

Subject:	Refuse	Changes		Status:	For Pul	blication	
Report to:	Full Cou	ıncil		Date:	28 <sup>th</sup> Se	ptember 2011	
Report of:	Directo	Director of Customers and		Portfolio Holder:	Environment		
	Commu	ınities					
<b>Key Decision:</b>		Forward F	Plan 🛚	General Exception		Special Urge	ncy 🗌
Community Imp	oact Ass	essment:	Required:	Yes	Attache	ed:	Yes
<b>Biodiversity Im</b>	pact Ass	sessment	Required:	No	Attache	ed:	No
Contact Officer	Fiona Meechan		Telephone:	01706	252491		
Email:	fiona	meechan@	Prossendale	ebc.gov.uk			

1.	RECOMMENDATION(S)					
1.1	For those farm, rural and other harder to reach properties which have had changes introduced as a result of the policy decision made in February 2011:					
	a. The point of collection prior to the policy decision in February 2011 to be re-introduced; and					
	<b>b.</b> Alternate weekly refuse/recycling collections to continue.					
1.2	For those farm, rural and other harder to reach properties which, due to extended consultation, have not yet had changes introduced as a result of the policy decision made in February 2011:					
	a. The point of collection prior to the policy decision in February 2011 to be maintained; and					
	<b>b.</b> Alternate weekly refuse/recycling collections to be introduced.					
1.3	The additional cost associated with refuse collection for 2011-12 be funded from other budget savings as identified in the Council's monthly Financial Monitoring reports.					

## 2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

2.1 This report sets out the background to proposed changes to refuse collections from farm, rural and other harder to reach properties, consultation and implementation to date, and responses received from the extended consultation process. It sets out the recommendations as a result of this extensive consultation.

### 3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 3.1 The matters discussed in this report impact directly on the following corporate priorities:
  - A clean and green Rossendale creating a better environment for all.
  - Responsive and value for money local services responding to and meeting the different needs of customers and improving the cost effectiveness of services.

### 4. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 All the issues raised and the recommendation(s) in this report involve risk considerations as set out below:

The need to ensure a balanced budget and the continued efforts to identify further budget reductions in the region of £1m will continue to present a challenge to the Council. The additional costs identified in this report will be added to the savings challenge.

Version Number:	1	Page:	1 of 4
-----------------	---	-------	--------

### 5. BACKGROUND AND OPTIONS

- As part of the 2011/12 budget, The Council made the decision to change to an end of lane or roadside collection for a number of properties within the Borough which were receiving doorstep collections, and confirmed that the implementation of this decision was to be complemented by detailed engagement and consultation with affected residents.
- During the consultation, which commenced in May 2011 and concluded in September 2011, the feedback from residents has been mixed, with many understanding the context of the changes in terms of budget reductions, some being willing to move to collection points, some expressing concern as to how it may affect them individually and with a number of residents expressing concern that they would have wished to have been consulted personally prior to the decision. It is acknowledged that extensive consultation has been carried out as part of the implementation phase, as requested at the time of the decision.
- 5.3 As a result of this consultation, structural improvements to some roads and bridges, and other work, we have been able to re-profile the work of some of our operational staff to allow us to continue to offer a doorstep collection service to a number of the properties which were originally affected.
- Having now analysed the feedback from Councillors and directly affected local residents, the recommendation is that the original doorstep collection points should be maintained for those properties which were still being asked to present their waste and recycling at other collection points, and that a recycling collection service should be offered to all those residents affected by the policy decision in February 2011.
- Those residents who started presenting their waste and recycling at other collection points in August 2011 and those residents who are receiving doorstep collections as a result of assisted collections in their area, should revert to having their own doorstep collection.
- 5.6 It is further noted that the affected properties will be offered wheelie bin and recycling sack collections rather than disposable bin bag collections, to facilitate the collections and to remove the ongoing cost of providing disposable bin bags.
- 5.7 This service will be delivered mainly by the Operations Team using a 7.5 tonne refuse collection vehicle (RCV) with a bin lift, but some of the most hard to reach properties will be serviced by one of the Street Cleansing cage trucks as they cannot be accessed by the 7.5 tonne RCV. These properties will need to retain bag collections.
- 5.8 The cost of delivering this service for those residents affected is contained in the Section 151 Officer comments below.

