

Your Views on our proposal to change the construction and demolition waste concession at recycling centres

Respondent information

Respondent Numbers

There were **231** responses received for this proposal. Of these, the majority (**163 people or 71%**) replied as individuals.

Responding as:			
An individual / member of the public	163	71%	89%
A family	41	18%	
On behalf of a voluntary or community group	0	0%	3%
On behalf of a statutory organisation	7	3%	
On behalf of a business	1	0 %	
A Norfolk County Councillor	0	0%	6%
A district or borough councillor	0	0%	
A town or parish councillor	12	5%	
A Norfolk County Council employee	3	1%	
Not Answered	4	2%	2%
Total	231	100%	100%

How we received the response		
Email	13	6%
Consultation paper feedback form	1	0%
Online submission	217	94%
Total	231	100%

Responses by groups, organisations and businesses

Eight respondents told us they were responding on *behalf* of a group, organisation or business but not all gave the names of their organisations.

Seven respondents told us they were responding on behalf of a statutory organisation. The organisations are: South Norfolk Council, Attleborough Town Council, East Rudham Parish Council, Shipdham Parish Council, Smallburgh Parish Council, Snettisham Parish Council and Stalham Town Council. The statutory organisations expressed the following views:

- In their opinion our proposals would increase the likelihood of illegal dumping of waste (fly-tipping). Illegal dumping of waste was considered a problem already, particularly for rural areas.
- That any increase in the illegal dumping of waste would generate costs for clearing up and disposing of this waste and that this expense would be passed on to district councils and / or land owners.
- One council stated that they would like to continue to work collaboratively with the County Council to promote their fly-tipping preventative campaigns to encourage residents to dispose of waste materials safely and legally.
- Other comments included calls for more emphasis on recycling, concerns about about potential closures of recycling centres, that the fact that disposing of construction waste is not the County Council's statutory duty was not understood by residents and that the proposal might be difficult to administer.

Twelve respondents told us they were **town or parish councillors** with Warham Parish Council, Wighton Parish Council and Rollesby Parish Council being named. Town and Parish Councillors expressed the following views:

- Similar concerns to parish councils were expressed that the proposal would lead to more illegal dumping of waste and that the costs of collecting and disposing of this waste would be transferred to district councils.
- That the policy would be difficult to implement for staff.
- Some expressed concerns about the current policy already encouraging people to dump waste illegally, dispose of it by burning or increasing pollution by people making more than one trip to the recycling centre.
- Others felt that there would be no impact, that the proposal seemed fair, that perhaps we should all pay a bit more to help balance the budget and that our proposal might still work out cheaper for householders than the cost of them hiring a skip.
- Some suggested alternatives such as increasing council tax, reducing opening hours and having an area set aside at recycling centres for wood that other people could collect and re-use.
- Other comments included that we needed to educate people about recycling, the service needed to remain free and the recycling centres kept open for longer.

Summary of main themes

Overall theme	Issues raised	Number of times mentioned	Quotes
<p>Concerns that the proposal would lead to an increase in illegal dumping of waste</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="562 426 1106 675">• A large majority of those responding expressed concern that our proposal would increase illegal dumping of waste. This was a concern even amongst those who felt that charging for disposing of this waste was reasonable. <li data-bbox="562 722 1106 898">• Some people expressed their scepticism of the evidence we have that illegal dumping of waste would not see a significant increase if our proposal went ahead. 	<p>161</p>	<p data-bbox="1417 426 2085 563">“I think that if you do away with the free service, you will get more people fly tipping as they will not want to pay to dispose of their DIY waste.”</p> <p data-bbox="1417 611 2085 818">“Your proposed approach will only increase fly-tipping, and will cause an erosion in support for the efforts to stop it - after all, if you took this waste at a proper recycling centre (which is designed to handle it) then it wouldn't be scattered over our countryside.”</p> <p data-bbox="1417 866 2085 970">“If these changes are brought in I look forward to seeing the Norfolk countryside disappearing under more piles of fly-tipped waste”</p> <p data-bbox="1417 1018 2085 1121">“I do not agree. There is too much fly-tipping as it is and charging would increase the fly-tipping”</p> <p data-bbox="1417 1169 2085 1345">“I think people would dump their waste around the countryside. It may be the case that at present, fly tipping doesn't include a great deal of construction material, but I believe this would change”</p>

