

Option	Residual		Dry recycling		Food		Garden		Modelled impact on recycling performance Note: this does not include fly tipping and street cleansing arisings which is why the baseline is higher than the 58.7% we report.	Pro's	Con's
	Frequency / vehicle	Container	Frequency / vehicle	Container	Frequency / vehicle	Container	Frequency / vehicle	Container			
Baseline			Fortnightly - Multi-stream - Sillage	x2 reusable sacks and x1 kerbside box					62.6% baseline	N/A	N/A
Option 1			Fortnightly - Multi-stream - RRV (driver + 1)	x2 reusable sacks and x1 kerbside box	Weekly - co-collected with garden waste - RCV	10 litre food waste container	Weekly - co-collected with food waste - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin or sacks	0.10%	Cheapest option. Based on current recycling service so easy to communicate. High TEEP compliance, likely to align with new national waste strategy. Some improvement to service with additional recycling materials and new cardboard container. Contamination is low and current participation is high	Doesn't address driver shortage. Driver plus 1 loader unpopular and so difficult to get agency staff to cover sickness and absence. Unlikely to result in a stepped increase in performance. Vehicles not flexible to changes in material quantities or national policy. Difficulty to hire Romaquip type vehicles. Romaquips are more costly to maintain and repair when damaged.
Option 2			Fortnightly - Multi-stream - RRV (Driver + 2)	x2 reusable sacks and x1 kerbside box	Weekly - co-collected with dry recycling in week 1 (RRV) and separately in week 2 (7.5t RCV)	25 litre food waste container	Fortnightly - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin or sacks	-0.70%	Third cheapest option (noting only £22k difference between cheapest & third cheapest) Based on current recycling service so easy to communicate. High TEEP compliance, likely to align with new national waste strategy. Environmental benefits from separating food and garden waste	Would be moving garden waste to fortnightly which might prove unpopular with residents and impact on recycling performance. Note: licence fee income but so would service costs - service is loss making so this should not impact negatively on Council's budget. Doesn't address driver shortage. Would increase pressure on the 'O' Licence. Unlikely to result in a stepped increase in performance. Vehicles not flexible to collect anything else. Difficulty to hire Romaquip type vehicles. Romaquips are more costly to maintain and repair when damaged.
Option 2b			Fortnightly - Multi-stream - RRV (Driver + 2)	x2 reusable sacks and x1 kerbside box	Weekly - co-collected with dry recycling in week 1 (RRV) and separately in week 2 (7.5t RCV)	25 litre food waste container	Weekly - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin or sacks	0.10%	Based on current recycling service so easy to communicate. Retaining weekly garden waste collections which should protect income. High TEEP compliance, likely to align with new national waste strategy. Environmental benefits from separating food and garden waste	Third most expensive option - significant impact on MTFs. Compounds driver shortage issues. Would increase pressure on the 'O' Licence. Unlikely to result in a stepped increase in performance without significant promotion. Vehicles not flexible to changes in material quantities or national policy. Difficulty to hire Romaquip type vehicles. Romaquips are more costly to maintain and repair when damaged.
Option 3			Weekly - Multi-stream - RRV (Driver + 2)	x2 reusable sacks and x1 kerbside box	Weekly - co-collected with dry recycling (RRV)	25 litre food waste container	Fortnightly - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin or sacks	0.10%	Partially based on current service so easier to communicate. High TEEP compliance. Should result in a stepped increase in performance.	NOT CONSIDERED VIABLE DUE TO O LICENCE ISSUE AND COST. Most expensive option placing very significant impact on MTFs. Driver shortages more of an issue with increased vehicles - new licences don't allow people to drive 7.5t vehicles. Ubico unable to deliver under present 'O' Licence restrictions and this presents an unacceptable risk. Unlikely to result in a stepped increase in performance. Vehicles not flexible to collect anything else. Difficulty to hire Romaquip and 7.5 ton type vehicles. Romaquips are more costly to maintain and repair when damaged.
Option 4a			Fortnightly - Multi-stream - Split back RCV and RRV	x2 reusable sacks and x1 kerbside box	Weekly - co-collected with garden waste - RCV	10 litre food waste container	Weekly - co-collected with food waste - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin or sacks	-0.70%	High TEEP compliance. Hire vehicles are easier to source. Vehicles flexible to be used on other services.	Second most expensive option so significant impact on MTFs. Difficult to communicate as change from current service. Unlikely to result in a stepped increase in performance. Food and garden waste continue to be collected together requiring separate processing.
