



Ricardo  
Energy & Environment

## Lewisham Citizen Forum Project Report

October 2015

---

Report for London Borough of Lewisham

**Customer:****London Borough of Lewisham****Customer reference:**

N/A

**Confidentiality, copyright & reproduction:**

This report is the Copyright of the London Borough of Lewisham. It has been prepared by Ricardo Energy & Environment, a trading name of Ricardo-AEA Ltd, under contract to London Borough of Lewisham dated 12/10/2015. The contents of this report may not be reproduced in whole or in part, nor passed to any organisation or person without the specific prior written permission of Sam Kirk, London Borough of Lewisham. Ricardo Energy & Environment accepts no liability whatsoever to any third party for any loss or damage arising from any interpretation or use of the information contained in this report, or reliance on any views expressed therein.

**Contact:**

Robin Clarke  
Ricardo Energy & Environment  
Gemini Building, Harwell, Didcot, OX11 0QR,  
United Kingdom

**t:** +44 (0) 1235 75 3304**e:** robin.clarke@ricardo.com

Ricardo-AEA Ltd is certificated to ISO9001 and ISO14001

**Author:**

Robin Clarke

**Approved By:**

Gareth Morton

**Date:**

12 October 2015

**Ricardo Energy & Environment reference:**

Ref: ED60895- Issue Number 2

## Executive summary

As part of its waste services review consultation, Lewisham Council held a Citizen Forum in September 2015. The Forum was attended by 50 Lewisham residents and lasted for a full day. The main findings from the Forum are presented below.

### **Views on the current waste and recycling service**

Participants in the Forum were broadly satisfied with current service. They like its simplicity – 2 bins, each collected weekly. However, there was some confusion about what materials could be put in the recycling bin. This led to a call for more information to be provided to clarify this. This desire for more information was a recurring theme throughout the day. Also, apart from there being two bins, many people did not know about other aspects of the waste and recycling service, for example, the location of the recycling centre and the existence of the garden waste service. The garden waste service became an issue of heated discussion throughout the Forum. Early comments about it focused on a few complaints about having to pay for it which led to some people saying they put their garden waste in with their general waste. Discussing what could be improved there were suggestions that the amount of general waste collected needs to decrease and the amount of recycling increase. They felt that changing the frequency of collections, introducing a food waste service and providing enough bin capacity for any additional recycling might be a means to achieve this.

### **How important is it to recycle more?**

There was a broad consensus within the Forum that recycling is important, the main reason being its environmental benefits. Forum participants did not associate increased recycling with achieving financial savings for the Council. People said they would recycle more but it needs to be easy for them to do – any ‘hassle’ factors are likely to put them off. If they were required to separate out recyclables and put them in separate bins, people would probably adapt to it, but it needs to be simple and obvious what goes in each bin. Again, people talked about the need for information, and preferably, stickers on bins. Some suggested that there should be small internal recycling bins for the home so they can put materials in the appropriate bin as soon as they discard them. Food waste bins were again mentioned - people thought this would be a good idea so long as they were collected frequently.

### **What should be the Council's priorities?**

Participants identified a broad range of possible priorities for the Council from providing a service that is easy for residents to use, to having incentives to encourage recycling or fines for those who don't. However, there was no consensus regarding these, or the other priorities they identified at this point. They then reviewed five suggested priority areas: saving money; reducing our impact on the environment; making it easier for residents to recycle; making it easier for the Council to collect good quality recycling material; and meeting recycling targets to avoid fines. There was considerable agreement that saving money; meeting recycling targets and, to some extent, collecting good quality recycling material are not what residents feel should be the main priorities. They also said that these are outcomes that will be achieved if the service in place makes it easy to recycle more - if residents do not effectively do this then none of the suggested priority areas will be achieved. Many felt the overall priority for the Council should be to reduce the impact on the environment – this should be seen as the overarching aim of improving the service.

### **Separate collections**

People were fairly relaxed about the suggestion of having a separate collection for paper. The idea of having a separate insert that sits inside their main recycling bin was felt to be a good space-saving way of doing this, providing it is of a manageable size. They thought it would be sensible for the Council to seek to generate income so long as it ultimately benefits residents, for example, by the money being used to protect other Council services. There was quite a strong feeling that there should not be exemptions allowed to any service changes, for example, if a property has minimal front garden space.

### **Food waste service**

There was widespread support for the idea of introducing a food waste service, providing it is collected weekly. People recognised that having this type of service would be an essential part of reducing the amount going into their general waste bin. Some people did have a few concerns about

the service apart from ensuring it is collected weekly. Would the plastic bags for the internal caddy be free? Would bigger families be allowed to have more than one internal caddy? Would the Council consider providing a free cleaning service for external bins? Would the external bins be secure enough to stop vermin accessing them? It was noticeable that when examples of the internal caddy and external bin were passed round the Forum some participants were much more reassured about the idea of this type of service being introduced. Again people felt there should not be any exemptions from this service.

### **Garden waste service**

There was a strongly held view amongst many participants that any garden waste service provided should be free. Only a few felt it was a different type of service to other waste and recycling collections as many residents do not have gardens so it is not a universal service, therefore those who want their garden waste collected should pay for it. As indicated earlier in this Executive Summary, a large number of participants were unaware that Lewisham already provides a 'pay per bag' garden waste service. When pushed on what an acceptable charge might be if the service was not free, there was a broad range of suggestions, mostly falling between £10 and £50. Nearly everyone felt the £80, £100 and £120 options were far too high. Most people with gardens said they would not sign up for a subscription service with an annual fee, especially if it was pitched somewhere between £80 and £120. Describing what type of garden waste service should be provided, many suggested an on request one, broadly along the lines of the current one rather than an annual subscription service.

### **Designing a new waste and recycling service**

When asked to work in small groups to design what a new service might look like, there were some commonalities across the groups. First, was the desire for a weekly food waste collection service. Many of the service designs also changed the frequency of services from their current configuration to encourage a focus on recycling. There were several suggestions for separating out recycling into different collections, particularly for paper. There was considerable variation in the design for a garden waste service – some suggested pay-as-you-go on request, while others preferred a seasonal service with a lower than subscription rate than the ones proposed by the Council. There was also a strong feeling that there should not be exemptions from any new service because a property might have minimal/no front garden space.

### **Changing opinions**

At the start of the Forum participants were asked to respond to three questions:

- *How important is recycling to you?*
- *How important is it that the Council recycles more?*
- *Do you think the Council should change its refuse and recycling service?*

They were asked the same three questions at the end to see if learning more about the service had changed their views. At the start of the Forum most people were likely to say 'fairly important' or 'very important' to the first two questions, and 'agree' or 'strongly agree' to the third one. By the end of the Forum, the views of many participants had shifted with even more expressing positive views, particularly in the 'very important' and 'strongly agree' categories. This demonstrates the value of communicating more with residents about these issues as, with greater knowledge and understanding, people have a better appreciation of the challenges facing services and how important they are.

### **Conclusions**

Participants in the Forum were broadly satisfied with the current waste and recycling service. They like its simplicity – 2 bins, each collected weekly. However, once they had discussed the importance of recycling they were increasingly open to thinking about changes to it. There was a strong view that increasing and improving recycling should be a priority for the Council and if it is to happen successfully residents need to be able to play their part easily and effectively. If separate collections are introduced it needs to be made clear to residents what goes where – the less 'hassle' there is for residents doing what is required of them (a major barrier) the more likely a new service will succeed.

Participants were also open to exploring whether there should be different collection frequencies for different types of waste. Some made a clear connection between changing a collection frequency and

changing residents' behaviour, for example, if general waste is collected less often then people will look at other options for some of the material they usually put in their general waste bin.

