

Shaping Surrey’s Community Recycling Centre Consultation Report Tuesday 29 January 2019

Purpose of report:

The council has to make some very tough decisions to ensure we deliver better outcomes for residents, especially vulnerable children, and to help us achieve the Community Vision for Surrey in 2030, where no one is left behind. This means we have to change how we deliver services, how we work more effectively with our partners, coupled with continuing to make savings.

We would like to thank the 12,132 residents and other stakeholders who gave their opinion on the proposed changes to community recycling centres (CRCs). We have listened carefully to these views and have taken them into consideration when developing a final plan. However changes to the service are absolutely necessary to set a sustainable budget, which enables us to continue to deliver a valued service by our residents in Surrey.

The recommendations set out below are the latest in a series of measures at CRCs. These have been designed to make CRCs better value for money by re-focusing them on their core offer: to provide places for residents to dispose of household waste that cannot be collected at the kerbside. We believe these recommended changes still support the strategic aims of increasing recycling and reducing landfill, and meets our legal requirements as a Waste Disposal Authority.

Recommendations:

1. Retain the community recycling centres (CRCs) located at Farnham and Lyne (Chertsey), based on the current and projected usage of these sites.
2. Extend the opening hours of Camberley, Caterham and Leatherhead CRCs from six days a week to seven days a week from Monday 1 April 2019.
3. Maintain the current prices for materials in the charging waste.
4. Proceed with the permanent closure of the CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham from Monday 1 April 2019 or as soon as practically possible after this.
5. Introduce a charge for construction wood and roofing felt from Monday 1 April 2019 or as soon as practically possible after this.
6. Introduce an annual application fee for van, trailer and pick-up permits from Wednesday 1 January 2020, when all permits are due for renewal.

Supporting information for these recommendations can be found in paragraph 36 to 39.

Background

1. As a result of rising demand for services particularly those supporting children, older people and our most vulnerable residents and a reducing government grant means the

Annex 4 – Shaping Surrey’s CRCs Consultation Report

council needs to make some very difficult decisions about the way it delivers services. With this in mind the Environment Service has been asked to propose measures, which would reduce the annual costs of managing waste at its CRCs. A programme of cost saving initiatives at CRCs has been underway since 2015/16 which has so far delivered circa £2.5 million of savings.

2. It has been identified that a further £1 million could be saved from the operation of the CRCs by introducing a number of service changes. The project associated with these changes forms part of the council’s transformation programme.
3. This report will inform the Cabinet about the legal background to the provision of the CRCs, provide facts around the current provision and describe the changes to the service that are being considered to make savings. The purpose of this will be to enable the Cabinet to make a decision on the proposed changes.

Legal Obligations of the Waste Disposal Authority

4. Surrey County Council (SCC) as Waste Disposal Authority has a legal duty to dispose of waste collected by the Surrey district and borough councils. In addition SCC must also provide places for residents to dispose of their own household waste free of charge (CRCs). In 2017/18 Surrey residents produced 510,000 tonnes of waste. Approximately 81% of this waste was collected at the kerbside by district and borough councils and around 19% (96,000 Tonnes) was collected at the CRCs.
5. SCC has discretion in the level of service that has to be provided at the CRCs. The key elements of this obligation are set out in **Table 1** as follows:

Table 1: Key elements of service level obligations

| Legal Requirement | Comments |
|--|--|
| To provide a place or places. | The number of facilities is not prescribed. |
| They must be provided for <i>person’s resident</i> within the county. | There is no requirement to provide any free facilities for residents who live outside Surrey. |
| They must accept residents’ own household waste free of charge. | There is no requirement to accept any waste other than a residents own household waste free of charge. A number of wastes already accepted for free are not household waste. |
| They must be reasonably accessible. | There is no definition of what is reasonably accessible, both with respect to distance travelled and vehicle type accepted. However Waste Resources and Action Programme (WRAP) has suggested that a good minimum level of CRC provision with some exceptions for very rural/ urban areas would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum catchment radius for a large proportion of the population: 3 to 5 miles (very rural areas: 7 miles) • Maximum driving times for the great majority of residents in good traffic conditions: 20 minutes (very rural areas: 30 minutes) |

