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Summary

The committee included in its work programme for 2013/14 a two-phase review of recycling. The second phase of the review is now complete and the report presents its findings and recommendations for consideration by the committee and submission to Cabinet.

1. REVIEW REPORT

On 19 September 2013, the committee approved the one-page strategy for Phase 2 of the recycling review. The first part of the review had been on the future of local recycling centres and this second phase is on household waste services in new developments.

The review is now complete and the report (attached at Appendix 1) presents its findings and recommendations.

2. PHASE 2 – HOUSEHOLD WASTE SERVICES IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS

In addition to developing policy for new developments, the task group followed up several unresolved matters raised during Phase 1 and in accordance with and also monitored the effects of the closure of the local recycling centres.

The task group held four meetings and has also held an informal evidence gathering meeting with the county council portfolio holder and service manager for refuse disposal. The task group has serious concerns about the adequacy of current arrangements for the disposal of residual (ie non-recyclable or reusable) waste and about the ability of the Hunters Lane recycling centre to deal adequately with the needs of the borough’s growing population.

On the positive side, the task group has arrived at a set of recommendations that will help equip the council to provide an efficient and effective waste collection service for new developments in an expanding Rugby.

The Portfolio Holder, Cllr Dr Williams, attended the last meeting of the task group and expressed support for the review’s recommendations and action plan.

The chairman of the task group, Cllr Miss Lawrence, will attend the committee meeting to present the report. Subject to the committee’s approval, the report will be submitted to Cabinet on 10 March.
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Rugby borough is the seventh fastest-growing local authority area in England in terms of population, and it is set to grow even faster during the coming decade. Notably, the radio station development of 6,200 new households will present opportunities and challenges, not least with regard to the way in which we store and collect household waste.

This review has risen to the challenge of ensuring that lessons from the past are applied to the planning of new developments. The planning of new developments needs to ensure that road layouts are designed to allow the free movement of refuse vehicles and that there are adequate places to store wheeled bins. The task group has also considered alternative ways in which household waste can be stored and it is important that new and innovative forms of waste storage are considered in future developments.

Hunters Lane recycling centre is used by residents as a place to dispose of a variety of types of waste. This review has also taken a critical look at the future operation and adequacy of the Hunters Lane recycling centre, as well as examining the strategic issue of refuse disposal. The services provided by Warwickshire County Council are vital to the future efficiency and effectiveness of the waste and recycling services available to our residents. Working in partnership with Warwickshire County Council, we hope to ensure that the facilities at Hunters Lane can provide a service that meets the demands of the growing population of Rugby borough.

I would like to thank the members of the task group and the officers from both Rugby Borough and Warwickshire County Council who participated in this scrutiny review. It is our wish that the services provided to the residents of Rugby borough have sufficient resilience to meet increasing demands now and in the future.

Councillor Kathryn Lawrence
Chairman
1. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Group proposes the following recommendations to Cabinet. They are all changes that may be carried out at low cost or no cost.

It is recommended that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The emphasis in the Refuse and Recycling Design Guide for Developers on streamlining of refuse storage, including underground storage, be supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At the earliest possible stage in the planning process for each residential development, Planning consult Environmental Services on estate layout and provision for storage of household waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The cost of providing bins or other receptacles for waste be passed on to developers in the first instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Warwickshire County Council be encouraged to work in partnership with Rugby Borough Council to continually review opportunities involving waste disposal facilities for residual waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Warwickshire County Council be encouraged to expand the services, accessibility and information regarding the county council recycling centres in order to meet current and future demands of the borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Sustainable Environment Portfolio Holder send a letter to Warwickshire County Council, expressing the points of concern raised following the evidence gathering meeting with the county council Portfolio Holder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The kerbside collection of comingled recyclable materials shall continue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. OBJECTIVES

2.1 Background

Since 2009, the council has operated a three-bin kerbside waste collection system as follows:

- **A blue-lidded bin** for comingled recyclables. The council has a contract with Kier Group PLC for the processing of this material at the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) at Ettington, near Stratford-upon-Avon.

