



Christchurch City Council

WASTE MANAGEMENT BYLAW REVIEW HEARINGS PANEL AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 15 OCTOBER 2008

AT 9AM

IN COMMITTEE ROOM 3, CIVIC OFFICES

Panel: Councillors Helen Broughton, Sally Buck, Claudia Reid, Bob Shearing and Sue Wells

General Manager responsible
Jane Parfitt

Advisers
Zefanja Potgieter, Senior Resource Planner
Simon Collin, Network Planning Team Leader
Mark Christison, City Water & Waste Manager
Tim Scott, Project Manager

Committee Adviser
Sean Rainey

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

2. APOLOGIES

Councillor Sally Buck

3. PRESENTATION BY STAFF

Staff comments on Draft Waste Management Bylaw attached.

4. HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

(9.30-11.10AM)

(15 minutes for each submitter followed by 10 minutes for questions)

- Barry Knight, Christchurch Manager, Living Earth Limited (6555) (9.30am)
- Adrian Marsh, General Manager, Meta NZ Ltd (6559) (9.55am)
- Paula Smith, Chairperson, Lyttleton-Mt. Herbert Community Board (6557) (10.20am)
- Gareth James, General Manager, Canterbury Waste Services Limited (6558) (10.45am)

All submissions and Draft Bylaw separately attached.

5. CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS

It is recommended that the Panel decide to table the submissions on the Waste Management Bylaw Review.