Annex 4 – Shaping Surrey’s CRCs Consultation Report

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum number of inhabitants per HWRC (in all but the most urbanised areas): 120,000 Maximum number of households per HWRC (in all but the most urbanised areas): 50,000 |
| They must be available at all reasonable times including during at least one Saturday or Sunday per week. | There is no definition of reasonable times other than the availability for a period on a Saturday or Sunday. |

6. It's worth noting that in 2015 the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) introduced legislation to prevent further authorities from charging entrance fees at CRCs. A number of authorities had already implemented or were planning to implement this in order to avoid site closures. This ruling lies separate from the ability to charge for non-household waste which legislation allows.
7. The government published its Waste and Resources Strategy on Tuesday 18 December 2018 which includes wide ranging proposals to change the way we manage waste in the UK. The main thrust of these proposals is to shift the responsibility for recycling from the consumer and local authorities to producers of packaging materials. However there is also an indication that government will be looking for consistency in the way that councils collect recyclable materials including the introduction of mandatory food waste collections and the possibility of a free garden waste collection service. Work is currently underway with the Surrey Waste Partnership to understand the potential consequences of the proposals in the new strategy, however given the timetable for further consultation we are unlikely to have detailed proposals until late 2019 and beyond.
8. It is worth noting that many authorities restrict the use of their community recycling centres to their own residents or impose charges on residents from outside their area. Surrey County Council currently restricts the use of some sites on its northern border to Surrey residents only. Hampshire County Council are proposing to introduce a residents only policy at their community recycling centres in September 2019 later, however they are proposing to allow non-residents to use the site for a £5 entry charge.

The current service

9. SCC provides 15 CRCs across the county. The amount of material that they handle has reduced significantly since the introduction of the first substantial changes to the service in April 2016. In 2015/16 the CRCs handled 140,510 tonnes. However this year (2018/19) we are projecting an estimated throughput of 86,000 tonnes of waste and recycling. At the same time there has been no overall increase in the volume of material collected at the kerbside or by district and borough councils as fly-tipping, as shown in **Annex 4b**. Officers believe that the most likely explanation for the decrease in tonnage is that residents are using commercial waste services such as skips and the increased level of checks introduced as part of the charging scheme deterring the illicit use of the site by traders.

10. The changes to the service that have been implemented to date are set out in **Table 2** below:

Table 2: Changes made at CRCs since 2015/16.

| Date | Details of Change |
|----------------|---|
| 1 April 2016 | Reduced opening hours, so that all sites open 8am to 4pm weekdays and 9am to 4pm at weekends all year round (The CRC at Shepperton has had its hours extended during the summer service as a result of the Eco Park construction) |
| 1 April 2016 | Closed Dorking, Caterham, Cranleigh, Farnham and Warlingham CRCs one extra day per week. |
| 1 April 2016 | Removed rubble containers from the sites located at Bagshot, Caterham, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham and Warlingham ahead of the introduction of charging. |
| 1 April 2016 | Introduced a new van permit scheme with an annual 12 visit allowance and extended Surrey Resident scheme to additional sites. |
| 1 Sept 2016 | Introduction of charges for rubble, soil, plasterboard and tyres with 1 bag free daily allowance for rubble, soil & plasterboard |
| April/May 2017 | Revive reuse shops opened at Earlswood, Witley and Woking CRCs. (A reuse shop was already in place at Leatherhead CRC on a trial basis, but this was extended to a permanent operation). |
| 4 Dec 2017 | Removed free daily allowance for rubble soil and plasterboard and extended Surrey resident scheme to the CRC at Camberley (The Surrey resident scheme was already in operation at Caterham, Epsom, Shepperton and Warlingham CRCs) |
| 8 Jan 2018 | Stopped vans trailers and pickups from using the CRCs at Bagshot, Caterham, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham and Warlingham. |
| 8 Jan 2018 | Retained a strategic network of 4 sites that would remain open 7 days a week (Earlswood, Shepperton, Witley and Woking) and reduced opening hours at most other sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caterham, Leatherhead, and Camberley - open 6 days per week • Epsom, Chertsey, Guildford, Farnham – open 5 days per week • Bagshot – open 4 days per week • Warlingham, Dorking, Cranleigh – open 3 days per week |

11. In 2017/18, 59% of the materials collected at the CRCs were recycled, composted or reused, 32% of materials were sent to energy recovery plants and 9% of materials were landfilled.

