

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO CABINET

15 MARCH 2016

REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES

WASTE SERVICES PROVISION

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To set out for consideration by Cabinet the findings of the recent public consultation on the provision of residual and recycling collection services and the provision of services at the Council's Household Waste Amenity Sites (HWAS).
- 1.2 The report will seek Cabinet's approval in a number of areas including:-
 - Approval to proceed to tender an external contract service provider.
 - The contract period.
 - The frequency of collection services.
 - Potential restrictions on the quantity of residual waste collected.
 - The option to collect absorbent hygiene produces (nappies etc.).
 - A review of resource levels required to administer the new service.
- 1.3 The proposals identified in the public consultation and brought forward for consideration by Cabinet in this report are in response to the Welsh Government's Blueprint for waste "Towards Zero Waste" and its Municipal Sector Plan, which sets out in detail amongst other things targets for the reuse and recycling of municipal waste. Cabinet will recall from previous reports that failure to achieve the Welsh Government targets could attract fines being imposed on the Authority of £200 per tonne.

2 Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives / Other Corporate Priorities

- 2.1 The performance and outcomes linked to the Waste Service Area are in accordance with the improvement priorities detailed in the Corporate Plan under Priority 6 - (Working Together to Make Best Use of Our Resources).

3 Background Waste Collection Services Contract

- 3.1 The Domestic Waste Collections Service and Household Waste Amenity Sites (HWAS) have been delivered via a contract for services since 2003 and 2004 respectively. On the 31st March 2010 both contracts were brought together following a competitive dialogue procurement exercise into a single integrated contract for the provision of waste and recycling services which was awarded at the time to May Gurney but is now operated by Kier, The current contract term is seven years with a contract provision to allow the extension of this contract, subject to agreement between the parties, for a further period of up to seven years.
- 3.2 The current operating model and collection methods set out in the contract for residual and recycling streams are broadly compliant with the Welsh Government's

(WG) Blueprint for separated recycling collection services, as described in their policy document 'Towards Zero Waste'.

3.3 The current collection service consists of:

- fortnightly collection of refuse, collected in black sacks with no restriction on the number of sacks collected.
- weekly collection of recyclables, collected in 2 x 35 Litre boxes and 1 x 85 Litre reusable sack.
- weekly collection of food waste (collected on same vehicle as dry recyclate), with provision of kerbside caddies, kitchen caddies and food waste liners.
- charged fortnightly garden waste collection April – October, with an annual subscription.
- The contractor manages 3 HWAS's and Tondu Waste Transfer Station on behalf of the Council ensuring that all necessary environmental controls are in place to allow the sites to be operated in compliance with relevant environmental standards.

4 Current Situation / proposals

4.1 Discussions with Neighbouring Authorities

4.1.1 In order to explore potential opportunities for collaborative working with Bridgend County Borough Council and its immediate local authority neighbours discussions have been held with the following authorities on the possibility of forging closer working ties in the area of waste management. The information given below outlines the discussions with each of the following Authorities.

- **Neath Port Talbot (NPT)**
- **Vale of Glamorgan (VoG)**
- **Rhondda Cynon Taff (RCT)**

4.1.2 NPT expressed their reservations in this particular area as the potential for local government reorganisation to reshape the boundaries of the local authorities was felt to be a key risk and a barrier to progressing any collaborative arrangement at this time. Therefore discussions with NPT were not pursued further.

4.1.3 Different collection methods amongst the Council's immediate neighbouring authorities presented further barriers to merging service provision. In particular the design and specification of collection vehicles and the contractual arrangements each of the Council's neighbours have in place for the disposal of the materials that they collect. These arrangements vary based on the quality of the waste streams i.e. co-mingled or source segregated systems. The VoG discussed the possibility of collaborative working with the Council on the collection service. Their interest was only in the residual collection due to the potential availability of excess collection capacity of their vehicles. In reviewing this option it was considered that the splitting of the refuse and recycling within the contract would increase the overhead and maintenance elements of the contract and therefore the option was discounted.