There was widespread support for the idea of introducing a food waste service, providing it is collected weekly. People recognised that having this type of service would be an essential part of reducing the amount going into their general waste bin. Some reassurance would be needed, for example, that caddies would not take up too much room and that plastic bags would be provided for free.

Introducing an annual subscription based garden waste service would be controversial, particularly if the charge is pegged between £80 and £120. If the Forum accurately reflects the views more widely held in Lewisham, then it seems unlikely that there would be a sufficient sign-up for this service to make it economically viable. Many felt this should be a free service. People also questioned whether a subscription service, with designated collection dates, would be the right design. The idea of an 'on request' service seemed to be more popular, but not many people knew this is the current offer (or that there is a garden collection service at all).

If changes are made, there were quite strongly held views among many participants that there should not be any exemptions to these changes. There might need to be creative solutions for those living in properties with minimal external space for bins, for example, affected properties could be supplied with stackable boxes. Also there might need to be some flexibility for bigger families, for example, bigger or additional bins. But the bottom line was that any changes should apply to all households.

As the Forum progressed it was clear that participants who were already quite keen that the current service is changed, became more certain about the need for this. As they learned more about the pressures the service faces and how it currently performs (for example, the relatively small amount that is currently recycled) they became stronger in their views that changes should be made to how waste and recycling materials are collected and how frequently this happens.

When asked to design their own service, participants came up with a range of different service configurations but some of the common themes emerged including:

1. Separate food waste collections, collected weekly. Two methods suggested:
  - a. indoor caddy, external bin and free bags
  - b. insert into the black residual bin
2. Separate collections for recyclables (and separate collection of paper in particular)
  - a. Groups were evenly split over collection frequency (weekly or fortnightly)
3. A separate garden waste collection service
  - a. Groups were very divergent in their views on how it should be operated (free, annual subscription, pay as you go, collection frequencies etc.)
4. Residual waste, collected fortnightly (although one group suggested monthly!)
5. No exemptions based on property size/frontage
  - a. Different systems were suggested for properties with space/storage issues including stackable boxes and smaller containers.

# Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Citizen Forum findings</b> .....	<b>2</b>
3.1	Current waste and recycling service .....	2
3.1.1	What is working well? .....	2
3.1.2	What is working less well? .....	3
3.1.3	What could be improved?.....	4
3.1.4	How important is it to recycle more? .....	5
3.1.5	What barriers prevent you from recycling more? .....	5
3.1.6	What would make it easier for you to recycle more? .....	5
3.1.7	What would motivate you to recycle more? .....	6
3.2	Council priorities.....	6
3.2.1	What should the Council's priorities be when it comes to recycling? .....	6
3.2.2	Saving money?.....	9
3.2.3	Reducing our impact on the environment? .....	9
3.2.4	Making it easier for residents to recycle? .....	9
3.2.5	Making it easier for the Council to collect good quality recycling material? .....	10
3.2.6	Meeting recycling targets to avoid fines? .....	10
3.3	Separate collections .....	10
3.3.1	How would separating paper from other recycling affect residents? .....	10
3.3.2	Should the Council collect paper separately to generate an income? .....	11
3.3.3	Would you be prepared to have a separate paper 'insert'? .....	11
3.3.4	Should properties with small front gardens be exempt? .....	11
3.4	Food waste service .....	11
3.4.1	Should the council introduce a weekly food waste collection? .....	11
3.4.2	What challenges for residents would this present? .....	11
3.4.3	Should properties with small front gardens be exempt? .....	12
3.5	Garden waste service.....	12
3.5.1	Views about a garden waste service.....	12
3.5.2	Views on an annual subscription and what level it should be .....	12
3.5.3	Would people sign-up for an annual subscription service?.....	13
3.5.4	What challenges for residents would this service present? .....	13
3.6	Designing a new waste and recycling service.....	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Participant survey</b> .....	<b>15</b>
4.1	How important is recycling to you?.....	15
4.2	How important is it that the Council recycles more? .....	16
4.3	Do you think the Council should change its refuse and recycling service? .....	17
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions</b> .....	<b>18</b>

## Appendices

Appendix 1	Summary process plan
Appendix 2	Design a new service game
Appendix 3	Before and after Forum survey

# 1 Introduction

The London Borough of Lewisham has undertaken a waste services efficiency review and is looking at making possible changes to the service, initially focusing on street level properties. As part of its decision-making process the Council committed itself to undertaking a thorough consultation with local residents. Part of this consultation was to carry out a Citizen Forum. This report details the discussions and outcomes from that Forum.

The Forum was tasked with discussing:

- The Council's current waste and recycling services, identifying what is:
  - (i) working well;
  - (ii) what is working less well; and
  - (iii) what could be improved.
- How important recycling is and:
  - (i) what barriers are there to recycling more;
  - (ii) what would make it easier to recycle more; and
  - (iii) what would motivate people to recycle more.
- What the Council's priorities should be when it comes to recycling:
  - Saving money?
  - Reducing environmental impact?
  - Making it easier for residents to recycle?
  - Making it easier for the Council to collect good quality recycling material?
  - Meeting recycling targets to avoid fines?
- What would it mean for residents if they were required to separate paper from other recyclable material?
- What are their thoughts about food waste collections? How would they feel if this was a weekly service?
- What are their thoughts about the garden waste service? Should there be annual subscription service? What would be an acceptable charge for such a service? Would they be likely to sign up for it?
- Should any changes to waste and recycling services apply to all street level properties or should there be some exceptions?
- What type of waste and recycling service would be best for the borough as a whole? What type of collections would there be? How frequent would they be?

## 2 Methodology

The Citizen Forum was a day-long deliberative event in which 50 Lewisham residents participated. A deliberative process is one that aims to move people on from 'top of mind' responses to more informed and carefully considered ones. This is achieved by giving people information to help them more fully understand the issues they have been asked to discuss, having sufficient time to engage with that information and discuss it with other residents.

In the case of this Forum, the information they received centred on a presentation explaining why Lewisham's service needs to change, including the need to:

- Comply with legislation;
- Contribute to the Council's required budget savings;
- Minimise the service's impact on the environment; and
- Provide a service that is easy for the Council to deliver and for residents to use.

The design of the Forum was such that most of the discussions took place in small groups interspersed with brief plenary sessions. This meant all participants were able to contribute their views as often they wished to. The overall structure of the day is as set out in the 'Introduction' section (previous page). The discussion sessions were broadly designed to mirror Lewisham's survey questions so that it would be straightforward to compare the outputs from the Forum with those from the online survey.

Participants in the Forum were recruited from across Lewisham, with a range of demographic criteria being controlled for. These were:

- Age;
- Gender;
- Ethnicity;
- Employment status;
- Housing tenure;
- Disability;
- Social class; and
- Views about the importance of the environment.

The overall recruitment aim was to have a Forum that was diverse and broadly representative of the borough's population profile.

When comparing the findings from this Forum with those of the survey, a factor to bear in mind is that the former are based on informed rather than top of mind responses.

## 3 Citizen Forum findings

### 3.1 Current waste and recycling service

At the start of the Forum participants were asked to discuss the current service in terms of what is working well, what is working less well, and what could be improved.

#### 3.1.1 What is working well?

People were generally quite satisfied with the current waste and recycling service that the Council provides. Its main strength being it is simple to understand: there are just two bins to use and they are both collected weekly. One person made this point:

*"I try not to fill refuse but sometimes need to, so it is good to have a collection every week."*

There were several positive comments made about the bin collection crews. One was that they provide an efficient and tidy service (although the opposite view was also stated):

*"The bins are emptied on the day that they are meant to be and they are then put back in the right place."*

The other view expressed was that the crews check bins for contamination and leave behind contaminated bins – this was felt to have a good educational value. There was also a positive comment about the provision of an assisted door collection for elderly, infirm or disabled residents.

