

HUTT CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of an ordinary meeting of The Hutt City Council held in the Council Chambers,
2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt on
Tuesday 15 September 2020 commencing at 5.00pm

PRESENT:

Mayor C Barry (Chair)	Deputy Mayor T Lewis
Cr D Bassett	Cr J Briggs
Cr K Brown	Cr B Dyer
Cr S Edwards	Cr D Hislop
Cr C Milne	Cr A Mitchell
Cr S Rasheed	Cr N Shaw
Cr L Sutton	

APOLOGIES: There were no apologies.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Ms J Miller, Chief Executive
 Ms H Oram, Director Environment & Sustainability
 Ms A Welanyk, Director Transformation & Resources
 Mr M Boggs, Director Strategy & Engagement
 Mr B Hodgins, Strategic Advisor
 Ms J Livschitz, Chief Financial Officer
 Mr B Cato, Chief Legal Officer
 Mr J Scherzer, Manager, Sustainability and Resilience
 Ms C Taylor, Principal Research & Evaluation Advisor (part meeting)
 Ms K Glanville, Senior Democracy Advisor
 Ms H Clegg, Minute Taker

PUBLIC BUSINESS**1. OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA TIMATANGA**

Kia hora te marino	<i>May peace be wide spread</i>
Kia whakapapa pounamu te moana	<i>May the sea be like greenstone</i>
He huarahi mā tātou i te rangi nei	<i>A pathway for us all this day</i>
Aroha atu, aroha mai	<i>Let us show respect for each other</i>
Tātou i a tātou katoa	<i>For one another</i>
Hui e Tāiki e!	<i>Bind us together!</i>

2. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Comments are recorded under the item to which they relate.

4. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS**

There were no conflict of interest declarations.

5. **HUTT CITY COUNCIL'S FUTURE RECYCLING AND RUBBISH COLLECTION SERVICES** (20/1014)

Report No. HCC2020/5/204 by the Strategic Advisor

Speaking under public comment, **Ms E Gregory, representing Al's Litta Binz** believed the public consultation process was flawed and misleading. She said the average price of bins listed did not include prices from Al's Litta Binz. She was frustrated that the public's social media data showing high satisfaction rates with current providers was being ignored. She explained that if the decision was made to adopt the officer's recommendations their business would cease due to Council's actions.

In response to a question from a member, Ms Gregory advised Al's Litta Binz price for a 120l bin was \$235 and that a \$10 discount was applied if a customer renewed their contract.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr G Birkinshaw** was critical of the competency and timing of the survey. He did not believe community groups had been consulted.

In response to a question from a member, Mr Birkinshaw did not believe the disabled community had been consulted. He was disappointed that Council's Accessibility and Inclusiveness Panel had no input into the process.

Speaking under public comment, **Mr D Wilshere and Mr R Werry** congratulated Council on a thoroughly researched report, which looked to the future and utilised a good consultation process. They said there was a responsibility on businesses and communities to reduce waste. They believed the report offered no incentives for waste minimisation. They supported the recommendations and suggested Council implement a strategy to encourage waste minimisation and the innovative treatment of waste products.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms J Wootton, Chair of the Wainuiomata Rural Association** noted there was little information concerning the future of rural waste collections. She did not understand why a residential collection service might not be suitable for rural areas. She said her rubbish was successfully collected by a private contractor. She believed the Wainuiomata response rate to the survey was low as many rural property owners did not respond due to lack of information being provided. She urged Council to maintain the status quo.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms C Manaton** explained she did not want to change from her current waste collector. She was happy with the level of service they provided.

Speaking under public comment, **Ms K Brown** supported the preferred option outlined in the officer's report. She thanked Council for the significant research that had been undertaken and the different options provided. She added that the city needed a Council-led, comprehensive, system-wide approach to waste and recycling. She believed a "pay-as-you-throw" option would lead to inequities and that investigations into green waste, compost and organic waste options should proceed. She requested that education concerning waste minimisation and reduction, composting and recycling occur.

Deputy Mayor Lewis read out a public statement on behalf of **Ms M Stronach-Marsh**

attached as page 13 to the minutes.

