

Proposed 2013 Amendment to 2012 Long Term Plan Submissions

Submitter: 1: Karen & Brian Butterworth

Topic: Solid Waste - change to bag and recycling collections

Seeks assurances that "Council's monitoring of their solid waste providers will ensure that (apart from allowing for inflation) the combined cost of solid waste bags and recycling will never rise under the new arrangement". Concerned that changes to the charging regime may remove any incentives for manufacturers/rubbish collectors to reduce unnecessary packaging.

"As long as Councils handled both waste disposal and recycling, they were subject to pressure from ratepayers and could put pressure on governments on their behalf to impose controls on the volume of waste foisted on consumers. Now that our Council proposes to define the householder as the 'user' of recycling as well as rubbish bag collection, manufacturers and rubbish collectors alike will assume private citizens will pay for any increase in waste and will rub their collective hands at the increased profit they will reap."

"The least Council can do is monitor the price of disposal, and should this rise, meet the difference from rates while they vigorously advocate to government on behalf of ratepayers to impose controls on the waste volume at source."

Seeks assurance Council will continue to pick up rubbish dumped by irresponsible people seeking to avoid 'user pays' policies. Asks for these provisions to be spelled out in the proposed amendment.

Submitter: 2: Tim Passy

Topic: Solid Waste - change to bag and recycling collections

Considers that waste management is a fundamental requirement of a local body and suggests that decisions to exit collection is a "knee jerk reaction". Asks what analysis has been done on "the hidden cost of a surge in volume to landfill? The cheaper bags will be stuffed to their maximum and green bins will gradually become redundant".

States "Focus on the basics. Keep the recycling in total Council ownership and forgo fanciful ideas such as 2nd slides at the pool and purchasing art works".

Submitter: 3: L Stockley

Topic: Solid Waste - change to bag and recycling collections

States "I object to your intention to devolve YOUR responsibility for waste collection to private enterprises. I would think, and submit, that waste collection is a core function of Council".

"Clearly Council has mismanaged this function by allowing (or perhaps encouraging) its contractors to undercut them. I can see that, in particular, the recycling will almost disappear!"

Submitter: 4: Tony Bevin

Topic: Solid Waste - change to bag and recycling collections

Asks for clarification on a number of issues before the scheduled public hearings.

Issues include:

- how do those who use other contractors for bins pay for their recycling?
- if a direct and separate charge is to be made for the recycling, isn't there a risk that people will use spare space in the wheelie bin for recyclables. This would be completely at odds with the Council's zero waste policy.
- Can the council explain the economics of current arrangements for refuse collection whereby up to 4 different contractors traverse each street picking up the rubbish from their respective clients? Considers one truck and team could do this almost effectively and efficiently as the current four.
- Concerned at the underlying waste and environmental effect of having four heavy vehicles do the work of one. Asks "has the Council considered the option of calling for competitive tenders for one refuse and recycling collection contract? If Council wanted to have some flexibility it could split the district geographically into more than one area, so having more than one contractor, thus enabling some monitoring of costs and efficiencies, and back-up in the event of default by a contractor."
- Notes that Council retains overall core responsibility for solid waste collection services. Asks if this also includes responsibility for arranging collection in the event of a default by one of the contractors?

Submitter: 5: Gordon Cameron

Topic: Solid Waste - change to bag and recycling collections

Supports Council exiting the rubbish bag market as there are now private suppliers in this market.

States "There is a future price risk to consumers, but should future pricing lead to a cartel or oligopoly, other parties (including Council) can always enter the market as commercial practice. Although this won't reduce rates (because solid waste activity is in theory funded from revenue), it will reduce the risk of incurring deficits in this business.

Solid waste is a good example of how a regional approach may deliver a more efficient/effective result. I am still in the dark about the ultimate ownership of the various players in the solid waste market, but that shouldn't matter if the market meets demand sustainably."

Submitter: 6: Helene Donaldson

Topic: Solid Waste - change to bag and recycling collections

Oppose

Concerned that Council is proposing to withdraw from the provision of rubbish and recycling collection services as:

- "Rubbish collection is a core Council service/activity
- The current 'price war' for rubbish bags is due to new players trying to gain market share. Once they have this share, we could well experience price "creep" increases
- With Council out of the supply picture, there will be no 'maximum' price established for rubbish collection services. Whilst this is currently being undercut as new players vie for customers (market share), this could well be reversed if one or more businesses withdraw due to not making any or enough profit.
- Residents could well end up with a monopoly provider able to set whatever charges they like.
- Charging separately for recycling may lead to the stealing the recycling tickets off bins, or ceasing to recycle at all and putting all their rubbish in one bin or bag. This will defeat the efforts of many years to encourage residents and businesses to recycle."

Recommends that Council remain a provider of rubbish bags.

Submitter: 7: Kapiti Coast Grey Power Association Inc

Topic: Solid Waste - change to bag and recycling collections

Oppose

Does not support the amendment.

Concerned that going over to private contractors will result in separate charges for rubbish and recycling collections. Considers the following problems with this:

- "- Could be ticketing for recycle bins; This will be open to abuse as some residents will have no compunction in gaining free recycling for themselves by stealing tickets from bins to use on their own bin.
- It was suggested 'recycling control' is for contractors to have schedules to establish households that have paid for recycling. This exercise will increase their costs, which will flow into the pricing.
- Many residents could well opt to reduce the cost of their overall rubbish collection by ceasing to recycle, putting all their rubbish in one bin or bag and omitting the recycling cost. This will defeat the efforts of many years to encourage residents and businesses to recycle."