6. CONSIDERATION OF REPORT

7. DELIBERATIONS

3. Staff comments on Draft Waste Management Bylaw 2008

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
6543	Rodger Ashton-Smith	No	I support the concept that is being presented and look forward to the time it becomes effective. Thanks for the help to get our community more involved in saving our wonderful country.	-	
6544	Robert Walsh	No	<p>1. Supports the bylaw. However has some reservations about the sizes of the bins chosen for the various functions.</p> <p>2. The size of the Organics bin is too small. Many of us have privately operated "green bins" at present and this waste goes to composting facilities. These bins will be discontinued with the introduction of the Council proposal due to cost. With the proposed size of the Organics bin it will mean that much green waste will end up in the Rubbish bin thus increasing the amount of waste to the landfill rather than reducing it.</p> <p>Compost it I hear you say and I do but there is a limit to this on the small urban sections of today. Also in the spring when there is lawn clippings and other green material there is no dry matter to help break this down and you finish with a wet mass that is unmanageable.</p> <p>3. For the average household the Recycling bin will be far too large and in many cases so will the Rubbish bin. Currently we rarely fill our recycling container and this includes paper and plastic bags. Also we currently have only about 1/3 of a rubbish bag full per week and this is usually put out once a fortnight although this has to be weekly in the summer due to the smell of food waste that cannot be composted.</p> <p>4. What I would really like to see is that ratepayers be given choice in the size of bins that they require for the various functions. I am not suggesting that that they could choose large bins for all functions but should be able to swap the various sizes for the various functions that most suit their particular situation. In my case I would be quite happy to trade smaller Rubbish and Recycling bins for a larger Organics bin.</p>	<p><i>Note: Consideration of wheelie bin sizes actually fall outside the scope of the bylaw special consultative procedure but as it has been raised by various submitters will be covered in this summary of submissions.</i></p> <p>In early October all addresses receiving the wheelie bin kerbside collection service will receive a letter providing more information on the service, including the option of downsizing the bin sizes and the option to contract an enhanced organics and/or recycling service.</p>	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
6545	Debbie Gardner	No	<p>1. We object to the SIZE of the new recycling bins that are going to be used in the coming future. I saw in the Christchurch Press the three sizes that the city council are looking at. As a " Garden City " we have plenty of people out there who look after their gardens, including myself.</p> <p>2. We object to the SMALL size of the " ORGANIC'S " Bin. I believe that the garden rubbish & kitchen scrapes should warrant a LARGE size bin, as this would get used the most in any house hold. Recycling warrants a medium bin & General rubbish the small bin size.</p> <p>3. I think that the bins are a fabulous idea & much needed venture for everyone.</p>	In early October all addresses receiving the wheelie bin kerbside collection service will receive a letter providing more information on the service, including the option of downsizing the bin sizes and the option to contract an enhanced organics and/or recycling service.	
6546	Paul-Jon Flewellen	No	<p>Currently, with the single bin process, due to the long list of how rubbish must be presented (ie; washed, tops removed), etc, all the rubbish collectors leave behind on the kerb many items which end up being scattered up & down sheets. With the introduction of the new 3 bin process, I can anticipate the mess on a much increased level. It seems that the principal job of removing rubbish is somewhat secondary as the collectors find a much higher level of items someone has arbitrarily deemed "unsuitable".</p>	<p>The website www.loveyourrubbish.co.nz provides information on what can be collected and how it is to be presented. From October this information will be made available in general publications.</p> <p>Proper use of wheelie bins should result in no kerbside spills. Contractors do not create a mess as they do not sort materials on the kerbside.</p>	
6547	Kay Thomas	No	<p>1. I fully support and look forward to the new system of 3 bins for waste management in Christchurch</p> <p>2. However I am concerned that this will not work for our holiday home in Akaroa. We go over once a month for the weekend leaving to return to Christchurch on Sunday in the late afternoon. My neighbours and I have discussed what we would do with the bins as all our neighbours are not permanent residents so there would be no-</p>	Council provides community waste and recycling drop off facilities on Banks Peninsula, including at Barry/s Bay, which customers who are unable to use collection services are able to use instead.	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			one to take the bins in,		
6548	Diane Monk		<p>Over a period of several months, the Christchurch City Council have endeavoured to remind the 52 residents of Balmoral Lane in Redcliffs that as a courtesy to neighbours and pedestrians, recycling crates and/or rubbish bags should not be placed at the kerbside any earlier than 6 p.m. the night before the collection day. This is the result of several complaints of wind blown debris, bag attacks by animals (rats) and vandalism (fires).</p> <p>Placing items out too early blocks footpaths, increases the risk of litter and has the potential to be a health and safety hazard and also detracts from the appearance of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The residents have been notified by circulating this request in the local newspaper(s) and personal notification by way of a letter from the Council.</p> <p>I would like to submit to the Committee that this process has been quite Ineffective and request consideration to the following:</p> <p><i>"Balmoral Lane is a private lane, with ownership shared by the property owners in the Lane. Private lanes do not receive a kerbside collection of refuse (rubbish and recycling). However, the Council introduced a policy several years ago whereby residents may apply for a private lane collection. This would be granted if certain criteria were met. One of these criteria is that the collection contractor's small vehicles must be able to safely negotiate the lane, and turn at the land end, without driving over footpaths, berms or driveways.</i></p> <p><i>Balmoral Lane has been assessed and does not currently meet the criteria to be approved for private lane collection. Residents group their refuse opposite the end of the lane on an area of Council land next to the estuary which is quite unsatisfactory and has encouraged illegal dumping from surrounding residents... even as far away as Taylor's Mistake.</i></p>	<p>The contract with the Collection Contractor and the proposed terms and conditions for the new residential kerbside collection service includes the current provisions for collection from private lanes and gated communities. The new collection fleet includes vehicles purpose specified to work in steep restricted streets to enable those provisions of the contract to be fulfilled.</p> <p>With respect to Balmoral Lane, both Council and the Contractor have agreed to include Balmoral Lane in the collection route, subject to over 50% of the residents agreeing to the service taking place.</p>	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p><i>Based on the capabilities of the new trucks for the three wheelie bin system it now appears that Balmoral Lane WILL BE be suitable for collection which will alleviate many of the problems that residents in Balmoral Lane (and those opposite the current refuse placement point) experience.</i></p> <p><i>Placing wheelie bins in McCormacks Bay will increase the risk of wind blown debris, continued vandalism and encourage further illegal dumping. I am therefore opposed to this alternative arrangement and request the wheelie bin collection be done from Balmoral Lane.</i></p> <p><i>It is also worthy of noting that any bins that are placed in the face of the nor west and southerly winds are prone to being toppled ... This is currently apparent in the Barnett Park to Sumner area. Several bins in this area block the footpath and make it very difficult for the elderly on mobility scooters and young mothers with prams (twins), children and dogs to negotiate the very popular walk on inadequate footpaths to Sumner.</i></p> <p>Please also note that the rubbish bins attached to lamp posts in the area are receiving large amounts of house hold rubbish on a daily basis. This is done to avoid purchasing the standard black rubbish bags. There should be notices on the bins that make this kind of dumping illegal.</p>		
6549	Don and Marie	No	<p>We live in Belleview Tce, Mt Pleasant and are unable to have wheelie bins due to a long steep driveway and also we are not as young as we used to be, therefore, the bins are not suitable.</p>	<p>Customers can decide to leave their bins wherever it is most convenient on their property – including inside the property at the street, and filling the bins when required as they pass by the bins at the end of the driveway.</p> <p>Elderly residents may take up the small bin option, which will be easier to handle than the large 240 and 140 litre bins</p>	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
6550	Raylene Hunter	No	<p>1. I fully support and look forward to the new system of 3 bins for waste management in Christchurch.</p> <p>2 however I am concerned that this will not work for our holiday home in Akaroa. We go over once a month for the weekend leaving to return to CHCH on Sunday in the late afternoon. My neighbours and I have discussed what we would do with the bins as all our neighbours are not permanent residents so there would be no one to take the bins in.</p>	<p>Council provides community waste and recycling drop off facilities on Banks Peninsula, including at Barry/s Bay, which customers who are unable to use collection services are able to use instead.</p>	
6551	TJ Seed	No	<p>I don't NEED any bins. I don't WANT any bins. I will not provide a free home for three such bins. Where are they to be put? Should I be compelled to provide space for storage bins I would like it minuted that in no way will I accept responsibility for them.</p> <p>I strongly object to having to pay for bins that I do not need and which (as measured at Fendalton Library) take up a standing 1.3m³ of space.</p> <p>The reason I don't need or want three bins:-</p> <p>I live alone and the waste is adequately taken care of by :</p> <p>(1) The 40ltr green Re-cycling bucket; each week this usually contains 3 Kg of junk, some plastic bottles and perhaps a few empty tins or glass jars.</p> <p>(2) A black bag of other household rubbish every third week. If I had use for a bin it would be the 240 ltr bin for green/garden waste.</p>	<p>Staff suggest that a new sub clause 4(1) be added to clause 4, as follows, to clarify the position regarding use of the kerbside collection service (the existing wording will become clause 4(2)):</p> <p>Proposed new Clause 4(1) <i>"If a kerbside collection service is provided by the Council to a property, persons residing at that property are entitled to use that service, unless the service has been withdrawn or suspended under clause 5 of this Bylaw. For the avoidance of doubt, this Bylaw does not require any person to use a kerbside collection service, just because it is available. "</i></p> <p>The objection to having to pay for bins is not a bylaw issue. The new service is paid out of rates and in this respect is no different to the current rubbish collection service, or other services that the Council provides such as libraries and community</p>	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
				facilities. These are paid for from rates, and although it is recognised that not every rate payer uses those services, there is no refund in rates for non-use.	
6552	AL and AK Charman	No	<p>1. Residents should be offered options which best suit their particular needs rather than be compulsorily required to accept the proposed bins. We have a small section of 0.0763 hectares and we compose kitchen scraps and a limited amount of green garden waste. We currently hire a 240 litre bin for green waste from Waste Management, and this is mostly full when emptied weekly. For us to compost a huge amount of garden green waste is a ridiculous demand as we would have to have numerous compost bins – and the composting process takes far too long! We point out too that the Christchurch City Council did a very poor job of leaf collection in our street last autumn! Composting is slow and hard work for old people. We will still need a 240 litre bin from a private contractor at an annual cost of \$175 plus the additional storage space for 4 bins.</p> <p>We have not tow bar on our car and no trailer, so are unable to take excess rubbish to the refuse centre. There are only two elderly residents at this address so we have very little household waste and only have 1 rubbish bag a fortnight and 1 recycling bin each week.</p> <p>What we need is a 240 litre green waste bin; a 140 litre recycling bin (a huge overkill in size for us); a 80 litre rubbish bin (a huge overkill in size for us)</p> <p>2. Compliance requirements we agree are necessary if it is possible to comply! Already there are all sorts of rubbish from households appearing in park bins, and bins in and around shopping areas, both small and large and how will this be managed or policed? Every day Council staff clean up Harper Avenue and there appears to be no effort made to catch the people who throw garbage from cars. If the Council don't in fact clean up Harper Avenue every morning-</p>	<p>1. In early October all addresses receiving the wheelie bin kerbside collection service will receive a letter providing more information on the service, including the option of downsizing the bin sizes and the option to contract an enhanced organics and/or recycling service.</p> <p>Upgrades to a larger organics bin will be possible. Because of the additional collection and processing cost such a service will be at an additional cost to the customer.</p> <p>2. The bylaw does prohibit the placing of waste in street/park bins, and this will be enforced, and will be accompanied by more public education.</p> <p>The non-compliance issues raised by the submitter have been referred to the Council's Inspections and enforcement unit for follow up.</p> <p>3. The bylaw does not prohibit mixed waste and recyclables being collected by commercial contractors. Inevitable increases in future dumping costs are likely to make</p>	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>then they should, because it is disgusting on a main road into the city for visitors. We live in the Ilam area which we believe was a nice suburb fifteen years ago, and now is becoming a trash area. It seems to us that the Council has big ideas at a huge cost to ratepayers, but does nothing to enforce the tidiness of the city!</p> <p>3. If bins are not put away out of sight the city will look even untidier, and in the Ilam area where there is a high concentration of students flattening, what strict policing of compliance laws will be undertaken to seriously reduce trash in public places (including super market trolleys)? We have people in our street who don't recycle and have a private contractor emptying a bin weekly which has all their rubbish in it- garden and household rubbish of all sorts. Will this be allowed to continue?</p> <p>4. Creating a new raft of compliance laws in our opinion, without very strict enforcements, will be a waste of time- there are too many people who don't care <u>and some of these are tourists!</u></p>	such services more expensive, and together with the publicity/education campaign that will accompany the new system, there is the anticipation that attitudes will change towards proper separation of wastes and recyclables.	