There were mixed views about the range of materials that can be recycled. On the one hand it was felt that the Council collects a good range of recyclable materials, partly demonstrated by some people saying their recycling bins are quite full each week. But there was another comment that a wider range of recyclable materials could be collected. There weren't any comments about the recent changes to the recycling service to collect a wider range of materials.

Discussing when bins are collected and what can go in each bin, there was a comment that the information provided is good and knowing what to put in each is helped by the stickers on the bins. However, later in the Forum there were many comments about there being a lack of information.

Apart from comments about the weekly general waste and recycling collections, there were very few comments about other aspects of the service.



### 3.1.2 What is working less well?

When asked what they felt was less good about the current service, the lack of knowledge about what can be put in which bin was a recurring theme. One person, who lives in a large house split into six separate flats, commented that, from her experience, each flat seems to do their recycling differently and concluded:

*“It’s confusing to know what should go in recycling and what should not go in it.”*

Another person said:

*“When you go on to the Lewisham website it is really unclear what is and isn’t recycling. And what it says on the website is different to what it says on the dustbin. So you just don’t know if you are doing it right or not doing it right and then there’s a lot of variation in do you clean something before it goes in the recycling?”*

This lack of knowledge can also lead to contamination problems. For example, discussing garden waste two comments were:

*“I would put food in with garden waste.”*

*“Can you mix garden waste with food waste?”*

It can also result in unnecessary weight being added to bins thereby increasing the cost of the service to the Council. One person said they put their garden waste in with their residual waste because they thought there was no other option.

Part of the problem here seemed to be that some people lacked the knowledge of what other options there are apart from the weekly bin collections. In one small group when this point about lack of knowledge was made, a participant said there is a recycling centre in the borough, but others pointed out that many residents do not have access to cars.

Discussing garden waste further, one person said they were well aware that they should not put garden waste in the general waste bin. The alternative is the pay on demand garden waste service, but they felt that £10 is too much to pay for a roll of 10 sacks. It was suggested that there could be a communal place to put garden waste, like there is for Christmas trees. A result of the current set-up for garden waste is it leads to some fly tipping, either because people do not know what to do with their garden waste, or do not want to (or can’t) pay for it to be collected. One person said an additional problem which might put people off using the service is because:

*“Garden waste bags need to be lugged to the end of the road”*

This ‘hassle’ factor was also picked up in a couple of other comments, this time referring to the recycling service. One person said washing cans takes too much time so they often just can’t be bothered to do it. While another person said:

*“It’s complicated, all the washing and stuff. I don’t like recycling, I’d rather just go to the bottle bank.”*

There were also couple of other comments about fly tipping. It was said that it is prevalent on housing estates. It was even commented that builders dump rubbish on estates to avoid using recycling centres to save themselves money.

A small number of participants said the current bin volumes and collection frequency can lead to bins becoming overfilled and, either not collected, or excess waste being put in other people’s bins. One person suggested that a solution to this would be to collect waste and recycling every day. Another suggested solution was either to provide bigger bins or make it easier to have more than one bin for both general waste and recycling.

Picking up on the comment in the previous section about the bin crews placing bins back neatly and correctly, the opposite view was:

*“The crew need to replace the bins back in gardens otherwise it can create a blockage on the pavement.”*

There were also come comments that the crews sometimes create litter and don’t clean it up.

Commenting on the timings of collections, although bins are collected on the same day some felt it was not helpful that there is not a specific collection time:

---

*“The time when you are asked to put out your bin is not consistent with when they collect – residents are in a rush to put it out in the morning.”*

Perhaps surprisingly, particularly considering that it became a major discussion point as the Forum progressed, there were very few comments at this stage about the current recycling collection being co-mingled. One person, who had lived in Manchester, said her recycling was separated out in and said this seemed to be a much better scheme and was one that was quite easy for residents to adapt to once they had got used to the idea.

### 3.1.3 What could be improved?

Continuing the information theme from the previous section participants suggested a number of areas for possible action:

*“The marketing and communications needs to have a stronger proposition (so it is clear what goes where).”*

It was also suggested the case needs to be made about why reducing waste and increasing recycling matters for the environment locally:

*“Need to make it local and about the local environmental issues rather than the global picture as people can't always relate to that.”*

Part of this informing and educating should be targeted at young people, perhaps through schools.

For residents moving into Lewisham from elsewhere, it was said that it was not clear what the waste and recycling service is. A solution to this could be to provide 'landlord leaflets'. The Council could work with housing associations and landlords to provide an information pack when people move house. This information could also be provided with the annual Council Tax bill.

Several people said that recycling could be increased by providing stickers on bins as a reminder. This could also improve quality of the recyclables collected:

*“Some people don't know about cross contamination and washing stuff out and don't realise the whole lot is contaminated.”*

A comment was made that sometimes residents do not seem to be encouraged to recycle. The person who made this point said she lives in a house split into several flats that had been provided with ten general waste bins and only one recycling one. More generally, a comment was made that part of increasing the rate of recycling is ensuring there is enough bin capacity for everyone to be able to do this.

Another main comment, made in response to the question of how the service could be improved, was a suggestion to introduce a food waste collection. It was said that a key benefit of doing this would be a reduction in the amount of residual waste produced.

Reducing the amount of waste placed in residual bins could also be achieved by changing the frequency of its collection:

*“If you collect the residual waste fortnightly it makes you recycle more so you don't fill it up”*

Also making the garden waste service more widely known could help here. There were a number of other comments about the garden waste service, mainly that it should be free. This feeling, that it should be free for all residents who have a garden, was a recurring theme throughout the Forum.

A few other suggestions were made by individuals, these included:

- Provide communal bins along the lines of the underground ones that you get in some other countries, such as Switzerland;
- Provide more local recycling sites so that they are more accessible to residents who don't have access to a car;
- Address the problem of bank holiday collections which can lead to some confusion about collection dates and mean that the 'week' between collections is longer;
- Have very early morning collections so bin lorries aren't clogging up roads during rush hour and the school run; and
- Address the problem of smelly bins, either through more frequent collections or having a bin cleaning service.

### 3.1.4 How important is it to recycle more?

There was widespread agreement about the importance of recycling, mainly because of its environmental benefits. A few people mentioned other benefits including sending less waste to landfill, the financial savings it can offer such as being cheaper than burning waste, and its benefits for public health.

But people do not want the process of recycling to be complicated, the more of a 'hassle factor' there is the less people are likely to recycle. Also, for some people recycling is not the 'norm' it should be. Reflecting on this point, some participants again emphasised the importance of education and information provision:

*"(the Council) can't rely on the assumption that everyone thinks recycling is good. There should be clearer communications coming from the Council saying this is the impact if we do it."*

### 3.1.5 What barriers prevent you from recycling more?

A recurring barrier that people mentioned was hassle, for example, the time people need to spend thinking about what should go where, or the effort required to make sure recyclable materials are clean. They said that if people need to spend too much time recycling they are less likely to do it:

*"If it's an effort people won't do it."*

There was a suggestion that this probably varies depending on the type of family unit – those with young children probably struggle more to recycle:

*"If you don't have the time to do it, you are not going to do it."*

Likewise older and more infirm residents may struggle with using big bins and boxes.

It was suggested that some residents might not recycle because they don't believe that the materials end up being recycled further down the line. There was a suggestion that it is just dumped abroad.

Participants in one small group discussion said if a new recycling service was introduced that involved separating out recycling materials and putting them into different bins, this might be an issue for some people to start with, but they would soon get used to it:

*"After a while it will become automatic."*

Some participants returned to the issue of information and understanding what can be recycled. They claimed there is a lack of information about what goes where and labels on products are misleading.

