner House</td>
<td>386.8</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>514.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Orchard Centre</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clocktower Balcony Bar</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Support Services</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Car Pound</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Crematorium Office</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Magistrates Court</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Sports Arena</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Action Team</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldon PHAB Hall Community Action Team</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldcrest Youth and Social Centre</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathfield Training Centre - Ballards Way</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathfield Training Centre - Coombe Lane</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury Community and Sports Centre</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlawn Memorial Park</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Transport Service</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite Centre for Adults</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segas House</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud Green Lodge</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surestart</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norwood CETS (21 wks)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waylands</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>weight landfill / tonnes</td>
<td>weight recycled/ tonnes</td>
<td>Total waste</td>
<td>Recycling rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Oaks NH</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Pound - Selsdon Road</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Addington (housing)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>weight landfill / tonnes</th>
<th>weight recycled/ tonnes</th>
<th>Total waste</th>
<th>Recycling rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleridge Taylor Centre</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombe Cliff CETS centre</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coteldands Centre Davidson</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Fieldway Community Centre</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Edwards Centre Smitham Centre</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Conningsby PRV</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timebridge Centre Leon House</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton Heath lib</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norwood lib</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbury lib</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon lib</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradmore Green lib</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purley lib</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley lib</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulsdon lib</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selsdon lib</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanderstead lib</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadgreen lib</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Addington lib</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Halls lib</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby Court, 34 Morland Road</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrens House, 58 Mileham Way</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheriton House, 20 Chipstead House</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsdown Reception Centre, 112</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Road</td>
<td>Brookhurst Court, 190 Selhurst Road</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brigstock Manor, Brigstock Road</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 Ashburton Road</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bell Court Res. Home, Windmill Grove</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Childrens Home, 47a Calley Down Cres</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Unit, 28 Lennard Road</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Unit, 24 Lennard road</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>weight landfill / tonnes</strong></td>
<td><strong>weight recycled/ tonnes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total waste</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recycling rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempfield, 1 Reedham Park Ave</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strand House, Zion Road</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frylands Court, 24 Hutchinson Road</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homefield House, 57 Homefield Road</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantern Hall, 190 Church Road</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrens House, Alverston Gardens</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud Green Home, Stroud Green Way</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rees House, Morland Way</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addington Heights, Cleeves Crescent</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Justice Service, 14 Whitehorse Road</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensham Day Care, 131 Bensham Grove</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Centre, Behind</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Departmental Recycling Rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total 1</th>
<th>Total 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>391.04</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>41.81</td>
<td>148.408</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>259.473</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>154.258</td>
<td>860.698</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS OF TRADE WASTE RECYCLING SURVEY

1 - RESPONSES
80 responses have been received so far:
- 18 replies from the “Love your business” conference
- 5 replies from the website survey
- 5 replies have been forwarded by the Greening Business officer
- 52 replies from visit by the Scrutiny Support Officer.

Of these, 21 businesses currently receive a waste disposal service from the Council, and another 17 used to do so.

2 - LOCATION
The locations of the businesses visited by the Scrutiny Support Officer were as follows:
- 14 were located in Thornton Heath
- 11 were in Croydon (High Street, Southend and Selsdon Road)
- 11 were in Portland Road, South Norwood
- 8 were in Purley
- 8 were in New Addington. Responses were obtained at a meeting of the Central Parade Business Partnership meeting.

3 - TYPES OF BUSINESSES
The following 29 had a close connection with food and drink, although many spoke mainly of their need to dispose of cardboard boxes:
- 5 butchers (some also sold vegetable and fruit)
- 2 cafés
- 2 “food shops”
- 1 delicatessen
- 4 “mini-supermarkets"
- 2 restaurants
- 4 take-aways
- 5 pubs
- 4 florists

The following businesses produced mainly paper waste:
- 8 estate agencies
- 6 office supply/services firms
- 4 newsagents’
- 4 schools/training establishments
- 2 firms selling insurance services
- 1 firm providing mortgage advice
- 1 respondent worked with Royal Mail.