### **COMMENTS FROM STATUTORY OFFICERS:**

## 6. SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 6.1 Initial proposed Council budget savings of £76k in 2011-12 and £88k in subsequent years (comprising of service savings and additional income) were set out in the January 2011 Cabinet Report. The Council's budget for 2011-12 and subsequent years was set in February 2011 and reflected the removal of these amounts from the Council's revenue budget.
- 6.2 Assuming that all of the affected properties still move on to an alternate weekly refuse/recycling cycle, the additional cost of re-introducing a doorstep collection for these remaining properties, and the added pressure on the Council's revenue budget, is therefore

Version Number:	1	Page:	2 of 4

- £38k in 2011-12 and £51k in 2012-13 albeit the adverse budget variance for 2011-12 has been offset by other Council favorable budget variances.
- 6.3 The ongoing revenue costs will be an additional financial pressure at a time when the Council seeks to identify £1m of revenue savings over the medium term.

### 7. MONITORING OFFICER

7.1 Comments included within the report.

# 8. HEAD OF PEOPLE AND POLICY (ON BEHALF OF THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE)

8.1 The proposed changes will have an impact on posts, it is proposed to disestablish two posts of non LGV driver/puller loader 37 hpw grade 3 and establish one post of LGV multi-skilled driver/puller hpw grade 4 plus agency cover. The Council's workforce agreements will apply.

# 9. CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT

- Information about, and data from, the consultation which was carried out with the public and elected members during the May-September period, has been integrated into the community impact assessment which has been further updated in September 2011. In addition, initial proposals were developed in consultation with the then Lead Member for the Environment.
- 9.2 Staff have been consulted with regards to the practical implementation of the proposals.
- 9.3 As part of the Council's Business Plan, we are aiming to review and improve all refuse and recycling policies and processes with a view to increasing recycling, improving customer satisfaction and providing value for money. As a result of the consultation process, a number of residents have indicated that they would like to be involved in informing this project going forward. A representative reference group will be established over the coming months.

## 10. CONCLUSION

- 10.1 Following extensive consultation with those residents affected by the policy decision in February 2011, it is clear that, whilst some residents understood the context of the decision and were willing to work with the changes, other residents were not happy with the changes to their bin collection service which would mean that they present their waste at a collection point. Furthermore, a number of residents have said they would like a recycling service.
- 10.2 Following the Council decision it is proposed to write to all affected properties to clarify what will happen next. Any changes to current practices as a result of the decision would be implemented from the week beginning 18 October 2011.

Version Number:	1	Page:	3 of 4
		- 0 -	

Backgr	ound Papers
Document	Place of Inspection
Cabinet - Wednesday 17 November 2010:  Item G4. Waste Collection and Recycling Report.  Minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2010.	www.rossendale.gov.uk
Cabinet - Wednesday 26 January 2011:  Item C1. Medium Term Financial Strategy Update – Appendix 1 and Community Impact Assessment  Minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2011.	www.rossendale.gov.uk
Cabinet - Thursday 17 February 2011:  Item C1. Revenue Budget, Council Tax and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011/12  Minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2011.	www.rossendale.gov.uk
Council - Wednesday 23 February 2011:  E1. Revenue Budget and Council Tax Setting  Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2011.	www.rossendale.gov.uk

Version Number:	1	Page:	4 of 4

# **Community Impact Assessment Form**

Name of Strategy/Policy:	Review of Refuse and Recycling Collections in relation		
	to Farm and Rural Properties.		
Officer Name(s):	Fiona Meechan		
Job Title & Location:	Director of Customers and	d Communities, Futures Park,	
	Bacup		
Department/Service Area:	Operations		
Telephone & E-mail	fionameechan@rossendalebc.gov.uk		
Contact:	Telephone ext 2491		
Date Assessment:	Commenced:	Completed:	
28.06.11	14.09.11	20.09.11	

### 1. Impact Assessment – Policy and Target Outcomes

a) Summarise the main aims/objectives of the strategy, policy, procedure, project or decision.