6553	AL and AK Charman (second submission)	No	<p>Our legal property description – Lot 24 DP 34984 Ref 2787094</p> <p>This property is a holiday home and access to our house from Onuku Road is down a steep flight of about 15 steps. There is no way that we could get wheelie bins up these steps, or store them at street level on the road verge as there is insufficient room.</p> <p>Because this is a holiday home and we don't want to leave rubbish bags or a recycling crate at the gate for collection – because of possible animal scavenging, or loss by theft of the recycle crate, we take all our household waste back to our home in Christchurch. This property has a considerable amount of kanuka and other native trees, plus our own garden plantings and produces considerable green waste. Some of this we compost but most of it is burnt once or maybe twice a year. We have no trailer or tow bar on the car and moving green waste from below the house to a mini skip at the roadside is very inconvenient and extremely hard work.</p>	Council provides community waste and recycling drop off facilities on Banks Peninsula, including at Barry/s Bay, which customers who are unable to use collection services are able to use instead.	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			The problem is: we do not want any bins, so why should we have to pay for them!		
6554	G Ross Gibson for Body corporate	No	When the Council determines the specific terms and conditions required for compliance to the Bylaws relating to the kerbside collection service, it takes cognisance of the effect of the service on the elderly, the disabled, and residents of apartments and units such as "over 60's", where space for storage is at a premium.	In early October all addresses receiving the wheelie bin kerbside collection service will receive a letter providing more information on the service, including the option of downsizing the bin sizes and the option to contract an enhanced organics and/or recycling service. The 80/80/80 service might be more suitable for the elderly, the disabled and units where space is at a premium.	
6555	George Fietje – Living Earth Ltd	Yes	<p>Living Earth Limited (LEL) fully supports the objective of Christchurch City Councils' (CCC) proposed Waste Management Bylaw, which is ".to prevent the contamination of recoverable resources and maximise the recovery of recyclable resources."</p> <p>LEL sees that the new bylaw will assist CCC in achieving its waste reduction targets a set out in the National Waste Strategy. The introduction of the Waste Levy Bill is a further incentive for CCC to minimise the volume of waste it sends to landfill.</p> <p>LEL endorses and wishes to highlight Clause 5 of the Bylaw, Non-Compliance with Conditions for Kerbside Collection Service. The success of the kerbside collection service is largely dependant on reducing the level of contaminants in the recyclables and organics collected. To achieve a clean incoming stream, CCC must be able to take enforcement action when any non compliance occurs. LEL recommends the adoption of a '3 strikes and you're out' policy, which is in place in Timaru and other Australian cities.</p> <p>Furthermore, LEL supports and wishes to comment on Clause 10, Restriction on Disposal of Wastes, sub-clause 2, where the council</p>	The proposed terms and conditions makes provision for the service to be withdrawn after 3 notices for non conformance in a 12 month period.	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			may prohibit certain materials from being deposited in an approved container. This clause further strengthens Clause 5 by defining what certain materials are unacceptable when deposited in kerbside collections bins.		
6556	Jeffrey Baker		<p>I have and continue to support re-cycling, composting and waste reduction but wish to state the following.</p> <p>Three bins will take up considerably more room than the present system. Presently I have the recycle bin in a laundry store cupboard and the rubbish bag sits on top. This takes up minimal space and is clean and tidy. My section is a reasonable size but there is no suitable place outside and no room in the garage. I know other people who keep theirs in the garage and will not have the space inside or out and do not support this proposal either.</p> <p>The idea of fortnightly rubbish collection concerns me. I have tenants who don't rap their waste and the thought of rubbish rotting in bins for up the two weeks is horrible and a possible health issue. Even well rapped waste can start to smell after a few days. What about the smell from multiple bins in apartment type situations after a week.</p> <p>The recycle bins should take more than 1 and 2 type plastics so this is a well needed improvement but these seem large and again having had years of tenant experience know that people will not use these bins correctly, putting un-clean or un-sorted materials within. Due to there size they will be outside and in many cases be an eyesore to the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The present bins are a more convenient size and stack into each other. With the three bins there are fewer options as to where you can store them and more chances of them being visual pollution to the city of Christchurch.</p> <p>How do the collectors know who is doing it right and wrong. Again tenants place plastic milk containers out complete with milk and lids on and beer bottles complete with cigarette butts. I know as I share the common drive with one tenant.</p>	<p>In early October all addresses receiving the wheelie bin kerbside collection service will receive a letter providing more information on the service, including the option of downsizing the bin sizes and the option to contract an enhanced organics and/or recycling service.</p> <p>Customers can decide to leave their bins wherever it is most convenient on their property – including inside the property at the street, and filling the bins when required as they pass by the bins at the end of the driveway.</p> <p>Council will be promoting the use of the organics bin for the putrescible waste stream and as this bin is collected weekly should not create the odour issue referred to in the submission.</p> <p>All plastics will be accepted once the new system is available.</p> <p>Council accepts and has budgeted for ongoing education and auditing of the use of bins.</p> <p>The processing systems chosen can</p>	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			Compost bins I'd agree with (I compost but always have more garden waste than I can handle) They appear the right size and are optional but if we are to be charged for this service wether we want it or not then one of the present contactors could provide this service.	accept small amounts of contamination without affecting the value of the end product.	
6557	Lyttelton-Mt. Herbert community Board	Yes	<p>General: Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board supports the provisions in the proposed Waste Management Bylaw 2009 and appreciates the clear and succinct way the bylaw has been drafted to deal with issues arising from the new wheelie bin system.</p> <p>One waste management issue in our area which is not addressed by the bylaw is the problem of people dumping greenwaste over banks on roadsides and into reserves. Dumping of garden waste can lead to the establishment of invasive plants in reserves which can have a significant harmful effect on biodiversity values. It is possible that this issue has been addressed in another bylaw or elsewhere, but we are not aware of it. If appropriate, we suggest that provisions to discourage or prevent this practice should be included in the bylaw.</p> <p>Clauses 4 & 5: We are aware there is still some anxiety among the elderly and those living in the steeper parts of Lyttelton about how the new system will work in practice. We ask that when considering matters which are to be covered by the terms and conditions (clauses 4 and 5) that a degree of flexibility be allowed for householders with mobility or access difficulties.</p> <p>On Tuesday 16 September Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community Board will be observing a kerbside collection trial in Lyttelton. If any other issues emerge which relate to the proposed bylaw we will raise them verbally when we speak to our submission during the hearings in October.</p>	Dumping of greenwaste over banks on roadsides and into reserves need not be included in this bylaw as it is covered by section 232 of the Local Government Act 2002 and section 15 of the Litter Act. There are also more specific provisions relating to roadsides in the Local Government Act 1974 (section 357) and relating to reserves in the Reserves Act (section 94).	
6558	Gareth James –	Yes	Background	The relief sought by the submitter to remove Clause 10 (1) is supported as	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
	Canterbury Waste Services Ltd		<p>4 CWS owns and operates the Resource Recovery Centre at Parkhouse Road, Sockburn, which provides a waste recovery, consolidation and transfer service for commercial waste collectors.</p> <p>5 The Parkhouse Road Resource Recovery Centre is a refuse station licensed under the Christchurch City Licensed Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw 2007. Therefore, it will be a "Licensed Refuse Station" for the purposes of the Waste Management Bylaw.</p> <p>6 Clause 10(1) of the draft Waste Management Bylaw provides that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"The Council may by resolution impose restrictions and conditions in respect of the type of waste that will be accepted at licensed refuse stations".</p> <p>7 This provision would enable the Council in future to impose by resolution, restrictions for the receipt of waste at licensed refuse stations, including the Parkhouse Road Resource Recovery Centre.</p> <p>Relief Sought by this Submission</p> <p>8 <u>CWS seeks that clause 10(1) of the draft Waste Management Bylaw be deleted.</u></p> <p>Procedural Issues</p> <p>9 The inclusion of Clause 10(1) and its potential impact is well outside the scope addressed in the balance of the proposed Bylaw, which sensibly focuses on issues necessary for the successful management of the new kerbside collection system to be introduced.</p> <p>10 The import of Clause 10(1) extends well beyond the bounds of the other clauses in the Bylaw, and accordingly appears as an</p>	<p>the Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw 2007 contains provisions under Clause 6 which, although not currently used, can be used in future to achieve control over what is received at transfer stations (waste handling facilities). These handling requirements can only be introduced after the Council has considered the factors listed in clause 6 (1) and has discussed those matters with applicants/licence holders.</p>	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>afterthought. Given that its focus has nothing to do with the new City kerbside collection system, and that its potential impact on others, particularly private businesses, is well outside any other aspect of the Bylaw, it seems out of place.</p> <p>11 Clause 10(1) of the draft Waste Management Bylaw would enable the Council in future to impose restrictions for the receipt of waste at licensed refuse stations by way of Council resolution.</p> <p>12 This could occur without public consultation or input from key stakeholders, or full cost-benefit analysis. These procedural issues are of significant concern to CWS.</p> <p>13 If the Council wishes to introduce powers to restrict what can be accepted at private facilities across the City, with consequent huge potential impacts for individual businesses, it should do so through a special consultative process in its own right, where the affected parties can put their case on the specifics of the materials proposed to be restricted. Introducing a single clause which gives Council the ability to make such dramatic changes within a Bylaw ostensibly to do with the management and administration of its own kerbside collection system, is unfair and an abuse of process.</p> <p>14 The Clause 10(1) is out of place in the Waste Management Bylaw 2009. Measures relating to licensed refuse stations already have a proper home, in the Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw, which was only recently reviewed by the Council.</p> <p>15 It is almost as though the Clause was written back in the days when the Council owned all Christchurch refuse transfer stations.</p> <p>16 CWS would have no Concerns if the proposed Clause 10(1) were amended to apply only to those licensed refuse stations under its control.</p>		