			<p>“ I am sure there will be a reasonable amount of people who once finding they have to pay will consider dumping it elsewhere (flytipping)”</p> <p>“Seems reasonable to charge but I am concerned that flytipping would increase.”</p> <p>“While it’s a good idea in principle I think it will encourage fly tipping so don’t agree to it.”</p> <p>“I still think it will encourage fly tipping.”</p> <p>“I disagree with your statement that fly tipping wouldn't increase. I'm pretty sure it would.”</p>
<p>Concerns that any illegal dumping of waste would be a particular problem for Norfolk’s rural areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few felt that any illegal dumping of waste as a result of the proposal would be a particular problem in the countryside. • There were also some specific issues raised relating to private land. 	<p>20</p> <p>12</p>	<p>“I suspect we might see more of such waste simply dumped/fly tipped by the roadside, especially in remote rural areas, thus spoiling our countryside.”</p> <p>“ ... the impact on the environment of rubbish dumped in the countryside is not acceptable.”</p> <p>“I am not happy about it. I think the impact will be fly tipping along our country lanes.”</p> <p>“ land owners are either not removing the unsightly dumping, they are burning the rubbish or they are disposing it without informing the council.”</p>

			<p>“More importantly the incidence of fly-tipping on private land has increased significantly over the years, something that doesn't seem to concern local authorities despite the fact that their policies are most likely to blame.”</p>
<p>Additional costs relating to clearing up any illegally dumped waste and disposing of additional waste</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several respondents felt that the proposal would lead to additional costs – in terms of clearing up any illegally dumped waste and disposing of any additional waste coming through the household waste stream. • There were also concerns that the proposal might just shift costs onto others – either partner organisations such as district councils or private landowners who would then need to pay for removal. 	<p>68</p> <p>22</p>	<p>“This will lead to more fly tipping in the area without a doubt and likely to cost NCC more in having to clear this up.”</p> <p>“If you succeed just watch as the fly tipping increases and will cost in clear up.”</p> <p>“Illegal fly tipping will increase and this has the knock on effect of costing you more to clear it away.”</p> <p>“Quite simply, more rubbish dumped roadside. Which I assume you'll use my taxes to pay for.”</p> <p>“This proposal will ... lead to the costs of collecting waste being transferred to district councils.”</p> <p>“Fly tipping on council owned land or the Highway will then mean that another Council department will end up paying for it.”</p> <p>“As a landowner anything tipped on my land, whoever by, has to be disposed of by me. Which I have to pay for however I do it! Or if on public land the council will have to pay for.”</p>

			<p>“whilst we recognise the difficult decisions that the County Council has to make in the context of a reduced funding envelope it is important that any cuts to County Council services do not simply move the need around the public-sector system, increasing pressures on other authorities. “</p>
<p>Costs of proposals outweighing any savings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some respondents questioned the logic of our proposal. In particular people felt that it might cost more in disposing of illegally dumped waste than the council would actually save. 	31	<p>“... the council will have to spend more money to clear up the mess that will be caused, possibly costing more than the savings that are made”.</p> <p>“... any perceived savings would soon be cancelled should increased clear up costs be met due to the proposal of inclusive pay as you throw.”</p> <p>“Imposing fees will only encourage fly-tipping so you might be saving in one hand but you'll be spending in another”</p> <p>I am sure the NCC spends more on fly tipping clear up than would be made on charges at landfill sites.“</p>
<p>Issues relating to alternative ways that people would decide to dispose of their waste</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some respondents were concerned that people would dispose of their construction waste in their household waste bins or suggested that this was an approach that they themselves might take. 	28	<p>“...I am concerned that people will just disguise the things they want to get rid of and would put it in their normal black bin.”</p> <p>“It is inevitable that people will add this type of waste into their household waste bins where they are able.”</p>
		14	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some were concerned that people would respond by burning, burying or storing their waste in their own gardens. This might impact adversely on neighbours. A few respondents suggested that they themselves might burn, bury or store their waste. 		<p>“ In the past waste such as this I have put into household waste bin”</p> <p>“I do not support the change in policy, as I believe that it would lead to an increase in fly-tipping, or other methods of disposal such as burning or burying waste on the property, which could potentially have a deleterious effect on the neighbours of those undertaking such activities.”</p> <p>“ ... I am likely to just leave the rubbish piled up in my garden, hardly acceptable is it?”</p> <p>“So waste may well end up in my garden, unsightly and maybe dangerous.”</p> <p>“I for one, while I will not fly tip, will take to burning said construction waste on my drive, it may upset the neighbours, but I'm paying council tax for you to provide a service. Provide it!”</p>
<p>Comments relating to environmental impacts other than illegally dumped waste</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People noted environmental impacts, other than illegally dumped waste that might happen as a result of our proposal. • One concern in particular was that people would end up taking more trips to the recycling centre in order to dispose of their waste. 	<p>18</p> <p>12</p>	<p>“There would also be a rise in garden bonfires which pollute the atmosphere and affect neighbours with lung disease or asthma thus causing more hospitalisation.“</p> <p>“For example I have shed that is falling apart, I suppose I'll have to dispose of it with several trips resulting in increased fuel consumption and pollution etc.”</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of these comments referred to our existing policy. 		<p>“The current limits being imposed also cause environmental pollution in driving to the recycling centres over repeated weeks to dispose of waste.”</p>
<p>Issues relating to the cost of the proposal to individuals</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents expressed concerns about the cost to themselves and people in general. • Some respondents expressed concern that the cost would adversely affect one group more than another, in particular those on low incomes. • Some respondents commented that they felt they had already paid for this service as part of their council tax. 	<p>26</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p>	<p>“The charges are also very high.”</p> <p>“Over the last month or two it would have cost me about £30 to dispose of some old bricks.”</p> <p>“As a retired person with an income of only £10,000 per year, I cannot afford any further rises that have always been free in the past.”</p> <p>“A Householder with little money would be affected by doing DIY to save money.”</p> <p>“It's also penalising those on a lower income.”</p> <p>“I am in the middle of trying to upgrade my home (lone parent, part time worker) on a limited budget and to charge for this would stretch my budget even further than it is already.”</p> <p>“I already pay to dispose of demolition waste - that's what my council tax is for!”</p> <p>“I appreciate that you need to pay your staff but honestly think this could be done by selling what you collect rather than making the taxpayer who has already paid for this service, pay again.”</p>