A few people talked about recycling banks with one commenting that people can be put off from using these if they are overflowing.

There were also a few comments about the collection of garden waste. There were many at the Forum who did not know that there is an existing garden waste service. And of those who did know of the service, some did not know how it works. One person who did know about the service and uses it made this complaint:

*"The leaves from the (Council) trees in the street fall into my garden and I have to gather them up and pay the Council to take them away. Why am I paying the Council to take away from leaves from their trees?"*

### 3.1.6 What would make it easier for you to recycle more?

Again, there were a lot of comments made about information. For example, product labelling could be made clearer and the Council should provide clearer information about how and what to recycle. Some of the information about what can be recycled should be visual as this can be easier to understand and might be more appropriate for those whose first language is not English. Also, information should be put out regularly so people are reminded about what they can recycle. And when people move house, recycling information could be provided in a new home welcome pack.

As mentioned earlier, there were some people who said having separate bins would make it easier for people to recycle:

*"If they are separate it makes it easier for you to know what can be recycled."*

As well as providing information, recycling needs to be made more convenient for people. For example, if there were bins that people can keep inside their house they are more likely to recycle

materials as they will be able to put them in a recycling box the moment they are discarding it, rather than have to go outside to a recycling bin. These would need to be of a suitable size so they do not take up too much room.

Some participants talked about introducing food waste bins, but said there would have to be frequent collections:

*“Food can’t stay outside for 2 weeks. If the Council had food bins and the food was separated, your rubbish wouldn’t smell.”*

But there was not a consensus about having separate recycling bins or boxes, with some participants saying they would not welcome separate collections:

*“I don’t want too complicated a recycling system...I like to throw it all in one recycling bin...I don’t want the front of my house covered in recycling bins.”*

*“It is convenient to dump it all in one place.”*

There was also a fear that residents would have to foot the cost of having any new bins:

*“It needs to be something they can buy at a discount or are provided with to put things in.”*

A final suggestion for making it easier for residents to recycle would be to have an easily accessible community recycling bank which people can use when their own recycling bin is full.

### 3.1.7 What would motivate you to recycle more?

The themes in this discussion broadly mirrored those in the previous section. Once again, people talked about information and education. However, rather than just being instructions about what can be recycled and how to do it, they felt it should also be targeted at changing people’s attitudes to recycling:

*“They (the Council) should provide leaflets every week with information on what to do and why.”*

*“Provide information about the impact of not recycling.”*

Some felt that the medium for providing any information and education should be carefully thought through with different approaches used for different audiences.

Introducing a financial incentive to recycle might also motivate people to do it more:

*“Have a prize for the best recyclers...have a street competition for the best performers?”*

*“How about having a Council Tax reduction?”*

As well as this gentle nudging about why recycling matters and having a financial incentive to recycle, some also suggested a more hardline approach, for example, charging people for producing excess rubbish:

*“Some people create more rubbish and they should pay for the extra.”*

If there was to be a new scheme introduced which meant separating out recycling and putting it into separate bins or boxes this should be made fun, attractive and compact. A stackable system might fit the bill.

## 3.2 Council priorities

In this discussion session participants were asked to discuss what they thought the Council’s priorities should be when it comes to recycling. At the start of the discussion they were asked to identify any priorities they liked, then for the remainder, they were asked to comment on the five possible priorities included in the online consultation survey. Some of the small groups decided to rank these 5 priorities from most important to least important.

### 3.2.1 What should the Council’s priorities be when it comes to recycling?

Asked what they felt the Council’s priorities should be when it comes to recycling the following unprompted suggestions were made (note: these are not in a priority order):

- A system that is easy for residents to use;

- 
- A system that is neat, tidy and safe e.g. it should not be an obstacle for people with visual impairments or wheelchair users;
  - Education and information provision: *"We've got a recycle bin and we're not using it properly"*;
  - Penalties for people who do not recycle;
  - Designing a cost effective system;
  - Health and safety;
  - Introducing a food waste service with weekly or twice weekly collections;
  - Providing a free garden waste collection;
  - Making sure people have enough bins: *"We don't have enough space (in the bins)"*;
  - Meeting the 50% recycling target;
  - Saving money;
  - Tackling fly tipping; and
  - Providing incentives rather than fines.

Two small groups in this discussion decided to rank the five suggested priorities that were included in the online consultation. Another small group split into four smaller groups and ranked the top and bottom priority only. Several individuals also ranked the priorities. The table on the next page shows these rankings.

	Rankings												
	Individual							Group		Top and bottom only			
Saving money	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	4	This follows on from others	5			1
Reducing our impact on the environment	2	4	1	2	5	3	3	2	This follows on from others			1	5
Making it easier for residents to recycle	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Making it easier for the Council to collect good quality recycling material	4	2	3	3	2	2	2	5	2			5	
Meeting recycling targets to avoid fines	3	3	4	4	4	5	4	3	This follows on from others		5		

### 3.2.2 Saving money?

Many participants felt 'saving money' would be an outcome from focusing on some other priorities, particularly 'making it easier for the Council to collect good quality recycling material' and 'making it easier for residents to recycle'. They also said that while this might understandably be a priority from the Council's perspective it was not something residents really think about.

However, some did say there could be some benefits for residents if the Council is able to save money, for example, it might help keep the Council Tax down or it might free up money to spend on other priorities such as services for older people. The flipside also applies - if the Council is unable to save money from its waste and recycling service it might mean cuts need to be made from other services to maintain it. Most participants seemed to reluctantly accept that there is a need to save money.

It was suggested that if saving money meant that the waste and recycling service would need to change, then any changes should be piloted before being rolled out across the borough. It was feared that a service that had been redesigned with saving money as the main driver for the change might, in practice, be a poorer one.

Envisaging what sort of service might result from a need to save money, the general view was that it would mean residents recycling more by separating out their recyclables. This resulted in a discussion about how having more boxes could be made to work with several people suggesting it would need to be a stacking system. Some felt that saving money would also likely entail less frequent collections.

### 3.2.3 Reducing our impact on the environment?

Many people felt this was the main reason why increasing recycling is important, that it is about much more than saving money:

*"One planet...the planet doesn't need us, we need the planet."*

*"We're all in this together."*

While some felt the environmental message focus should be about its global importance, others suggested, as mentioned earlier, that many people would be unable to relate to that, so the focus should be on local benefits instead:

*"The (local) environment has an impact on all of us...gardens, nice streets with no rubbish gives a nice feeling about your area, the city, yourself."*

Some said that, like achieving savings, reducing our impact on the environment would result from having an effective and easy to use service in place so the focus should be on the process needed to achieve the outcomes:

*"If it's easy for the residents and easy for the Council, that will automatically reduce our impact on the environment."*

Again people started talking about what this would mean in terms of the service they received. In practical terms, they said it would mean separating out recycling materials. There would also be a need to introduce a food waste service. Some suggested there should be a free garden waste collection service as well. There was a suggestion that bin sizes could be changed, with greater volume for recyclables and a smaller one for residual waste. However, it was said that this could result in increased fly tipping. Information would need to be provided about any new scheme and an education campaign to target any people who might be stuck in their ways or don't see the importance of recycling more. There was some concern that some older people and those with disabilities might struggle with any service that requires them to do more.

### 3.2.4 Making it easier for residents to recycle?

Many said this should be the most important priority for the Council as recycling levels won't improve unless residents are motivated and able to play their role well. They felt it would mean a service with separate collection bins. But any new system introduced would need to be simple and obvious if residents are to recycle accurately. There was no clear resolution about what a simple scheme, one that was based on having separate collections for recyclables, would look like.