Customer satisfaction and site usage

12. The CRCs are very popular with residents and attracted an estimated 2.6 million visits in 2017/18. The quarterly resident surveys undertaken by a research company on behalf of SCC still show that the CRCs are one of the highest rated services that SCC provides, with 69.8% of respondents stating that they are either satisfied or very satisfied with the service. (Last measure taken April 2018 – June 2018). There is a risk that satisfaction levels may drop as a result of the proposed closures and additional charges.
13. As explained in paragraph 9 above, the amount of waste that CRCs now manage has fallen significantly. There has also been a drop in the number of visitors by car to CRCs, as shown in **Table 3** below:

Table 3: Car visits to CRCs compared against annual waste tonnages received from 2015/16 to 2018/19.

| Year | Estimated annual car visits to CRCs (using weekly averages) | Waste tonnages |
|---------|---|--------------------|
| 2015/16 | 3,160,152 | 140,510 |
| 2016/17 | 2,948,608 | 113,649 |
| 2017/18 | 2,603,588 | 95,845 |
| 2018/19 | 2,523,000 (projected) | 86,000 (projected) |

14. A further breakdown on car visits and waste tonnages by site can be found in **Annex 4b**.

Potential for further savings at Surrey’s CRCs

15. Officers have identified a further number of possible service changes which could be implemented to reduce costs. If implemented, they would affect the delivery of the service to residents therefore are subject to public consultation. These proposed changes are set out in paragraphs 18 to 27 below.

Changes which can be implemented without public consultation

16. Some of these proposed changes have no effect on the delivery of the service to residents, and can be implemented without a public consultation. Others have the potential to effect the service offered to residents, and therefore require a public consultation to understand their views and potential impacts to help inform the decision making process.
17. The following changes require no public consultation and will be implemented provided they prove cost effective.

a) Recovery of more recyclable materials from black bag waste.

For the past few years, our contractor, Suez has stationed staff at the residual waste bins on the CRCs to intercept black bin bags brought in by residents. These bags are then split open to recover any recyclable materials which can then be placed in the appropriate container. By diverting these materials from disposal, the council has reduced its costs by around £0.5m per year.

Composition analysis has shown that around 30% of the material delivered to the CRCs in black bags is recyclable, but not all of this material is currently captured. Officers are planning to operate a mechanical sorting trial in February 2019 to investigate the cost effectiveness of this as a means of increasing capture. This process would be undertaken away from public areas of the sites. Once this trial is complete the benefit of any savings by operating on a permanent basis will be quantified.

b) Selling Advertising Space at CRCs

Officers are investigating whether there is any potential to generate income from business advertising at the CRCs. Other local authorities who do this at their recycling

centres have told us that they generate very limited income from this. Preliminary discussions have taken place with a provider and site surveys are proposed to establish potential locations for advertisements.

c) Open a further reuse shop at Shepperton CRC

It is proposed to open a further reuse shop at Shepperton CRC during 2019 as soon as the Eco Park construction works are completed. This reuse facility will include the opportunity for e-sales. Suez with SCC are also exploring other ways where it can generate further income through the reuse initiative; for example, working with prisons to refurbish bicycles and selling high value items online.

d) Increase income from trade waste activities

Officers are working with Suez to investigate ways to increase the amount of trade waste handled through the waste transfer stations and to generate more income from this activity.

Consultation Proposals and Approach

18. SCC have sought the views of residents and other stakeholders on proposed changes to CRCs via a public consultation that ran from Tuesday 30 October 2018 to Friday 4 January 2019. Consultation respondents were asked for their views on the following four proposals:

Proposal one: Permanently closing a number of smaller, less effective CRCs, whilst increasing the opening hours at some CRCs. The sites under consideration for closure are: Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham.

Proposal two: Introducing a charge to dispose of construction wood and roofing felt.

Proposal three: Increasing the cost of disposing of items we already charge for.

Proposal four: Charging an annual application fee for van, pickup and trailer permits

19. The approach taken to prepare and deliver the consultation [can be found on the council's website](#). Further information and thinking behind the consultation proposals is provided below.

