

---

## **Regulatory and Hearings Committee** **(Rubbish and Recycling Review)**

### **OPEN MINUTES**

---

**Minutes of a meeting of the Regulatory and Hearings Committee held in Council Chamber, Municipal Building, Garden Place, Hamilton on Thursday 16 February 2017 at 9.00am and Friday 17 February 2017 at 9.30am.**

#### **PRESENT**

**Chairperson:** Cr Angela O’Leary

**Deputy Chairperson:** Cr Leo Tooman

**Members:** Deputy Mayor M Gallagher  
Cr M Bunting  
Cr J R Casson  
Cr S Henry  
Cr D Macpherson  
Cr G Mallett  
Cr Pascoe  
Cr G Taylor  
Cr P Yeung

**In attendance:** Julie Clausen – Strategy Programme Manager  
Emily Botje – Facilities Unit Manager  
Maire Porter – Unit Manager Waters

**Governance Advisors:** Becca Brooke – Governance Team Leader  
Claire Guthrie – Committee Advisor  
Ian Loiterton – Committee Advisor  
Amy Viggers – Committee Advisor

---

**1. Apologies Resolved:** (Crs O'Leary/Tooman)

That the apologies from Mayor King, Crs Southgate, and Macpherson (for lateness) be received and accepted.

**2. Confirmation of Agenda**

**Resolved:** (Crs O'Leary/Bunting)

That the agenda is confirmed.

**3. Declarations of Interest**

No members of the Council declared a Conflict of Interest.

**4. Public Forum**

No public forum was required.

**5. Rubbish and Recycling Public Engagement**

**Resolved:** (Crs O'Leary/Henry)

That the report is received.

The Chair noted that:

- the consultation process was triggered by a proposed significant change to Council's waste and rubbish procedures and that over 2800 submissions had been received;
- recommendations from the hearing were to be considered as part of the deliberations report going to Growth and Infrastructure Committee in March 2017;
- a copy of the Rubbish and Recycling Proposal consultation document had been circulated to Elected Members;
- an electronic list of submitters with a link to their submissions had been circulated to Elected Members; and
- the speaking order of submitters would change to reflect their attendance.

The following people spoke to, and responded to questions on, their submissions:

**Ross Millar (Submission 2192)**

Mr Millar spoke in support of recycling because waste was a potential resource and should be collected for recycling. He submitted the following points: encouraged Council to support community gardens and to subsidise compost bins for lower socio-economic areas; suggested a six monthly collection of technology waste; because food packaging was a major issue for rubbish collection asked Council to support initiatives that reduced packaging by including the cost of disposal in the cost of production.

**Paul Perry (Submission 104)**

Mr Perry explained that storage for three bins would be a problem along with the possible smell of the food bin. He submitted the following points: there would be an increase in plastic bags as waste because the bins would be lined with plastic bags; hosing bins to clean them would create more rubbish in the street or stormwater; putting out three bins would take several trips; bins could be left out in the street creating a hazard. He supported the status quo and suggested it would be better for the money to be invested in staff to sort rubbish and for biodegradable rubbish bags or that the money was spent on kerbside maintenance.

**John Fisher (Submission 42)**

Mr Fisher explained he had worked as a rubbish truck driver in Australia where householders paid for recycling as required and that this worked well and he suggested that tenants in multi-unit blocks went on a pre-pay system. He made the following points: if people recycle well collections would not need to be weekly or fortnightly; food businesses would need more frequent food waste collection; residents with long driveways could hook the bins onto the car towbar to take them in and out and this would not cause any damage to the bins.

**Aaron Wong (Submission 565)**

Mr Wong strongly supported recycling and for Council taking responsibility for waste as waste was a cost to everyone. He believed user pays would increase illegal dumping. He made the following points: it was important residents were encouraged to recycle as much as possible; that everything that was recyclable could be collected; that the collection timetable needed to be clearly communicated as different collections occurred in different weeks; that the service needed to be easy to use and cost should be covered by rates – user pay was more inefficient. He pointed out there was the chance that the bins would become very smelly.

