



Direct Dial/Ext: 01622 694002
Fax: 01622 694383
e-mail: peter.sass@kent.gov.uk
Ask for: Peter Sass
Your Ref:
Our Ref:
Date: 23 March 2012

Dear Member

COUNTY COUNCIL - THURSDAY, 29 MARCH 2012

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at next Thursday, 29 March 2012 meeting of the County Council, the following report(s) that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

Agenda No	Item
12	<u>Petition Scheme Debates</u> (Pages 1 - 4)

Closure of Richborough Household Waste Recycling Centre

Yours sincerely

Peter Sass
Head of Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 5**RICHBOROUGH ACTION GROUP**

Our group believes that Richborough HWRC (and others) site should stay open and regrets how Kent figure in the Table below reinforce the view that more sites should be open rather than close any!

County	Population	No. Of Sites	Sites per head of population
East Sussex	517,040	12	1:43,087
Hampshire	1,296,800	24	1:54,033
West Sussex	780,000	11	1:70,909
Kent	1,427,400	19	1:75,126
Essex	1,600,000	21	1:76,190

1. Despite Protestations to the Contrary

Despite efforts by KCC villagers and residents in and around Sandwich can point to sites where fly-tipping even now takes place. Finance and resources make this a challenging area to police 100% at the best of times, closure of a site like Richborough will increase this risk, any increase would be a direct result of a decision for closure.

2. Flawed Consultation

Few people in the affected areas have been made aware of the proposals. The 85% figure of satisfaction, if the survey is to be believed, is very high and closing sites is a mistaken response to Council success.

3. Flawed Information Received or Absent

Leading questions in the survey (for example, Q's 15 & 17) produce distorted and inaccurate responses which do not aid a real 'consultative' process. No data has been included in papers regarding the impact of closure on neighbouring sites. One example of response is that "a large minority of respondents agreed to closure" in response to a leading question, a majority did not! No detail on alternative options is provided. The absence of criteria or data provided makes a reasoned judgement impossible and, along with the limited reach of the consultation, is why RAG believes it would be prudent and sensitive of the Council to explore alternatives to closure before reaching any decision. Closure can only worsen our service in comparison with three of our county neighbours noted in the table above?

4. The Corridor, Localism and an Economic Centre

We understand that 63% of material received by Richborough is reclaimable. We are not given comparative figures with other sites nor what makes any site more or less economic. We wonder why, inconsideration of the Strategic Plan regarding the Richborough Corridor, this closure was excluded. We note that Recycling Sites are

included in these proposals. We believe that retaining the current Site until the Corridor's proposals are implemented makes sense. If there are to be such centres in the future we cannot believe that KCC feel that these would be uneconomic then, so why now? Dover D.C. are charging for green waste thought Localism Act meant joined-up thinking, residents around our area do not see this!

5. Flawed Facts and Figures

No detail of where the 150 households not affected is provided. We argue that far more than 150 households will be affected especially when one takes account of increased queue times, impact on residents of neighbouring sites, journey times. If the guide time of 15/20mins travel to sites is being maintained no figures are provided to justify this figure. Flawed data, insufficient evidence, public concern in the light of a successful service mean KEEP RICHBOROUGH HWRC OPEN!

Jeffrey Loffman
March 2012

By: Bryan Sweetland, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste

To: County Council – 29 March 2012

Subject: Richborough Household Waste Recycling Centre

Classification: Unrestricted

Petition

On 16th March 2012 a paper-based petition was submitted to Kent County Council containing 1302 signatures.

The wording of the paper-based petition is:

We the undersigned petition the Council to decide to keep the household waste recycling facility at Richborough near Sandwich.

Current position

The site closure is proposed in the Review of Household Waste Recycling Centres report, the recommendations of which were endorsed by Cabinet at its meeting on 19 March 2012. Cabinet referred the matter back to me as the Cabinet Member for Environment Highways and Waste for final decision, after taking account of the debate in respect of this petition.

The Cabinet report recommended a range of operational and strategic measures, supported by £18m of capital investment, to make the HWRC network better for the future. It was formulated through the work of a cross-party Informal Members' Group which received support for all its findings from the POSC. The review has been subject to a comprehensive 10 week consultation which produced a high response rate from 3,500 residents.

Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) Review

During the year-long review it was noted that there are 5 sites in NE Kent, namely at Canterbury, Herne Bay, Margate, Deal and Richborough compared to other parts of the county where there is under-provision. In fact, the hinterland for the Richborough HWRC overlaps with that of the Deal and Margate sites, such that approximately only 150 households would be disadvantaged to the extent that their journey time to an alternative site could exceed a 20 minutes drive time. As an indication of its level of use, the Richborough HWRC has one of the lowest tonnage throughputs in the county (7,112 t/year) compared for instance to the popular Margate site (22,441 t/year).

The Richborough site is a legacy site located adjacent to a closed landfill site. There is sufficient capacity to accommodate the recycling and residual waste, currently collected at Richborough, at the two nearest alternative sites at Southwall Road, Deal

and Manston Road, Margate, the latter having been enlarged in recent years. Furthermore Kent County Council already owns land adjacent to the Deal site, currently used for container storage, which would enable expansion if required at minimal cost. Projected savings from the closure are £255k per year.

I have noted residents' concerns, particularly regarding the perceived risk of increased fly-tipping and seek to reassure them that when other sites have closed, such as Pepperhill which was closed for 6 months for re-development, an increase in fly-tipping does not occur.

In conclusion, there is a greater need for additional HWRC provision in other parts of the county such as in the Tonbridge & Malling area and to relieve severe pressure on the Maidstone HWRC as well as to continue as appropriate the Council's modernisation and enlargement programme. For this reason, £18m of capital funding has been provided for investment in developing the network. This will contribute to achieving the aim of making the service fit for the future. Savings from the revenue operating costs will help offset those of new facilities in the long-term.

After listening carefully to the petitioners and the Council debate, I undertake to consider the matter in the light of all the information available and based on the advice that I receive from Members of the County Council (under Appendix 4, Part E, section 5E.4(f) of the Constitution) before making the final decision in my capacity as the Cabinet Member for Environment Highways and Waste.