

**14 September 2016**

## **Environment & Housing Management Committee**

### **Assessment of Bring Sites**

**Report of:** Dawn Taylor – Business Support Services Manager

**Wards Affected:** Brentwood South; Herongate, Ingrave and West Horndon; Hutton North; Pilgrims Hatch; Warley

**This report is:** Public

#### **1. Executive Summary**

- 1.1 The Council currently maintain five bring sites in the Borough and there are ongoing contamination issues at the following bring sites: Brentwood Centre, Rayleigh Road and the Town Hall. The West Horndon site had similar issues, however this was closed as of 12 August 2016.
- 1.2 The Environment Panels of 16 September 2014 and 12 November 2014 recognised the issues; since then the bring sites at Blackmore village hall, Crown corner, Hunter Avenue car park, Mountnessing village hall, and William Hunter Way have been closed. The Waste Strategy Group of 4 July 2016 acknowledged there were continuing adverse issues at the remaining bring sites and as such suggested closure of at least two sites.
- 1.3 The Waste Strategy Group on the 4 July 2016 suggested that the bring site at Warley should remain and be extended to incorporate other waste elements, such as small household waste electrical equipment.

#### **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 **That the Committee agree to the immediate closure of the following bring sites: Brentwood Centre, Rayleigh Road and the Town Hall.**
- 2.2 **That the Committee recognise that a number of residents wish to continue to dispose of their recyclables at a bring site, therefore the bring site at Warley should receive additional investment and be enhanced.**

### **3. Introduction and Background**

- 3.1 Bring sites are subject to fly-tipping, vandalism and the illegal deposit of trade waste. This has a detrimental impact on the quality and quantity of the dry recycling collected, as well as adverse financial implications, as the quantity of non-recyclable waste items being left at a bring site is increasing.
- 3.2 These issues were recognised by the Environment Panel on 16 September 2016 and 12 November 2014. The Waste Strategy Group have also discussed the issue of the value of the bring sites.

### **4. Issue, Options and Analysis of Options**

- 4.1 Operational services have provided greater attention by increasing the frequency of visits to the bring sites, however the presence of non-recyclable waste items require the attention of the residual waste crews and street care teams incurring additional expenditure.
- 4.2 The residual waste crews collect an estimated 125 tonnes as residual waste on an annual basis. This tonnage will include an element of dry recyclable waste which will have been deposited in good faith; with the closure of the suggested bring sites this will encourage residents to use the kerbside services, ensuring their material is processed accordingly.
- 4.3 The material recycling contract requires a low contamination rate and the containers emptied at a bring site are known to contain non-recyclable material which is not apparent to a collection crew until the container has been tipped. Collection crews are aware of the need to minimise the collection of contamination but it is difficult, on occasions, for this to be noticed until after tipping.
- 4.4 Signage at the bring sites is clear about what recyclables can be deposited and warnings of covert surveillance have had a negligible impact on the behaviour of some of the users of the bring sites.
- 4.5 It should be noted that the previous closure of six bring sites did not result in waste continuing to be deposited at those sites.

### **5. Reasons for Recommendation**

- 5.1 It is recognised that bring sites played an important part in the past but they are now regarded as an anachronism with the comprehensive kerbside collection services now provided by the Council. Dry mixed

recyclables are collected on a weekly basis as residual waste, negating the need for residents to seek alternate methods of disposal.

- 5.2 The non-recyclable waste material deposited at bring sites has an adverse impact on the street scene and can also be hazardous for example, at Rayleigh Road bring site - broken glass is regularly scattered about the adjacent play area and material was used to start a fire which damaged a piece of play equipment. This has raised concerns about young persons using the play area safely.
- 5.3 The Brentwood Centre bring site has ongoing issues, which have been identified by the CEO of the Brentwood Leisure Trust – please see Appendix A for a copy of a letter dated 25 August 2016 supporting the closure of this bring site. The Brentwood Centre has a high profile in the borough and the presence of the bring site is not a welcome one for residents and others visiting the centre. Further benefits with the closure will be an improvement to the quality of the local environment and the additional car parking spaces that will be freed up.
- 5.4 The Town Hall bring site also has a detrimental impact on the immediate environment and the image of the Town Hall.
- 5.5 The bring sites incur significant costs and the closure of the bring sites suggested will enable better use of resources.
- 5.6 Residual waste crews have to visit each bring site on average three times a week to tip at least 50% of the recycling containers. The man hours of over 700 hours equates to costs in excess of £13,000 p.a. with an additional £3,000 p.a. cost attributed to the attention provided by the street care teams. Recycling collections also incur similar costs to the residual waste collections. The diverted costs will enable resources to be better utilised elsewhere.
- 5.7 Unmanned bring sites are open to abuse, but the Operational Services will be able to monitor and control with greater scrutiny the use of the bring site at Warley as it is immediately located adjacent to the Works Depot.
- 5.8 It is intended to upgrade the Warley bring site to improve its appearance and to ensure that abuse is limited. Containers will be renewed at a cost of £2,700, with the addition of a container for small household electrical items. Signage, barriers and surfaces will also be improved at an estimated cost of £5,000 to £6,000 and, depending upon location

additional surveillance cameras will be deployed at an estimated cost of up to £5,000.

- 5.9 If the closures are approved, signage will be erected at those sites stating that they are closed and indicating available disposal sites: e.g. Warley bring site, RCHW sites at Mountnessing and Coxtie Green Road, Brentwood.

## **6. References to Corporate Plan**

- 6.1 The approval of the recommendations will benefit the street scene and environment.

## **7. Implications**

### **Financial Implications**

**Name & Title: Ramesh Prashar, Financial Services Manager**

**Tel & Email: 01277 312 513 ramesh.prashar@brentwood.gov.uk**

- 7.1 Any expenditure incurred in the closure of the bring sites and the enlargement of the Warley bring site, will be contained within existing budgets.

### **Legal Implications**

**Name & Title: Saleem Chughtai, Legal Services Manager**

**Tel & Email: 01277 312 500 / Saleem.chughtai@brentwood.gov.uk**

- 7.2 There are no immediate implications arising from the recommendations contained within this report.

**Other Implications** (where significant) – i.e. Health and Safety, Asset Management, Equality and Diversity, Risk Management, Section 17 – Crime & Disorder, Sustainability, ICT.

- 7.3 None.

## **8. Background Papers** (include their location and identify whether any are exempt or protected by copyright)

- 8.1 None.

## **9. Appendices to this report**

- **Appendix A** – Letter from the CEO of Brentwood Leisure Trust

**Report Author Contact Details:**

**Name:** Dawn Taylor

**Telephone:** 01277 312668

**E-mail:** dawn.taylor@brentwood.gov.uk