The Strategic Advisor elaborated on the report. He introduced **Ms Alice Grace and Mr Dan Bonifant**, consultants from Morrison Low. He advised Morrison Low had extensive experience advising Councils throughout New Zealand in reviewing waste and recycling services. He said it had been 20 years since Council had last reviewed its waste and recycling services. He stated that the officers' recommendations best addressed the five key objectives of the review. He acknowledged the preferred option, Option 3, would not suit all residents and that 71% of survey respondents supported Option 3. He added that Kāinga Ora and the Department of Health both supported Option 3 as it was an affordable solution for their tenants. He cautioned analysing the systems adopted by other local authorities as each local authority had undertaken a different journey with different objectives, to arrive at their preferred system.

The Strategic Advisor advised specific details would be developed once the chosen option had been finalised and that responses to individual circumstances would be possible. He acknowledged that whilst the preferred option would suit the majority of the city, there would be some properties for which an individual plan would need to be developed. He explained that under Option 3, bin sizes would be able to be changed during the year and that a service charge, yet to be determined, would be applied.

The Strategic Advisor acknowledged the difficulties in undertaking consultation for a proposed new waste and recycling system at the same time as the procurement process for a possible new provider. He added that officers had undertaken a thorough evaluation process. He acknowledged the impact Option 3 would have on the current local operators.

The Manager, Sustainability and Resilience advised that officers had utilised all publicly available bin prices when compiling data for the average bin price. He said that details for the rural collection services had yet to be finalised. He noted that the cost to rural and residential ratepayers would be the same.

In response to a question from a member, the Manager, Sustainability and Resilience advised there were no two-compartment recycling wheelie bins available in New Zealand. He said that officers recommended a crate for glass recyclables.

In response to a question from a member regarding triggering the Significance and Engagement Policy, the Strategic Advisor advised any option which changed the cost structure significantly would trigger the policy. The Manager, Sustainability and Resilience added that economies of scale were utilised when calculating the costs of each option, and that if a large number of residents chose to opt out of a proposal, end costs would have to be spread amongst a smaller base.

In response to a question from a member, the Strategic Advisor clarified it had been 20 years since the waste and recycling service had been reviewed and not the service contract. He added there had been several contracts awarded during that time period.

In response to a question from a member regarding specialist plans for residents, the Strategic Advisor explained that the successful contractor would find solutions with residents who required assistance plans if needed.

In response to questions from a member concerning the projections used, Ms Grace

explained it was good practice to allow for a small percentage, less than 10%, of the population to opt out of a system. She added that higher opt-out rates would result in a smaller population base to spread the costs. She further added that opt-out individuals were usually those in multi-unit situations, rather than low waste producers. The Manager, Sustainability and Resilience acknowledged that the preferred option would not cater for low waste producers who would effectively be subsidising higher producers and that Option 4 would better suit those low producers. The Strategic Advisor added that the preferred option was a similar model to the current situation with the provision of water where a one-person household pays the same amount for water as a 15-person household.

In response to a question from a member, the Manager, Sustainability and Resilience confirmed members of the public had the opportunity to have their say and that the Accessibility and Inclusiveness Panel was disestablished. He reminded members an assisted service for those who required it would be available, and that similar services existed throughout New Zealand.

In response to a question from a member concerning the proposed cost to ratepayers now and in the future, the Strategic Advisor explained the cost would be spread amongst all ratepayers.

In response to questions from a member regarding the cost of the bin sizes, Ms Grace explained there were a number of factors influencing the proposed prices. She added that the collection costs were similar for each bin size and that volume dictated landfill fees. She clarified that overall rates revenue would cover the whole cost of the range of bin sizes.

In response to a question from a member regarding the length of time between the initial consultant report, approximately one year, and now, Ms Grace acknowledged technological advances were rapidly developing with several new technologies currently being tested and pilot studies being undertaken. She reiterated that the preferred option best met the five objectives.

In response to questions from a member concerning inequities, the Manager, Sustainability and Resilience advised the existing plastic bag system did not suit everyone, especially those in Kāinga Ora homes.

In response to a question from a member concerning how weight of bins was calculated, Ms Grace advised the weight of the truck was measured at the landfill, not individual bins. She highlighted that surveys were undertaken to assess approximately how much rubbish was in each bin to assess how much rubbish each truck might carry. She added it was assumed that not all bins would be full each week.

In response to a question from a member concerning the connection between waste and recycling, the Manager, Sustainability and Resilience explained the two were highly connected. He said it was not appropriate to look at each system individually. He added that there was a high risk of recycling contamination if only recycling bins were provided as individuals would put all their rubbish into the one bin. He added there would be several strategies put in place with whatever option was chosen, including education, bin inspectors and cameras on trucks. He added that Option 3 would not eliminate recycling contamination.

