

Council Meeting – 3 February 2016

ITEM 7 - Joint Authority Questions:-

Transport for Greater Manchester

1. What consideration has been given by T4GM to working with bus operators to introduce a 'CycleAlert' or similar system in Greater Manchester? Cycle Alert has been used by Transdev buses in York since 2013 in an important effort to reduce the amount of cycle deaths as a caused by large vehicles. Such a system could reduce cycling deaths in the city region.

(Councillor D'Albert)

(To be answered by Councillor Noel Bayley – Committee for Transport for Greater Manchester Transport representative)

Transport for Greater Manchester has a keen interest in cycling, and are playing a pivotal role in increasing the number of cycle trips across the conurbation, as well as providing improved infrastructure and complementary measures to benefit cyclists.

Greater Manchester is continuing to improve cycle infrastructure across the city region, to increase the opportunities to cycle traffic free for those who prefer.

Cycle safety is an extremely important issue in Greater Manchester, and TfGM are continuing to educate cyclists and drivers.

- **Over 2000 cyclists have received bespoke one to one on-road training since our training programme started in 2012.**
- **Safe Urban Driver Training, accredited training for HGV and bus drivers has been rolled out to almost 500 drivers, and this will continue to educate HGV drivers.**
- **TfGM have worked with bus drivers to allow them to experience riding a bike, and educating them from a cyclists point of view, at bus depots across Greater Manchester.**

Cycle Alert presented at a recent Bus Operators meeting and TfGM are considering options around this. However, Cycle Alert are one of a growing number of commercial products that can help manage a safe interface between cyclists and motor vehicles.

2. Could I ask about Radcliffe Bus Station and the investment around the bus station. How much was spent on the bus station and do you agree this make a significant investment in Radcliffe.

(Councillor Parnell – TfGM)

(To be answered by Councillor Noel Bayley – Committee for Transport for Greater Manchester Transport representative)

The new Radcliffe Bus Station became operational on 13 December 2015.

The £2 million Bus Station project has been developed in partnership with Bury Council and involved the relocation of the existing bus station to a new site on Dale Street / Pilkington Way. The former bus station site will now be released for future redevelopment as part of Bury Council's regeneration strategy for Radcliffe town centre.

The new bus station provides high quality, fully enclosed, passenger waiting shelters set in an attractive area of public realm. The site is monitored by an extensive CCTV system, which provides enhanced safety and security to the public when using or passing through the bus station.

Greater Manchester Waste Authority

What consideration, if any, has been given to moving to a single stream of recyclables, making use of improved sorting technology? Single recycling streams are used in some areas of the country, and this could be a way of both increasing recycling and reducing the number of bins needed in the household waste system. What is the estimated financial impact of mixed recyclable streams and has any work been done to look at whether a simpler system would increase resident recycling rates?

Councillor Tim Pickstone

(To be answered by Councillor Quinn– GMWDA representative)

Recycling collections in Greater Manchester are based on a dry recyclable stream (glass, cans, plastic bottles) and a pulpable stream (newspapers, cardboard, tetrapak) which are collected separately. The dry recyclables are separated into their constituent elements at a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) and the pulpables are bulked up and sent direct to market. When GMWDA was investigating what materials to collect together, a number of visits were undertaken to neighbouring authorities, including those that collect dry recyclables/pulpable materials together. In these authorities, the materials were also being separated at a MRF facility. The presence of paper and card in the MRF causes issues with masking of other materials that affect the effectiveness of the sorting equipment. In all MRFs visited that processed paper, the first stage of the process was a sorting cabin

involving 20 plus staff manually spreading the material out to improve the efficiency of separation later in the process. This sorting stage requires elbow length ballistic gloves to be worn to prevent needle stick injuries and was not a process/quality employment that GMWDA members wanted to replicate. The other issues with paper processing in MRFs is the high levels of dust produced which has issues for occupational health exposure and fire control. In addition the paper reprocessing industry has imposed strict contamination limits on recovered paper in particular for glass and food residues which make are extremely difficult to meet using paper recovered at a MRF that also processes dry recyclables. For these reasons, GMWDA did not promote a system that co-collected all recyclables together.

Since the signing of the GMWDA contract, the Waste Framework Directive has also introduced a requirement for separate collection of the 4 main recyclables ie paper/card, glass, cans and metals unless it is technically, economically and environmentally practicable (the TEEP assessment) to do so. GMWDA has conducted a TEEP assessment on the collections and the fact that paper/card is collected separately means that the system is automatically compliant for that waste stream. The glass, cans, plastics have also been assessed and deemed compliant as a kerbside sort system would be expected to reduce material capture. This means that the current collection system is compliant with the legislation and reverting to a single stream collection would be at risk of legal challenge by the Environment Agency.

From an economic perspective, collecting all dry recyclables and pulpables as a single stream will have an impact on collection costs. It is likely that bin capacity would be exceeded on the current collection frequency thereby necessitating more frequent collections at additional cost. Changes to rounds and potentially additional vehicles would be required to accommodate the additional volume of material collected at the same time. Bury officers would therefore need to model this to determine the economic impact on collection costs.