4.1.4 RCT showed interest through AMGEN Cymru (The Local Authority Waste Disposal Company (LAWDC) wholly owned by Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough

Council), in undertaking the management of the Authority's Household Waste Amenity Sites (HWAS) operations. However, this would again result in a split service delivery.

- 4.1.5 Legal advice was obtained from which it is understood that the service would need to be competitively tendered to secure the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) and could not be 'given' to RCT. This would result in the tender documents having to be revised to take account of separating the services with the HWAS's as one contract and the residual / recycling collection service as another.
- 4.1.6 There is no guarantee that should RCT(AMGEN Cymru) place a bid for the work that they would win the contract, as with the VoG discussions, splitting of the contract would likely increase the overhead and maintenance elements of the contract and therefore the option was discounted.

4.2 Waste Services Model Options

- 4.2.1 The Authority has considered various methods of service delivery as set out in this report. However three challenges will be critical to the selection of the new service provision.
 - 4.2.1.1 To support the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) the new service provision from 2017, shall be driven by price and as low a cost option as possible taking into account any relevant economic and social factors.
 - 4.2.1.2 The service model chosen must, however, also place the Authority in a position to meet the Welsh Government (WG) recycling targets as it move forwards:

The current level of recycling of BCBC municipal solid waste is projected to fall short of the 58% target required by the WG.

The WG recycling rate targets moving forward are:

2015/16 – 58%
2019/20 – 64 %
2024/25 – 70 %

On the basis of the above with no change to the current collections methodology, the authority would inevitably fall increasingly behind the recycling targets required, with the potential consequence of fine levels at £200 per tonne for material not recycled. For clarity if the Authority were to miss the recycling target by 1%, this may result in fines of around £150,000; there is also the potential that special measures may be imposed by Welsh Government. Therefore retaining the status quo collection methodology has considerable financial implications.

- 4.2.3 The option selected will need to take into account the results of the public consultation recently undertaken on the provision of waste services.
- 4.2.4 In order to look closely at options that will meet the recycling targets at lowest cost a series of meetings were held with WRAP Cymru (Waste & Resources Action Programme in Wales). WRAP is funded by Welsh Government to give local authorities "hands on" practical expertise, advice and financial help. WRAP agreed

to model waste flow utilising its knowledge of performance and cost with other Welsh Authorities and predict what effects differing service offerings will be likely to have in terms of output and cost in order to inform the Authority's choice of service model.

4.2.5 In order to increase recycling, a number of methods exist that can facilitate changes in the behaviour of the residents of BCBC to recycle more material. In order to reduce residual waste that is still being presented in black bagged waste sacks, some of the steps that can be taken include:

- Increasing the promotion of recycling via: radio, schools campaigns, door step engagement and general publicity material including newspaper advertisements, flyers and leaflet drops.
- Increasing the range of recyclable materials collected or recycled at home, this could include: nappy recycling, black plastic recycling and film.
- Consideration of enforcement activities if and when the appropriate legislation and or guidance is issued by Welsh Government.

4.2.6 All of the above steps listed in paragraph 4.2.5, (some of which already occur as part of the existing contractual relationship with the current provider), will help to improve the recycling levels, but come at an increased cost to the Authority and typically would be unlikely, by themselves, to improve the recycling percentage by more than 1-3%, albeit they would potentially form an essential part of any new campaign to improve recycling. However, they are not considered the stand alone answer to the challenges faced, rather they are a contribution to the ongoing challenges.

4.2.7 The principle of restriction of residual waste (black bagged) is known to be by far the greatest driver for increasing recycling percentage, as was demonstrated by the increase in the Bridgend County recycling percentage when residual collections were changed to a fortnightly cycle. The constraint effectively drives residents to further recycle their waste. It also has the beneficial effect of reducing costs, as lower levels of resources are required to collect waste materials and lower waste disposal / treatment costs are incurred with decreasing tonnages.

4.2.8 Cabinet should note a 5% change in the Authority's municipal solid waste stream from residual to recyclable waste would save circa £0.5 million p.a. based on current disposal costs.

