



Council name	<b>COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL</b>
Name and date of Committee	<b>CABINET – 4 JUNE 2026</b>
Subject	<b>WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT – SERVICE DESIGN OPTIONS</b>
Wards affected	All
Accountable member	Andrea Pellegram, Cabinet Member for Environment and Regulatory Services Email: <a href="mailto:andrea.pellegram@cotswold.gov.uk">andrea.pellegram@cotswold.gov.uk</a>
Accountable officer	Helen Martin, Director of Communities and Place Email: <a href="mailto:helen.martin@cotswold.gov.uk">helen.martin@cotswold.gov.uk</a>
Report author	Peta Johnson, Head of Waste and Environment Email: <a href="mailto:peta.johnson@cotswold.gov.uk">peta.johnson@cotswold.gov.uk</a>
Summary/Purpose	<p>This report sets out a package of waste and recycling service design options to support a cohesive, compliant, and efficient approach to service delivery. It enables Cabinet to consider the removal of some services alongside the introduction and simplification of others, recognising that reductions in recycling income can be mitigated by reduced operating costs and operational efficiencies.</p> <p>The report describes the rationale, impacts and risks associated with: (1) demobilising the Council-provided bring bank service; (2) introducing kerbside collections of Plastic Bags and Wrapping in line with Simpler Recycling requirements, including the proposed approach to resident presentation of material; and (3) moving to the combined collection of paper and card to simplify collections and improve operational resilience.</p>
Annexes	<b>Annex A</b> – Bring Site Service: financial and waste flow performance <b>Annex B</b> – Collection of Plastic Bags and Wrapping: options for containerisation <b>Annex C</b> – Mixed Paper and Card: impact on services



Recommendation(s)	<p>That Cabinet resolves to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Agree to the withdrawal of the bring bank service.</li><li>2. Agree to the proposed approach for how residents will present the new recyclable plastics at the kerbside (i.e. in a tied, self-supplied, single-use sack).</li><li>3. Agree to a reduction in the size of the standard issue refuse bin (from 180 litre to 140 litre) on a replacement/ phased basis.</li><li>4. Agree to the new arrangement for the combined collection of paper and card.</li><li>5. Notes the financial implications.</li><li>6. Grant delegated authority to the Director of Communities and Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment &amp; Regulatory Services to take the required steps to implement the recommendations above. In terms of timeline: The withdrawal of the bring sites would take place within this financial year, with savings realised at the start of next year; The collection of additional plastics (plastic bags and wrapping) is planned in line with the requirement of Simpler Recycling i.e. to be in place by 1 April 2027. The reduction in the standard bin size would occur at the same time; A shift to mixing paper and card would occur when replacement recycling vehicles start to be used on the collection services.</li></ol>
Corporate priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Delivering Good Services</li></ul>
Key Decision	NO
Exempt	NO
Consultees/ Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Portfolio Holder for Environment and Regulatory Services</li><li>• Cabinet</li><li>• Corporate Leadership Team</li></ul>



## **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**1.1** This report brings together a set of waste and recycling service design proposals to support a cohesive approach to service delivery, enabling the Council to consider the removal of some services alongside the introduction and simplification of others. While some changes reduce recycling income, the overall position is mitigated by reduced operating costs and efficiencies across the wider service.

**1.2** Cabinet is asked to agree:

(1) demobilisation of the Council-provided bring bank service at 24 sites, which currently contributes around 0.7% to the recycling rate but has become a net cost and attracts fly-tipping and graffiti;

(2) the proposed containerisation approach for Plastic Bags and Wrapping, required under Simpler Recycling from 1 April 2027, with residents presenting material in a tied single-use bag that they self-supply (supported by an extensive communications programme and a proposed move to a 140L standard refuse bin by replacement);  
and

(3) moving to the collection of mixed paper and card to simplify collections and improve operational resilience, recognising an estimated c. £20k per annum reduction in recycling revenue, but a move that future-proofs the services and is expected to provide long-term financial benefits.