**Erana Brewerton (Submission 2281)**

Ms Brewerton spoke in support of the food collection option and encouraged Council to subsidise composting and worm bins for residents. Residents who did not have a street verge would find it difficult to put out three to four bins and they would be a hazard for pedestrians and cars. She supported alternate weeks for collection, separate containers for the different collections and suggested all the bins should have wheels.

**Geoff Kreegher (Submission 2215)**

Mr Kreegher said he generally supported the proposal but found the business case presented to the Finance Committee last year to be confusing. He made the following points: some households would not need any food waste collection; some households would need weekly collection of glass waste; supported a general rates increase to cover the costs of the proposal rather than a targeted rate.

**Brian Burne (Submission 2751)**

Mr Burne spoke against the proposed rubbish bins as properties would not have room for them; they would be blown around by the wind; they could be stolen; and would be smelly and unwashed. He believed current rates were sufficient to cover rubbish collection costs. It would be more useful if recycling collection for more plastics was increased. He strongly supported improvements to the current rubbish dump – improved access, a better fence, plantings removed which block traffic view and provision of a larger carpark.

**Ety Willemse (Submission 2213)**

Ms Willemse spoke against bins because bigger rubbish bins meant more rubbish going into the landfill. She believed the bins would fill up footpaths, stay out on the footpaths for long periods and stated the rubbish bags were less space consuming. There would be problems with trucks emptying bins when cars were parked on the road – had seen cars being damaged in Auckland by this. She supported education to encourage people to reduce waste production and suggested a competition for households to have the least waste.

**Nick Willemse (Submission 2359)**

Mr Willemse did not support introduction of bins as they would not create cost savings, had a carbon footprint, spilled rubbish onto the roads and more volume equalled more disposal costs. He foresaw difficulties with the trucks which would fill up quickly with the higher volume, would be noisier, slower (more bins), harder to manoeuvre around the streets and cars, causing hazards for everyone. He supported tackling the problem at production end – reduced plastic wrapping on food, producers made responsible for the disposal costs and encouraged to produce recyclable solutions along with education about the environmental damage caused by rubbish/waste to encourage change.

**Bruce Davidson (Submission 2540)**

Mr Davidson provided an additional written submission with photos of his multi-unit student rental property showing that there was insufficient road frontage for multiple bins to be collected and no storage for them around the units. He explained that the existing system did not work well for him as current contractors would not collect heavy bags or bags with broken glass or recycling materials and would not pick up cartons. But bins would not work for multi-unit apartments and he would prefer retaining bags.

**Dorothy Miller (Submission 2249)**

Ms Miller supported composting food waste and encouraged Council to stop using herbicides and pesticides.

**Liz Hoskyn (Submission 1121)**

Ms Hoskyn spoke in support of having both bags and bins. She encouraged Council to focus on limiting the use of plastics with plastic only for long term items and biodegradable plastic used for food items.

**Amanda Board (Submission 896)**

Ms Board supported use of bins as this would remove bags from landfill. She spoke of an urgent need for more recycling opportunities as children were taught at school about recycling but most items cannot be recycled in Hamilton. She believed it was wrong that products can be bought that cannot be recycled. She pointed out that ratepayers always have to pay for rubbish and Raglan has a zero waste policy which was profitable.

**Rangi (Submission 882)**

Ms Rangi supported all recycling options.

### **Arthur Muldoon (Submission 2322)**

Mr Muldoon spoke to an additional written submission and supported minimisation at source as the best way to reduce waste and supported food waste collection. He noted the report had not considered any innovative solutions such as refundable deposits on drink bottles. He believed the focus on rubbish bags was misplaced as they were less than 1% of waste in landfill (sanitary waste was 12%). Gisborne City Council had considered a subsidy on the provision of multi-use shopping bags in supermarkets. Mr Muldoon believed there would be increased costs with the multiple collections as these would need more staff. Households would not sort items properly which would lead to contamination and items would then be unfit for recycling.