The decision made by Cabinet in January 2011, and re-affirmed by Full Council in February 2011 as part of the budget setting process, allowed for the introduction of alternate weekly waste and recycling collections from the 668 farm, rural and other harder to reach properties in the Borough, to bring them in line with the 98% of properties in the borough who are already on alternate weekly collections. The policy would require some residents to present their waste and recycling at collection points so that they could be collected by the front-line collection service. Approximately 30% of properties across the Borough already present their waste at collection points, including a number of farm, rural and other hard to reach properties who have presented their waste in this way for a number of years.

As a result of the policy decision in February 2011, residents in some of the affected farm, rural and other hard to reach properties, would therefore no longer benefit from the enhanced doorstep collection service that they currently receive.

Ongoing consultation with residents with regard to the implementation of this policy from May to August 2011 showed that some residents were happy to adapt to the changes, some have said they were not happy about it, but understood the reasons for it and were willing to adapt to the changes, and some have said that they do not agree with the changes and would not adapt to them.

The changes were delayed from 1 July to allow for more consultation and changes were implemented on 1 August for those residents who did not contact us to register any issues. Site meetings continued with other residents (over 100 visits with around 450 residents) and the changes for those residents were initially delayed to 1 September to allow for further consultation.

Following feedback from some residents that they did not believe that there had been consultation on this issue, at the end of August, we wrote again to all those properties who were being asked to present their waste and recycling at collection points to further urge them to give us their opinion if they had not already done so. We asked for

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 1 of 14	

responses by mid September, with a view to presenting the results of the consultation to Councillors at Cabinet in October. This date was subsequently brought forward to Full Council on 28 September. Following the consultation between May and August, 21 properties were approved for assisted collections. In all, alternative solutions to collection points were found for around 300 properties. The remaining 369 properties (approximately 1% of all properties in the Borough) were being asked to present their waste at 107 collection points. b) Is the policy or decision under review (please tick) New/proposed ☐ Modified/adapted ⊠ Existing c) Main or intended groups identified as beneficiaries, targets or users of this strategy, policy, project, procedure or decision? Main groups: This policy impacted on the 2% of properties which make up our farm, rural and other

harder to reach properties (668 properties). 98% of properties are not affected by this policy.

Following consultation, whilst all 668 will now have an alternate weekly waste and recycling collection service, overall 1% of properties (369) would be required to present their waste at collection points along with other residents who already do this. Alternative collections have been agreed for the remaining 299 properties.

d) Please detail below specific equality groups who will be the main beneficiaries, targets and users of this strategy, policy, project, procedure or decision, or who will be affected in any other way.

Key equality groups as main beneficiaries or affected in any other way (where appropriate):

This would introduce a change in the way that refuse and recycling is collected from the 668 farm, rural or other harder to reach properties. Key equality groups who may be affected by this policy, who live in the 2% of properties which are affected, will include older people, people with disabilities, women and men in certain circumstances, people whose first language is not English and people living in rurally isolated properties.

Consultation has been ongoing since the end of May with regards to identifying the main issues that people have with this change in policy, identifying those who may be more affected, and identifying measures to mitigate the impact of the changes. This has included writing to everyone affected, and carrying out site visits with residents, as follows:

May – letter to all affected properties setting out the decision and asking for views. June – letter to affected properties setting out key issues raised and proposed solutions

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 2 of 14	

to mitigate impact, including the provision of car boot liners and composters, and site visits to discuss proposed collection points.

Following consultation, overall 1% of properties (369) would be required to present their waste at collection points along with other residents who already do this. Alternative collections were agreed for the remaining 299 properties.

e) Please detail in the box below, the information you have considered to make this decision/recommendation regarding the communities affected by this.

Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme, Allowances have been allocated to Waste Disposal Authorities by the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) for each year until 2020. Landfill Tax Introduced in 1997 with the intention of diverting waste from landfill, the tax is charged in addition to the actual cost that landfill operators charge for every tonne of waste disposed of to landfill. The rate of landfill tax for municipal waste in 2009/10 stands at £40 per tonne and this rate will increase by £8 per tonne every year to 2013. Therefore by April 2013 the tax will stand at £72 per tonne Regional Waste Strategy The Regional Waste Strategy sets out the Strategy. Waste Management Strategy for Lancashire, Reduce and stabilise waste to 0% growth each year, Recycle and compost 56% of all waste by 2015, increasing to 61% by 2020, Recover 81% of all waste by 2015 and 88% by 2020 Customer feedback - enquiries and requests from residents to enable them to recycle Feedback from colleagues - passing on requests Consultation with staff Benchmarking with other authorities

In May 2011, we wrote to everyone affected by this change and asked them to contact us about the changes and approximately 25% of residents in the properties affected did this. We collated all of their feedback on a database then wrote out again in mid-June with initial feedback on actions taken in response to feedback to date.

This included acknowledgement of concerns around animals ripping open bags of waste – we offered to provide free composters to residents so that they could avoid putting food waste into bags, we also advised them to double bag if they are concerned and have reassured residents that this has not been a problem in other areas of the Borough where people already present their waste in this way.

This also included acknowledgement of the distance that some people will have to take their waste and the fact that some people would want to put the waste in their cars but did not want to get their cars dirty – we offered to provide free robust, waterproof car boot liners with lids for residents to use if they wish.

We have identified that some people may have disabilities or mobility difficulties and, as with other people across the Borough, we will offer them our assisted collections service whereby our Street Cleansing staff would be re-directed to collect waste and recycling directly from their properties. In addition, as a gesture of goodwill, where properties are en route to an assisted collection, we would also collect their waste directly from their property when we are passing.

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 3 of 14	

In addition, we have identified that women who are heavily pregnant and do not have anyone else in the household who is able to move the waste, will also be eligible for assistance. Further, if women have small children, no-one else in the household who is able to either move the waste or look after the children, and no access to a car, they may also be eligible for assistance; obviously this could also apply to men in the same circumstances.

Where people were concerned about the site of a proposed collection point, we carried our around 100 on-site visits with residents to discuss the most suitable options for their areas. In some cases, because of improvements to the conditions of the local road, and their proximity to the main road, or because land owners have allowed us to use their land, we have been able to offer to continue to collect some residents' waste and recycling from their properties using the front-line collection vehicles.

The distance of collection points from farm, rural and other hard to reach properties ranges from 17m to approximately 1mile.

f)	Is further consultation, data collection or research still required?				
	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No		

#### **Key Actions:**

Changes have been delayed from 1 July to allow for more consultation. The changes were implemented from 1 August 2011 for those people who did not contact us with any feedback. Implementation was delayed to 1 September 2011 for those residents who had site visits. Around 100 site visits with around 450 residents took place. At the end of August, we wrote to all properties who were still being asked to present their waste and recycling at a collection point to urge them to give us their opinion if they had not already done so.

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 4 of 14	

# 2. Impact - Evidence

Using the table below please tick whether you have evidence that the policy/strategy/decision has a negative, positive or neutral impact **from an equalities perspective** on any of the equality groups listed below.