Mayor Barry left the meeting at 6.03pm. Deputy Mayor Lewis assumed the chair.

In response to a question from a member concerning the proposed Waste Bylaw, the Manager, Sustainability and Resilience explained the bylaw would make it an infringement to accumulate rubbish on your property. He recommended having a system in place which would reduce the likelihood of that occurring in the first place.

Mayor Barry returned to the meeting at 6.05pm and resumed the chair.

Deputy Mayor Lewis left the meeting at 6.05pm

The Manager, Sustainability and Resilience acknowledged any new system would not eliminate litter. He added preferred Option 3 would ensure minimal excessive rubbish.

In response to a question from a member regarding situations where no targeted rate would be applied, the Manager, Sustainability and Resilience confirmed this might occur where there was no building on a site. He also confirmed where it was physically impossible to collect rubbish and possibly for some multi-unit developments, depending on their waste collection requirements.

Deputy Mayor Lewis rejoined the meeting at 6.08pm.

The Manager, Sustainability and Resilience added that some multi-unit developments might have shared waste bins and that Lower Hutt District Plan required waste storage areas to be provided for all multi-unit developments.

In response to a question from a member, the Director Environment and Sustainability advised that if accumulated rubbish was presenting a health hazard, officers had the power to act to remove it.

In response to questions from a member, Ms Grace advised there were many wrap-around services which assisted lower socio-economic households. She said a rates funded waste and recycling system was an affordable option for all. She acknowledged low waste producers would face an increase in their waste disposal costs with preferred Option 3.

In response to a question from a member, the Strategic Advisor advised if another option was consulted on it would add an additional four months to the timeframe, with un-estimated costs. He added this would then result in the 1 July 2021 deadline not being met.

In response to a question from a member regarding different ways to fund a waste and recycling system, the Chief Financial Officer advised that Council could decide to not fund a system through a full targeted rate, but that that had not been consulted on. She agreed that costs could be distributed amongst all ratespayers, including commercial.

In response to a question from a member regarding cardboard recycling, the Manager, Sustainability and Resilience advised CBD retailers had a separate cardboard recycling scheme which would not be altered. He acknowledged some businesses might use the residential recycling centres to dispose of their cardboard recyclables.

Mayor Barry thanked officers and the consultants for the work undertaken to date. He

notified members of his intention to move two additional recommendations: to establish a waste minimisation working group; and the inclusion of a clause in the kerbside rubbish and recycling contract that nothing in the contract prevents the parties from considering and implementing the latest relevant technology and collection methods. This would be done by agreement at any time.

Cr Dyer notified members of his intention to move an additional recommendation agreeing to conduct a review of Council's new waste and recycling services 12 months after it became operational. He stated the review would focus on any possible improvements, with a particular focus on low waste households and wider environmental outcomes.

Mayor Barry believed waste and recycling should be dealt with together as they were inherently connected. He expressed support for Option 3 as it would help reduce recycling contamination, help reduce wind-blown rubbish, provided equity across the city and resulted in fewer trucks on the road thereby reducing emissions. He added that it provided choice, reduced cluttering of footpaths, was the most supported option in the community survey and supported the Council's environmental outcomes. He believed if the waste collection service was not changed with the introduction of a new recycling system, the whole arrangement would fail. He said more recycling contamination would occur and recyclables would end up at the landfill.

Mayor Barry acknowledged the trade-offs inherent in Option 3, notably the impact on local business owners. He held sympathy for them, adding that jobs in the sector would remain. He also recognised that low waste producers would pay more for their rubbish and recycling disposal. He believed having a mandatory 12 month review of the system was important to assess if any changes were required. He believed dealing with waste and recycling was a fundamental local authority job, as were the landfill and cleaning up of illegal dumping of rubbish. He reminded members that making a decision was the start of the journey. He urged members to make a decision which would ensure better environmental outcomes for the city.

Cr Hislop thanked officers for their work to date. She wished for an equitable and available, fair system to be introduced. She acknowledged that whilst low waste producers would see a rise in their disposal costs, she compared the situation to other Council provided services where some residents made more use of them than others. She believed a rates funded, council-controlled system was the only way to deliver an equitable waste and recycling collection service. She commented that a predator-free city would be a step closer if rubbish was not dumped in backyards. She was satisfied that choice would be available through the different bin sizes and that the up to 4,000 Kāinga Ora residents would now have bins provided by their landlord. She expressed support for Option 3.