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p data-bbox="584 300 1200 352">Practicality of Removing Specific Material from Mixed Waste</p> <p data-bbox="517 384 1256 576">17 The previous (and sensible) focus of the Council's waste minimisation strategy has been to foster services and incentives that will ensure recoverable material is removed from the waste stream before it gets anywhere near a transfer station floor, and/or before it is put into contact with mixed refuse. The new kerbside collection system is a prime example of that approach.</p> <p data-bbox="517 608 1256 967">18 This is based on the simple fact that mixed general waste, once loaded into trucks, becomes too contaminated to be economically, practically, or safely separated. The world-wide negative experience with "Dirty MRF's" is testament to that difficulty, and no doubt underlies the reason why Christchurch chose a source separation system at collection in the first place. (A "dirty MRF" is a material recovery facility that accepts mixed municipal solid waste, unseparated or sorted at receipt, and then attempts to sort the material into recoverables and residual waste. They are very different from the type of MRF being built under the Christchurch contract with Meta, which will accept pre-sorted material with minimum residual waste contamination.)</p> <p data-bbox="517 999 1256 1238">19 Private companies are following the Council's lead, and introducing a variety of source separation collections for the commercial sector, such as the Transpacific "Combo" system. They are managing single stream or uncontaminated loads in a manner that allows maximum economic recovery of recyclables. Not only is this consistent with Council and Government waste strategy, it makes good commercial sense, as recoverable material prices are the best they have been for many years.</p> <p data-bbox="517 1270 1256 1347">20 General waste transfer stations are thus becoming the receivers of residual waste, which has already been largely picked over for recoverable materials before it is sent to the</p>		

