# **ENVIRONMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE**

### Agenda Item 22

**Brighton & Hove City Council** 

Subject: Permission to Consult on Communal Refuse

**Collection in Hanover, Elm Grove and The Triangle** 

**Areas** 

Date of Meeting: 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012

Report of: Director of Place

Contact Officer: Name: Jan Jonker Tel: 29-4722

Email: jan.jonker@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: Hanover & Elm Grove/ St Peters & North Laine

#### FOR GENERAL RELEASE

#### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 Large parts of Hanover & Elm Grove and The Triangle Area consist of properties which have no frontage. These areas are unsuitable for wheelie bins as residents have no room to store them. Refuse is still collected in black sacks or in some instances 'Binvelopes'
- 1.2 Black sacks are often ripped open by wildlife scavenging for food resulting in litter strewn streets. While Binvelopes do contain refuse they are not very user friendly as they require the resident to take them in through their house after refuse collection day. They have a limited life span compared to wheelie bins and are relatively expensive.
- 1.3 This report seeks permission to consult with residents in parts of Hanover & Elm Grove and The Triangle to introduce communal refuse collection to try and improve the service and street cleanliness.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Committee grants permission for residents of Hanover & Elm Grove and The Triangle to be consulted on proposals to introduce communal refuse collections. The results of the consultation will be brought back to this committee for a decision on the scheme.
- 3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 In Hanover and Elm Grove refuse is collected in black refuse sacks, or to a lesser extent contained in 'Binvelopes'. Most properties do not have storage for a wheelie bin. Refuse sacks are prone to being ripped open by wildlife even when put out on the correct collection day. Split sacks result in litter strewn streets.
- 3.2 Binvelopes are collapsible containers that will hold two refuse sacks. They should be put out on collection day and taken back in by the resident after collection. They are not very user friendly and many residents don't like to bring them back indoors as they tend to get dirty. They are not particularly robust and have a much shorter life span than wheelie bins.
- 3.3 Because of the problems with refuse sacks in Hanover, binvelopes have been trialled in a few streets over a period of time. They have not been particularly successful at containing refuse for the reasons set out above.
- 3.4 Communal refuse containment has been trialled on small scale in Coleman Street and Washington Street in Hanover and in Park Crescent in The Triangle. The trials which were established with the help of the Hanover LAT and The Triangle LAT have been in place for approximately a year and informal feedback has been positive.
- 3.5 In light of the positive response to the trials permission is now sought to consult residents more widely in Hanover & Elm Grove and The Triangle. Details of the consultation are set out below.

#### How Would The Scheme Work?

- 3.6 The areas which are being considered for communal refuse collection have been agreed with ward councillors and representatives from the respective LAT. The streets which form the proposed consultation areas are listed in Appendix 1. Maps showing the proposed areas are attached as Appendix 2. The bins that would be used in Hanover are smaller than the communal bins used in the city centre because of the lack of space in these areas. The bins will have 1100 litre capacity (the same as those used at recycling points) as opposed to the 3200 litre capacity of the communal bins in the city centre. Most of the bins in The Triangle will be the larger bins also used in the city centre.
- 3.7 The area has been surveyed to identify proposed bin locations and agreed with Highways officers. Each location has been audited to ensure bins do not form an obstruction to pedestrians or road users, are safe to use and service and minimise nuisance for residents. Loss of parking space has been minimised, the expected reduction in parking spaces is summarised in the table below.

Area	No of bin locations	No of Streets	No of Households	No of parking spaces lost
Hanover & Elm Grove	30 (108 bins)	19	1680	42
The Triangle	19 (27 bins)	20	1168	14 and 8 loading bays

Note: Some locations may have multiple bins

3.6 If permission is granted the consultation will take place during November and a report detailing the outcome of the consultation and recommendations will be brought back to this committee early in 2013.

