

**REPORT OF:** ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES MANAGER

**TO:** EXECUTIVE

**DATE:** 8<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2016

**Report Author:** David Walker  
**Tel. No:** 01282 661746  
**E-mail:** David.walker@pendle.gov.uk

## REMOVAL OF RECYCLING SITES

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek approval for the removal of all public recycling-sites from the Borough.

### RECOMMENDATION

To agree to the removal of all public bring-sites

### REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- (1) The removal of the sites would reduce the level of flytipping within prominent locations of the Borough and would assist Environmental Services in achieving the £25,580.00 saving agreed at the Executive meeting held on the 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2016.
- (2) The removal of the sites would also reduce the burden brought by the additional charge of £4504.00 per annum being introduced by Palm Recycling

### ISSUES

### BACKGROUND

1. In May 2016, Environmental Services received notification from Palm Recycling that they had undertaken a rate review for all existing bring bank collection services and based upon a number of factors such as a drop in the volume of paper recovered from recycling bring banks and a corresponding deterioration in the quality of the material recovered they were to introduce a monthly service charge of £500 to cover the emptying of paper skips located throughout the Borough.
2. Within the same communication we were advised that Palm Recycling would introduce a payment mechanism which would see the Council receiving £20.00 per tonne for recyclable paper, no payment for downgraded material such as mixed paper and cardboard and a cost

for the disposal of general waste such as burnt material or household rubbish which is reported to be found in the paper banks.

3. Calculations based upon the collected tonnages for April 2015 through to April 2016 identified that the Council would following the introduction of Palm Recycling payment mechanism receive £1496.00, the Council however would incur costs of £6000 resulting in a deficit of £4504.00 per annum. These costs do not consider any level of contamination and would rise should any contaminants be found within the recycling banks.
4. Further to the above, members may be aware that Environmental Services over the last municipal year have received requests from both ASDA and B&Q to remove recycling containers from their sites due to an increased level of misuse by commercial users.
5. Requests from members of the Brierfield and Reedley and Nelson Area Committee's to meet with B&Q representatives have been declined and we have received a further request to have the site removed from the B&Q carpark by early December 2016.
6. ASDA more recently have reported that they would be willing to allow the site to remain following Environmental Services agreement to increase the number of days it visits the site from 5 up to 6 days each week. The increased visits themselves incur an additional cost of £522.00 based on a 30 minute visit with one person each Saturday.
7. Further to the issues reported above internal investigation into the time taken clearing public recycling sites has identified that over an eight week period from the end of July 2016 to Mid-September 2016 Environmental Services had spent a total of almost 114 hours clearing up recycling sites. The breakdown being shown as;

ASDA, Colne = 29.10 hours  
Red Lion Car Park, Colne = 29.06 hours  
Rainhall Road Barnoldswick = 17.50 hours  
B&Q, Car Park, Nelson = 14.05 hours  
Boot Street, Car Park, Earby = 13.10 hours  
Goitside CarPark, Nelson = 10.30 hours  
Barley, Picnic site carpark = 52 minutes

8. To aid members in the decision making process Officers have taken the opportunity to review the stance on bring-sites for neighbouring authorities. The outcome of this investigation identified that Blackburn, Burnley and Hyndburn no longer provide their own recycling sites, relying solely on sites provided by local supermarkets.
9. Exception to the above rule was found to be Ribble Valley who reported reviewing the need for bring sites following the introduction of kerbside collection schemes and deciding at that time to retain sites for householders who due to location or storage capacity could not be provided with a kerbside collection service.
10. Though discussion has not taken place with supermarkets affected by the removal of the Council's recycling sites it is thought that similar to neighbouring areas ASDA and Morrison's may follow Sainsbury's lead and provide self-managed facilities to retain customer numbers.
11. Pendle currently provide an alternate week collection service to 39,470 properties with a further 390 properties receiving a weekly collection through the 'flyer' service. It is felt the removal of the recycling sites would not greatly impact on domestic residents of the

Borough but may increase the demand for commercial waste collections as the contents of many flytips found at Recycling sites do link to commercial activities.

## **IMPLICATIONS**

<b>Policy:</b>	No implications arising directly from the Report
<b>Financial:</b>	There is no budget to cover Palm Recycling's monthly service charge.
<b>Legal:</b>	No implications arising directly from the Report
<b>Risk Management:</b>	No implications arising directly from the Report
<b>Health and Safety:</b>	No implications arising directly from the Report
<b>Sustainability:</b>	No implications arising directly from the Report
<b>Community Safety:</b>	No implications arising directly from the Report
<b>Equality and Diversity:</b>	No implications arising directly from the Report

**APPENDICES** None

**LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS** None