### **Katie Clemens (Submission 2752)**

Ms Clemens was concerned as an elderly person about managing the number and weight of bins as her property has steps and was a long way to the gate. She supported the collection of soft plastics. She was concerned there was nothing about waste minimisation in the plan.

### **RB and CE Armstrong (Submission 2765)**

Mr and Mrs Armstrong spoke to their additional written submission which supported retaining rubbish bags because they are an elderly couple down a very long ROW. They had calculated they would walk over one kilometre for 4 bins to be taken out and brought in. The driveway would not be suitable for trucks to drive down to collect at their house.

Elected Members brought up the following issues from submissions for staff to investigate:

- Springhill landfill – was any recycling going into the landfill?
- Rotorua was said to use a mixed bags and bins model – how did this model work?
- with regards to matters such as high density areas, steep sections, small sections, and long driveways – what options were available for people to manage bins?
- option 22 has increased costs for landfill – what metrics supported this?
- with regards to overseas models such as Queensland, England – what information could be provided about them?
- what were the implications for costs if assisted collection services were implemented?
- what information was available with regards to subsidies on bottles and cans in Australia?
- in relation to Waitakere Council where rates paid for rubbish and users paid for recycling – how did that work?
- advertising on bins – would that be possible?

**The meeting adjourned at 12.05pm and reconvened at 9.30am on Friday, 17 February 2017.**



### **Roger Stratford (Submission 2461)**

Mr Stratford stated he objected to the introduction of bins as it would discriminate against rental units and foresaw that management of the bins would need to go into tenancy agreements. He supported renewal of the current contract but would like to see incentives for recycling programmes. He stated bins could lead to health and safety risks with broken glass, children could play in the bins and bins would be hard for some residents to use.

### **Veronica Maxey (Submission 1901)**

Ms Maxey strongly supported food waste collection and composting and would like to see community education encouraged.

### **Rosemary Allbrook (Submission 2548)**

Ms Allbrook stated she did not support changes to rubbish collection for the following reasons: bins were unwieldy for the elderly; there were insufficient storage areas in flats and smaller houses with courtyards; bins would be left on footpaths; and some areas had no street verges to put them for collection.

### **Pat Chamberlain (Submission 2301)**

Ms Chamberlain agreed waste needed to be minimised but believed there were costs such as visual pollution from all the bins on the footpaths. She was concerned with several issues including: multi-unit buildings would have a very large numbers of bins to be collected; problems negotiating steep driveways; who paid for lost or damaged bins; and recycling was currently done at the kerbside - how would this happen with the new system?

She questioned why Hamilton needed bins to have more recycling as it could be introduced with current system.

She recommended consideration of the German model for food collection which had a central street bin where all residents put their food waste cutting out the need for separate household bins.

Elected Members raised the following points for consideration and investigation by staff:

- What options were available to assist elderly people to manage bins?
- Was there an option for bins or bags?
- Were there any options for polystyrene collection?
- What were the costs for bin replacements?
- What were the best practice guidelines for waste and recycling for high density units/apartments?
- Were there any other options in the business case worthy of consideration after hearing submissions?
- How can contamination in recycling be mitigated – food on paper, different glass types?
- Was an annual collection of inorganic waste possible?
- Could there be different sizes of bins for different size families/houses?
- Were incentives for ratepayers to minimise waste and reduce collections an option?
- What options were available for Council to encourage less commercial packaging?
- Were current contractors supposed to pick up rubbish that fell on the ground during collections?
- Were there economic factors to changing weekly/fortnightly collections?
- Could there be consequences for not taking in bins or bags?
- How did body corporates/property managers work with current rubbish collections?
- What were options for communal rubbish collection for multi-units?

**The meeting was declared closed at 11.00am.**