Option 4b	Fortnightly - RCV	180 litre wheeled bin (some households provided with 120 litre wheeled bins or plastic sacks - 1,100 or 660 litre bins used in flats)	Fortnightly - Multi-stream - Split back RCV and RRV	x2 reusable sacks and x1 kerbside box	Weekly - co-collected with dry recycling in week 1 (RRV) and separately in week 2 (7.5t RCV)	25 litre food waste container	Fortnightly - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin or sacks	-0.10%	High TEEP compliance. Hire vehicles are easier to source. Vehicles flexible to be used on other services.	Expensive option. Difficult to communicate as change from current service. Split back vehicles are the most expensive. Would be moving garden waste to fortnightly which might prove unpopular with residents and impact on recycling performance. Driver shortages more of an issue with increased vehicles - new licences don't allow people to drive 7.5t vehicles. Higher revenue costs to collect food separately. Unlikely to result in a stepped increase in performance.
Option 5a			Fortnightly - Two-stream - Split back RCV	240 litre wheeled bin and reusable sack	Weekly - co-collected with garden waste - RCV	10 litre food waste container	Weekly - co-collected with food waste - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin or sacks	2.80%	Second cheapest option. Simple service with fewer containers. Should improve recycling performance. Hire vehicles are easier to source. Reduction in vehicle numbers would address driver shortages. Vehicles flexible to be used on other services. Maintains weekly garden waste collection.	Some risk regarding TEEP as limited evidence to support these changes. Risk of increased contamination which can impact on recycling performance and on costs (Council would have to pay MRF for disposal of non-recyclable waste). Difficult to communicate as radical change from current service. Uncertainty over MRF gate fee and bulking/transport costs which are strongly affected by fluctuating material values. Cotswolds geographically doesn't have a MRF close by. Would be element of contaminated recycling. Could conflict with new national waste strategy
Option 5b			Fortnightly - Two-stream - Split back RCV	240 litre wheeled bin and reusable sack	Weekly - 7.5t RCV	25 litre food waste container	Fortnightly - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin or sacks	2.10%	Mid-cost option. Simple service with fewer containers. Should improve recycling performance. Hire vehicles are easier to source. Vehicles flexible to be used on other services.	Some risk regarding TEEP as limited evidence to support these changes. Risk of increased contamination which can impact on recycling performance and on costs (see 5a). Difficult to communicate as radical change from current service. Driver shortages more of an issue with increased vehicles - new licences don't allow people to drive 7.5t vehicles. Higher revenue costs to collect food separately. Uncertainty over MRF gate fee and bulking/transport costs. Cotswolds geographically doesn't have a MRF close by. Would be element of contaminated recycling. Could conflict with national waste strategy
Option 6a			Fortnightly - Co-mingled - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin	Weekly - co-collected with garden waste - RCV	10 litre food waste container	Weekly - co-collected with food waste - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin or sacks	3.30%	Mid-cost option. Simplest service model for residents and fewest containers. Hire vehicles are easier to source. Reduction in vehicle numbers would address driver shortages. Vehicles flexible to be used on other services. Would likely be a stepped increase in recycling performance. Likely to be popular with workforce.	NOT CONSIDERED VIABLE DUE TO SIGNIFICANT TEEP RISK. Not considered compliant with TEEP so high likelihood of challenge. Difficult to communicate as radical change from current service. Likely to be high levels of contamination. Uncertainty over MRF gate fee and bulking/transport costs. Cotswolds geographically doesn't have a MRF close by. Uncertainty over costs of containers and delivery out to the public. Could conflict with new national waste strategy.
Option 6b			Fortnightly - Co-mingled - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin	Weekly - 7.5t RCV	25 litre food waste container	Fortnightly - RCV	240 litre wheeled bin or sacks	2.50%	Mid-cost option. Simplest service model for residents and fewest containers. Hire vehicles are easier to source. Vehicles flexible to be used on other services. Would likely be a stepped increase in recycling performance. Likely to be popular with workforce.	NOT CONSIDERED VIABLE DUE TO SIGNIFICANT TEEP RISK. Not considered compliant with TEEP so high likelihood of challenge. Difficult to communicate as radical change from current service. Likely to be high levels of contamination. Uncertainty over MRF gate fee and bulking/transport costs. Cotswolds geographically doesn't have a MRF close by. Uncertainty over costs of containers and delivery out to the public. Risks associated with fortnightly garden waste as highlighted in options above. Could conflict with new national waste strategy.