		Positive Impact – (It could benefit)	Negative Impact – (It could disadvantage)	Reason	Neutral Impact (Neither)
Gender	Women			Women who may be heavily pregnant may have mobility difficulties. If no one else is in the household to move the waste, they may struggle to move the waste themselves. The Council already has an existing assisted collection policy. If eligible the assisted collection policy may apply to any residents who found it difficult to present their waste and/or recyclate at a collection point  Women who have young children, and no one else in the household who could either move the waste or look after the children, and no access to a car, may have difficulty moving the waste to the collection point if it is far from the house.	
	Men			Men who have young children, and no one else in the household who could either move the waste or look after the children, and no access to a car, may have difficulty moving the waste to the collection	

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 5 of 14	

		Positive Impact – (It could benefit)	Negative Impact – (It could disadvantage)	Reason	Neutral Impact (Neither)
				point if it is far from the house.	
Race (Ethnicity or Nationality)	Asian or Asian British people			People who may not have English as their first language may have difficulty understanding what is required as part of the changes. If affected properties are identified as such communication material will be produced in easy read and/or translation offered/provided.  Pictorial information is already being provided to all properties.	
	Black or black British people			People who may not have English as their first language may have difficulty understanding what is required as part of the changes. If affected properties are identified as such communication material will be produced in easy read and/or translation offered/provided. Pictorial information is already being provided to all properties.	
	Chinese or other ethnic people			People who may not have English as their first language may have difficulty understanding what is required as part of the changes. If affected properties are identified as such communication material will be produced in easy read and/or translation offered/provided. Pictorial information is already	

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 6 of 14	

	Positive Impact – (It could benefit)	Negative Impact – (It could disadvantage)	Reason	Neutral Impact (Neither)
			being provided to all properties.	
Irish people				$\boxtimes$
White people			People who may not have English as their first language may have difficulty understanding what is required as part of the changes. If affected properties are identified as such communication material will be produced in easy read and/or translation offered/provided. Pictorial information is already being provided to all properties.	
Chinese people			People who may not have English as their first language may have difficulty understanding what is required as part of the changes. If affected properties are identified as such communication material will be produced in easy read and/or translation offered/provided. Pictorial information is already being provided to all properties.	
Other minority communities not listed above – e.g. Eastern European			People who may not have English as their first language may have difficulty understanding what is required as part of the changes. If affected properties are identified as such communication material will be produced in easy read and/or	

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 7 of 14	

		Positive Impact – (It could benefit)	Negative Impact – (It could disadvantage)	Reason	Neutral Impact (Neither)
				translation offered/provided. Pictorial information is already being provided to all properties.	
Disability	Physical/learning/mental health			People with some physical disabilities or some mental health disabilities may not be able to move their waste to the collection points. The Council already has an existing assisted collection policy. If eligible the assisted collection policy may apply to any residents who found it difficult to present their waste and/or recyclate at a collection point  People with some learning disabilities may have difficulty understanding what is required as part of the changes. If affected properties are identified as such communication material will be produced in easy read or other measures as appropriate. Pictorial information is already being provided to all properties.  People who may not have English as their first language may have difficulty understanding what is required as part of the	
				changes. If affected properties	

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 8 of 14	

		Positive Impact – (It could benefit)	Negative Impact – (It could disadvantage)	Reason	Neutral Impact (Neither)
				are identified as such communication material will be produced in easy read or other measures as appropriate. Pictorial information is already being provided to all properties.	
Sexuality	Lesbians, gay men and bisexuals				
Gender Identity	Transgender people				
Age	Older people (60+)			Some older people may have mobility problems which would make it difficult for them to move their waste to collection points. The existing assisted collection policy may apply in regards to mobility difficulties.	
	Younger people (17-25), and children				
Belief	Faith groups *				$\boxtimes$
Other Groups (e.g. carers, rurally isolated, gypsies & roma travellers, people on low incomes)				People living in isolated rural properties with no access to a car and mobility difficulties may find it difficult to move their waste to collection points if they are far from the properties. The existing assisted collection policy may apply in regards to mobility difficulties.	
,				People living in isolated rural	

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 9 of 14	

	Positive Impact – (It could benefit)	Negative Impact – (It could disadvantage)	Reason	Neutral Impact (Neither)
			properties with a car may incur additional fuel and wear and tear expenses if they choose to drive their waste to collection points and if they do not incorporate the journey into one that they are making anyway.	