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>station for consolidation and eventual disposal. The amount of uncontaminated material that is now in the waste stream at the CWS transfer station that can be practically, economically and safely removed is very small.</p> <p>21 Any restrictions for receipt of specific Wastes at licensed refuse stations will require full "dirty MRF" sorting of waste streams to remove any "restricted material", in order to ensure compliance with the restrictions.</p> <p>22 Whether the sorting is labour or capital intensive, the sorting costs involved would be substantial, and Would require high volumes of recovered recyclables and/or high gate fees in order to be financially viable. Such volumes are unlikely, because the Council's own new collections, and the new style of commercial collections and dry waste processing systems now operating or being introduced, will mean the volume of material recovered and therefore available to offset costs, will be minimal. CWS considers that the sorting costs would be prohibitive within the existing refuse station structure, and could force the closure of some licensed refuse stations, and consolidation to only one or two stations.</p> <p>23 Because scale will be a critical factor in the economics of complying with the need to remove "restricted" waste, it could provide an incentive for the major companies to concentrate their resources in a single transfer station and sorting operation in the City. They would then work hard to obtain the largest possible share of all residual waste, a process likely to eventually result in closure of the smaller operations. This would be a shame, as the smaller operators currently offer diversity in the market place.</p> <p>24 In summary, the planned greater level of at-source segregation of recyclables and diversion of organic waste will further reduce the ability of refuse stations to operate financially viable resource recovery operations. With the high cost of modern separation systems, and the greatly reduced</p>		

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>proportion of recoverable material in the waste stream received at the refuse stations due to the enhanced segregated collection system, further processing of mixed waste at the refuse stations is unlikely to be financially viable.</p> <p>Source Segregated Collection</p> <p>25 CWS supports the approach of segregation of recoverable materials from residual waste before sending the latter to the refuse station. This is very much the basis of the Council's new three-bin system for households, and what is behind the current and planned initiatives in the commercial waste sector.</p> <p>26 This largely reflects the difficulty of contamination once waste is mixed, and is consistent with various waste-related legislation and policies both at national and local levels.</p> <p>27 Imposing restrictions for receipt of specific wastes at licensed refuse stations would be inconsistent with this approach.</p> <p>28 Banning specific waste Components from licensed refuse facilities is targeting the wrong end of the process, as operators do not see the waste until it is tipped onto the floor, when it is too late to stop it coming in. Any regulation must target the waste producers, who have the ability to not produce, or to separate recoverables from residual waste. Refuse stations are not waste producers, and have no practical options once the waste is tipped and mixed with nappies, needles, food waste, etc, but to send it for disposal.</p> <p>Health and safety</p> <p>29 Occupational health and safety issues will arise from any requirement to remove specific wastes at licensed refuse stations. For example, in the case of manual sorting, which would almost certainly be needed if specific materials were required to be removed in total, sorters would be exposed to needles, broken glass, contaminated health products, and</p>		