Again, it was said repeatedly that information and education was key to making this happen. The animation film shown at the Forum was felt to be a good way of getting the message across to some

audiences. Many other comments about providing information have been mentioned earlier in this report, for example, putting stickers on bins and using images rather than just words to indicate what can go in each bin:

*“Be clear what the expectation is of residents when it comes to using each bin.”*

One new comment was the communication should be positive in its tone; using words like ‘compliance’ might be counterproductive.

### 3.2.5 Making it easier for the Council to collect good quality recycling material?

Many did feel this was an important priority, if not quite the most important one. It was felt that in the longer term, it might help the Council to make money and close the required savings gap. Focusing on the need for recyclables to be clean and for there to be no contamination, means separate collections would be required and residents would need to be mindful about ensuring they are accurate about what goes in each bin/box.

Focusing on what would be needed to collect good quality paper that could be sold for a good price, some participants suggested it would require providing boxes that would not let rain in.

Unsurprisingly, participants said information a key part of any separate collection being successful. They said this could also be supported by having incentives in place to encourage people.

### 3.2.6 Meeting recycling targets to avoid fines?

Most participants struggled to think of much to say about this priority. This was partly because it was harder for them to relate back to how it might affect them personally, although a few posited that it could lead to an increase their Council Tax bill. There were a few suggestions that if the Council is to avoid fines, maybe it should have a fines system in place for residents:

*“Some people need to feel a pinch somewhere to take notice.”*

However, most participants were opposed to the idea of fines feeling it would not be effective, not least because it would be hard to police and enforce.

In terms of what it might mean for the waste and recycling service for residents, it was felt it might mean increasing the recycling volume and reducing the volume for residual material. To help residents with this there would probably need to be a waste food collection scheme introduced, and possibly a free garden waste one (earlier in this report it was mentioned that some residents currently put garden waste into their residual waste bin).

## 3.3 Separate collections

People were asked to briefly discuss what they thought about the idea of having to separate paper out from other recyclables and whether it would be acceptable for the Council to make an income from this.

### 3.3.1 How would separating paper from other recycling affect residents?

Most participants were quite comfortable with the idea of having to separate paper out from other recyclable material.

It would be helpful if there could be an internal bin for paper. If the Council wants people to recycle more and to do it well, they need to capture them in the moment i.e. immediately when they have finished with an item.

Space would be an issue for some residents. Most people felt that having a bin insert for paper would probably be the best means to tackle this. Another suggestion was to have an incentive scheme where neighbours with more room could offer to have bins for other people as well as have their own.

If there was a separate box rather than an insert, it would need to be watertight so the paper stayed dry, otherwise the box might become too heavy and unmanageable for some residents and the quality of the material collected would be poorer.



### 3.3.2 Should the Council collect paper separately to generate an income?

Yes, it is common sense to do this if it is relatively easy to do. There was very little opposition to the Council seeking to collect good quality paper and generate an income so long as there are benefits for residents from any profit made, for example, it being used to protect services.

### 3.3.3 Would you be prepared to have a separate paper 'insert'?

Most people felt this made good sense, so there was very little opposition to the idea so long as any insert is easily manageable and not too large.

To make sure that people actually used the paper insert it was suggested that the Council would need to communicate clearly why this was being done and what the benefits of it would be for residents.

### 3.3.4 Should properties with small front gardens be exempt?

Many participants were adamant that there should not be any exemptions for any scheme that involved people having additional bins or boxes:

*"You are giving people an excuse."*

There were repeated mentions across several of the small group discussions that a stacking system for separate collections might make sense where space is at a premium.

There might also need to be some flexibility built into any separate collections system, for example, larger families could request larger bins.

## 3.4 Food waste service

In this part of the Forum participants were asked to discuss how they would feel if a weekly food waste collection service was introduced and whether there should be any exemptions for those who live in properties with small front gardens.

### 3.4.1 Should the council introduce a weekly food waste collection?

There was widespread support in all of the small group discussions for the idea of introducing a food waste collection:

*"This would be a really good thing, why haven't we done it before?"*

*"It's a good idea without a doubt."*

They agreed that it would have to be a weekly collection.

Many participants recognised that there is a pressing need to stop this waste going into the general waste bin and this type of collection could have a big impact. To help make sure that people did actively separate out their food, most felt that waste plastic bags for the internal caddy would need to be free.

There was a suggestion that, as well as introducing a weekly food waste collection, there should also be an education campaign at the same time asking people to think about the amount of food they waste and to decrease it. Some thought that once people see how much they put in the food waste boxes and bins, they might be quite shocked and change their buying habits.

### 3.4.2 What challenges for residents would this present?

The main theme here was about the need to minimise the smell by making sure the food waste is collected at least once per week. There was a suggestion during the warmer summer months it should be collected twice per week. It was also suggested that people should be able to ring the Council and ask for an extra collection, for example, if they have just had a party. There might also be a need for an extra collection over Christmas. Also, bigger families might need more than one kitchen caddy. Again people raised the need for free bin liners. If free bin liners were not provided for the outside bins, would the Council introduce a free bin cleaning service?

For the external food waste bin, the lid of the bin would need to have a secure lid to prevent vermin from scattering the food waste around. There were queries about whether the Council would provide free bin liners for these external bins.

Also, quite a few had worries about having a kitchen caddy: they thought it might get dirty and smelly. And there were a small number of comments about whether a kitchen caddy would take up too much space, but people were generally reassured once they saw the size of one:

*“Now we’ve seen the size of them, they wouldn’t take up much space.”*

*“It looks like it would work.”*

They also said, that to ensure that the right things go into the bin, there would need to be very clear communication to residents about the new service using visual images of what should and shouldn’t go into the food waste bins.

### 3.4.3 Should properties with small front gardens be exempt?

As with any other changes to the waste and recycling service that might be introduced, most participants felt that there should not be any exemptions. The comment below was quite typical of how people felt:

*“No. The bin could be in the street or in the house. There is no reason everyone shouldn’t have the same system or use it in the same way.”*

There was a suggestion that properties with minimal front garden space could have communal containers, although it wasn’t specified where these would be.

Several people said landlords should have a responsibility to make sure that their properties have sufficient room for food waste boxes and bins.

## 3.5 Garden waste service

In this session participants were asked for their views about a garden waste service and if it was a subscription one what the annual charge should be. They were also asked whether they would be likely to sign-up for it and if it would present any challenges for residents that the Council would need to think about.

### 3.5.1 Views about a garden waste service

Many participants felt that any garden waste service should be freely available to all residents:

*“We should have a free collection...or at least a series of locally accessible drop-off sites.”*

Only a few said it is different to other waste and recycling collections and should therefore be treated as such, namely people should have to pay to receive it:

*“Food waste is produced by everyone so collecting that should be free, but not everyone has a garden and producing waste is a choice therefore people should pay.”*

Most people did not seem to know about the current collect on request service with a charge per bag.

A few people suggested that the Council should provide a compost bin for residents. A garden waste collection service could then be an optional extra that could be charged for. Those who commented on how garden waste should be collected said it should be in a wheeled bin, rather than sacks.

### 3.5.2 Views on an annual subscription and what level it should be

Most people did not feel this should be an annual subscription service. If people were to be required to pay to have their garden waste collected, they preferred the idea of a pay as you go service. Most of those who were in favour of this type of service said residents should be charged by the bag (maybe charged at £2 per bag), although a few suggested it should be done by weight. Another suggestion was that there should be some type of means testing, for example, if people own their property they should pay up to £80.

