

Bring/Recycling Site - Parish Councils & Other Comments

APPENDIX E

Comments Received

Parish Councils Comments - Hall Street Bring Site, Crosshills [October/November 2015]	Comment	Council's Response
Glusburn and Cross Hills Parish Council	Happy for the recycling bins to be removed and the site closed. Proviso that the area is turned into car parking spaces.	Can develop designs which could include additional car parking spaces.
Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council	While the Parish Council understand the traders views. The site is very well used and if removed completely there is concern with regards to fly tipping. Can it be re-sited on an industrial estate for instance? (If this site was removed would then all sites across Craven be removed?)	The site is for domestic waste. To place these bins on an industrial estate would mean that they could not be monitored, so the problem could be worsened. Fly tipping is monitored, investigated and enforced. Only focussing on the Cross Hills Village Centre Improvement Plan.
Farnhill Parish Council	Would like the site to be retained with the possibility of either scaling back or relocating. The bins at the site always seem to be full to overflowing so it obviously is still being used and if it is completely removed than we think there would be problems with fly tipping.	The site is for domestic waste. To place these bins on an industrial estate would mean that they could not be monitored, so the problem could be worsened. Fly tipping is monitored, investigated and enforced.
Cowling Parish Council	The current site in Crosshills is the best location for the recycling bins and they should be retained.	Regardless of the location, there is not sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this site is being used solely by residents.
Kildwick Parish Council	Cross Hills should keep its facilities even if not on the present site. Some Kildwick households use the ones in Cross Hills because there is a tetra pack recycling facility which they don't have. (Via JH - Collected by a contractor - Skipton Town Hall, Settle and Ingleton. The loss of the tetra pack doesn't make a load of difference.)	The Council to contact the contractor as to whether it would be possible to relocate the tetra pack.
Lothersdale Parish Council	No comments received up to the 13.11.15.	
South Craven Together Group (Cross Hills)		

Chris Dixon via SCTG	Needs to be consideration that nearest waste centre is Skipton which for local NY residents is a 30 mins round trip. Unable to use the one in Keighley. To lose this facility completely would not be in the interests of local businesses or residences or indeed the environment. (Disappointing that 'cardboard' was removed as an option to recycle as many local businesses get deliveries as well as the increase in residences receiving packages through the post e.g. amazon.)	The recycling site is not for local businesses but for domestic purposes. It is illegal for traders to use these facilities as they should have a duty of care/form of contract. This site will be monitored, which may lead to prosecution/enforcement.
----------------------	---	--

Parish Councils and other Comments to Craven wide Consultation [April to June 2016]	Comments	
Glusburn Institute	As Chair of the Trustees for Glusburn Institute, we have agreed to recycling containers on our land. We think these should be continued as a service to the local community, especially since nearby properties have very little outside space for their own bins. If you do not have a car then access to other recycling sites is extremely difficult. We have no reason to believe our site is being misused by local traders but we do think the modern trend for online shopping has led to a big increase in large cardboard boxes needing to be recycled. Again breaking these up is easy for someone who is physically able but difficult for more elderly residents	
Farnhill Parish Council	Farnhill Parish Council would like to respond to the consultation on Recycling Bring Sites by stressing that they feel the sites should be kept open. Kerbside Recycling is carried out once every two weeks for cardboard and once every 4 weeks for plastic & tins, but for some properties where space is limited struggle to find the space to keep the goods and take some to bring sites in between collections. We feel that to close the sites would result in more fly tipping which results in more expense for the Council.	
Embsay with Eastby Parish Council	The Parish Council are in favour of retaining the village 'bring bins'. The recycling site at Embsay Main Street Car Park (not the Village Hall as listed on the CDC website) is well used by residents in the locality who do not have a blue bin - either by choice or more importantly beacue there is insufficient space fopr storage of the bin within the curtilage of the property. The Parish Council would therefore request that the site remains in situ.	
Bentham Parish Council	As the associated questionnaire appears to be designed for individual use, asking specific questions about the use of kerbside / bring site recycling, the Council asked me to respond to you directly.The Council acknowledges that the recycling of cardboard, possibly commercial, is costing Craven a significant sum, but feels that the Bring Sites are still popular. It can only comment directly on those in High & Low Bentham, but these sites are well used - most often by those who live in properties that do not have space for recycling bins. It noted that the NSPCC monthly paper collection in Bentham will soon cease due to funding changes, which may lead to greater usage of the local Bring Sites as another recycling alternative will be lost.The Council would actively encourage Craven to maintain these sites as it believes that their removal will almost certainly increase fly tipping around the District which will add significant cost to the District Council in dealing with the problem.	
Grassington Parish Council	Grassington had a prominent recycling site on the YDNP car park which was encouraging fly-tipping and excessive amounts of commercial cardboard. YDNPA removed this facility last year which transferred the problem to the site operated by CDC adjacent to the Town Hall. Accordingly Craven DC have, in response to a request from Grassington PC removed their "bring site" from Grassington. We do not wish to have such a facility in our village	

Parkfoot Holiday & Park Homes, Ingleton	<p>We pride ourselves in having a sustainable tourism business which includes encouraging our customers to recycle as much as possible. In addition to the bins for paper, cardboard, glass, and tin in the 'bring site' at Parkfoot, we collect batteries, stamps, books, videos, dvds, mobile phones, ink cartridges for recycling. We have specially designed signs on the 'bring site' gates requesting customers recycle tetrapaks and plastics at the 'bring sites' in Ingleton and Settle. We have also purchased signs for the normal waste bins aimed at reminding customers to recycle wherever possible. So for the Council to consider reducing recycling facilities seems to me a very retrograde step. Several years ago I asked if a bin for plastics recycling could be added at Parkfoot as I am aware that our general waste contains many plastic bottles: not everyone is prepared to collect them and then drive several miles to recycle them or even take them home – they're on holiday! The idea was treated sympathetically but rejected. I am sure that someone within the Council is well aware how much waste is recycled in the Parkfoot 'bring site'. unlike the general waste bins, the recycling bins are not being charged for by the Council. However, our general waste bins are rarely full, and with recycling facilities are unlikely to be so, but we have never reduced the volume paid for preferring to ensure that customers have a bin in a reasonable handy position for them to use. However if the recycling facilities are reduced here, and in Craven as a whole, I am certain that the general waste levels will rise significantly. Charging for the recycling bins would not produce the increased income that you'd expect as businesses would make strategic changes to ensure that, even if the recycling site was retained, the costs of waste processing did not significantly increase</p>
---	---