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 10 of 14	

### 3. Impact – Nature/Type

a)	<ul> <li>Could you further improve the strategy, project, policy, procedure or decision's positive or neutral impact? If "Yes", this should be detailed in the Action Plan.</li> </ul>					
		YES	$\boxtimes$	NO		
Key	Actions:					
	Actions already identified are set out in the attached action plan, which has been updated.					

## 4. Impact Assessment - Summary

### Key Findings:

The introduction of alternate weekly collections brings these 2% of properties in line with the other 98% of properties who currently have a recycling collection service. The introduction of collection points would be in line with the 30% of properties across the Borough who already present their waste at collection points, which are varying distances from their properties. The distance of collection points from houses as a result of these changes ranges from 17m to approximately 1mile.

Key equality groups affected by this policy have been identified and actions implemented to minimise the impact. Assisted collections are being provided to those with mobility difficulties (21 have been identified so far) and support from Locality Officers will be offered to those who may have difficulty understanding what is required.

Following extensive consultation, alternative collection methods have been agreed for around 300 properties. This means that 369 properties (1%) would now be asked to present their waste at collection points.

### 5. Impact Assessment – Further Action

Please give the details of the monitoring/evaluation/review process that has/will be set up to check the successful implementation of the policy, project, strategy or decision including improved outcomes/impact and identify the review date.

Evaluation/ monitoring/ review process:

Consultation with residents was extended so covered the period 26 May to 19 September 2011.

Review Date: the review date of 31.10.11 was brought forward to 20.09.11. The next review date will be 31 March 2012.

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 11 of 14	

# 6. IMPACT ASSESSMENT ACTION PLAN

Please list below any recommendations for action that you plan to take as a result of this impact assessment

Issue	Action required	Lead officer	Timescale	Resource implications	Comments
Identify demographics of those affected by the decision identify any mitigating actions	Identifying residents who may need language or literacy assistance	Locality Officers	End of October	Within existing resources	Residents will be identified via site meetings where possible, and after implementation, where refuse is not presented, staff will check if this is due to difficulties understanding what is required and put in place the appropriate support.
Identify demographics of those affected by the decision identify any mitigating actions	Identifying residents who may need their containers marking up if they are colour blind or have other visual impairments/needs	Locality Officers	End of October	Within existing resources	Residents will be identified via site meetings where possible, and after implementation, where refuse is not presented, staff will check if this is due to difficulties understanding what is required and put in place the appropriate support.
Identify demographics of those affected by the decision identify any mitigating actions	Identifying residents who may require the use of the councils assisted collection service.	Locality Officers	End October	Within existing resources	Residents are currently being identified via site meetings where possible. All residents have been sent a letter to highlight that they should contact us if they would like the service, and after implementation, where refuse is not presented, staff will

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 12 of 14	

					check if this is due to mobility difficulties and will put in place the appropriate support.
Waste Issue	Consutation with affected residents of farm properties and those living near proposed collection points	Locality Officers	End of August	Within existing resources	All affected residents have been written to, asking them to get in touch if they wish to discuss the proposals.  All affected residents have also been sent a response to the initial feedback and offered free composters, car boot liners, and assisted collections where appropriate.  All those being asked to present waste and recycling at collection points were further written to at the end of August to urge them to give us their opinion if they had not already done so.  Around 100 site meetings with approximately 450 residents, including those living near proposed collection points, have now taken place and a number of local solutions which are more acceptable to residents have been identified.

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 13 of 14	

Waste Issue	Identification of collection points, some locations may have a detrimental effect on adjacent properties. Potential for large numbers of stored bins and bags	Locality Officers	End of August	Within existing resources	Where these issues have been identified, Locality Officers have met with the affected residents on site to discuss possible alternative solutions to reduce the potential impact on them.  Around 100 site meetings with approximately 450 residents, including those living near collection points, have now taken place and a number of local solutions which are more acceptable to residents have been identified.
-------------	---	----------------------	------------------	---------------------------	--

Responsible Section/Team	Operations/PP	Version	2
Responsible Author	Operations Manager	Due for review	31.03.12
Date last amended	28.06.11	Page 14 of 14	