Cr Edwards referred to the five identified objectives of the waste and recycling review. He said that whilst he would prefer a fortnightly collection service, he understood the health reasons for having a weekly service. He acknowledged the situation facing low waste producers. He believed waste and recycling were core services for Council and the community should collectively pay for it. He expressed support for a 12 month review of the system, noting that a composting service could be an option to be assessed. He believed that removing rubbish bags would save up to 42kgs of plastic per household for the 15 year period from reaching the landfill. He also acknowledged the negative impact

a Council operated system would have on local businesses and the sound, personalised service they provided. He expressed support for Option 3.

Cr Dyer thanked officers, colleagues and the public for their involvement throughout the review. He believed there was no option which would please everyone. He considered that Option 3 would produce the best outcome for the environment, whilst offering a weekly, affordable and accessible service. He asked organic food waste collection be investigated as a future service. He acknowledged the negative impact on local businesses. He encouraged officers to find ways to support all businesses involved in waste and recycling collection services. He expressed support for Option 3.

Cr Sutton supported the recycling recommendations as the current recycling system was not functioning adequately. She expressed opposition to any changes to the waste collection services as she believed those services were operating well. She advised other waste operators would collect rubbish bags if the main contractor pulled out of that service. She expressed opposition to Option 3 due to the negative impact it would have on local businesses. She criticised the process that had resulted in no consultation with local businesses. She concluded that the community wanted choice and competition in the market and that local businesses should be supported.

Cr Shaw looked forward to better controls to keep recycling contained in bins. She acknowledged previous comments regarding the work from all involved. She maintained that adhering to the five objectives was important and that the community supported Option 3. She added she was concerned for the local businesses impacted. She expressed support for Option 3.

Cr Rasheed believed the current recycling system required an “overhaul” but that a one-size-fits-all approach to waste collection was not appropriate. She preferred Option 4 and believed members had been misled with advice regarding the status of rubbish bag collection. She was concerned for family owned, local businesses who provided a great level of service. She believed, especially in the post-Covid era, that Council should not be enforcing a system which would put them out of business. She expressed opposition for Option 3.

Cr Bassett acknowledged the challenging decision before members. He expressed concern for local businesses and questioned whether it was appropriate for Council to enter into the waste collection business.

Cr Brown acknowledged the work of officers and submitters. She believed it was time to look at the environment and how waste, recycling and the landfill were managed. She advised disposal of waste was often not an education problem rather a priority one for low income households. She expressed conflict due to the negative effect a Council operated system would have on local businesses. She said that the benefits to the environment that Option 3 offered were important. She welcomed a 12 month review and expressed support for Option 3.

Deputy Mayor Lewis reflected that 20 years since the last review was too long a period, and that the environment had changed in that time. She believed the time had come to act to ensure the City was clean and green. She expressed support for Option 3.

Cr Mitchell thanked officers for their work to date. He considered Option 3 provided for secure bins for recycling and that Type 5 plastics could be recycled. He expressed

frustration that no options offered much flexibility. He said a pay-as-you-throw option could be the most flexible as it was the fairest, most equitable system and encouraged waste reduction. He tabled a spreadsheet, attached as page 14 to the minutes, which highlighted the rising costs for low waste producers under Option 3. He asked whether a discount could be offered for community service card holders. He considered Kāinga Ora homes could have their own waste and recycling systems. He considered that if a weekly collection system was adopted, and later a pay-as-you-throw system was introduced, this would increase collection costs.

Cr Milne expressed opposition to Option 3 as it would result in the disestablishment of many local businesses. He questioned the need to change the status quo, and that implementing a monopoly would not offer consistent service and price and would suffocate innovation. He believed the Auckland pilot studies into innovation and new technologies would result in new systems being able to be implemented nationwide. He questioned why members could not talk with those in the industry during the consultation process. He believed officers had misled members regarding collection of rubbish bags.

Cr Briggs raised a point of order regarding the disrespectful comments made by Cr Milne and the length of his speaking time.

Mayor Barry asked Cr Milne to conclude his comments.

Cr Milne apologised. He believed changes to the status quo would produce more costs than benefits. He expressed support for Option 4, with local businesses collecting rubbish bags.