**1.3** On the bring banks, the expected waste-flow scenario suggests an approximate 0.1% reduction in the recycling rate. This would be offset by avoiding annual service costs of £43,923, although recycling income would fall by £14,800. Overall, this represents an improvement of £29,123 compared with the current position. Any savings in 2026/27 are expected to be used to fund demobilisation, with the full benefit realised from 2027/28.

**1.4** There is no statutory duty to provide bring banks (though notice is required to end the current operational arrangement), whereas the plastics change is legally required and will be delivered through the Ubico service agreement; the mixed paper/card approach remains compliant with Simpler Recycling.



- 1.5** Key risks—such as displaced fly-tipping, participation levels for plastics, and changing paper/card composition—will be mitigated through communications, site cleansing, and service design that better utilises vehicle capacity.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

A range of service design options are currently under consideration. These are provided together in this report to give a broader perspective on service delivery as a whole, where the removal of one service can be considered against the expansion/simplification of others.

Although there are cost implications for each area, overall, reduced revenue is mitigated by reduced costs.

The service design options are:

- Removal of the bring site service (net savings);
- The collection of plastic bags and wrapping;
- Collecting mixed paper and card (leading to a reduction in recycling revenue, but mitigating risks in the short term, and delaying cost increases in the medium term).

## **3. BRING SITE SERVICE**

### **3.1 Bring Site Service Background**

The Council provides recycling collections from a network of bring sites around the District. There are 24 sites in total. These sites are a legacy service, i.e. were initially rolled out to provide recycling services to residents. Residents now receive collections of an extended range of recycling from the kerbside (or from communal facilities).



The majority of the bring site service was operated by Thamesdown Recycling Ltd up to February 2025. Cherwell District Council have been operating the service since this date.

Each site has a range of bring banks to allow the collection of the following materials (**NB** the range of materials collected per site varies across the District):

- Council Provided Banks:
  - Cans, glass, and paper – collected by Cherwell District Council
  - Foil - collected by Ubico
- Third Party Banks:
  - Textiles and books – collected by third party providers, usually charities

The material collected from the bring sites contributes to the Council's recycling rate. However, the cost of providing the bring site service has increased in the last year, and these sites attract some anti-social behaviour e.g. fly tipping and graffiti. The rectification of which is a resource demand on the street cleansing service, delivered by Ubico.

A review of the bring site service has been conducted. This is provided as **Annex A - Bring Site Service: financial and waste flow performance**. A summary is provided below along with the recommendation to remove the Council provided bring banks, i.e. demobilise this service.

### **3.2 Bring Site Service – Finance and Waste Flow Impacts**

#### Finance

The costs and revenues for the bring site service are variable in nature. Variations between years will naturally occur as recycling revenue varies according to commodity pricing, and costs are often tonnage based, e.g. handling costs at the transfer station.

A series of assumptions have therefore been made to allow a comparison between the current and previous service provider, and the potential changes to recycling income, and recycling rates, where the bring bank service is removed.



These assumptions are as follows:

- Thamesdown costs: 2024/25 budget
- Cherwell District Council: Projected annual cost
- Recycling revenue, transfer station rates, recycling credits: Current rates

A comparison between the net cost of recent service providers is provided in the following table:

<b>Costs/ Revenues pa</b>	<b>Thamesdown (provided services up to February 2025)</b>	<b>Cherwell District Council (current provider)</b>
<b>Bring Site Service Cost</b>	£28,860	£43,923
<b>Income pa</b>	-£29,600	-£29,600
<b>Net cost of service</b>	-£740	£14,323

The current bring site service also creates demand for Ubico where fly tipping or graffiti occurs and requires removal. Removal of the bring site service would lead to a reduction in enviro-crimes at these locations, reducing demand on Ubico. Although it may be difficult to result in a cost efficiency through this reduction in demand, it would provide additional time that could be used to target improvements in other areas.

