# ENVIRONMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

# Agenda Item 63

**Brighton & Hove City Council** 

Subject: Communal Refuse Collection in Hanover, Elm Grove

Date of Meeting: 27<sup>th</sup> March 2013

Report of: Strategic Director, Place

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

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

Ward(s) affected: Hanover & Elm Grove

#### FOR GENERAL RELEASE

#### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 At the previous Committee Meeting on the 6<sup>th</sup> of February a report was presented detailing the outcome of the consultation on communal refuse bins in the Hanover and Elm Grove Area. The outcome of the consultation was very close and a petition, signed by 414 people, was received against the introduction of communal bins as a result of which a decision on implementation was delayed until after a further public meeting.
- 1.2 The public meeting was held on the 5<sup>th</sup> of March. Having considered the consultation the petition and the feedback received at the public meeting it is not proposed to change the service. This report sets out the background and is for information only.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the outcome of the consultation in relation to the proposed communal refuse bins in Hannover and Elm Grove and agrees not to proceed with extending the scheme in this area.
- 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 Following discussions with Ward Councillors and the local LAT about the problems associated with the lack of refuse containment residents were consulted on proposals to introduce communal refuse collection. The details of the consultation process were presented to committee at the meeting on the 6<sup>th</sup> February 2013.
- 3.4 44% of residents responded to the consultation and the results were very close with 48% for communal refuse bins and 46% against. In light of these results and the petition received against communal containers a decision on the scheme was deferred until after a public meeting. The meeting was held on the 5<sup>th</sup> of March where the issues for and against communal containers were discussed. The meeting was well attended with over 100 residents. The majority of people were not in favour of the scheme.
- 3.5 In light of all the information it is proposed that the existing service remains in place. Residents will be written to, to confirm the outcome of the consultation and the decision of the Committee.
- 3.6 The communal containers that were being considered for the scheme are smaller than the bins used elsewhere in the city. They would have been collected using the existing collection vehicles that already collect the black sacks. Therefore there are no implications in terms of capital investment or revenue costs if this area is not included in communal refuse containment and no implications on the viability of the existing communal bin service in the city centre.
- 3.7 Communal containers are in place in Washington Street and Coleman Street as part of a trial. Residents in these streets will be written to and asked whether they want to retain the bins or revert back to black sack collections.

#### 4 FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

#### Financial Implications:

4.1 There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation in this report. The proposed scheme would have used existing fleet and therefore retaining the current service has no capital or revenue implications.

Finance Officer Consulted: Jeff Coates Date: 13/03/2013

## **Legal Implications:**

4.2 The proposals in this report recommend no change to the current arrangements following consultation. In carrying out consultation the Council is under a general duty to ensure that any consultation is fair. This means that it must be carried out

when proposals are being formulated, that adequate time and information about proposals must be given to consultees to ensure that they can provide a proper response, and that any consultation responses must be properly considered in reaching the decision.

Lawyer Consulted: Elizabeth Culbert Date: 140314

#### **Equalities Implications:**

4.3 No change is proposed to the service. Residents who have difficulty accessing the refuse collection service will continue to receive assisted collections.

#### **Sustainability Implications:**

4.4 None - there is no change to the service.

**Crime & Disorder Implications:** 

4.5 There are no implications for crime and disorder.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

4.6 None - there is no change to the service

Public Health Implications:

4.7 None - there is no change to the service

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

4.8 None

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

5.1 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.

#### 6. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 The recommendations are based on the outcome of the consultation.

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

#### Appendices:

1. None

## **Documents in Members' Rooms**

1. None

# **Background Documents**

1. None