Proposal one - Permanent closure of smaller less well used CRCs

20. It can be seen from **Annex 4b** that there is a significant variation in the use of CRCs. The consultation identified the potential to close up to six of the fifteen CRCs. These sites are located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham. These sites are smaller, less well used and, with the exception of the Lyne (Chertsey) site, are undeveloped single level sites which require to be closed to the public when bins are exchanged. Between them, these six sites currently handle less than 18% of the total waste dealt with at the CRCs.
21. The consultation sought the public's view on three potential options for closure.

Annex 4 – Shaping Surrey’s CRCs Consultation Report

1) Close the four smallest CRCs at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham and re-open the nearest alternative CRCs at Leatherhead, Caterham and Camberley seven days per week.

2) Close all six CRCs listed above and reopen all remaining CRCs seven days per week. In addition we would increase the number of staff and/or invest in facilities and technology to serve customers efficiently at these.

3) Close all six CRCs listed above and open all remaining sites five days per week in the winter (October – March) and seven days per week in the Summer (April – September) with extended opening hours past 4pm into the evening during summer where demand exists and where planning permits. In addition we would increase the number of staff and/or invest in facilities and technology to serve customers efficiently at these

Proposal two – Introducing a charge for construction wood and roofing felt

- 22. As described earlier in this paper, the legal obligation of the Waste Disposal Authority is to provide places where residents can dispose of their **household** waste free of charge. However not all waste that arises from a resident’s home is classified as **household** waste. For example construction and demolition waste from households and waste arising from excavations are not defined as **household** waste.
- 23. A number of different wastes are classed as non-household. It is legal for local authorities to charge residents for the disposal of these wastes and many Waste Disposal Authorities already charge for or restrict these types of wastes.
- 24. SCC already charges for non-household waste comprising rubble, soil, plasterboard and tyres as well any construction waste that is brought to sites in a van, trailer or pickup.
- 25. The proposal was to extend the existing charging scheme to include charges to residents for dealing with construction wood (materials such as sheds, fencing panels and posts, decking, and fitted kitchen units) and roofing felt. The charges for these items would be solely to cover the costs of dealing with these materials, including the administration of the charging system. The charge would be £4 per bag or item including VAT.

Proposal three- Increasing charges for rubble, soil and plasterboard

- 26. The charges that were introduced in September 2016 have not been increased to reflect inflation in costs. The proposal put forward in the consultation was to introduce a price increase per bag and per item of charging scheme waste from £4 to £5 to cover the increased disposal costs. The current disposal costs of £12 per sheet of plasterboard, £5 per tyre or part tyre and £50 for loose loads of construction waste per car will remain unchanged.

Proposal four - Introduction of charges for van, trailer or pickup permits.

- 27. Any resident wishing to use a CRC using a van, trailer or pickup must first apply to the council for a van and trailer permit. This allows residents to bring their household waste

Annex 4 – Shaping Surrey’s CRCs Consultation Report

to one of our larger CRCs up to 12 times in any calendar year. Currently 11,032 live permits are registered to the system. A permit is currently free of charge. However it is proposed to introduce charges to cover the administration of this system. The exact charge is still being worked up but we believe it will be between £5 and £10 per year, to visit up to 12 times in that calendar year.

Summarised Consultation Analysis

28. The consultation received a total of 12,132 responses including 12,097 from residents, and 35 responses from organisations/groups such as district & borough and parish & town councils.
29. Seven petitions were received concerning the proposed closure of Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham CRCs.
30. The headline results can be found in **Table 4** below and the consultation summary report [can be found on the council's website](#).

