

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

meeting date: 5 JANUARY 2021
title: REVIEW OF REFUSE COLLECTION POINTS
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
principal author: LINDA BOYER, WASTE MANAGEMENT OFFICER

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide Members with information regarding issues where access to some properties in the Ribble Valley is restrictive and to seek the support of Committee for a necessary review of current practice and future policy

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Corporate Priorities - To ensure a well-managed Council providing efficient services based on identified customer needs.
- Other Considerations - To use our own experience of what works best in Ribble Valley to ensure, as far as possible, an uninterrupted, high quality service.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Council operates a fleet of 10 refuse collection vehicles. 8 of these are standard width vehicles and 3 of them are narrow track vehicles. Of the 3 narrow tracks, 2 are single backed vehicles used for paper collection and the other is a split bodied used for refuse collection allowing for collection of refuse and recycling. The remaining 7 are split bodied used for refuse collection.

2.2 Also, there is a smaller single backed DAF vehicle that is used to collect trade waste, bulky collections and occasionally as a back-up for paper and card collections. This vehicle always has work allocated to it and is only used for refuse as a last resort.

3 ISSUES

3.1 The narrow track split bodied vehicle has been off the road for 3 months due to a number of mechanical faults. This vehicle is used on the round where the width of the vehicle helps with the issue of access. Currently, where there have been access problems for the standard width replacement vehicle, the DAF has been used to complete the household collections.

3.2 Inevitably using this vehicle means that the recycling separated by the householder is mixed with residual waste and is sent to landfill; extra diesel is used to send 2 vehicles to the same locations, and additional time taken away from the usual works carried out by this vehicle. This is not sustainable, clearly, in the long term.

3.3 On a number of new developments the developer is cutting costs of building roads by introducing long shared driveways. The shared driveways have not been built to an adoptable structural standard and so the refuse vehicle is likely, over time, to cause damage to the drive for which the council would be seen to be responsible. It is for this

reason that the Council do not travel over roads that are not to be adopted. A note to this effect is written on all planning applications where this is applicable. Unfortunately, the house purchasers are not always informed.

3.4 A number of Borough Councils now stipulate that the refuse crews will not drive down unadopted roads or tracks and communal bins at lane ends will be utilised.

3.5 The service also has problems with the following situations:

- Narrow lanes with overgrowing trees and bushes causing damage to the vehicles (particularly electrical boxes)
- Private roads which are often potholed resulting in damage to the vehicle
- Insufficient areas to manoeuvre once on site
- As it happens, in many of the locations where we experience these problems, we also have excessive distances to travel for small numbers of bins. So, where a tricky, narrow, potholed access of 20m may not be too much of a problem, manoeuvring a 26T vehicle for up to a mile is now an issue.

A review has been started to consider the sites where the above situations arise.

4 CONCLUSION

4.1 There are many locations throughout the Borough where end of lane collections do take place as they have since the roll out of wheeled bin collections in 2006. These collections, both residual and recycling, take place with relatively few problems, and any issues are easily remedied when they arise.

4.2 The Environmental Protection Act 1990 allows for local authorities to determine how and where waste must be placed for its' collection. Whilst this is a power the Council would prefer not to exercise, the proposal would be to negotiate with the affected properties to resolve the matter to a satisfactory conclusion for both parties, however it is worth noting this may not always be possible.

5 RISK ASSESSMENT

5.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – There are none arising as a direct result of this report but the challenge of collecting weekly from an ever-increasing number of properties means that we must keep under constant review those elements of the operation that impair efficiency or which are dangerous.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – Close manoeuvring in a large vehicle is both difficult and fuel intensive so we try to minimise those manoeuvres. A reversing vehicle must be guided by a crew member on foot, so long reversing movements are also undesirable because of the time taken.

From a legal perspective, we are receiving increasing numbers of claims for damage to private roads and drives which are not built to accommodate heavy goods vehicles and we are not obliged to use those accesses if we specify an alternative collection point.

- Political – None arising as a direct result of this report, although the review seeks to use better the resources available so that existing service standards, including weekly collection of residual waste, can be maintained.
- Reputation – It is quite likely that in areas where collection points are changed, the decision will be unpopular. However, a number of residents have previously expressed deep concern about the impact of our vehicles on private property.
- Equality & Diversity – None arising as a direct result of this report.

6 **RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 6.1 Support the review taking place and where deemed necessary support officers in their decision to adopt the means of collection that suits the location.

LINDA BOYER
WASTE MANAGEMENT OFFICER

JOHN HEAP
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

For further information please ask for Linda Boyer, extension 4467.