4.3 Public Consultation

4.3.1 A public consultation reviewing Bridgend County Borough Council's household waste and recycling service was undertaken over an eight week period from 14 December 2015 to 8 February 2016. The consultation received 2,795 responses from a combination of the consultation survey, social media interactions, letters, emails and telephone calls.

4.3.2 The survey was available to be completed online through a link on the consultation page of the Council's website or by visiting www.bridgend.gov.uk/consultation. Paper copies of the consultation were also made available at local libraries and the

Civic Offices, or alternatively, they could be sent directly to the residents upon request in either English or Welsh.

- 4.3.3 Three proposals were considered which required a reply from respondents. All questions in the survey were optional and all survey responses offered the option of anonymity.
- 4.3.4 Details of the consultation were sent as part of a press release, emailed to the stakeholders including; Councillors, town and community councils, members of the Local Service Board (LSB), neighbourhood networks, the Youth Service Cabinet (YSC), Bridgend Equality Forum (BEF), Bridgend Business Forum (BBF) and business directory, Bridgend First, Bridgend Employer Liaison Partnership database, Communities First database and local media outlets, Citizens' Panel members interested in receiving additional consultations from Bridgend County Borough Council were invited to complete the survey using a link provided.
- 4.3.5 The Council's corporate Facebook and Twitter accounts were used to promote the consultation throughout the live campaign period.
- 4.3.6 In total there were 2,795 responses received to the survey.

Total Survey Responses

Response format	No	%
Online survey responses	2,361	84.5
Social media	218	7.8
Social media debate	91	3.3
Emails	57	2.0
Paper survey responses	57	2.0
Telephone	11	0.4
Total	2,795	100.0

4.3.7 The survey included:-

- 2,361 responses to the consultation surveys were received online – of the responses received there were 2,347 English online submissions and 14 Welsh versions completed.
- During the social media question and answer sessions there were a total of 19 interactions from Twitter and 120 interactions from Facebook, being seen a total of 15,977 times on Twitter and 8,446 times on Facebook respectively. During the consultation period there were a total of 468 interactions using social media.
- There were 57 responses received by email, 57 responses by post and 11 responses via telephone call.

4.3.8 A sample of 2,795 is robust and is subject to a maximum standard error of ± 1.84 per cent at the 95 per cent confidence level on an observed statistic of 50 per cent.

Thus, we can be 95 per cent confident that responses are representative of those that would be given by the total adult population, if a census had been conducted, to within ± 1.84 per cent of the percentages reported. This means that if the total adult population of Bridgend had taken part in the survey and a statistic of 50 per cent was observed, we can be 95 per cent confident that the actual figure lies between 48.16 per cent and 51.84 per cent.

4.3.9 The following proposals were consulted upon during the public consultation reviewing Bridgend County Borough Council's household waste and recycling service.

4.3.10 **Proposal 1 - How the Council collects black bag household waste.**

While recycling will remain weekly, there were three options that the Council invited residents to consider for residual waste collection (black bag collections) with further options for the collection of absorbent hygiene products, the Councils Household Waste Recycling Centres and the use of wheeled bins as set out in more detail below: -

4.3.10.1 Option one: Two week collections restricted to two black bags.

Under this option, refuse collections to remain fortnightly but there will be a restriction on the number of black bags allowed; a householder will only be able to put out 2 black bags on each collection day.

4.3.10.2 Option two: Three week collections restricted to three black bags.

This option would reduce the frequency of refuse collections to once every 3 weeks but there will also be a restriction on the number of black bags allowed; a householder will only be able to put out 3 black bags on each collection day.

4.3.10.3 Option three: Four week collections with unrestricted black bags

This option would reduce the frequency of refuse collections to once every four weeks, but householders would not be restricted in the number of bags that they could put out.

4.3.10.4 In association with these three options residents were also asked which waste storage method would be most suitable to respondents between 'wheelie bins' and the current method of refuse sacks.