Table 4 Headline results from the consultation

| Consultation subject | Result |
|--|--|
| CRC visits in the last 12 months | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-thirds of respondents (66%) said they had used a CRC monthly or more in the last 12 months. |
| CRC sites used in the last 12 months | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than seven-tenths of respondents (72%) said they used one of the six CRCs that are proposed for closure in the last 12 months. One in four respondents (26%) said they used the CRC in Farnham. |
| Respondent location | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Almost one in four respondents (24%) said they were from the postcode areas GU9/GU10 – Farnham and surrounding areas. |
| Proposal one: Permanently closing a number of smaller, less effective CRCs, whilst increasing the opening hours at some CRCs. The sites under consideration for closure are: Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than half of the respondents (54%) said they did not support option 1 to close the four smaller CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham while increasing the opening hours at Camberley, Caterham and Leatherhead. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use one of the CRCs proposed for closure in option 1 the percentage that did not support this proposal increased to 93% More than four-fifths of respondents (81%) said they did not support option 2 to close the six CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and Warlingham while increasing the opening hours at the remaining nine CRCs. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use one of the CRCs proposed for closure in option 2 the percentage that did not support this proposal increased to 95% Almost nine-tenths of respondents (88%) said they did not support option 3 to close the six CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking, Farnham, Lyne (Chertsey) and |

Annex 4 – Shaping Surrey’s CRCs Consultation Report

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Warlingham, and reduce the service at the remaining nine CRCs to five days a week during the winter period but increase their opening hours over the summer. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use one of the CRCs proposed for closure in option 3 the percentage that did not support this proposal increased to 97%.</p> |
| <p>Proposal two: Introducing a charge to dispose of construction wood and roofing felt.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than half of respondents (55%) said they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to charge for construction wood. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use the charging scheme service the percentage that either disagreed or strongly disagreed increased to 65%. • More than two-fifths of respondents (41%) said they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to charge for roofing felt. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use the charging scheme service the percentage that either disagreed or strongly disagreed increased to 48%. |
| <p>Proposal three: Increasing the cost of disposing of items we already charge for.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than half of respondents (51%) said they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal to increase the cost of disposing items we already charge for in the charging waste scheme. When looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use the charging scheme service the percentage that either disagreed or strongly disagreed increased to 59%. |
| <p>Proposal four: Charging an annual application fee for van, pickup and trailer permits.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exactly half of respondents (50%) said they either agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal to charge an annual application fee for a van permit. However, when looking at just the respondents who told us they use or will use the van permit scheme two-thirds of respondents (66%) told us that they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this proposal. |
| <p>Suitability for making savings</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than seven-tenths of respondents (71%) felt that CRCs were not an appropriate area for the council to make savings by changing the service. • More than half of respondents (52%) felt savings should instead be made from other council services |
| <p>Key comments received via the questionnaire or by email and letter on the proposals.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant number of respondents in particular highlighted that any reduction to a CRC service especially permanently closing CRCs could increase journey times to the nearest alternative CRCs, increase traffic/congestion and have a negative impact on the environment including an increase in vehicle emissions, more bonfires, noise pollution and an increase in fly-tipping at an additional cost to council's and private landowners. • There is concern the proposals will make it difficult for residents to dispose of waste especially those with mobility issues, financial difficulties and/or not transport. It's also feared that the proposals could have a negative impact on |

Annex 4 – Shaping Surrey’s CRCs Consultation Report

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>recycling with more recyclable waste being thrown away in the kerbside black bin.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It’s also felt that proposals to permanently close CRCs don’t take into account future demand with projected population growth and new dwellings that are set to be built in Surrey the next 10 – 15 years. • A number of concerns were raised about the suitability and safety of roads to alternative CRCs should their site close. • Some current van permit users felt they were being unfairly treated because they didn’t own a car. • Urged to fully consider the impact of DEFRA’s recently published resources and waste strategy before a decision is made on closures. |
|--|---|

Proposals Implications and Mitigation Options

31. The savings effect of each of the components of the CRC Transformation Programme has been calculated and is set out in Table 5 below. The saving is shown for 2019/20 and 2020/21 recognising that some changes may only deliver a part year effect in 2019/20.