			<p>“Not everyone can afford to pay twice for everything, (isn't this already paid for in our council tax).”</p>
Impact of proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A few people responded by stating that they personally would not be affected by the proposal. This included people who both generally supported and opposed the proposal. 	17	<p>“no impact, agree with your proposal”</p> <p>“Minimal impact on me but I totally disagree with this charge being introduced.”</p>
Income generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some people queried the necessity to charge for a recycling service when they felt the council could make money from the recycled materials. 	23	<p>“As for the Scrap metal dumping the council can make money out of the scrap metal collection so charging people to safely dispose of this valuable material is bizzare”</p> <p>“Most people know that scrap metal and glass have some value, so why the idea of charging people to dispose of them?”</p> <p>“Why can't you sell rubble? As for charging for scrap metal you ought to be welcoming it.”</p>
Practical issues relating to implementing the proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some felt that the proposal would be difficult to implement for various reasons and would add to conflict and confusion. 	14	<p>“ It will lead to arguments at the sites”</p> <p>“I am also unsure of how the centres will tell the difference between excess domestic waste and DIY waste ? people will mix the two in one bag if they think they can then deposit it for free.”</p>

			<p>"I am concerned that your proposals will need a great deal of monitoring. Every time I visit a waste disposal site, my waste bag will need to be viewed. Otherwise, I could be accused of smuggling waste into the waste site. This could become a nightmare."</p>
<p>Comments relating to the definition of construction waste</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Others queried or criticised the definitions of household waste and construction waste. 	9	<p>"I think it is disappointing how a pane of green house glass or a fence panel etc are classified as 'demolition waste'"</p> <p>"why does it matter whether its commercial or domestic waste, there I have a new kitchen and I bring the waste to you or my builder brings the waste to you, its still waste."</p> <p>"It also seems a bit random to allow people to dispose of a free-standing cupboard, but not one that's part of a fitted kitchen."</p>
<p>Impact on recycling targets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was also some concern that the proposal would reduce the likelihood of Norfolk meeting its recycling targets. A few people commented that the proposal would discourage some from recycling. Some respondents commented on or disagreed with the current policy of accepting one bag for free. Others felt that the council should accept much more material for free at recycling centres. 	<p>19</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p>	<p>"This proposal is totally unworkable, and not within keeping of NCC recycling targets and policy."</p> <p>"There will be a direct and adverse impact on me and all residents of Norfolk as the suggested changes will lead to ... a decrease in people's interest in recycling."</p> <p>"It is difficult enough as it is to educate people about the importance of recycling"</p> <p>"Councils should be making it easier for people to dispose of rubbish not harder before"</p>