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>other hazards within the residual waste stream. This impacts on both employee safety, and statutory compliance costs.</p> <p>30 The sorting and removal of specific materials from a mixed waste stream is an entirely different proposition than sorting from “dry waste” or similar pre-sorted waste streams. It is difficult to see how a manual sorting process for mixed waste could be operated in compliance with New Zealand health and safety laws.</p> <p>Marketplace Considerations</p> <p>31 Waste handling facilities target different sectors of the market. Waste handling and sorting processes that may be viable for some operators may not be for operators in other sectors. For example, at present, the proportion of economically recoverable material in the household waste stream is significantly higher than that in the commercial waste stream. Some waste handling facilities target predominantly household waste, and others target predominantly commercial waste. One facility in Christchurch targets only one very specific sector of the waste stream, and there could well be more single product waste handling facilities developed in the future.</p> <p>32 If the Council makes it a requirement to eliminate any specific waste type from disposal, this will impose a requirement to sort incoming waste at transfer stations. The investment needed for this will make the companies wishing to stay in the game very keen to maximize their market share, as recovering costs of such additional investment requires scale and the largest possible volumes. This would inevitably squeeze out the smaller, less well resourced operators.</p> <p>33 A common waste type ban regime imposed on all operators could disadvantage specific operators relative to others, and reduce their ability to compete.</p> <p>34 On the other hand, waste type ban regimes imposed</p>		

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>differentially on different operators would open the Council up to all sorts of potential conflicts.</p> <p>35 Some operators are likely to look to develop facilities outside the jurisdiction of the Council, in part to avoid potential sorting obligations.</p> <p>36 Imposition of waste sorting regimes on waste handling facilities will be a difficult exercise for the Council, unlikely to create a level playing field between operators of licensed refuse stations.</p> <p>37 The Council must also take account of the very large private investments that have been made in existing facilities, and ensure that any legislative changes they wish to impose that will have an impact on the businesses that have made those investments in good faith, have timelines that allow managed change.</p> <p>38 Businesses that are unable or unwilling to comply, should be able to exit the marketplace in a reasonable timeframe to minimise or avoid destruction of asset value. Similarly, businesses wishing to reinvest to ensure compliance with new rules should have sufficient timeframes to achieve this in a structured manner.</p> <p>39 That said, Council will also need to ensure that any regime they propose to introduce does not eliminate or restrict the ability of private operators to offer competing services or have the effect of lessening competition between privately owned and publicly owned facilities.</p> <p>Other Mechanisms</p> <p>40 By far the greatest incentive to households and businesses to properly sort waste into recoverable material and residual waste, is the cost of disposal. This has increased substantially in recent years.</p>		

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>41 With the introduction of the National Waste Levy, planned for commencement in 2009, and the effect of the Emissions Trading Act, combined with the higher price of fuel, it is CWS's view that the cost of disposal will rise dramatically in the next few years, potentially more than doubling its current level, depending upon the price of carbon.</p> <p>42 This change will have more effect than any form of regulation, and is likely to lead to changes in the refuse station structure that will be difficult to predict at this point.</p> <p>43 It may not be the best time to Consider changing the existing regulations for licensed refuse stations, just before quantum Changes in the operating environment are about to occur.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>44 CWS welcomes the Council's consideration of this submission and the opportunity to discuss the matter with the Council.</p>		
6559	Adrian Marsh – Meta NZ Ltd		<p>Introduction</p> <p>The purpose of the Bylaw as stated in the 'Object of the Bylaw' is: <i>"...to prevent the contamination of recoverable resources and maximise the recovery of recoverable resources."</i></p> <p>However this is a wider definition than that indicated in the Statement of Proposal, namely creating a comprehensive bylaw to replace the 1995 and 2002 bylaws, and support the introduction of the new kerbside collection methodology.</p> <p>The proposed bylaw clearly supports the introduction of the new kerbside collection system by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. defining the parameters for delivery of the kerbside collection services 2. specifying terms and conditions to utilise the service 	The relief sought by the submitter to remove Clause 10 (1) is supported as the Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw 2007 contains provisions under Clause 6 which, although not currently used, can be used in future to achieve control over what is received at transfer stations (waste handling facilities). These handling requirements can only be introduced after the Council has considered the factors listed in clause 6(1) and has discussed those matters with applicants/licence holders.	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>3. applying adverse consequences for non-compliance with the terms and conditions.</p> <p>The bylaw makes an excellent job of introducing and supporting the new collection services and Meta NZ wholly supports the introduction of those items. However, Meta NZ believes the Bylaw has three areas of concern:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. it does not provide Schedules to define acceptable and unacceptable materials for disposal through the kerbside collection system 2. it does not provide a specified methodology for changes to its provisions 3. it provides a route for the Council to directly intervene in private commercial business without a due consultative process <p>1 — Bylaw Schedules</p> <p>There are precedents for Schedules in CCC bylaws. The Cleanfill Licensing Bylaw specifies a schedule of material that is permitted for disposal into cleanfill; the Trade Waste Bylaw uses schedules to specify discharge characteristics.</p> <p>Addition of a schedule to the proposed Waste Management Bylaw will provide a mechanism to define what the permissible materials for each collection service are, and what materials are specifically excluded.</p> <p>The 1995 Refuse Bylaw contains its list of prohibitions within section 6. The list of prohibited materials is largely general in nature, which is to be expected if listed within the body of the document.</p> <p>The advantage of providing the prohibitions list within a schedule is that specific items can be listed alongside general provisions making a much more comprehensive specification. Items are more easily added as new products develop, and removed as recycling technologies develop. This has been evidenced recently with the push to remove concrete from the Cleanfill Licensing Schedule A as concrete crushing has become more cost effective giving alternate</p>		