Cr Briggs acknowledged the work of officers and the consultants. He appreciated the high level of community engagement in the process to date. He expressed concern with the current high level of recycling contamination, especially in Naenae and Wainuiomata and with the high level of illegal dumping of waste in the environment. He believed Option 3 laid the foundation for the future treatment of waste and recycling. He welcomed a 12 month review of the new system and acknowledged the difficult transition period which was to come. He highlighted the negative impact on local businesses if the collection services were changed. He expressed support for Option 3.

Mayor Barry clarified that officers had advised there was a general direction away from rubbish bags collection services and bag collection was not an option moving forward. He once again thanked all involved in the process to date.

The Chief Executive advised implementing a 12 month review of a system was good practice.

RESOLVED: (Mayor Barry/Cr Dyer)(By Division)

Minute No. C 20501(2)

"That Council:

- (i) *notes that information and recommendations presented in the officer's report are the culmination of a comprehensive systems based review of kerbside rubbish and recycling collection services;*
- (ii) *notes that the overarching objective of rubbish collection services is to help ensure a clean and healthy city;*

- (iii) notes that five main review objectives were identified to help guide the process:
 - (a) to reduce waste and protect the environment from the harmful effects of waste;
 - (b) to provide services that are cost effective;
 - (c) to provide services that are safe;
 - (d) to provide services that reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and
 - (e) to provide services that customers want and can use appropriately;
- (iv) notes and considers the many submissions received following public consultation on the service options Council agreed to at its meeting in February this year, and thanks submitters for their feedback;
- (v) notes that a procurement process has been undertaken in parallel with public engagement, and that this resulted in a favourable response from the market;
- (vi) agrees to adopt the proposal for kerbside recycling, being the introduction of a fortnightly wheelie bin collection service for mixed recycling (cardboard, paper, cans and plastic), and a crate for glass only, for residential properties;
- (vii) agrees to adopt Option 3, ie a weekly rates-funded kerbside rubbish collection service, for the following reasons:
 - (a) it ensures access to a waste collection service in an equitable manner across the wider community, in order to help protect residents and the environment from the harmful effects of waste;
 - (b) it provides choice on bin size and associated costs that will assist in incentivising a reduction of waste;
 - (c) it is a cost effective solution for most households;
 - (d) it provides service improvements that are more inherently safe;
 - (e) it is an effective option for reducing greenhouse gas emissions associated with the collection of waste, by minimising the number of total trucks movements and by enabling a move to electric collection vehicles; and
 - (f) it provides a service that is best fit in regard to what the community wants and can use, based on the results of the community consultation;
- (viii) notes that an opt out from the rates funded rubbish solution presents a significant change from the proposed draft Long Term Plan Amendment, which would trigger the Significance and Engagement Policy and require additional consultation;
- (ix) agrees to adopt the proposal for the introduction of an opt-in four weekly green waste service, for residential properties;
- (x) requests officers to explore options for a food waste trial in Hutt City in partnership with social enterprise;
- (xi) notes the community's support for introducing recycling in schools and early childhood education centres and that officers will report back with the exact costs of providing this service as part of the Long Term Plan 2021-2031;
- (xii) notes that following these decisions by Council, officers will finalise the Long Term Plan Amendment and complete the final stages of the external audit;
- (xiii) agrees that the audited Long Term Plan Amendment be reported back to Council for adoption on 27 October 2020;

- (xiv) *agrees to delegate to the Chief Executive the power and financial authority to negotiate and conclude the kerbside rubbish and recycling contracts with the preferred supplier(s) ahead of the formal adoption of the Long Term Plan Amendment;*
- (xv) *requests the Chief Executive to report back to each meeting of the Community and Environment Committee on the progress of the implementation of the new services including contract management arrangements;*
- (xvi) *agrees that changes required to the Rates Remission Policy in line with the changes be developed as part of the Long Term Plan 2021-2031 and be formally consulted on as part of that process;*
- (xvii) *agrees to establish a waste minimisation working group which will focus on improving environmental outcomes within the wider city; and asks officers to draft a terms of reference in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Community and Environment Committee, which will be considered at a future meeting of that committee;*
- (xviii) *requests officers seek the inclusion of a clause in the kerbside rubbish and recycling contract that makes it clear that nothing in the contract prevents the parties from considering and implementing the latest relevant technology and collections methods, by agreement at any time; and*
- (xix) *agrees to conduct a review of Council's new waste and recycling service 12 months after it becomes operational. The review would focus on any possible improvements, with a particular focus on low waste households, and wider environmental outcomes."*

The motion was declared CARRIED by division with the voting follows:

For

Mayor Barry
Deputy Mayor Lewis
Cr Briggs
Cr Brown
Cr Dyer
Cr Edwards
Cr Hislop
Cr Mitchell
Cr Shaw
Total: 9

Against

Cr Bassett
Cr Milne
Cr Rasheed
Cr Sutton
Total: 4

The meeting adjourned at 7.23pm and resumed at 7.32pm.