The remaining businesses included engineering firms, a drycleaner’s, 3 pet shops, 1 furniture shop, etc.
4 - SIZES OF BUSINESSES
62 responses were from firms with 10 or less staff, 8 were given in by representatives of very large organisations e.g. the Home Office and the Brit school, which were well represented at the “Love your business” conference, 7 responses were from organisations with between 11 and 99 staff, and 3 did not reply to this question.

5 - WEEKLY VOLUMES OF WASTE PRODUCED
Estimates of these are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASTE PRODUCED</th>
<th>NO OF BUSINESSES PRODUCING THIS QUANTITY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLE QUESTIONED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 2 BAGS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 - RECYCLING
Do you recycle trade waste?
37 respondents stated that they did some recycling, and 38 stated that they did not. 5 did not respond to this question. 17 out of 18 of the respondents who attended the Love Your Business Conference stated that they recycled. 4 out of the 5 web respondents do, and 1 out of the five respondents interviewed by the Greening Business Officer stated they did too. 14 out of the 51 businesses contacted by the Scrutiny Officer stated that they recycled at least part of their waste.

Most businesses expressed interest in recycling as well as ignorance on how to go about it.

What trade waste would you like to recycle?
- 34 respondents stating that they wanted to recycle paper and cardboard (and have been sent details of the Council’s service as they provided contact details). Details for other materials are as follows:
  - 14 interested in plastic recycling
  - 11 interested in metal recycling
  - 10 interested in glass recycling
  - 9 interested in recycling packaging
  - 9 interested in recycling food waste
Hurdles to recycling

- As regards hurdles to recycling, the main obstacles perceived were:
  - that the businesses had nowhere to store their recyclable waste (19 responses)
  - that they did not know they could recycle trade waste (16 responses)
  - that no one provided a recycling service for some of the materials the businesses wished to recycle (8 responses). These included pet shops, a veterinary practice, a butcher's shop, but also an office supply business and a pub - both of which could easily recycle their paper, card and glass waste.
  - that they had too little waste to recycle (7 responses). These typically produced 2-3 bags of waste a week, or less.
  - that it took too much time to recycle trade waste (7 responses).

- 3 businesses also reported that staff co-operation could also be a problem. This was not listed as one of the options on the form and may be a greater problem than the results of this survey may show. Only 1 respondent could not see the point of it.

What would encourage you to recycle more trade waste?

- 30 stated that they would recycle more if it were easier and more convenient,
  - that they would recycle more if a service were offered for the type of waste they produce
  - 19 stated that they would benefit from receiving useful information on recycling and 16 felt that they would recycle more if the service were cheaper.

7 - AWARENESS OF COUNCIL SERVICES

27 out of 79 respondents stated that they knew of Croydon’s trade waste recycling service. 46 respondents requested further information on this service and their details were forwarded to Trade Waste Marketing Officers in ECSS.

14 respondents knew of the services provided by Envibe officers. 30 were happy to be sent more information about their work.
ENVIBE - Environmental Business Excellence

Businesses in Croydon who want to make positive improvements to their environmental performance and save money on the cost of waste disposal and utilities such as electricity, can receive support and recognition through ENVIBE.

ENVIBE gives hands-on support and rewards environmental business excellence. It also puts businesses in touch with a network of specialist organisations providing impartial advice and services. Businesses have the opportunity to achieve a bronze, silver or gold award to reward their efforts, which can improve their corporate image and bring more business their way.

ENVIBE is predominantly financed by government funding so most of what is on offer is free. The more that a business gets involved the more it can benefit from cost savings, good publicity, staff motivation and legislative compliance.

ENVIBE recognises good practice through a tiered award scheme.

The law requires all businesses to comply with a Duty of Care. Those who demonstrate they do, through a simple 10-question self-assessment, will automatically be eligible for a Bronze award.

Once a business has achieved Bronze you can progress to Silver and Gold. These levels build on businesses’ legal obligations and develop environmental business excellence through proactive involvement in the environment and the local community.