

STEVENAGE BOROUGH COUNCIL

**ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY SELECT COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

Date: Monday, 1 September 2025

Time: 6.00pm

Place: Council Chamber

**Present:** Councillors: Leanne Brady (Chair), Andy McGuinness (Vice Chair), Robert Boyle, Jim Brown, Alistair Gordon, Claire Parris, Ceara Roopchand, Peter Wilkins and Jade Woods

**Start / End**      Start Time:    6.00pm  
**Time:**            End Time:      7.35pm

**1      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Forhad Chowdhury and Anne Wells.

There were no declarations of interest.

**2      MINUTES - 11 JUNE 2025**

The Committee considered the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2025. Amendments were noted relating to corrections to apologies for absence for Cllr Ceara Roopchand and clarification of speaker attribution. Subject to these amendments, it was agreed that the Minutes be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**3      OFFICER PRESENTATION - WASTE & RECYCLING FROM RESIDENTIAL COUNCIL FLAT BLOCKS**

The Chair introduced the item and advised Members that while fly tipping would be referred to as part of discussions, enforcement matters were not within the scope of the review.

The Assistant Director (Stevenage Direct Services) introduced the Head of Environmental Operations and the Environmental Development Officer who were leading on the presentation.

Officers provided a detailed presentation which covered the following:

- Approximately 8,000 flats exist in Stevenage, representing 21% of the housing stock. Many were built in the 1960s and 1970s before modern waste systems, creating long-term challenges;
- Key issues included lack of space for bins, difficult access and stairs, and higher rates of contamination compared to houses;
- Refuse chutes in high-rise blocks were often abused or blocked, creating fire risks and requiring daily attendance from caretaking teams;

- Borough-wide contamination rates stood at 1.2%, but flats contributed disproportionately due to misuse and limited information;
- Case studies from Turpin's Rise and Monument Court showed excess cardboard, dumping beside bins and residents using bin stores incorrectly;
- Lessons from phase 1 pilot sites showed large increases in recycling rates following introduction of new signage and leaflets. A sustained increase was maintained over the following year;
- Phase 2 pilots were being prepared with further sites selected across the town;
- Government funding of £700,000 had been secured through Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) to support the works required by the March 2026 'Simpler Recycling' deadline.

Members asked a range of questions and made comments, as summarised below:

### **High-rise refuse chutes and fire risk**

Members queried issues with refuse chutes in high-rise blocks. Officers explained that these were often abused and blocked, creating fire hazards. Caretaking teams had to attend daily to clear them and maintain safety.

### **Frequency and capacity of collections**

Members asked if large blocks such as Monument Court had adequate capacity. Officers confirmed refuse was collected weekly and recycling fortnightly. Monument Court had substantial bin capacity, and discussions with housing providers were ongoing to expand provision ahead of food waste collections.

### **Population density and capacity calculations**

A Member questioned whether population density was factored into planning. Officers confirmed capacity was calculated per property, not per person. Standard allowances were 180 litres refuse, with larger bins provided for households of six or more.

### **Misuse and external dumping**

Concerns were raised that non-residents were depositing waste in bin stores. Officers stated that most misuse came from residents themselves. Newer blocks had coded or gated stores to limit access. CCTV was limited but effective where used.

### **CCTV coverage**

A Member asked what proportion of blocks had CCTV. Officers advised that Monument Court did, but most older blocks did not. Some blocks acted as public cut-throughs, increasing the risk of misuse.

### **Affordability of bulky waste charges**

Members highlighted challenges for residents without cars. Officers confirmed a bulky waste collection service was available for £49. They acknowledged this would not suit everyone, but added that cardboard could be disposed of over several weeks, though this was difficult in small flats.

### **Fly tipping at Bring Bank sites**

Members noted that residents often believed leaving items beside overflowing bins was acceptable. Officers emphasised this was still fly tipping. Campaigns were underway to change perceptions, and there were concerns about commercial misuse of Bring Banks.

### **Consistency of Bring Bank provision**

Members asked if all sites had the same recycling facilities. Officers explained provision varied by site size. Larger sites, such as The Oval, had more bins. Around 40% of townwide fly tipping was linked to Bring Banks.

### **New legislation and deadlines**

Officers confirmed that 'Simpler Recycling' required every household to have access by March 2026. Surveys showed 74 blocks had no recycling, 41 of which were Council-owned and required substantial works. Solutions included ramps, new stores, or using car parking bays.

### **Ramps, bin stores and new bin design**

Members raised the difficulty of installing ramps. Officers said solutions would be site-specific. The new three-wheeled bin worked well for short, shallow steps (up to five) but was unsuitable for larger blocks. The innovation had attracted national media coverage and officers were seeking professional advice as to whether the Stevenage Direct Services design could be patented and the design sold to other authorities to help fund future recycling innovations and projects.

### **Funding and costs**

Officers confirmed £700,000 of government funding had been secured through Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR). Early estimates suggested costs might be lower than expected, though some blocks would still require major investment.

### **Pilot outcomes and communications**

Members asked about monitoring. Officers reported recycling increased by 185% after new signage and leaflets, and remained 85% higher a year later. Phase 2 pilots were underway with four additional sites. Communications materials were redesigned to be clearer and more accessible.

### **Resident feedback on interventions**

A Member suggested that residents should be asked which methods (signage, leaflets, bin design) had been most effective in encouraging participation. Officers responded that this had not been included in phase 1, but confirmed it would now be considered for incorporation into phase 2 surveys as a result of the suggestion.

### **Colour coded bins**

Members discussed with officers the merits of colour coded bins. SDS officers explained that coloured bins were more expensive to purchase, so the new recycling bins would all be black but have a large colour sticker on the front and lids. Members queried whether there could be coloured lids used.

### **Possible areas for recommendations**

Members made some suggestions that could become review recommendations

around the following issues:

- Regarding recycling champions officers would be asked to consider encouraging recycling with awards and recognition for the areas with the most recycling, promote with young residents, consider smiley stickers on bins etc.
- Consider using large colour wraps on the bin lids to differentiate different recycling bins
- Regarding Bring Bank sites consider using mobile CCTV of sites with signage saying CCTV in operation – where fly tipping can be evidenced follow up with education and civil prosecution
- Regarding any future plans to rationalise the Bring Bank Sites Members asked to see the plans for early consideration ahead of any public consultation as there were concerns over reducing the capacity

The Committee noted the update and expressed support for the work being undertaken, recognising the challenges of implementing recycling provision across such a diverse range of flat blocks.

#### **4 NOTES OF SITE VISIT TO SBC LOW RISE RESIDENTIAL FLAT BLOCKS**

The Chair introduced the notes from the recent site visit, which were included in the agenda pack, explaining that the visit had provided Members with the opportunity to observe first-hand the challenges and practical constraints associated with waste and recycling provision in a number of flat blocks.

For the benefit of those Members who had been unable to attend, the Chair highlighted the main observations. These included the limited space available for bin storage in older blocks, the difficulties posed by stair access, and the impact of poor signage and contamination on recycling levels.

The Chair noted that Members had also seen examples of positive practice where improvements had already been trialled, and highlighted the value of site visits in informing the Committee's ongoing scrutiny of waste and recycling services.

#### **5 URGENT PART 1 BUSINESS**

There was no Urgent Part I Business.

#### **6 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

Not required.

#### **7 URGENT PART II BUSINESS**

There was no Urgent Part II Business.

### **CHAIR**