- **A green bin** for garden and kitchen waste. This material is sent to Biffa Waste Services’ in-vessel composter (IVC) at Ufton.

- **A black bin** for residual waste that cannot be recycled, composted or reused. Until recently, most of this waste went to landfill at Ling Hall, Lawford Heath. Warwickshire County Council has directed that the borough council must now dispose of this material at the Coventry Energy from Waste Plant (operated by the Coventry and Solihull Waste Disposal Company – a joint venture by Coventry and Solihull councils).
This review is the second phase of a review on waste collection. Each phase has focused on aspects of waste services that are of immediate concern.

The first phase, which was completed in July 2013, tackled the issue of local recycling centres. The task group found that, following the introduction of the three-bin comingled waste collection service, these local centres provided little of value to the borough’s householders. The centres were frequently misused, and the cost of operating them diverted resources away from the pressing needs of an expanding kerbside collection service. The review’s recommendation to close council-operated centres was implemented during September 2013.

The second phase of the review has pursued several issues raised during phase one relating to the county council waste disposal strategy and the Hunters Lane recycling facility. However, the main focus of phase two, of which this is the report, has been the provision of a domestic waste collection service in new housing developments. This has become a matter of elevated priority in view of the imminent development of the radio station mast site.

2.2 The one-page strategy

One of the final acts of the task group during phase one was the drafting of a one-page strategy for phase two. [The “one-page strategy” is the name given to the scoping document for each of Rugby Borough Council’s scrutiny reviews. The one-page strategy defines the task and the improvements being aimed for, and how these are going to be achieved.] Corporate Performance Committee agreed the following one-page strategy on 19 September 2013.

What is the broad topic area?

Phase 2 of the review of recycling – broadening the topic to look at the development of policy in waste services and the associated planning policy.

What is the specific topic area?

The main focus of the review will be future options for recycling and refuse collection in new developments.

The review will also follow up several topics touched on during phase 1 but outside the scope of that phase. These include Hunters Lane hours and restrictions, monitoring of the effects of closure of the recycling centres and the long term strategy for waste disposal sites

What is the ambition of the review?

To ensure that our policies for waste collection and for the planning of new developments are mutually supportive and environmentally and financially sustainable, providing effective methods of waste collection and at the same time maintaining the visual amenity of the street scene in different types of neighbourhood.

How well do we perform?

The location of waste treatment facilities detracts from our ability to operate a cost-effective waste collection service.
In some housing developments, the arrangements for refuse collection and recycling detract from the street scene and the wider environment.

**Who shall we consult about the current service and about how we can improve it?**

Planning and Environmental Services officers, other councils, companies providing waste collection facilities in new developments.

**What other help do we need?**

There will be a need for the task group to learn about the planning policy process and the issues of financial viability that face the council, developers and future residents.

Expert advice as and when required. Possible site visits. Comparisons with other town authorities that have similar circumstances.

**How long should it take?**

Aim to finish by the end of 2013, to enable the review to influence the 2014/15 budget if necessary. [As the review progressed, it became clear that there would be no budgetary implications in 2014/15, so the task group continued its work into early 2014.]

**What will be the outcome?**

A set of evidence-based recommendations to inform the development of policies.

### 2.3 Alignment with the Corporate Strategy

The review’s recommendations will contribute to the following priorities:

**Environment:** Promote and maintain high levels of waste recycling and minimise the impact of fly-tipping.

**People:** Provide safe and attractive streets

**Business:** Work with developers to provide new housing and infrastructure

### 2.4 Background papers

The task group papers for this review are published at www.rugby.gov.uk. Click on agendas, reports and minutes near the foot of the page and then select all committees.

### 3. EVIDENCE

#### 3.1 Effect of closure of local recycling centres

On 19 August 2013 Cabinet approved the recommendations of the first phase of the review, and the review’s recommendation to close the local recycling centres was subsequently implemented in accordance with the review’s action plan. The action plan required the task group to monitor the effects of closing the sites.
There has been some fly-tipping at sites of the closed recycling centres but this has been minimal in comparison with the amount that regularly occurred before the closures.