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>potential for the material.</p> <p>There are also international examples of Waste Bylaw Schedules from cities with successful 3 bin collection systems in operation. Refer chapter 844 of the Toronto Municipal code.</p> <p>2 — Methodology for Changes</p> <p>Clause 10(1) of the proposed bylaw states “The Council may by resolution impose restrictions and conditions in respect of the type of waste that will be accepted at licensed refuse stations.”</p> <p>Imposing restrictions by resolution makes no provision for a required consultative process. As waste disposal services at licensed refuse stations are provided by private companies the Council is providing a mechanism to directly interfere with commercial businesses without providing a right of consultation.</p> <p>If the Council wishes to provide a mechanism for prohibiting certain materials being delivered into licensed refuse stations as part of its waste minimisation strategy; it is appropriate that a requirement for consultation with relevant stakeholders be a part of the process.</p> <p>If a change facility is required by Council it is appropriate that this clause be modified to require a consultation process. Meta believes this provision is more suited to insertion into the Licensed Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw.</p> <p>3 — Prohibited Wastes</p> <p>The statement of proposal does not allude to a requirement to control the type of waste sent to licensed transfer stations. Clause 3(4) in the Statement of Proposal under ‘Bylaw Provisions’ indicates the Council desire to prohibit disposal of certain identified wastes or materials. This does not specify licensed facilities being subject to these prohibitions. However, Clause 10(1) of the proposed bylaw extends the scope of prohibitions to licensed refuse stations.”</p> <p>The extension of the scope of the provision in 10(1) is of significant concern to Meta NZ. This provision has the potential to create direct political control over private commercial business. The Council owned transfer stations are leased and operated privately; there are</p>		