4.3.11 **Proposal two: Introducing an absorbent hygiene products collection service.**

This proposal would introduce an absorbent hygiene products collection service to coincide with a restriction on the number of black bags being collected, and is intended to support families and residents who use absorbent hygiene products.

4.3.12 **Proposal three: Recycling black bag waste at household waste amenity sites.**

This proposal would see changes made at household waste amenity sites so that they would become community recycling centres, which prohibits the disposal of black bag waste to improve recycling.

4.3.13 Detailed breakdowns of the results of the public consultation are attached to this report at **Appendix A**.

An extract of the information attached to each proposal and the options relating to each proposal is presented at **Appendix B**. This table provides members with an overview of the finding of the public consultation.

The Equality Impact Assessment is attached to this report at **Appendix C**.

4.3.14 The following information is presented to Cabinet and is based on the outcomes of the public consultation as presented in Appendix A.

4.3.15 The specific residual waste collection option with the strongest support is the 2 weekly collection with a 2 bag restriction, this option was preferred by 76% of respondents.

4.3.16 If the collection methodology of 2 weekly collection with a 2 bag restriction is adopted then this along with other measures is anticipated to achieve a recycling target of 64%.

4.3.17 In considering all of the options placed before Cabinet, option 1 of proposal 1 is considered to be the most appropriate collection methodology to take forward and achieve both the aims of the MTFs and meets the public's preference as demonstrated by the outcome of the public consultation.

4.3.18 During the public consultation exercise a number of consultees raised comments on the potential for the proposed restriction on the number of black bags placed at the kerbside for collection, to be flouted or abused by householders not wishing to comply with the scheme.

4.3.18.1 The comments listed amongst the concerns included the potential for householders to place additional bags against neighbouring properties, or for those who present their waste in communal areas to put out for collection as many bags as they want due to the difficulties that the Council would have in identifying the households or individuals concerned. Should Cabinet be minded to proceed on the basis of restricted residual waste collection, then as a means of addressing these concerns and overcoming some of the anticipated behaviour of some of the Boroughs householders, it is proposed to review the levels of enforcement. To further support the proposed restriction, the colour and markings on the bags used by the public could be changed to uniquely identify them as Bridgend County Borough Council residual waste sacks.

4.3.18.2 The appropriate number of bags to service each household would then be issued to the public to use i.e. an annual allocation of 52 refuse bags. The contractor will only collect the uniquely identified 2 sacks per / household each fortnight, detailed proposals will be contained within the contract specification of the measures to be adopted where householders present more than the 2 bag limit, such measures may include leaving excess waste at the kerbside, placing stickers to bags, recording location and address to be subsequently followed up by a home visit

- 4.3.18.3 The anticipated cost of providing branded refuse bags of the type described above will be £ 147,300 per annum, whilst the cost of supplying plain black bags to householders is anticipated to be £ 124,300 per annum. This would prove to be a cost effective measure against both the reductions in enforcement needed to police the scheme and the reductions in the costs of residual waste disposal that the restriction will generate.
- 4.3.19 As indicated in paragraph 4.3.10.4 of the report the respondents were asked to consider the use of wheeled bins as opposed to sacks for storage of residual waste, the public expressed a preference within the consultation for utilising wheeled bins.
- 4.3.20 The utilising of wheeled bins for the storage of residual waste would result in the Authority limiting its options to undertake changes to the contract at a future date within the contract period i.e. by selecting a containment capacity based around a 2 weekly 2 bag collection (140 Litre bin) the Council would have to provide at a capital and operational costs in excess of £2,000,000 over the term of the contract). Should recycling targets not be met during the contract period and the need to introduce a revised collection cycle become apparent, the 140 Litre bin would not have the containment capacity necessary to accommodate additional residual waste; the bin would then become obsolete at the point of change, forcing the Authority to provide revised storage capacity with the purchase of new containment bins (240 Litre bin) with all the associated capital costs. If, however, sacks are selected for use to contain residual waste under the new contract and the issue of having to increase the recycling rate arose at some future point within the contract, issuing of additional sacks would not pose a great problem, with minimal additional cost involved.
- 4.3.21 It is therefore recommended that the use of sacks is selected, as the use for containment of residual waste over wheeled bins.
- 4.3.22 It is anticipated recycling containers will be agreed with the incoming contractor, who may need to revise / change the containers to ensure compatibility with the collection vehicles and collection system used.