There is no evidence of any increase in fly-tipping elsewhere associated with the closure of the centres.

3.2 Hunters Lane recycling centre

The task group has continuing concerns regarding the current operation of the Hunters Lane recycling centre and the adequacy of the facility to cope with the expanding population of the borough.

These fears were expressed in a question and answer session with the county council portfolio holder, Cllr Jeff Clarke, and the Group Manager, Glenn Fleet, whose comments on the issues raised are summarised in the italicised sections below.

Some residents are barred from using the Hunters Lane recycling centre if they carry domestic waste in vans, pick-ups, larger 4x4s and trailers.

The rules exist to control the levels of materials being disposed of illegally and to restrict traders, and also for reasons of public safety.

It was estimated that the measures taken to restrict traders had resulted in savings across the county of £1 million.

The policies were introduced several years ago and have been refined over time to accommodate residents’ vehicles. If the vehicle is the only one in the household WCC will consider issuing a permit.

Over the past year, the relatively low number of 61 residents in Rugby have applied for permits and 54 of these have been approved. The refused applications have been rejected because either the vehicle is too big, or the household has another vehicle. These figures are low compared with those of other local authorities.

This system was reviewed in 2010. The size limits for trailers used for green waste were increased, and opening times were set when bigger vehicles may use the facility. There are particular rules in place for maximum vehicle sizes and the number of visits that bigger vehicles may make to the site, using a voucher system. If anyone needs to dispose of a bulky item, RBC’s charged-for service is available.

A number recognition system is used to monitor frequency of use by vehicles, particularly vans. WCC has the right to remove permits if they are being abused. The system is mainly used to keep checks on vans and look out for commercial operators.

DIY waste is not defined as household waste, even if it is being generated by a householder. There is a limit of 75 kilograms per month free of charge and high level users are stopped.
CONCLUSION

Residents are not aware they can apply for permits, or of the times and arrangements for the use of bigger vehicles. They find out if they are stopped at the site, or by visiting the WCC website. There is a need for improved quality of information and communication of the information.

It needs to be made easier for pedestrians and cyclists to use the Hunters Lane facility.

Cyclists are allowed onto the site but pedestrians are a problem from a safety point of view. The WCC policy allows pedestrians living within one mile to use the facility provided they pre-book an appointment. This information is available on the WCC website. If a member of the public turned up with some rubbish this would be accepted but they cannot access the ramp. This does not prevent them from going to the Age UK shop.

CONCLUSION

WCC may wish to give some thought to the amount of housing being built close by on the former GEC site.

The facilities at Hunter's Lane need to be made easier for people who are less strong such as some women and people with disabilities.

All WCC sites have assistants who will help people use the facilities. A survey was held on this topic in April and of 85 per cent of residents who were offered assistance only 15 per cent accepted it. No complaints have been received.

CONCLUSION

WCC’s response does not seem to square with experience of some of the task group members.

Signage and improved communications is needed. (It was found after the meeting that there is a sign at Hunters Lane offering assistance.)

Lack of a paint disposal facility at Hunters Lane

The nearest paint disposal site is at Leamington Spa. Efforts have been made to educate the public on how to deal with paint before disposing of the empty container locally. There is a re-use store at Stockton.

Gloss paint that is not water based is classed as a hazardous substance while in its liquid form, and Hunters Lane is not licensed for hazardous waste.

Once it is dry, the paint can and its contents can be disposed of in the black bin.

WCAVA run re-use facilities at Stockton and Wellesbourne. The nearest chemical store is at Leamington Spa.
This information, together with information on how to solidify paint, is on the WCC website along with a paint calculator to help people to avoid buying too much paint.

Paint cans can only be recycled if they are completely clean. Most emulsion and some gloss paints are water soluble and can be washed out, but there are other environmental concerns with this.