6. **ELECTORAL VOTING SYSTEM** (20/1022)

Memorandum dated 8 September 2020 by the Senior Democracy Advisor

RESOLVED: (Mayor Barry/Cr Mitchell)

Minute No. C 20502(2)

“That Council resolves to undertake a poll of electors on the electoral system to be run in conjunction with the 2022 triennial local government elections to be held on 8 October 2022.”

7. **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

8. **CLOSING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA**

Whakataka te hau ki te uru

Cease the winds from the west

Whakataka te hau ki te tonga

Cease the winds from the south

Kia mākinakina ki uta

Let the breeze blow over the land

Kia mātaratara ki tai

Let the breeze blow over the ocean

E hī ake ana te atakura

Let the red-tipped dawn come with a sharpened air.

He tio, he huka, he hau hū

A touch of frost, a promise of a glorious day.

Tīhei mauri ora.

There being no further business the Chair declared the meeting closed at 7.34 pm.

C Barry
MAYOR

CONFIRMED as a true and correct record
Dated this 29th day of September 2020

**STATEMENT TO BE READ AT COUNCIL MEETING 15/09/20 AT 5PM REGARDING
RE HUTT CITY COUNCIL'S FUTURE RECYCLING AND RUBBISH COLLECTION
SERVICES**

Kia ora koutou,

My name is Michelle Stronach-Marsh and am unable to be present in person due to a clash with two other meetings today. I am a small business owner, volunteer and mother. I go plogging (picking up litter whilst you jog/walk) 7 days a week at Petone Beach.

I geo-tag in excess of 2,500 pieces of litter each week at Petone Beach and in the streets leading to the beach. Simply put, it is overwhelming. We have private rubbish collections running 6 days a week from residential and commercial properties at present in Petone. A large percentage of the litter I collect is caused by the process during the emptying of the bins and also due to the fact that the lion's share of wheelie bins do not have a bin latch attached and are therefore blown open when awaiting kerbside collection. If these are not intercepted in the street, they then wash down our storm water network and discharge at the beach.

As difficult as it is, it is time that we put the environment ahead of profit and have one contract to our council for our waste management programme. Our community and its environs cannot continue to suffer. We owe this to future generations: our waterways and wildlife can no longer continue to take a back seat whilst we create additional pollution during the process of rubbish collection. It's time to adopt a new approach and for council to take the reins on our recycling and rubbish collection services with a new pathway to sustainable practices including the types of transport used to for collection and providing a more cohesive approach to collection days throughout our community.

Ngā mihi nui,

Michelle Stronach-Marsh
Founder, Plogging in Petone

Service option	Pre-Paid Official Refuse Bag	Opt-out Refuse Service	Rates Funded Refuse Bins	PAYT Refuse Bins
Assumptions				
	\$2.50 per bag in Lower Hutt	\$3.50/mn, 80L bin \$4.62/wk, 80L bin \$5.50/wk, 120L bin \$8.50/wk, 240L bin	\$2.19/wk, 80L bin \$2.77/wk, 120L bin \$5.54/wk, 240L bin	\$4.50 per pick up for 120L bin
Household A: One person, 60L of rubbish every three weeks				
Estimated annual cost	\$42.50 (17 bags)	\$42 (monthly 80L bin)	\$114	\$39 (pick up six-weekly)
Cost impact		1% decrease	168% increase	8% decrease
True cost		108% of true cost	292% of true cost	100% of true cost
Household B: Three people, 120L of rubbish per week				
Estimated annual cost	\$260 (104 bags)	\$286 (weekly 120L bin)	\$144	\$234 (pick up weekly)
Cost impact		10% increase	45% decrease	10% decrease
True cost		122% of true cost	62% of true cost	100% of true cost
Household C: Five people, 240L of rubbish per week				
Estimated annual cost	\$520 (208 bags)	\$442 (weekly 240L bin)	\$288 (weekly 240L bin)	\$468 (2 bins, pick up weekly)
Cost impact		19% decrease	45% decrease	10% decrease
True cost		94% of true cost	62% of true cost	100% of true cost