Absorbent Hygiene Products Waste Collection Service

- 4.3.23 Respondents were asked to what extent they would support the introduction of a new Absorbent Hygiene Product (**AHP**) waste collection service for items such as nappies and incontinence pads. Strong support was shown for this proposal which would complement any restriction in the collection of residual waste. Cabinet are therefore asked to consider the provision of a separate AHP collection for residents wishing to access the service. This will remove this material from the residual waste stream and provide additional capacity for those who have a requirement to dispose of such material. The introduction of this service would be accompanied by a corresponding increase in the contract sum, however, dependent on costs to be established during the tendering exercise it may be possible to mitigate this cost by treating the nappies and removing them from the residual waste stream. This would also have the added benefit of increasing the Councils recycling percentage by approximately 0.7 percent per annum, depending on take up of the scheme. It is proposed that Absorbent Hygiene Product (**AHP**) are collected at the same time and frequency as the

Council's residual waste, i.e. fortnightly. The public will be able to register with the contractor in order to make use of the scheme and issued with an appropriate number of identifiable sacks.

4.3.24 Household Waste Amenity Sites

4.3.24.1 The final proposal in the public consultation exercise asked respondents to consider a change to amenity sites into possibly becoming community recycling centres, which prohibits the disposal of black bag waste to improve recycling at each of the sites.

4.3.24.2 The results of the consultation showed that 72.6% of respondents were opposed to this option.

4.3.24.3 Therefore as a means of mitigation and meeting Welsh Government Recycling targets the following compromise is proposed:-

- Under this proposal residents would still be able to dispose of residual waste at the sites, but they would be asked to separate any black bag waste into the various recyclable components i.e. plastics, paper etc. and to dispose of these in the appropriate containers on the site, prior to disposing of the remaining and true residual part of their waste, which in practice should only represent a very small part of the waste contained in most black bags taken to the sites. This will have the effect of increasing the recycling performance of the sites, while significantly reducing the disposal costs for residual waste.
- Cabinet in considering this recommendation may also wish to take into account the proposed restrictions to residual waste to 2 bags collected fortnightly, which is supported by the public. If black bags were to be permitted into the HWAS without the type of control described above, it is likely that large numbers of households would still not recycle and take their black bag waste to the Household Waste Amenity Sites to be disposed of. This would have a significant negative impact on the performance and costs of operating these sites.

4.4 Resource levels

4.4.1 If Cabinet are minded to accept the recommendations contained in this report, particularly those relating to the restriction in the presentation of residual waste at the kerb-side by householders, it is likely that to ensure the effectiveness of this service, additional resources may be required to ensure compliance, to enable monitoring, education and enforcement where households do not comply with the 2 bag limit collection system. Accordingly Cabinet are asked to note that the Corporate Director – Communities will review the requirement for additional resources prior to the commencement of the proposed contract on 1st April 2017.

4.4..2 Whilst the principal changes to the waste collection system have been outlined for the Cabinet to consider in the body of this report there will inevitably be other minor operational decisions, which will be included in the contract specification, to be taken which will influence and effect the manor and way in which the service at the commencement of the new contract on 1st April 2017 is finally delivered. Cabinet are asked to delegate responsibility for these decision to the Corporate Director – Communities for action. The type of decisions are limited to operational matters

related to the delivery of various aspects of the service. This could include such additional steps as to enforcement of the two residual waste sacks (if approved by Cabinet), which could include the possibility of branded sacks as part of this process. A further report on the outcome of the tendering process for the new Waste Services Collection Contract will be placed before Cabinet for Cabinet's further consideration.