WCC will be reviewing its policies in February but spending cuts will impact on all services. There may be opportunities to look at this again in the future.

Officers commented that Hunters Lane accepts other forms of hazardous material such as asbestos. Mr Fleet said that, to have a licence from the Environment Agency, there must be an on-site chemist.

CONCLUSION

Better communication needed. Some information could be included on the RBC website. Consider other methods of communication other than website.

Consider a scheme for Hunters Lane similar to the WCAVA one at Stockton.

The possibility of changing the opening hours of the Hunters Lane recycling centre should be considered so it is more likely to be open when people most need it.

April-October the site is open on Wednesdays until 6.30pm. The choice of Wednesday for late opening is based on trend data.

As part of a wider review that took place in 2011/12 WCC evaluated the opening times, with the following results:

- Saturday was the busiest day with peak trading hours of 11-12 noon
- Wednesday was the quietest day and quietest hours were 8am-9am and 5-6pm

As part of the review members of the public were asked if they would prefer shorter opening hours and more days, or longer opening hours and fewer days.

- 1200 people across Warwickshire were surveyed.
- 170 responses were received from the Hunters Lane site
- Overall the public were satisfied with the current opening hours. This equated to 82.7 per cent overall and 75.8 per cent for Rugby.
- All sites – 30 per cent of people visit once a month and 33 per cent every two months
- Rugby – 35 per cent of people visit once a month and 34 per cent every two months
- Rugby – 34 per cent of people were aware of the late night opening compared with 18 per cent overall.
- Rugby - 84.5 per cent of people were aware assistance was available.
- Rugby – number of visits (2010) was 199,000.

The expansion of Rugby town will put even more pressure on Hunters Lane.

There are no plans to expand Hunters Lane or build an additional facility.
Waste analysis both at Hunters Lane and at the kerbside was carried out. Results included:

- 47 per cent of material taken to Hunters Lane could be recycled at the kerbside. This could realise an income at £40 per tonne.
- 19 per cent of material in black bins could be recycled.

Rugby has a good rate of recycling but this could be improved.

Members have observed that traffic already queues out onto the road at Hunters Lane and this situation will get worse as demand increases.

Members gave examples of assistants at the Hunters Lane site advising people to put recylates in with general waste.

CONCLUSION

The WCC strategy of improving kerbside recycling rates through educating householders is unlikely to result in sufficient reduction in residual waste to counteract the increased demand resulting from urban expansion.

Improvements to signage are required at Hunters Lane, along with improved communication and education.

The task group has recommended that the Sustainable Environment Portfolio Holder send a letter to Warwickshire County Council incorporating the conclusion points from the meeting held between the task group, the Warwickshire County Council Portfolio Holder and service manager.

3.3 Waste Disposal Strategy – the national picture

A recent report by Deloitte\(^1\) examines the pressure that firms in the UK waste sector are increasingly under as a result of structural changes driven by Government policy and directives which have led to a reduction in waste to landfill and the incurring of high costs in the development of alternative treatments.

In part, the pressure on waste treatment and disposal (and collection) companies is increasing as the Government objective of moving to a zero waste economy makes its impact and companies compete for smaller volumes of waste. Additionally, fluctuating commodity prices create uncertainty for reprocessing operations.

A further consideration, which is of particular relevance to councils, is that, under the EU Waste Framework Directive and enacting UK legislation, landfill and incineration without energy recovery are seen as a last resort.

The discussion recorded in 3.4 below should be interpreted in the light of the pressures described above.

\(^1\) UK waste management – Littered with issues – Deloitte LLP 2013
3.4 Waste Disposal Strategy – the local picture

The meeting reported in 3.2 above also discussed wider issues relating to the waste disposal strategy, with particular regard to the move of the residual waste disposal point from Ling Hall to Whitley, and the effects of urban expansion.

The relocation of the main residual waste disposal point from Ling Hall to Whitley has had a detrimental effect on the cost-effectiveness of RBC’s waste collection service. As Rugby’s urban area expands there are fears that this problem will worsen.