Table 5: Estimated annual savings from the recommended changes to the CRC service

| Proposal | Estimated saving 2019/20 (£000s) | Estimated saving 2020/21 (£000s) | Comments |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Permanent closure of the four CRCs located in Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham, | £650 | £650 | This assumes all closures will go ahead from Monday 1 April 2019. If all closures were deferred to Tuesday 1 October 2019 the in-year saving for 2019/20 would reduce to £338,000. |
| Charging for construction wood and roofing felt | £300 | £300 | This assumes the introduction of charging for construction wood and roofing felt would go ahead from Monday 1 April 2019. If these changes were deferred to Tuesday 1 October 2019 the in-year saving for 2019/20 would reduce to an estimated £120,000. |
| Further changes to the reuse scheme: opening of the Shepperton revive shop and online trading | £50 | £100 | The current reuse scheme is on course to achieve £200,000 in 2018/19, and assumes that growth of an additional £50,000 can be achieved each year. |

Annex 4 – Shaping Surrey’s CRCs Consultation Report

| | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---|
| Selling advertising space at CRCs*** | £5 | £10 | Initial talks suggest that £5,000 could be achieved in 2019/20, and learning from the first year of delivery could be incorporated into the scheme to double savings the next year. |
| Introduction of charges for van & trailer permits**** | £10 | £50 | The saving for 2019/20 is less recognising that the change won't come in until January 2020. |
| Recovery of more recyclable materials from black bag waste | £TBC | £TBC | A mechanical black bag trial is scheduled for February 2019 to obtain more intelligence on composition and to identify the most cost effective way to extract recyclables. |
| Increase income from trade waste activities at waste transfer stations | £TBC | £TBC | Talks are still ongoing with the contractor regarding ways to generate more income from trade waste. |
| Total | £1,015 | £1,060 | |

32. The results from the consultation indicated the strongest opposition to the proposals to close some of community recycling centres. Unsurprisingly closure of a site was almost universally opposed by respondents who used that particular site. There was less opposition to the introduction of charges for wood and roofing felt and for charges for van permits although a significant proportion of respondents were still opposed to these proposals.
33. As can be seen from **Table 5** above, the bulk of savings relate to the closure of some of the CRCs and the introduction of charges for construction wood and roofing felt. Therefore if a decision were made not to implement these proposals, savings would be significantly reduced.
34. It is officers' intention to engage with our waste contractor Suez to explore opportunities for further cost savings through a contract restructure. This process is likely to commence in early 2019.
35. In addition to the specific responses to the options put forward in the consultation, there were a number of key issues that were raised by respondents that they felt would have negative effects if the proposals were implemented. These issues and proposed mitigations are listed in **Table 6** below.

Table 6: key issues raised in the consultation and mitigating actions

| Issue raised | Proposed mitigation |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Increase in fly-tipping | From our experience of recent changes to the service, and anecdotal evidence from other local authorities who have closed sites, fly-tipping is not expected to increase. In recent years the service have introduced measures to enforce against illegitimate use of CRCs by traders and this is reflected in the lower amounts of waste and visitors that the service is now dealing with. However it's possible that some traders are still illegitimately using the CRCs that are proposed for closure, and therefore there is a risk that fly-tipping could increase. The |

Annex 4 – Shaping Surrey’s CRCs Consultation Report

| | |
|--|--|
| | service will continue to monitor the position with fly-tipping, and will work with partners to tackle the issue. More information fly-tipping statistics can be found in Annex 4b . |
| Increase in cost to councils and private landowners to deal with any increases in fly-tipping | In recent years since changes have been made at the CRCs, the number of tonnes of fly-tipped material collected by district and borough council has decreased overall. This means that in 2017/18 the county council’s disposal cost for fly-tipped material was £100,000 less than it was in 2015/16. As above the service will continue to monitor the position and where necessary take appropriate mitigation. We’ll continue to work with private landowners through the SWP enforcement group to help prevent fly-tipping. |
| Increase in journey times | This is acknowledged, and the service estimate that up to a maximum of 54,295 households in Surrey (if they use the service) will now have a longer journey time to an alternative CRC. The impact of which has been mapped as shown in Annex 4b . However as part of the communications programme the service will advertise what alternatives are available to a CRC such as kerbside collections through the district and borough council or commercial waste companies. |
| Increase in vehicle emissions | <p>The service have reviewed the catchment areas for the CRCs located at Bagshot, Cranleigh, Dorking and Warlingham to determine the vehicle emissions impact on households having to travel further in a car to reach an alternative CRC should these sites close. Using average return journey road distances in the original and new catchment areas, postcode survey data, CRC traffic count data, and typical emissions from a passenger vehicle, the closure of these sites would in theory lead to an estimated increase in vehicle emissions of an additional 571 tonnes per annum (equivalent to the energy used in 70 homes a year).</p> <p>However, this is the worst case scenario with <u>all</u> current car trips from these sites in 2018/19 transferring over to alternative CRCs in 2019/20. Based on our previous experience of changes to the service, we believe the impact will likely lead to less emissions, as we believe not all current users of these CRCs will make the additional journey to an alternative CRC. The service will also seek to minimise impact further by communicating to residents that they should try not to make specific trips to a CRC, and should instead, where possible, do this as part of one of their everyday car journeys such as going to shopping centres, or to work.</p> <p>It’s also important to note that the recent service changes that have been introduced in the last few years have seen a significant fall in car journeys to Surrey’s CRCs, which in theory could have led to a decrease in vehicle emissions.</p> |
| More congested sites | This will be mitigated by increased workforce with charging scheme (processing cars faster) and the service looking into ANPR investment as a means for enforcing against illegitimate use by traders. |
| Recycling negatively impacted | It is possible that some residents may choose to dispose of their recyclables in their residual waste bin as an alternative to using |