#### Waste Flow

There are 24 Council operated bring sites in the District. Each bring site has a range of bring banks that allow the deposit of cans, glass, and paper. Some sites also have foil banks collected by Ubico (very low tonnage), and some additional banks are provided and managed by third parties e.g. textiles. The tonnages for 2024/25 are shown below:

<b>Material</b>	<b>2024/25 tonnes per annum</b>
<b>Cans</b>	7
<b>Glass - Mixed</b>	195
<b>Paper</b>	51



CDC Tonnage	<b>253</b>
<b>Textiles (third party providers)</b>	49
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>302</b>

The recycling collected via the Council bring bank service contributes approximately 0.7% to the overall Council recycling rate. Where the Council bring site service is removed, this recycling will shift to another service or system. To understand the potential impact of this, a series of scenarios have been considered:

**Scenario 1:** All recycling from the Council bring bank service is diverted to kerbside residual waste.

**Scenario 2:** 50% of the recycling is recycled at the kerbside. 50% is diverted (i.e. waste minimisation and reflecting that some material may currently be commercial in origin)

**Scenario 3:** All recycling from Council bring banks is diverted to the kerbside recycling service

<b>Scenario</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Scenario Description</b>	100% recycling to kerbside residual waste	50% recycling to kerbside recycling scheme 50% waste minimisation (commercial)	100% recycling to kerbside recycling scheme
<b>Impact on Recycling Rate</b>	-0.7%	-0.1%	0.0%
<b>Impact on Income</b>	Reduction in income: £29.6k	Reduction in income: £14.8k	No reduction in income

Where the impact of bring bank removal is close to Scenario 2:

- The recycling rate would decrease by 0.1%
- The Council would save the cost of the service: £43,923
- The Council would receive £14,800 in revenue



This would be a shift from a net cost for the service of £14,324, to net revenue of £14,800 i.e. a positive move of £29,123.

It is important to note that this information relates to the removal of the Council bring banks only. Any bring banks operated by third parties would remain in service.

### **3.3 Bring Site Service – Demobilisation**

Where the Council bring site service is removed, savings will be realised following the demobilisation process, however costs will be incurred in the first instance. These include:

- Officer time to develop and deliver communications to residents about the change;
- A full review to understand the current condition of the sites and the repair requirements where the sites are removed;
- The cost of the physical removal and storage of bring banks
- The disposal of bring banks (however resale/ recycling will be investigated in the first instance)

It is therefore recommended that cost savings are budgeted from the start of next financial year. Any savings in this financial year would initially be redirected to fund demobilisation activities.

### **3.4 Bring Site Service - Alternative Options**

The alternative options to demobilisation of this service are:

- Continue with the current range of sites and materials collected;
- Reduce the number of Council provided bring sites e.g. to six sites, strategically located across the District.

Where the Council continues to provide a bring site service the service will require additional investment, for example a full condition survey of the existing banks to



improve signage, stickering and general appearance of the bring banks and the sites themselves.

A reduction in number of bring sites is another consideration with sites placed at strategic locations across the District. The placement of strategic sites aligns the Council with Tewkesbury Borough Council and Cheltenham Borough Council:

- Both councils have four sites offering the collection of clothes and shoes and will be provided by a third party e.g. a charity collector;
- Tewkesbury BC have two other sites collecting a wider range of materials;
- Cheltenham BC have seven other sites collecting a wider range of materials.

These sites would however still offer the collection of limited materials (paper, cans, and glass) compared to the full and extending range of materials collected at the kerbside or from communal bin stores.

#### **4. PLASTICS BAGS AND WRAPPING – CONTAINERISATION AT THE KERBSIDE**

##### **4.1 Plastics Bags and Wrapping – Background**

The Council is required to collect additional plastics at the kerbside from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2027 to remain compliant with Simpler Recycling guidance from Government.