4.5 Public Communication

- 4.5.1 Under the current contractual arrangements the responsibility for responding to requests for service and complaints from the public is split in various proportions between the Council and the Contractor. In the case of complaints these are currently received by the customer contact centre who will try and respond to the customer's complaint at the point of contact, where they are unable to do this the complaints are referred to the contractor or passed to the Cleaner Streets Teams in Civic Offices to investigate and respond. In many instances the contact centre, Cleaner Streets Team and the Contractor are all involved with responding to a complaint. Under the new contract it is proposed that all requests for service and complaints are referred directly to the Contractor as first responder; only matters which he has not been able to fully resolve would be dealt with by the Council's contact centre or Cleaner Streets Team. The Welsh Language (Wales) Measure 2011 and the Welsh Language Standards (No 1) Regulations 2015 are now in force and under these regulations any activity being carried out by a body, or any service being provided by a body on behalf of the Council are bound by the Welsh Standards imposed upon the Council. Compliance with the standards is not optional and the Welsh Language Commissioner has the power following a County Court Judgment to fine the Council £5,000 for each breach of the standards that have been imposed. The new contract would have to contain a provision that the Contractor agrees to comply with the Standards imposed upon the Council. To ensure that appropriate checks and balances are in place and that matters of financial probity and transparency are properly considered the Contract would be managed going forward through exception reports presented at appropriate frequencies by the Contractor at operational and partnership board meetings, these reports would contain the relevant detail required by the Council on performance and delivery of the service.

5 Effect upon Policy Framework & Procedure Rules.

- 5.1 There are no effects on the Policy Framework and Procedures Rules.

6 Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1 A full Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out in conjunction with consultation with the public and is attached.

7 Financial Implications

- 7.1 The introduction of wheeled containers for residual waste would have a financial impact on the waste collection budget in the order of £2,000,000 over the term of the contract. The figures supporting this are set out in section 7 of this report.

- 7.2 A further report on the outcome of the financial implications from the tendering process for the new waste services collection contract will be placed before Cabinet for Cabinet's further consideration.

8 Recommendations

Cabinet is recommended:

- 8.1 To consider the outcomes of the public consultation which was undertaken over an eight week period from 14 December 2015 to 8 February 2016.
- 8.2 To give approval to tender The Waste Collection Service Contract with the documentation prepared for a term of 7 years commencing on 1st April 2017 and the specification in that contract should be based upon the Cabinet's resolutions in respect of this report.
- 8.3 To approve the proposals to collect residual waste on a 2 weekly cycle, and to restrict the amount of residual waste collected from each household to 2 number sacks in line with the findings of the public consultation.
- 8.4 To consider the outcomes, associated costs and consequences of the public consultation and attached information on the type of containment for use on the household waste collection service, and to approve the use of sacks as opposed to wheeled bins as a method of residual waste containment.
- 8.5 To approve the option of a change to the specification of the residual waste collection sacks, as a means of contributing towards compliance with the collection system.
- 8.6 To approve the option of introducing an Absorbent Hygienic Products collection service to coincide with a restriction on the number of sacks that are collected, this is intended to support families and residents who use Absorbent Hygiene Products.
- 8.7 To approve the renaming the Household Waste Amenity Sites as Community Recycling Centres, and to approve the introduction of a policy for use at the Authority's Community Waste Amenity Sites of asking the public to presort any residual waste collection sacks waste into its recyclable components to minimise the residual waste arising at the sites.
- 8.8 To delegate to the Corporate Director – Communities the power to take decisions on operational matters related to the delivery of various aspects of the service, and to approve and issue the tender documentation for the Waste Collection Service Contract in consultation with the Assistant Chief Executive Legal & Regulatory Services and the Section 151 Officer.
- 8.9 To note that Cabinet will receive a further report on the outcome of the tender process for the procurement of Waste Collection Service Contract and to seek Cabinet's approval to award a contract as a result thereof.

