

8. DRAFT SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN: PART 2 - ACTION PLAN LTCCP SUBMISSIONS

The Committee considered a report from the City Water and Waste Manager and the Senior Planner, City Water and Waste Unit recommending a response to the Long-Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) submissions received on the Draft Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan: Part 2 - Action Plan.

The report provided details of the previous resolution of the Council of 25 May 2004;

- “1. *That the amended Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan: Part 2 - Action Plan be approved for release for public consultation as part of the 2004/05 LTCCP process.*
2. *That the Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee be afforded the opportunity of viewing submissions on this plan and making a recommendation to the Annual Plan Subcommittee.”*

and provided a summary of the submissions. It noted that some 33 submissions had been received on solid waste matters most of which were directed at a proposed kerbside collection service for household organics. Sixteen submissions were in favour of such a service, including several Community Boards and eight submissions were opposed to the service.

Other matters raised by the submitters were also detailed in the report which noted that in the staff replies to submissions about the household organics collection service, staff had proposed that a trial be carried out, involving 5,000 households over a 10 month period.

It is considered that such a trial would also fulfil the 18 March 2004 Council resolution:

- “1. *That a kerbside domestic kitchen food waste collection is not proceeded with at this stage and not allowed for in the current budget.*
2. *That options for reducing both food waste and garden waste to landfill be further developed to take into account social, environmental, cultural and economic factors ...”*

Budget requirements and sources of finance were detailed in the report and the proposed trial was estimated to cost some \$324,000 in operating costs in the 2004/05 financial year. It was proposed that the City Water and Waste Unit operating budget be increased by this amount from 2004/05 onwards to fund this which would result in a rate increase of 0.200%.

Following discussion of the report the Chairman moved, seconded by Councillor Sally Buck:

1. *That the Committee note:*
 - (a) *That a successful household organics trial has already been held.*
 - (b) *That the Waste Plan sets a target of a 90% reduction in organic waste to landfill by 2010 and there is a similar target in the Regional Waste Plan. The National Waste Strategy targets a 95% reduction by 2010.*
 - (c) *Information from other cities where such services are provided is available.*
2. *That another household organics trial at a cost of \$324,000 not proceed.*
3. *That, in view of the submissions, the Council proceed with the household organics collection (by way of a staged introduction) and processing plans originally proposed for the draft LTCCP following the statutory consultation process as soon as possible.*
4. *That no changes be made to the Waste Plan.*
5. *That home composting continue to be encouraged (as well as the above).*

The above motion on being put to the meeting was declared **lost** on Division No 1 by six votes to four, the voting being as follows:

Against (6): Councillors Broughton, Corbett, C Evans, M Evans, Williams and Wright
For (4): Councillors Buck, Condon, Stonhill and O'Rourke.

Councillor Chrissie Williams then moved, seconded by Councillor Carole Evans, the staff recommendations as contained within the report, ie:

1. *That the Sustainable Transport and Utilities Committee:*
 - (a) *Confirm that they wish this household organics trial to proceed.*
 - (b) *Recommend to the Annual Plan Subcommittee that the trial be financed by an increase in the City Water and Waste Unit operating budget of \$324,000 per year from 2004/05 and ongoing.*
2. *That based on the submissions, staff make appropriate changes to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Management Plan: Part 2 - Action Plan and bring the final document before the Council for approval in August 2004.*

On being put to the meeting this motion was declared **lost** on Division No 2 by six votes to three, the voting being as follows:

Against (6): Councillors Buck, Condon, Corbett, M Evans, Stonhill and O'Rourke
For (3): Councillors C Evans, Williams and Wright.

Details of the above voting, in the absence of a recommendation by the Committee, was accordingly reported to the Annual Plan Subcommittee.