The group name for these additional plastics is Plastic Bags and Wrapping. This name has been defined following a series of focus groups, conducted by the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) i.e. this group name is well recognised by residents and supports clear communication of services and service rules. Examples of Plastic Bags and Wrapping include plastic carrier bags, bread bags, cereal liners, and detergent pouches.

At this stage in service development, we are considering how residents will bag/present the new recyclable plastics at the kerbside. Options for collection from communal locations will be considered at a later date. The reason that kerbside bags are being considered at this point is to ensure that where they are deemed a



requirement (NB against the recommendation of this report) there is still time to source the bags. These have a significant lead time and require global supply chains.

Trials have been conducted in the UK, funded by the packaging industry and Government, and the findings of these have been published (the FlexCollect Project), including a series of recommendations. In addition, North Somerset Council was the first authority in England to roll out Plastic Bags and Wrapping collections to all residents.

Considering these sources, the recommendation is clear that residents should present Plastics Bags and Wrapping within a tied single-use plastic bag (rather than a reusable sack, which is returned to the resident once emptied by the collection crew).

These sources however differ in terms of how these single used bags are supplied:

- North Somerset Council require residents to self-supply bags;
- The FlexCollect project recommends that the collection authority supplies bags.

#### **4.2 Plastics Bags and Wrapping – Self Supply of Bags by Residents**

5. There is a clear desire to harmonise the collection methodology for plastic bags and wrapping across the Waste Collection Authorities in Gloucestershire; however, while this ambition is understood, the diversity of existing services means a single, standardised approach may not be appropriate. Collection methodologies are closely linked to broader system arrangements, including collection infrastructure, transfer processes and material brokering, all of which vary between authorities. As such, full harmonisation is more likely to be achievable through Local Government Reorganisation. From a resident perspective, harmonisation is likely to be judged based on how materials are presented—such as the type of bags used, kerbside presentation methods, and the range of materials accepted. In practice, harmonisation is most feasible in relation to the materials collected, albeit with some minor local variations.

At this stage we are considered the type of bags to be used be residents, with a review included in **Annex B** – *Collection of Plastic Bags and Wrapping: options for*



*containerisation*. Factors that have been considered are cost of supply, potential wastage, the supply chain, alignment with other materials, yield of material and potential for contamination.

The outcome of this review is to recommend that residents self-supply bags. The key reasons for this are as follows:

- If we chose to supply bags, we would be contributing to plastic waste. Admittedly where residents participate in the scheme these bags would be recycled (in the trials in Cheltenham the collection bag made up 4% of the overall material collected). However, the participation in the scheme may be low. FlexCollect indicates that where the equivalent of one bag per week was provided to residents, on average 0.35 bags were used i.e. waste of 0.65 bags or 65%
- By not supplying bags we are aligning with the methodology for other recycling materials. Whilst we do supply reusable sacks, boxes, and bins, we do not provide single use bags or sacks for the presentation of textiles, small WEEE, batteries, residual waste and food waste (we do however provide single use sacks for residual waste for a small number of households, for some limited reasons).

The FlexCollect report indicates that the self-supply of bags by residents may be linked to:

- Lower levels of participation;
- Unsuitable bag selection;
- Greater quantities of untied bags presented at the kerbside.

However resident supplied bags or the presentation of loose material was only tested in limited areas. Trials in all original areas (nine local authorities) initially supplied bags. One authority was added at a later date with material collected loose in a commingled collection. This system is not comparable to the service provided by the Council.



One authority, South Gloucestershire Council, initially trialled council supplied bags, but extended their trial into an area where residents were asked to supply their own bags. Although FlexCollect is not recommending resident supplied bags, the report states that the trial in this second area achieved reasonable levels of participation, suggesting that good communications can help compensate for the absence of a dedicated bag.