Annex 4 – Shaping Surrey’s CRCs Consultation Report

| | |
|--|---|
| | a CRC, however there is no evidence that changes to the service to date have negatively impacted on recycling rates and residual waste volumes. The service will continue to take steps such as increasing reuse and trialling further black bag sorting initiatives as part of the CRC transformation programme. |
| Population growth/new dwellings | The sites proposed for closure wouldn't be appropriate to send more residents to i.e. we need to get them to attend split level sites where they are better equipped to handle more tonnages/visitors. That said, in the next 10-15 years the council would hope to see the positive effects of extended producer responsibility, and advancement in technology, which in theory should mean that businesses take more responsibility for dealing with items such as waste packaging, further reducing the need for recycling centres. A map showing from the Surrey Infrastructure study showing expected housing growth by 2030/31 is attached as Annex 4b . |
| Van permit users getting an unfair deal | There is a need to control vans and trailers because these are often used by traders to dispose of waste. Vans & trailers can carry greater volumes of waste, rather than banning vans and trailers a control system has been introduced and it is right that those who utilise the convenience of a van or trailer pay for this. |
| More difficult for residents to dispose of waste especially those with mobility issues, financial difficulties and no transport | <p>The location of the CRC's and types of waste brought to them mean that nearly all journeys are made by car. It is accepted that some residents will have to drive further to a CRC but there is an opportunity for residents to consider how often they need to visit a CRC or whether they can use the kerbside collection as an alternative.</p> <p>The service acknowledge that pedestrians who used the CRC at Warlingham will be impacted if they have no transport or are unable to drive. However anecdotal evidence suggests that most pedestrians who use the Warlingham CRC actually park their car outside the site and then walk in.</p> |
| Any decisions on site closures needs to be delayed until the full impact of the government's new resources and waste strategy is understood | The Government's Waste and Resources Strategy was issued on Wednesday 18 December 2018. Its main focus is on shifting the responsibility and costs for recycling to producers and in terms of local authorities the main focus is on kerbside collections undertaken by district and borough councils. The only reference to community recycling centres is with respect a future review of the regulations that allow councils to charge for construction waste. Should this review remove the ability of the council to charge for construction waste then the council would expect the government to provide compensating funding to negate the effect. |
| Concern about the suitability and safety of roads to alternative CRCs | In recent years no road traffic accidents have been reported involving vehicles turning to/from recycling centres which are near to those earmarked for closure. The service are currently modelling traffic flow, and will consider any further assessments that are required, and what mitigations we may be able to offer with the local highway and/or the configuration of alternative sites before any sites close. |

Recommendations supporting information

36. It's accepted that closure of any of the CRCs will be unpopular with those who use them, however without closing any CRCs there will be a significant shortfall in savings. It is therefore recommended that closure of CRCs is limited to the minimum number necessary to achieve the savings. This would mean the permanent closure of CRCs at Cranleigh, Dorking, Warlingham and Bagshot. These CRCs are those which handle the least waste and have the lowest number of visitors (**Annex 4b**). The CRCs at Farnham and Chertsey would remain open noting that the closure of these sites would effect a greater number of users.
37. In order to meet the savings objective, it will also be necessary to extend the charging waste scheme to include construction wood and roofing felt.
38. It is not recommended that a price increase is introduced for existing charging scheme wastes as officers believe charges are already at the upper end of range of charges imposed by other councils and the saving achieved by increasing the price would be relatively modest.