Mark Shephard
CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES
July 2015

Contact Officer: ZACHARY SHELL
Head of Neighborhood Services

Telephone: (01656) 643403

E-mail: Zak.Shell@bridgend.gov.uk

Background Documents:

Welsh Assembly Government - Towards Zero Waste, One Wales One Planet

Welsh Assembly Government – Municipal Sector Plan

Waste Public Consultation Report

Cabinet Report 1 September 2015 Waste Services Provision

Appendix A

7.1.1 Proposal one – preferred option

Of the three options put forward for proposal one, all respondents were asked to rate which option was the most preferable to them (N.B. this question is only in relation to the proposals put forward and should also be considered alongside any alternative suggestions put forward in the qualitative question, see section 7.4).

Table 1 - survey respondents: preferred option of proposal one

Response	Two week collections	Three week collections	Four week collections
#	1657	101	421
%	76.0	4.6	19.3

7.1.2 Proposal one – storing waste

Residents were asked which waste storage method would be most suitable to respondents between 'wheelie bins' and the current method of refuse sacks.

Table 2 - survey respondents: storage method

Storing waste	#	%
Wheeled bins	1344	59.8
Refuse sacks	904	40.2
Total	2248	100.0

From the 2,229 respondents who answered this question the wheelie bins were the most popular option with six in ten (59.8%) supporting this option. When comparing responses by age category, the younger a respondent the more likely they were to support wheelie bins, from 87.7 per cent for those aged between 18 – 24 years old to 29.4 per cent for those aged 65+.

7.2 Proposal two

Respondents were asked to what extent they would support the introduction of a new hygiene waste collection service for items such as nappy waste and incontinence pads.

Table 3 - survey respondents: proposal two

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
#	107	73	532	706	953
%	4.5	3.1	22.5	29.8	40.2

Overall, 70.1 per cent of respondents would agree or strongly agree with the introduction of the hygiene waste collection service. The level of agreeability is lowest for those aged between 45 – 54 with the acceptance level falling to 61.8 per cent.

7.3 Proposal three

The final proposal asked respondents to consider a change to amenity sites into possibly becoming a community recycling centres which prohibits the disposal of black bag waste to improve recycling.

Table 4 - survey respondents: proposal three

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
#	1174	549	236	285	128
%	49.5	23.1	9.9	12.0	5.4

In total seven in ten (72.6%) selected either disagree or strongly disagree in regards to proposal three. Those aged 65+ were the only age group to deviate from this however, the age range still did not support this proposal (av. 62.1%).

Appendix B

	Which collection option is the most preferable to you	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Recycling Rates ¹	Comment
Option one -two week collection If we were to collect refuse sacks every two weeks, residents would be limited to having two sacks.	76%	32%	18%	8%	27%	14%	69% Inclusive of trade waste and HWAS's Excluding of AHP Collection	1% More expensive than Base Case Option
Option two -three week collection If we were to collect refuse sacks every three weeks, residents would be limited to having three sacks.	5%	59%	26%	6%	7%	2%	72% Inclusive of trade waste and HWAS's Excluding of AHP Collection	0% Base Case Option ²
Option three -four week collection If we were to collect refuse sacks every four weeks, there would be no limit on refuse collected per household	20%	65%	16%	6%	9%	5%	67% Inclusive of trade waste and HWAS's Excluding of AHP Collection	8% More expensive than Base Case Option

¹ Recycling rates From WRAP report estimates

² Base Case refers to 3 Weekly Collection Option

	Which collection option is the most preferable to you	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Recycling Rates ¹	Comment
<p>Absorbent Hygienic Product Collection</p> <p>To what extent do you agree with the introduction of a hygiene waste collection for nappy waste or incontinence pads.</p>		5%	3%	23%	30%	40%		It is noted that 70% of respondents either agree or Strongly Agree with the proposal
<p>Household Waste Amenity Sites</p> <p>To what extent do you agree with the introduction of removing black bag waste collection in order to encourage more residents to recycle</p>		50%	23%	10%	12%	5%		It is noted that 73% of respondents either Strongly Disagree or Disagree with the proposal
<p>Storing waste</p> <p>How would you prefer to have your refuse stored and collected.</p>	Using Wheeled Bins 60%							
	Using Refuse Sacks 40%							

Appendix C