The roll out of Plastic Bags and Wrapping collections will be supported by an extensive communications campaign. This will consider the guidance set out in the FlexCollect report. This covers the following communication methods: instruction leaflet, dedicated web pages, nudge techniques, how-to photography, information sharing with crews and customer services and the development of FAQs.

#### Reduction in the Size of the Standard Refuse Waste Bin

As further mitigation to a potentially lower participation rate, there is strong evidence that reducing the volume of refuse bins drives residents to better engage with recycling services. This could be done in a dramatic way (South Gloucestershire Council for example removed all 240 litre refuse bins and replaced them with 140 litre bins) or can be done more gradually. It is recommended that the standard refuse bin size is changed when the Plastic Bags and Wrapping service is rolled out. The standard bin size would change from 180 litres to 140 litres. This would be by replacement only i.e. for new properties or where a damaged bin requires replacement. This shift in policy would bring the Council in line with the policies of Cheltenham Borough Council, which is beneficial from a Local Government Reorganisation perspective.

As with Cheltenham Borough Council, larger bins would be made available for larger households, or households with medical needs.

### **5.1 Plastic Bags and Wrapping – Alternative Options**

The alternative option is for the Council to supply bags directly to residents. The FlexCollect report indicates that bags could be approximately 3p each and delivery costs could be in the region of £1.15 per household. For an authority the size of



**COTSWOLD**  
District Council

Cotswold, assuming one bag per household per week, this leads to a cost of approximately £120k for the first year. This is before we consider:

- Officer and Ubico time for issue management/ re-delivery where bags are not received;
- The provision of additional capacity for high recyclers;
- The process for re-stocking residents. This could either be a re-stock for all households (i.e. approximately £120k per annum) or stock issue to participating households only (a lower cost for bags i.e. limited wastage, but a higher unit cost for delivery).

The FlexCollect report indicates that participation could be as low as 35%. The case for supply bags in the first instance is therefore harder to justify as 65% of households may not be using the service (at a cost of c. £80K per annum).



## **6. COLLECTION OF MIXED PAPER AND CARD**

### **6.1 Mixed Paper and Card – Background**

Paper and card are currently collected in separate compartments on the recycling collection vehicles. These materials are delivered to the transfer station at Thamesdown Recycling Ltd. Thamesdown bulk these materials and broker them on our behalf.

The Council pays a handling fee per tonne of material and receives revenue according to a mechanism. This mechanism is based on industry pricing published in this location: <https://www.letsrecycle.com/prices/>

Collecting these materials separately, delivers maximum recycling revenue for the Council, however collecting paper separately from card:

- Requires residents to separately present card and paper (the distinction between the two can be difficult to determine);
- Takes additional time for the crews to collect;
- Takes up more space on the vehicles. The collection of separate paper and card requires two compartments. Due to variations between rounds these compartments fill at different rates. When one compartment fills, there can be space left in the other leading to underutilisation of the vehicle as a whole.

An additional factor relates to the continued decline in the use and therefore recycling of paper, and the continued increase in the amount of card in the waste stream. Card use has increased with increasing home deliveries and is now increasing where manufacturers are shifting from the use of plastic packaging to the use of card packaging. Further developments of card packaging blur the lines between paper and card, making the distinction between the two more difficult for residents to determine. Collecting mixed paper and card is easier for residents.

Where these materials are mixed, changes to the overall capacity required is mitigated to some extent as one tonnage is decreasing and the other is increasing (accepting that the high density paper is being replaced with low density card).



## **6.2 Mixed Paper and Card – Impact (for residents, for crews, financial impact)**

More information is provided in **Annex C – Mixed Paper and Card: impact on services**. A summary of which is provided below.

### Initial Impact for Residents

There would be no initial impact to residents from a containerisation perspective. Residents currently have a blue sack for card, and a recycling box for paper. They could continue to present mixed paper and card in either one or both containers. Over time we would seek to optimise the containerisation for this material stream. This would include the potential to increase the standard container size for paper and card, assisting residents with this growing waste stream. Any improvements to containerisation would also aim to keep the material dry, and streets free from windblown litter e.g. with a sack that fully seals rather than sealing on one edge. Improvements to containerisation would be planned to be in place following the issue of the current stock of blue sacks. There are currently circa. 15k blue sacks held in stock.