			<p>“The current system is already a challenge of - bag per week.”</p> <p>“If anything the amount that can be recycled per week should be increased to encourage people to bring sorted waste to the recycling centres”</p> <p>“You should be encouraging householders keeping their property up to date and clean and tidy by not just maintaining the status quo but expanding the amount of building and garden maintenance that can be taken to the recycling sites.”</p>
Supportive comments / promoting our policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some people expressed general support for a charge – of these some (7) were supportive but with caveats • In particular people mentioned the need for clear information about what is charged for and the amount of any change. • Clear promotion of our policy was also an issue for a few who generally opposed our proposal. 	19	<p>“Agree with proposal. All centres should take all types of waste and making a small charge is acceptable”</p> <p>“I support the proposal. It wouldn't have a big impact on me personally as I don't use recycling centres now as I don't have a car. I don't think council tax should be used to subsidise people's DIY projects.”</p> <p>“I would be happy to pay if I could dispose of the waste at my local recycling centre.”</p> <p>“ I think that a small charge for accepting plasterboard, fence/shed wood, old kitchen units and rubble etc is quite reasonable. An excessive charge would encourage 'fly-tipping'.”</p>

			<p>“The need for the council to save money is clear and this seems a reasonable and proportionate step..as long as facilities to pay and dispose are rolled out across all sites promptly.”</p> <p>“Hopefully there are enough sites where construction waste can be taken to, and publication of this should be available easily.”</p> <p>“As long as prices are clear, good idea”</p> <p>“If clearly stated in our council tax bills that the removal of diy and construction waste is not included in the bill and the sites clearly sign post the policy this may help.”</p>
<p>Alternatives to our proposal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several respondents took the opportunity to suggest their own ideas for saving money as an alternative to our proposal. • A few suggested making changes to the proposal. • A couple of respondents suggested increasing council tax to enable people to dispose of their waste for free. 	<p>40</p> <p>6</p> <p>3</p>	<p>“If you wish to charge for DIY waste have you considered leasing out Council owned skips?”</p> <p>“People should be given a loyalty type card which logs how much use they make of the tips”</p> <p>“Would it not be easier to open specific sites that deal only with construction waste and put this straight into roll on roll off skips”</p> <p>“If more of the items disposed of, i.e. furniture, mirrors, doors, wood which could be used for fires could be taken away for reuse by members of the public this would reduce the amount going to landfill.”</p> <p>“There should also be an area where people are able to take things such as timber (to use</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some respondents felt that they would prefer a reduction in opening hours over having a charge for disposing of construction waste. However, a similar number (4) stated they felt that previous reductions in opening hours had led to more illegal dumping of waste or that current opening hours were restrictive. 	5	<p>on woodburners or to make furniture or birdhouses etc.) “</p> <p>“Charge for plasterboard, Charge for rubble, DON'T charge for timber, DON'T charge for fluroscent/lights/light electrical items, DON'T charge for garden waste”</p> <p>“Maybe reduce the charge per load so people are happy to pay.”</p> <p>“We would rather pay a small amount extra on our council tax than see the increase in waste disposed of in our countryside.”</p> <p>“Far better to reduce the opening hours and save on staff wages.”</p> <p>“You should continue the opportunity for people to dispose of modest amounts of household waste of all types, without charge, even if that did result in needing to review opening times of centres.”</p>
Preventing commercial waste entering our recycling centres / crack down on those illegally dumping waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A few people felt that our proposal penalised law abiding residents. Some felt that the council should do more to crack down on traders abusing the system for commercial waste. 	10 19	<p>“You are relying on good, honest citizens to pay and to ALSO pay to clear up the mess left by those who won't pay and who dump at the side of the road!!!!”</p> <p>“I am concerned about the impact on people who currently legitimately use this service a handful of times a year, who are being penalised due to a lack of diligence on the</p>

			<p>councils behalf allowing the disposal of trade waste”</p> <p>“Firstly you should make sure your sites dont let trades people in.”</p> <p>“Also make more effort to catch and punish offenders”</p> <p>“I suppose around £5 for a very large sack isn't out of the way but as usual the honest, law abiding people will pay their fees and the uncaring scumbags will fly tip and probably get away with it. The council needs to catch fly tippers and fine them such a large amount of money that it easily deters others.”</p>
Comments about the consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few respondents commented on the consultation itself with one questioning the timetable and three stating they felt they did not have enough information in order to comment. 	4	<p>“I object to the proposal in its current form, as it will result in the loss of an important service, the consequences have not been properly considered, and no evidence has been provided for the estimated cost savings, making them highly suspect.”</p>