The WCC view is that the excess haulage payment of £5 per tonne for domestic waste should be adequate recompense in view of the prolonged vehicle life if vehicles are offloading on a hard standing rather than at a landfill site. An option was to operate a shunting service such as the one that is reported to be working well at Nuneaton and Bedworth BC. [Shunting is the system whereby, when the vehicle is full, the crew switches to an empty vehicle and the full vehicle is driven to the disposal point without a crew. This means that crew time is not wasted while the drive to and from the disposal point is taking place.]

CONCLUSION

The task group received the following observations from the Head of Environmental Services:

- The excess haulage payment has been received for both Bubbenhall and Whitley but it is not enough to compensate for the additional costs. Factors other than fuel consumption have to be taken into account.
- At Rugby the resource cost is a key factor. Crews are offloading three times per day.
- Rugby crews already work a full day and there is no spare resource for the additional trips needed.
- There are delays caused by queuing and traffic congestion.
- How often vehicles need to be replaced will not be known for several years and we have already factored in extended vehicle replacement frequencies.
- Shunting has been tried in Rugby but does not work for us because the journey to Whitley is so long that, in the time it takes for the crewless vehicle to make the return trip, several more vehicles will have been filled. Shunting is better suited to short trips in densely populated areas where the journeys to and from the disposal point are able to keep up with the rate of filling of the other vehicles.
- Experience of using landfill sites has been good and Rugby has made few complaints.
- The council was first informed of the relocation to Whitley as the main disposal point on 10 January 2013. This change had to be implemented by 1 April 2013.
- Once vehicles have offloaded, waste is bulked up so rounds can be completed by the end of the day.
- WCC have been reviewing this for the past three years. Project Transform was based on diverting waste away from landfill sites. Some parts of Rugby borough are nearer to Whitley than Ling Hall but, on average, there is approximately six miles extra per trip each way.
Rugby is growing and there are several large housing developments due to be built on the urban fringes. The situation will get worse and there are concerns about how WCC deal with this?

_WCC has no funds for a transfer station and considers that Whitley will suffice in terms of waste disposal capacity for the next 25 years._

**CONCLUSION DRAWN**

Future consideration should be given to the use of the Malpass Farm MBT facility², especially given the potential operational benefits.

**When future WCC treatment/disposal contracts are being procured the County Council should consider the following when carrying out the any tender evaluation:**

- Whole cost not just gate fee. As such giving full consideration to the overall costs of collection as well as treatment/disposal.
- Environmental as well as economic factors, providing the ability to reduce the overall carbon footprint associated with both the collection and disposal/treatment elements of waste.

_WCC’s advice is that there would be a need to go out to private tender and Malpass Farm would be included in that process. Informal discussions had been held with SITA as part of soft market testing and their prices were high._

_Officers commented that environmental impact should be considered. The SITA site at Malpass Farm removes recyclates during the process, which the facility at Whitley does not. The end product is a valuable resource that is more environmentally friendly and helps support the economy and industry in general._

_However, the Whitley facility does pipe steam into Coventry to heat buildings._

Following the meeting the council received clarification from Cemex of SITA’s position with regard to municipal waste. This stated that SITA’s preference at Malpass Farm is to process commercial waste as this allows the plant to run most efficiently, recover the highest quality of recyclables, produce the highest quality of Climafuel and have to separate the least amount of reject material for disposal. However, the facility is designed to process commercial and municipal wastes in a blend, hence securing the contract for Northamptonshire’s waste from 2015. SITA would be interested in discussing with Warwickshire the receipt of both their commercial and municipal wastes. However, the price to process each stream will differ and reflect the quality of the material, notably the ability to extract recyclable materials from it and the expected conversion rate into Climafuel. SITA would be happy to work with the council to identify any current or future waste streams that would be particularly cost effective to process at Malpass Farm based on their expected volume and composition.