To support this change we would develop a communications campaign, and we would work with the customer services team to update Knowledge Articles and Guidance for residents.

### Impact for Crews

Currently residents present paper and card separately. Sometimes this is not done accurately, and crews need to carry out some additional sorting at the kerbside. In any case, they need to take two container types to two different areas of the vehicle to load these materials. The collection methodology would be simplified for crews where the materials are presented and collected mixed. This will speed up collections. This increased efficiency is unlikely to deliver cost savings but is likely to mitigate future cost increases. In other words, it will save time creating capacity for collections of more material and from new properties due to housing growth, reducing / delaying the need for additional collection vehicles.



### Financial Impact

Paper is currently a high value commodity, and mixing paper and card will reduce the value derived from this waste stream. It is estimated that this would reduce recycling revenue by circa. £20k per annum. Although this is a negative impact this is mitigated considerably by the points set out above: Greater levels of recycling (paper & card due to simplifying the process), greater recycling collection capacity & future proofing etc. This would have a long term financial benefit.

An additional consideration relates to the ongoing provision of containers. Initially no changes would be made to this i.e. there is no financial impact. However, over time we would seek to provide additional containment for paper and card via two sacks. The annualised cost of these is expected to be in line with the cost of the current box/ sack, but with volume equivalent to a box and two of the current sacks. This would represent an increased volume for the collection of mixed paper and card, at no additional cost for the containers themselves.

### **6.3 Mixed Paper and Card – Alternative Options**

The alternative option is that we continue with the separate collection of paper and card. This will retain the current level of recycling revenue, but not deliver on:

- Improved ease of use for residents;
- Potential to improve containerisation for paper and card;
- Improved efficiency of the collection services, and potential to absorb the collection of more materials and housing growth in the future.

## **7. CONCLUSIONS**

**7.1** The main conclusions from this report are provided in the following table:



<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>
<b>Bring Site Service Removal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Removal of bring sites would lead to a reduction in environmental crime (fly tipping and graffiti);</li><li>• Where the results are closest to Scenario 2 (50% diversion to kerbside recycling; 50% waste minimisation) there would be a small decrease in recycling rate (circa. 0.1%);</li><li>• Costs would be saved following the removal of the bring site service but absorbed in 2026/27 to fund the demobilisation itself. Savings would be delivered in full in 2027/28.</li></ul>
<b>Plastic Bags and Wrapping Containerisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Asking residents to self-supply sacks would ensure that this new service is delivered in line with current collection methodology;</li><li>• By residents' self-supplying sacks i.e. only where they participate in the services, costs will be limited for the Council (and ultimately taxpayers) and wastage will be reduced;</li><li>• Any potential negative impacts e.g. lower levels of participation in the service, could be mitigated with an extensive communications programme.</li><li>• In addition, the Council could choose to provide smaller refuse bins as standard (140 litre rather than 180 litre). Reduced refuse bin sizes have been strongly linked to driving up participation in recycling services.</li></ul>
<b>Collection of Mixed Paper and Card</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mixing paper and card would improve ease of use for residents and crews</li><li>• The aim will be to optimise containerisation over time. A larger, fully sealed bag, will support the capture of increased material, keep this material dry, and reduce windblown litter</li></ul>



## 8. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 A summary of the financial implications is provided in the following table:

Subject	Negative Impact	Positive Impact	Net Impact
<b>Bring Site Demobilisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced recycling revenue (Scenario 1) £14,800 (revenue)</li> <li>Demobilisation costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removed service change £43,923 (cost).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>£29,123 improvement against current position</li> <li>To be realised in 2027/28.</li> </ul>
<b>Plastic Bags and Wrapping Containerisation</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>£0 additional cost to the Council and taxpayers.</li> <li>Costs will be incurred at a later stage in the mobilisation e.g. to provide communication to residents.</li> </ul>
<b>Collection of Mixed Paper and Card</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced recycling revenue estimated at circa. £20,000 per annum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Future proofed services/ long-term financial benefit e.g. through a delayed requirement for additional vehicles due to property growth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial reduction in revenue (estimated at £20,000 per annum).</li> </ul>



**1.1.** If all three proposals are implemented, they are expected to be largely cost neutral overall, with the potential to deliver a small saving. Costs associated with the demobilisation of the bring site service would result in a net cost in 2026/27 only, which would need to be met from savings identified elsewhere within the budget.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

**9.1** A summary of the legal implications is provided in the following table:

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Legislative Requirement</b>	<b>Service Contract</b>
Bring Site Demobilisation	We are under no obligation to provide bring bank services.	Cherwell District Council currently provides the service. The current service would require notice to terminate the operation.
Plastic Bags and Wrapping Containerisation	Required under new regulations made under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 ("Simpler Recycling"). To be in place by end of March 2027.	The service will be delivered by Ubico (inclusion in new Service Agreement currently being negotiated).
Collection of Mixed Paper and Card	Simpler Recycling requires the collection of paper and card. These materials may be collected mixed.	No change to current Service Contract with Ubico. Change to crew instructions/ working procedures.  Change to the composition of recycling handled by Thamesdown i.e. no paper, and more mixed card.



## 10. RISK ASSESSMENT

High level risks and mitigations are provided in the following table:

Subject	Risks	Mitigations
Bring Site Demobilisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Sites may continue to attract fly-tipping and graffiti.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The demobilisation programme would be linked to strong communication and site cleansing.</li></ul>
Plastic Bags and Wrapping Containerisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The self-supply of sacks by residents may be linked to lower levels of participation in the service.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The roll out of the service will be accompanied by an extensive communications campaign;</li><li>Where deemed necessary, sacks could be rolled out at a later date (it is easier to turn-on this service later, than start by issuing sacks and turn-off later);</li><li>Smaller bins will encourage recycling.</li></ul>
Collection of Mixed Paper and Card	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Waste composition changes over time. The long term trend is for more card and less paper which creates capacity issues on the vehicles.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Mixing paper and card mitigates this risk by better utilising the available space on the collection vehicles.</li></ul>

## 11. EQUALITIES IMPACT

### 11.1 Demobilisation of the Bring Site Service:

The bring banks themselves can be difficult to use for people with physical disabilities. Removal of this service removes this issue. All recycling materials can be recycled at the kerbside, and assisted collections are provided to residents in line with Cotswold District Council's Waste, Recycling & Street Cleaning Policy.



**11.2** Plastic Bags and Wrapping/ Mixed paper and card:

These services will be delivered in line with the current collection services, where assisted collections are provided to residents in line with Cotswold District Council's Waste, Recycling & Street Cleaning Policy.

**12. CLIMATE AND ECOLOGICAL EMERGENCIES IMPLICATIONS**

**12.1** A summary of the climate and ecological emergencies is provided in the following table:

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Carbon Emission e.g. fuel use/ avoided emissions</b>
Bring Site Demobilisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduced fuel use as a separate vehicle is no longer required to provide collections from bring sites;</li><li>• Assumed that materials continue to be recycled, either through the household service, or independently through a commercial collection i.e. no impact on avoided emissions.</li></ul>
Plastic Bags and Wrapping Containerisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No requirement to purchase bags from global supply chains or provide delivery services to residents, reducing the transportation needs of the services.</li></ul>
Collection of Mixed Paper and Card	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Future proofing of the services delays the need for additional vehicles, effectively reducing the per household transport related carbon emissions of the collection services.</li></ul>

**13. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

**13.1** [none]

(END)