Table 7 Comparison of charges for rubble at CRCs

| Local authority | Charge per bag of rubble |
|--------------------|--|
| Surrey CC | £4 per bag |
| East Sussex CC | £4 per bag |
| Bracknell Forest | £3 per bag |
| Norfolk CC | £3 per bag |
| Buckinghamshire CC | £2.50 per bag (<i>proposing to charge</i>) |
| Hampshire CC | £2.50 per bag |
| Devon CC | £2.20 per bag |
| Oxfordshire CC | £1.50 per bag |

39. It is recommended that an annual charge for van permits be introduced. The exact cost is still being finalised, and will be confirmed as part of the advance communication to van permit users, but expect it will be between £5 and £10 per year, to visit up to 12 times in that calendar year. The earliest this could be introduced would be Wednesday 1 January 2020 because permits are renewed at the beginning of each year. This will mean that the saving achieved in 2019/20 would only be an estimated £10,000. In a full year it is estimated that the saving would be £50,000.

Environmental sustainability implications

40. As set out in Table 6 in paragraph 35, the key environment impacts that have been identified concern fly-tipping and vehicle emissions. The service have looked at a range of potential environmental impacts. Please see this summary assessment in **Annex 4c**.

Risk management and implications:

41. A common concern raised by respondents to this consultation and to all previous consultations is that closure of CRCs and the introduction of charges for certain types of waste will lead to more fly tipping, which will lead to increased clearance costs for private landowners and district and borough councils. Whilst increased fly tipping cannot be ruled out as a consequence of these changes, our experience to date with the changes that we have introduced over the past two years is that that fly tipping has not increased. However officers will need to monitor this carefully and take appropriate action such as increasing the frequency of fly tipping prevention publicity campaigns and working closely with the Surrey Waste Partnership enforcement officers group to identify further preventative actions. Recent changes in legislation which allow district and borough councils to issue fixed penalty notices for ‘duty of care’ offences should also assist in deterring fly tipping.
42. Fly tipping is an existing problem and in 2016, the Surrey Waste Partnership developed a fly tipping prevention strategy. The aim of this strategy was to raise awareness amongst members of the public of their responsibility to ensure any waste generated by them is disposed of correctly and also to improve the coordination between and effectiveness of district and borough enforcement teams.
43. If fly tipping were to increase as a result of these changes then part of the cost of clearance would fall to the county council because it is responsible for arranging and paying for disposal of fly tipped material collected by district and borough councils.
44. It should be noted that in the Waste and Resources Strategy published on Tuesday 18 December 2018, the government have indicated that they propose to review the regulations which enable local authorities to charge for construction waste generated in the home. This review would be subject to a consultation but there is no indication of when this review is likely to take place.

Financial implications:

45. The Section 151 Officer notes that the savings presented in this report are estimates. The actual saving may change depending on a number of factors such as the actual volume of waste or, in the case of site closures, depending on formal agreement with the council’s waste contractor Suez. The estimated saving assumes measures are implemented on Monday 1 April 2019, and any delay will potentially reduce the saving available in 2019/20.

What happens next

46. The proposals will be implemented from Monday 1 April 2019, as stated in the recommendations section above.
 47. Begin engagement on decommissioning CRC sites set to close.
 48. A communications programme will be devised to ensure that the changes are effectively publicised in advance to residents and other stakeholders. This will also include information regarding alternative recycling methods available at the kerbside or commercially, and general tips on what can be done to improve recycling.
-

Annex 4 – Shaping Surrey’s CRCs Consultation Report

Report contact: Richard Parkinson, Waste Operations Group Manager

Contact details: Tel 03456 009 009

Background papers:

Shaping Surrey’s Community Recycling Centres – Consultation results

Annexes:

Annex 4a – Community Recycling Centres Equality Impact Assessment

Annex 4b – Waste Service Information

Annex 4c – Environmental Consideration Summary