---

² The Malpass Farm Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) plant will produce fuel (branded as Climafuel) from commercial and household waste. The plant will be operated by SITA in partnership with CEMEX, whose adjacent cement works will use the fuel that the plant produces.
Risk assessment against the climate change policy

An evaluation against additional mileage and carbon has been carried out

3.5 Waste (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2012

The Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC) includes a requirement that, at the point of collection from households, waste must be separated at least into plastics, paper, glass and metal. This has been enacted by the Waste (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2012.

The responsible Defra minister, Lord de Mauley, has sent a letter to waste collection authorities reminding them that they must comply with this regulation by 1 January 2015. The letter restates the requirement to collect paper, metal, plastic and glass separately if separate collection:

1. is necessary to provide high quality recyclates, and
2. is technically, environmentally and economically practicable.

A judicial review in August 2013 appears to support the contention that councils may make the decision at local level as to whether separate collection is necessary for these purposes.

The regulations have largely been prompted by the failure of some MRFs to prevent contamination of paper recyclate by glass fragments. The task group has received advice that the Ettington MRF is equipped to produce high quality recyclate.

Adoption of separate collection would require the early cancellation of the council’s contract with the MRF, which runs until 2019. It would also be necessary to invest in changing the vehicle fleet, additional manpower and new containers. Therefore, on economic grounds alone, separate collection would not be practicable for Rugby Borough Council. An argument on technical and environmental grounds could be made as well.

3.6 Household waste collection – the good and the not-so-good

In terms of population and household growth, the 2011 census shows that Rugby borough is the fastest growing local authority area in the West Midlands and the seventh fastest growing in England. With a number of significant new developments having been built in recent years, it has been possible to build a body of qualitative evidence about what works well and what does not in a range of different types of development.

The Good

Comprehensive collection system – The present system allows for the collection of residual waste, comingled dry recycling and biowaste by use of wheeled bins.

Ease of use – No pre-sorting of recyclable materials required.

Public support – From day one the public of Rugby have embraced the collection model provided.
**Results** – This collection system moved RBC from lower quartile to top quartile performance.

**Cost-effective** – Adopting the current system reduced collection costs.

**Food waste collected weekly** – RBC adopted a collection system that allowed its residents to dispose of its food waste weekly, thus countering any arguments about “smelly bins, rats and maggots” that had appeared in some of the popular press and certain television programmes at the time the service was introduced in Rugby.

**Tailored service/individual needs** – RBC so far as is possible provides a tailored service for its residents and considers individual needs wherever possible. Home visits take place and the council carries out bin audits to ensure that the correct number and size of bins are provided to suit the individual needs of residents.

**Medical exemptions** – In certain cases additional residual waste containers are provided to families where there is a need due to excessive medical non-recyclable packaging (polystyrene for example).

**Non-specialist vehicles** – The system uses standard refuse collection vehicles. This allows one of our own spare vehicles to be used when a vehicle is off-road and also means that it is possible to get temporary replacements from commercial hire companies.

**The not-so-good**

**Communal bin store abuse** – Fly-tipping regularly occurs in communal bin storage areas. Additionally, there are significant contamination issues in some locations. It is believed that one of the reasons for this is residents of short-term lets having no ownership of the service provided. Landlords are charged for the clear-ups of these sites.
Bins on footways – This is a problem that affects all areas, including both low and high density housing, old and new.

Narrow street collections – A problem when drivers are trying to manoeuvre large collection vehicles in narrow streets. This can sometimes lead to minor accidents. It is unavoidable in older traditional housing areas but could be designed out of new schemes.

Parked cars – The bane of any refuse collection service is that of inconsiderate parking on collection days. A lot of this type of problem occurs in the “backs” of the high density housing areas.

Unsuitable highway construction – There are some relatively recent developments in the borough where roadways have not been constructed to highway standards and will not bear the weight of refuse collection vehicles.

Long private roads and driveways – Refuse collection vehicles are not allowed to drive on these private roads. The residents are required to pull their bins to a suitable location to allow collection. This can cause conflict on occasions.