When asked what the annual fee should be for any garden waste service, there was strong opposition to the suggested options of £80, £100 or £120. It was felt that these were far too high, with one person saying:

*“It should be somewhere between £0 and £25 or we just stick it in the rubbish bin!”*

In another small group discussion it was suggested that the fee should be between £15 and £50. Another one suggested between £10 and £30 per year. Some wondered whether the idea of making

an annual subscription service was the wrong idea and whether it should be a seasonal service instead with a requisite decrease in the subscription charge.

### 3.5.3 Would people sign-up for an annual subscription service?

Most people with gardens said they would not sign for an annual subscription service and that they preferred an on-request service. Some felt that the sign-up rate might be too low to make this a cost effective service.

Another suggestion was that, instead of providing a collection from home service, maybe there could be communal skips at the end of streets or in public parks. These could be free and available for 6 months or so each year. These would need to be well advertised locally.

### 3.5.4 What challenges for residents would this service present?

Some people mentioned that if wheeled bins were introduced this could cause some storage problems particularly if other boxes and bins are also going to be introduced for some other recyclables. They also wondered whether older people and residents with health problems would be able to manage wheeled bins or sacks containing what might be quite heavy waste.

## 3.6 Designing a new waste and recycling service

In the final part of the Forum participants were asked to work in small groups to design a waste and recycling service they felt would be of benefit to the borough as a whole. They were provided with some guidance rules and assumptions to help them with their thinking and discussions:

- The service must change from the current service;
- A garden waste subscription service must be included;
- They must consider the pros and cons of weekly, fortnightly, or other options; and
- They must make the service as efficient as possible for all households that have wheeled bins across the borough, remembering the different housing types that exist.

The following table presents a summary of each of the eleven services the Forum designed.

Group	Summary of service
1	<p>Main suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A weekly food waste service – this would include a kitchen caddy</li> <li>• Recycling separated out into different colour coded containers – all collected weekly</li> <li>• Monthly garden waste service</li> <li>• No exemptions from service, recommended stacking box system for those with limited space</li> </ul>
2	<p>Main suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A weekly food waste service</li> <li>• Recycling collected fortnightly, paper to be separated out into a bin 'insert'</li> <li>• Pictures to show what goes into each bin</li> <li>• No exemptions from service</li> </ul>
3	<p>Main suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A weekly food waste service</li> <li>• Paper collected weekly</li> <li>• Glass and plastic collected fortnightly. They would each have their own container</li> <li>• Refuse collected once per month</li> <li>• No exemptions but recommended some sharing of containers where space is an issue</li> </ul>
4	<p>Main suggestions:</p>

Group	Summary of service
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A weekly food waste collection service – indoor caddy, external bin and free bags</li> <li>• Fortnightly refuse collection – larger families could have a larger volume bin</li> <li>• Pay as you go garden waste service</li> <li>• Paper to be collected separately fortnightly</li> <li>• Uncertainty about whether rest of recycling should be weekly or fortnightly - it partly depends on whether the truck collecting food waste weekly could also collect something else</li> <li>• No comment made on exemptions</li> </ul>
5	<p>Main suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food waste and other recyclables to be collected 3 times per month. Food waste would be separated out</li> <li>• Local collection sites for any extra or missed collections</li> <li>• No exemptions, use of stackable boxes</li> </ul>
6	<p>Main suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food waste collected weekly</li> <li>• Other recyclable materials collected fortnightly, paper to have an insert in main bin</li> <li>• Residual waste collected fortnightly</li> <li>• Quarterly garden waste with one-off bin payment of £30 to £50</li> <li>• Unclear if there would be any exemptions</li> </ul>
7	<p>Main suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food waste collected weekly</li> <li>• Recycling and residual waste collected fortnightly</li> <li>• Garden waste to be collected on demand – phone service</li> <li>• No exemptions, but variable bins and boxes for different sized properties</li> </ul>
8	<p>Main suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food waste collected at least once per week</li> <li>• Residual waste collected fortnightly</li> <li>• Recycling collected weekly</li> <li>• Garden waste to be a 6 month service with collections every 2 months</li> <li>• No exemptions, but variable bins and boxes for different sized properties</li> </ul>
9	<p>Main suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food waste collection – this would be an insert into the black residual bin</li> <li>• Residual waste collected fortnightly</li> <li>• Recycling collected weekly</li> <li>• Garden waste to be a 6 month service with collections every 2 months</li> <li>• No comment regarding exemptions</li> </ul>
10	<p>Main suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food waste to be collected weekly</li> <li>• Residual waste to be collected weekly</li> <li>• Paper, plastic, glass to be collected weekly</li> <li>• Garden waste to be collected free on request</li> <li>• No exemptions</li> </ul>

Group	Summary of service
11	<p>Main suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food waste to be collected weekly</li> <li>• Residual waste to be collected weekly</li> <li>• Glass and plastic to be collected fortnightly</li> <li>• Paper and card to be collected fortnightly</li> <li>• Garden waste to be collected free on request</li> <li>• No exemptions</li> </ul>

The groups developed a range of different service configurations but some of the common themes emerging from the process include:

1. Separate food waste collections, collected weekly. Two methods suggested:
  - a. indoor caddy, external bin and free bags
  - b. insert into the black residual bin
2. Separate collections for recyclables (and separate collection of paper in particular)
  - a. Groups were evenly split over collection frequency (weekly or fortnightly)
3. A separate garden waste collection service
  - a. Groups were very divergent in their views on how it should be operated (free, annual subscription, pay as you go, collection frequencies etc.)
4. Residual waste, collected fortnightly (although one group suggested monthly!)
5. No exemptions based on property size/frontage
  - a. Different systems were suggested for properties with space/storage issues including stackable boxes and smaller containers.

## 4 Participant survey

Participants in the Citizen Forum were asked three questions at the start of the day and then the same three at the end. The purpose of this was to see if views changed as they learned more about the issues. The questions asked were:

- *How important is recycling to you?*
- *How important is it that the Council recycles more?*
- *Do you think the Council should change its refuse and recycling service?*

### 4.1 How important is recycling to you?

The first question they were asked was: *'How important is recycling to you?'* The table below presents the results:

	Start of the Forum	End of Forum
Very important	29	28
Fairly important	19	8
Neither important or unimportant	1	1
Fairly unimportant	1	0
Not at all important	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>37</b>

At first glance this does not look encouraging as those who thought that recycling is 'very' or 'fairly' important fell from 48 at the start of the Forum to 37 at the end. However, a closer look reveals a different picture: at the start of the Forum 50 participants provided a response to this question, but there were only 37 at the end of the day. Looking at each individual response sheet we know the following:

- Nobody said recycling was *'not at all important'* either at the start or end of the Forum.
- One person said it was *'fairly unimportant'* at the start but at the end said it was *'neither important or unimportant'*.
- One person said it was *'neither important or unimportant'* at the start, but they changed their view to *'very important'* by the end.
- Nineteen people said it was *'fairly important'* at the start, but this dropped to 8 by the end, a difference of 11. But from the individual sheets we know that by the end 10 of those had changed their mind had changed it to *'very important'*. The other person did not complete a response at the end, but made the comment *"I am more knowledgeable of the problem"*. Eight who said *'fairly important'* at the start had not changed their view by the end of the Forum.
- Twenty-nine said it was *'very important'* at the start and 28 said it was *'very important'* at the end. But we know from the comments above that at the end of the Forum, 11 people moved from saying it was *'neither important or unimportant'* or *'fairly important'* to saying it was *'very important'*. Seventeen of those who said *'very important'* at the start had not changed their view by the end. The individual sheets show that there were 11 people who said it was *'very important'* at the start did not complete a response to this question at the end of the Forum. This explains why the end of Forum figure is 28 and not 39.
- Therefore by the end of the Forum 12 had decided that recycling was more important than they had originally thought, while 25 had not changed their view.