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>three other private transfer station operators within Christchurch. The city has ample provision and significant competition for waste disposal, each business with an independent business model. It is inappropriate for the Council to provide itself with the ability within the proposed bylaw for direct intervention of this nature. Market economics and the ability of technologies to viably separate waste are the appropriate defining factors.</p> <p>The potential control of waste type sent to licensed facilities is only defined in both the 1995 and 2002 bylaws as a phrase within the clause regarding the Control of Refuse Transfer and Disposal Sites. When these clauses were written the respective councils had a monopoly control of refuse transfer facilities within their areas, The tenor of these clauses is focused on control of these operations; not defining what materials should or should not be recycled. If the Council wishes to have greater definition in its control over waste streams delivered to refuse transfer stations, it is appropriate for those provisions to be built into the Licensed Waste Handling Facilities Bylaw.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Meta NZ supports the introduction of the proposed bylaw.</p> <p>Meta NZ would like to see Clause 10(1) removed from the proposed bylaw.</p>		
6560	Layne Sefton - TPI		<p>As contractor to the City Council for the kerbside collection of waste and recycle containers I support the intent of the by law to encourage the uniform presentation and contents of wheelie bins to ensure a safe working environment for the collection staff and processing plant workers. The introduction of the three bin system encourages increased waste resource recovery without compromising staff or residents.</p> <p>I support strong enforcement of breaches of the bylaw including physical monitoring of bins, removal of services for repeated non compliance and any other means the council adopts to encourage correct use of the service and discourage litter or illegal dumping. The council should also consider the effectiveness of ongoing education programmes in support of the service and the provision of</p>	A comprehensive public education programme will precede the introduction of the new collection system.	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			adequate funding in the budget for these programmes.		
6561	Jane Soons		<p>As a resident in her seventies, living on a back section accessed by a long drive leading to a steep, unsealed lane, which in turn leads up to the road, I would find it impossible to push a wheelie bin up to the collection point. My only option would be to leave the bin(s) by the road side.</p> <p>At present I can transport my rubbish bag, bin, and bundles of newspapers in the back of my car to the collection point.</p> <p>The proposal to use wheelie bins needs recognition of the potential difficulties of ratepayers whose properties may be distant from the road, who may be aged and living alone, and whose access is by no means flat.</p>	Customers can decide to leave their bins wherever it is most convenient on their property – including inside the property at the street, and filling the bins when required as they pass by the bins at the end of the driveway.	
6562	Ian McLean	No	How about free dumping of organic at the transfer stations?	Transfer stations operations including charges for services are not controlled by the Council.	
6563	Scott Campbell	No	Under the new wheelie bin system is it possible to have a larger wheelie bin for organics / garden waste. At present, it's proposed that an 80 litre bin will be provided. This will be too small for my requirements. I currently use a 140 litre bin provided by Waste Management. Will individuals be able to opt for a larger size wheelie bin for organics / garden waste??	Larger organics wheelie bins can be arranged directly with collectors at an additional cost.	
6564	Bruce Dale on behalf of residents of Kidson Terrace, Cashmere	No	<p>Background:</p> <p>The eight homes in the above group are all based up a long, uphill driveway. Some of our houses have steps, which will make the siting and shifting of wheelie bins very difficult, if not impossible.</p> <p>Whilst accepting that a towing apparatus is available for cars, not all residents' have cars with tow balls.</p> <p>As our communal driveway is extremely steep, we submit that should a bin be wheeled down that driveway (especially by an older woman) there is potential for a serious accident should the bin 'get away'.</p>	The contract with the Collection Contractor and the terms and conditions for the new residential kerbside collection service includes the current provisions for collection from private lanes and gated communities. The new collection fleet includes vehicles purpose specified to work in steep restricted streets to enable those provisions of the contract to be fulfilled	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>Collection Situation:</p> <p>At the present time householders are able to carry their recycling bins and rubbish bags to the kerbside, or to transport them in the boot of their cars, and place them <u>behind</u> our stand of letterboxes, leaving the footpath clear. With the new wheelie bins,</p> <p>(a) there will be insufficient space for the all the bins behind the letterboxes; and</p> <p>(b) the contractor will have difficulty accessing them from this area.</p> <p>Some key issues:</p> <p>As above:</p> <p>a. Some householders will experience difficulties in transporting their rubbish to the collection point as they do not have tow balls on theft cars.</p> <p>b. In the Council green paper, it is outlined that the wheelie bins will be put on the kerb. In our case, there is only a narrow footpath. On “two wheelie bin” weeks, there could be 16 bins on the narrow footpath. Our communal drive meets Kidson Terrace on a blind corner, a fact recognized by the Council who have painted yellow “no parking” lines on the road.</p> <p>e submit that by placing 16 bins in such a position, a very real hazard would be created for pedestrians, especially the school children who use Kidson Terrace in the mornings. The obstacle of the bins would force them onto the road and the yellow lined area.</p> <p>Suggested solution:</p> <p>We are aware that some areas of the city (e.g. Hollis Avenue) have a small truck picking up rubbish bags from private lanes, under the current scheme. There is a suitable area up our driveway where wheelie bins could easily be put for such a collection, an area which affords adequate turning for a mid-sized truck. We ask that the Council, or the contractor, contact the writer to discuss this solution to</p>	<p>The Contract and proposed terms and conditions also includes a provision for the collector arrange an alternative pick up point where the normal kerbside location is not appropriate (reasons include lack of space, traffic safety, wrong side of road in one way streets etc)</p> <p>As the submitters' communal driveways only serve 8 homes it is less than the cut off point for a private lane service (12 homes). However that does not preclude the contractor coming to an arrangement with the residents for a collection as described and would be deemed to be an alternative pick up point..</p> <p>The information from this submission has been forwarded onto Council's contractor for further action.</p>	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
			<p>this wheelie bin problem.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>As a number of the residents of the houses involved are over 65, we would ask that either a staff member of the rubbish unit, or a Councillor, of similar age, come up to our properties and handle a fully-laden wheelie bin up/down steps and down our drive, and then reposition an empty unit.</p>		
6565	Burwood – Pegasus Community Board	No	<p>The Board agrees with the Council's preferred option of making a bylaw to regulate the management and collection of the city's waste.</p> <p>The Board supports the objects of the intended bylaw with its focus on maximising the recovery of recyclable resources and also the intended measures to mitigate and control nuisances around waste collection and litter generation.</p> <p>The Board also notes that in other areas of the country as well as overseas, recycling bins are available in public areas and the Board would be interested to know whether this is likely in Christchurch to compliment the new wheelie bin kerbside collection service.</p> <p>Of interest to the Board will be the operational frameworks to give effect to the bylaw provisions. In this regard, the Board would propose that a presentation be made to elected members on this aspect at the appropriate time, given the community interest and feedback that is likely to occur.</p> <p>Although outside the scope of the bylaw, the Board recalls the past practice of the Council providing 'skip days' in local communities and would be interested to know whether it is to occur again in the future.</p>	<p>New recycle bins in public places are being introduced in the revamped Cashel Mall, Colombo Street and The Botanical Gardens. Budget provisions will determine to what extent more such bins can be provided, if proved to be successful.</p> <p>There is currently no provision nor planning for 'skip days'.</p>	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
6566	RK Craw	No	<p>I have read the proposals outlined in the Waste Management circular which seems to cover most circumstances except their suitability for hilly parts of Akaroa Town there does not appear any dispensation for ratepayers who will find the proposed regulations unacceptable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The container will be too big and heavy for old people on steep slopes. 2. The present bag system would be a lot easier for the staff to handle than heavy containers when full. 3. If containers are not put out to be collected until full some smell would be apparent in summer. 4. The banning of fires has greatly inconvenienced a lot of gardeners and has increased the rubbish needed to be collected. 5. It is apparent that the council takes the view that one size fits all a mistaken view. 6. If its not broke don't fix it. 	<p>Council provides community waste and recycling drop off facilities on Banks Peninsula, including at Barry/s Bay, which customers who are unable to use collection services are able to use instead.</p> <p>It is an option to have smaller bins where these are a suitable size for the household.</p> <p>The wheelie bin system is a mechanical lifting system which is proven to improve the health and safety standards in the waste collection industry.</p> <p>It is not compulsory to fill the bins before putting them out for collection.</p> <p>The contract with the Collection Contractor and the proposed terms and conditions for the new residential kerbside collection service includes the current provisions for collection from private lanes and gated communities. The new collection fleet includes vehicles purpose specified to work in steep restricted streets to enable those provision s of the contract to be fulfilled</p> <p>The Contract and proposed terms and conditions also includes a provision for the collector to arrange an alternative pick up point where the normal kerbside location is not appropriate (reasons include lack of</p>	

No	Submitter	To be heard	Submissions	Staff Comments	Panel Comments / Recommendations
				<p>space, traffic safety, wrong side of road in one way streets etc)</p> <p>As the submitters communal driveways only serves 8 homes it is less than the cut off point for a private lane service (12 homes). However that does not preclude the contractor coming to an arrangement with the residents for a collection as described and would be deemed to be an alternative pick up point..</p> <p>The information from this submission has been forwarded onto Councils contractor for further action.</p>	