#### 4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Early consultation has taken place with ward councillors and local residents groups who are supportive of the proposals to consult. This report seeks permission to carry out a wider consultation with all households in the area to inform any final decision. Officers have worked closely with residents groups to develop the consultation materials in partnership to increase buy in from the local community.
- 4.2 The consultation will consist of a mail out to all households which will contain details about the proposed scheme, including proposed bin locations and seek views from residents about the principles of the scheme and on proposed bin locations. People will be able to respond by returning hardcopies or completing the consultation on line. An exhibition will be held in both areas to enable residents to meet officers to ask any questions they might have.

#### 5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

#### **Financial Implications:**

5.1 The cost of the consultation will be funded from the existing communications revenue budget, and the bins will also be funded out of existing budgets. If the scheme is rolled out, there will be no further revenue implications.

Finance Officer Consulted: Name Karen Brookshaw Date: 06/09/12

#### **Legal Implications:**

5.2 The council has powers under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to specify and provide the types of receptacles to be used for depositing waste for collection and may also require particular locations, including the highway, to be used. There are no adverse Human Rights Act implications to be taken into account.

In carrying out consultation the Council must comply with the legal requirements for fair consultation that have been set out by the courts:

- consultation must take place while the proposals are still at a formative stage;
- those consulted must be provided with information which is accurate and sufficient to enable them to make a meaningful response;
- they must be given adequate time in which to do so:
- there must be adequate time for their responses to be considered; and
- the council must consider responses with a receptive mind and in a conscientious manner when reaching its decision.

Lawyer Consulted: Carl Hearsum

#### **Equalities Implications:**

5.3 Communal refuse collection has been assessed through the Equalities Impact Assessment process. Refuse collection services need to be easily accessible to all residents and assisted collections would be provided to residents who struggle to use the communal refuse bins if the scheme is implemented.

Date: 30/08/2012

#### Sustainability Implications:

5.4 Based on experience elsewhere in the city communal refuse collection will result in significantly improved street cleanliness.

#### Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.5 There are no implications for crime and disorder.

#### Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

5.6 Communal collections are tried and tested in the city and small scale trials have taken place in Hanover and The Triangle areas. If the scheme is rolled out in response to the consultation the risks are considered to be low.

#### Public Health Implications:

5.7 Containment of refuse will significantly reduce wildlife scavenging for food and will improve street cleanliness.

#### Corporate / Citywide Implications:

5.8 None

#### 6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

6.1 Options for refuse containment in this area are limited. Binvelopes have been trialled but have not been very successful for reasons set out in the body of this report.

#### 7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 The consultation will inform future decisions on refuse containment in the area.

#### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

#### **Appendices:**

1. List of street names in proposed consultation areas

2. Map showing area which will be consulted on communal refuse.

#### Appendix 1 List of street names in proposed consultation area

### <u>Triangle & Lewes Road Proposed Communal Refuse</u> <u>Consultation Area by Street</u>

Aberdeen Road

**Brewer Street** 

Caledonian Road

Edinburgh Road

**Gladstone Terrace** 

**Inverness Road** 

Lewes Road (Gladstone to Elm Grove, Elm Grove to

Gyratory)

Melbourne Street

**Newport Street** 

Park Crescent

Park Crescent Place

Park Crescent Road

Park Crescent Terrace

Rose Hill

St Martins Place

St Martins Street

St Mary Magdalene Street

St Pauls Street

**Trinity Street** 

**Upper Lewes Road** 

## <u>Triangle & Lewes Road Proposed Communal Refuse</u> <u>Consultation Area by Street</u>

**Albion Hill** 

**Belgrave Street** 

**Ewart Street** 

**Grant Street** 

**Grove Street** 

**Hanover Street** 

Hanover Terrace

**Holland Street** 

**Islingword Street** 

Jackson Street

Jersey Street

Lincoln Street

Montreal Road

Newark Place

**Quebec Street** 

**Scotland Street** 

Southampton Street

Southover Street

**Toronto Terrace**