## 4.2 How important is it that the Council recycles more?

The second question asked was: *'How important is it that the Council recycles more?'*

	Start of the Forum	End of Forum
Very important	31	33
Fairly important	13	5
Neither important or unimportant	4	1
Fairly unimportant	1	0
Not at all important	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>39</b>

As with the previous question the results need to be looked at carefully to understand what really happened to people's views between the start and the end of the Forum. At the start 49 people provided a response to the question, but this fell to 39 at the end. Looking at the individual surveys this is what we can conclude:

- Nobody said the Council recycling more was *'not at all important'* and start of the Forum or at the end of it.
- One person at the start said it was *'fairly unimportant'* but by the end they said it was *'neither important or unimportant'*.
- At the start, 4 participants said it was *'neither important or unimportant'* but all 4 changed their views by the end, with all saying it was *'very important'*.
- Thirteen people said it was *'fairly important'* at the start but this fell to 5 people at the end. From the individual sheets we know that 7 changed their view to *'very important'*. Four did not change their view and the other 2 did not complete a response at the end of the Forum. However, 1 person did move from saying it was *'very important'* to *'fairly important'*.

- By the end of the Forum, the number saying it is *'very important'* that Council recycles more rose from 31 to 33. From the individual sheets we know that 22 of these were the same people. Of the other 11, as the previous bullet points indicates, all of these were people who at the start had said it was *'neither important or unimportant'* or *'fairly important'*. But that still leaves the 9 who said it was *'very important'* at the start: Eight did not complete a response at the end and (as previously mentioned) 1 moved from *'very important'* to *'fairly important'*.
- This means that 12 people had decided by the end of the Forum that it was more important that the Council recycles more than they had initially thought. A further 26 had not changed their views by the end of the day.

### 4.3 Do you think the Council should change its refuse and recycling service?

The third question the survey asked was *'Do you think the Council should change its refuse and recycling service?'*

	Start of the Forum	End of Forum
Strongly agree	12	22
Agree	23	11
Neither agree or disagree	9	3
Disagree	3	2
Strongly disagree	1	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>38</b>

As with the previous 2 questions it is necessary to look at the individual survey responses to fully understand what is happening in the table above:

- The person who said *'strongly disagree'* at the start did not respond at the end. For this reason we have decided that it would be misleading to say nobody thought this at the end, so we have not put a '0' in the box.
- Two of the 3 people who indicated *'disagree'* at the start did not change their views at the end. The other changed to *'agree'*.
- Nine said *'neither agree or disagree'* at the start but this dropped to 3 by the end of the Forum. All of these 3 did not change their opinion over the course of the day. Of the other 6, 4 of them changed their view to *'strongly agree'* and 2 to *'agree'*.
- At the start of the Forum 23 said that they *'agree'* that the Council should change the refuse and recycling service, but this fell to 11 at the end. Of those 11, as indicated above, 2 had moved from *'neither agree or disagree'* and 1 from *'disagree'*. That means 8 were people who had not changed their mind. Of the 15 (of the original 23) that were left, 5 did not complete a response at the end and the remaining 10 changed their view to *'strongly agree'*.
- By the end of the Forum those who said *'strongly agree'* had risen from 12 to 22. Of these 22, 8 were people who had not changed their views during the day. As the previous bullet points indicate, 10 of these were people who started the Forum by saying *'agree'* and 4 had said *'neither agree or disagree'*. The missing 4, who had said *'strongly agree'* at the start, did not complete a response at the end.
- Therefore, by the end of the Forum, 17 participants felt that there was a stronger case for the Council changing its refuse and recycling service than at the start. Twenty-one had not changed their mind, and nobody felt there was less of a case for changing the service.

## 5 Conclusions

Participants in the Forum were broadly satisfied with the current waste and recycling service. They like its simplicity – 2 bins, each collected weekly. However, once they had discussed the importance of recycling they were increasingly open to thinking about changes to it. There was a strong view that increasing and improving recycling should be a priority for the Council and if it is to happen successfully residents need to be able to play their part easily and effectively. If separate collections are introduced it needs to be made clear to residents what goes where – the less ‘hassle’ there is for residents doing what is required of them (a major barrier) the more likely a new service will succeed.

Participants were also open to exploring whether there should be different collection frequencies for different types of waste. Some made a clear connection between changing a collection frequency and changing residents’ behaviour, for example, if general waste is collected less often then people will look at other options for some of the material they usually put in their general waste bin.

There was widespread support for the idea of introducing a food waste service, providing it is collected weekly. People recognised that having this type of service would be an essential part of reducing the amount going into their general waste bin. Some reassurance would be needed, for example, that caddies would not take up too much room and that plastic bags would be provided for free.

Introducing an annual subscription based garden waste service would be controversial, particularly if the charge is pegged between £80 and £120. If the Forum accurately reflects the views more widely held in Lewisham, then it seems unlikely that there would be a sufficient sign-up for this service to make it economically viable. Many felt this should be a free service. People also questioned whether a subscription service, with designated collection dates, would be the right design. The idea of an ‘on request’ service seemed to be more popular, but not many people knew this is the current offer (or that there is a garden collection service at all).

If changes are made, there were quite strongly held views among many participants that there should not be any exemptions to these changes. There might need to be creative solutions for those living in properties with minimal external space for bins, and that for example, affected properties could be supplied with stackable boxes. Also there might need to be some flexibility for bigger families, for example, bigger or additional bins. But the bottom line was that any changes should apply to all households.

As the Forum progressed it was clear that participants who were already quite keen that the current service is changed, became more certain about the need for this. As they learned more about the pressures the service faces and how it currently performs (for example, the relatively small amount that is currently recycled) they became stronger in their views that changes are made to how waste and recycling materials are collected and how frequently this happens.

When asked to design their own service, participants came up with a range of different service configurations but some of the common themes emerged including:

6. Separate food waste collections, collected weekly. Two methods suggested:
  - a. indoor caddy, external bin and free bags
  - b. insert into the black residual bin
7. Separate collections for recyclables (and separate collection of paper in particular)
  - a. Groups were evenly split over collection frequency (weekly or fortnightly)
8. A separate garden waste collection service
  - a. Groups were very divergent in their views on how it should be operated (free, annual subscription, pay as you go, collection frequencies etc.)
9. Residual waste, collected fortnightly (although one group suggested monthly!)
10. No exemptions based on property size/frontage
  - a. Different systems were suggested for properties with space/storage issues including stackable boxes and smaller containers.



## Appendices

Appendix 1: Summary process plan

Appendix 2: Design a new service game

Appendix 3: Before and after Forum survey

## Appendix 1 – Summary process plan



### Lewisham Citizen Forum – agenda Saturday 19<sup>th</sup> September

Time	Session
10.00 – 10.15	<b>Welcome and introductions</b>
10.15 – 10.45	<b>Small group discussion 1:</b> waste and recycling now
10.45 – 11.00	<b>Plenary feedback 1</b>
11.00 – 11.20	<b>Scene setter presentation:</b> why do things need to change?
11.20 – 11.30	<b>Question and answer session</b>
11.30 – 11.45	<b>Coffee break</b>
11.45 – 12.30	<b>Small group discussion 2:</b> recycling priorities & separate collections
12.30 – 12.45	<b>Plenary feedback 2</b>
12.45 – 13.30	<b>Lunch</b>
13.30 – 14.00	<b>Small group discussion 3:</b> food and garden waste
14.00 – 14.15	<b>Plenary feedback 3</b>
14.15 – 15.15	<b>Game:</b> design your own collection service
15.15 – 15.35	<b>Plenary feedback 4</b>
15.35 – 15.40	<b>Next steps</b>
15.40 – 15.45	<b>Complete evaluation forms</b>

## Appendix 2 – Design a new service game



### Lewisham Citizen Forum

## A Game of Bins

Please design a waste and recycling service that you feel would be of benefit to the borough as a whole. Please remember, the service we are designing is for residents with wheeled bins only (i.e. estate properties or flats above shops who share communal bins are not included in this service design).

### Game Rules and Assumptions:

1. The service must change from the current service.
2. A garden waste subscription service will be offered.
3. You must consider the pros and cons of weekly, fortnightly, or other options, and be able to justify your choices.
4. You must make the service as efficient as possible for all households that have wheeled bins across the borough, remembering all the housing types.

List of housing types:

No frontage	Minimal Frontage	Medium Frontage
Large frontage	Properties with steps up / down	Shared occupancy

### How to play:

In your 'Borough' you will develop the system you feel best meets the needs of the Borough by selecting the material streams collected, frequency of collection and type of container etc. At the end of the game you need to present your solution to everyone (see the Playsheet).

### Your presentation needs to:

1. Explain the collection system and why your waste collection strategy is the best option for the Borough

2. Tell us why you have chosen each bin system and its collection frequency (for example: We chose to have fortnightly refuse collections because... and then we chose to have weekly recycling collections because...etc.).
3. Show how this service can be applied Borough wide (to those with wheeled bins)?

In your presentation you will also need to justify (by scoring) whether your service meets a number of criteria.

Scoring system:

3	Fully meets criteria	2	Partly meets criteria	1	Does not meet criteria
---	----------------------	---	-----------------------	---	------------------------

The maximum score is 15 points. Your service must score at least 8 points and ideally over 10 (see scoring sheet and the example Playsheet).

Criteria	Score each out of 3
Helps Council to meet targets	
Helps to solve the budget gap	
Helps the environment	
Easy for the Council to deliver	
Easy for people to use	

**Things to take into account might include:**

- Houses have a wide variety of frontages and storage areas, ranging from very large to minimal to having a flight of steps
- Collection frequency (fortnightly, weekly or other)
- How many material streams are collected (for example, does it include a food-waste service?)
- Will your service comply with legislation? (The cost of not complying may be less than having a service where you need to separate out recycling)
- Does your service consider impact on the budget and the environment?
- Does your service consider residents and how they will cope with it?

**Other points to consider**

The following is not an exhaustive list of pros and cons, but the examples below might help you to think of more reasons why or why not to put an idea into place.

Drivers	Pros	Cons
Legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping some of our recycling separate would mean cleaner, better quality recycling. The Council could recycle more of it and (potentially) recoup some</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all of the recycling would be separate so therefore may be seen as not complying with the legislation.</li> </ul>

	costs from the sale of the materials.	
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We could change how often our rubbish and recycling get collected. Less frequent collections save money.</li> <li>Less frequent refuse collections might make people recycle more so there's space in their bins for the things they still have to throw away.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With fortnightly refuse collections, if people don't use all the services properly there might be a greater risk of contamination in recycling bins. This is because if refuse bins are full people might use their recycling bins for their excess waste (it has to go somewhere!).</li> <li>To add new services (like food waste), unless we alter the frequency of collections elsewhere, the running of this extra service could cost more.</li> </ul>
Ease of delivery & use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewer changes would help ensure a smooth continuation of service delivery and use.</li> <li>We could have a new, more user friendly garden waste service to collect grass clippings, hedge trimmings, and twigs for composting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents would need to subscribe and pay an annual charge for the garden waste service.</li> <li>To make sure food waste didn't get smelly, we would need to collect it regularly (every week).</li> <li>Residents would need to separate out paper and card, potentially into an extra box or 'insert' (mini container) in the bin.</li> </ul>
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We could have a collection for our food scraps. They would be turned into useful gas and fertiliser. This would cut down what goes into our black bins. At the moment 38% of the rubbish in our black bins is food waste.</li> <li>By introducing more recycling collections, the recycling rate and our environmental performance would improve.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With little or no changes to services we would risk having a low or no increase in recycling rates.</li> </ul>

## A Game of Bins Playsheet

**Your Presentation:**

**What is the collection system?**

*It has four weekly refuse collection with weekly multi-material recycling collections (all in separate containers), including food waste and free garden waste collections for all properties.*

**How does it work?**

Black bin for refuse – collected once every 4 weeks  
 Box for glass - weekly  
 Box for paper and card - weekly  
 Box for cans and plastic - weekly  
 Caddy for food waste - weekly  
 Wheeled bin for garden waste (subscription) - weekly

This is an example of a very complicated service.  
  
It does not meet the game criteria - it only scores 8 points.

**How will it be applied to different housing types?**

No frontage	They can stack the boxes on top of each other to reduce space
Minimal Frontage	Boxes can be stacked
Medium Frontage	Boxes can be stacked
Large frontage	Storage is not a problem
Shared occupancy	Use wheeled bins instead of boxes for shared houses
Properties with steps up / down	Boxes are easier of move than wheeled bins

**Why is this waste collection strategy the best option for the Borough?**

*It maximises recycling and makes throwing things away very inconvenient due to the time between collections.*

**Does it meet the game criteria?**

The maximum score is 15 points. Your service must score at least 9 points and ideally over 10.

Scoring system:	3	Fully meets criteria	2	Partly meets criteria	1	Does not meet criteria
-----------------	---	----------------------	---	-----------------------	---	------------------------

Criteria	Score (1 - 3)
Helps Council to meet targets	3
Helps to solve the budget gap	1
Helps the environment	2
Easy for the Council to deliver	1
Easy for people to use	1
<b>Total score</b>	<b>8</b>
Can it be applied Borough wide (to those with wheeled bins)?	<del>Yes</del> /No
Is it likely to make contamination better (reduce it) or worse (increase it)?	<del>Better</del> /Worse

# A Game of Bins Playsheet

## Your Presentation:

What is the collection system?

--

How does it work?

--

How will it be applied to different housing types?

No frontage	
Minimal Frontage	
Medium Frontage	
Large frontage	
Shared occupancy	
Properties with steps up / down	

Why is this waste collection strategy the best option for the Borough?

--

Does it meet the game criteria?

The maximum score is 15 points. Your service must score at least 8 points and ideally over 10.

Scoring system:

3	Fully meets criteria	2	Partly meets criteria	1	Does not meet criteria
<b>Criteria</b>					<b>Score (1 - 3)</b>
Helps Council to meet targets					

---

Helps to solve the budget gap	
Helps the environment	
Easy for the Council to deliver	
Easy for people to use	
<b>Total score</b>	
Can it be applied Borough wide (to those with wheeled bins)?	Yes/No
Is it likely to make contamination better (reduce it) or worse (increase it)?	Better/Worse



## Appendix 3 – Before and after Forum survey



### 1. How important is recycling to you?

	Start of Forum	End of forum	If your views changed please briefly explain why
Very important			
Fairly important			
Neither important or unimportant			
Fairly unimportant			
Not at all important			

### 2. How important is it that the Council recycles more?

	Start of Forum	End of forum	If your views changed please briefly explain why
Very important			
Fairly important			
Neither important or unimportant			
Fairly unimportant			
Not at all important			

## 3. Do you think the council should change its refuse &amp; recycling services?

	Start of Forum	End of forum	If your views changed please briefly explain why
Strongly agree			
Agree			
Neither agree or disagree			
Disagree			
Strongly disagree			



Ricardo  
Energy & Environment

The Gemini Building  
Fermi Avenue  
Harwell  
Didcot  
Oxfordshire  
OX11 0QR  
United Kingdom

t: +44 (0)1235 753000  
e: [enquiry@ricardo.com](mailto:enquiry@ricardo.com)

[ee.ricardo.com](http://ee.ricardo.com)