Modern urban design conflict – Although aesthetically pleasing, some modern urban design can create problems when it comes to manoeuvring large refuse collection vehicles. It is desirable to design estates with good “flow” where vehicles may make progress with a minimum of complex manoeuvres.
**Seasonal variation in collection** – This affects the biowaste service. In the summer months, the crews are working flat out to accommodate the day’s work to the extent that service supervisors and managers have to make alternative arrangements to ensure the day’s work can be completed (allowing biowaste loads to be dropped off at the Hunters Lane depot and arranging for a haulier to forward the material to the Ufton IVC). In the winter months the situation is the absolute opposite with the crews collecting small tonnages. Householders will be encouraged to use the green bins rather than black bins for food waste in winter, though the council will at the same time continue to support the Love Food Hate Waste campaign with the aim of reducing the quantity of food waste overall.

**Recycling market issues** – The market for most, but by no means all, recycled materials is in a slump and has been for more than a year. This is creating a problem for reprocessors throughout the country and gate prices are increasing.

### 3.7 Road layout

The task group has examined recently-built developments to identify factors which help or detract from the ability to provide an efficient and effective waste collection service.

**Coton Park East**

This is an example of a well-planned and designed development with plenty of off-road parking and wide roadways. The design provides good flow through the estate. No particular problems with collection have occurred.
Pavilions

This is a difficult estate for waste collection. The roads are narrow and there is limited or inconvenient off-street parking, so it is often difficult for the collection vehicle. Also, where there are bin stores, they are not sited to provide ease of access for collection. The density for some phases of the mast site will be of a similar density, and it will be important not to repeat these problems.

Bernhard’s

On this development, there is space for off-road parking but the roads are quite narrow and there is no vehicular flow through the estate. This creates some difficulties for waste collection.
Cattle Market

Although the road flow could be better, this development works quite well for waste collection. However, the street scene is spoilt by bins being left at the front of properties rather than being kept at the rear. This may be a design issue but equally it may be a matter of residents’ choice. If developers wish to enhance the appearance of their developments by keeping frontages free of bins, they may wish to consider imposing covenants.

Projects Drive

This estate flows fairly well but the roadways are narrow for a refuse vehicle. Some problems arise from one of the apartment blocks being 30 metres from the bin store.

3.8 Refuse and Recycling Design Guide for Developers

The approach of the planning service towards influencing provision for waste collection services has evolved in recent years. Traditionally, waste collection services were not actively considered when holding discussions with applicants.

Problems of the type described in the sections above prompted the production of the Refuse and Recycling Design Guide for Developers (attached at Appendix 1). This
recognises a shared objective between the planning and waste collection service to provide a high quality environment and at the same time enable an operationally effective and efficient waste collection service.

The following parts of the guidance will help to deal with a number of the problems encountered in existing developments:

- Requirement for hard standing areas for single dwelling operating the three-bin system
- A preference for underground waste storage for flats and high density housing, including courtyard terraced dwellings, where individual provision is not always practical. Euro bin storage requirements are also specified for cases where this is not viable.
- Private roads either to be constructed to highways standard or alternatively for the an accessible bin storage area to be provided
- Roads to be wide enough to allow space round the vehicle and space for reversing
- A maximum distance of 10 metres from the bin to the vehicle
- Design to enable safe manual handling and operation of lifting equipment

It is acknowledged that the three-bin system will continue to be the norm in all but the densest developments. Where the three-bin system operates, the design guide requires a place to be provided to keep the bins within the curtilage of each property or in a communal store if each property’s private garden space is too small or inaccessible. Although it is preferable from an operational point of view for all properties to be accessible from a road along which a collection vehicle may travel, it is unrealistic to expect developments of narrow cul-de-sacs to be refused. Where such layouts are approved, the design guide states that the developer should provide a place where bins will be left for collection.

3.9 Underground storage

The Refuse and Recycling Design Guide for Developers states a preference for using underground waste storage systems in developments of flats and courtyard terraced housing where individual provision is not practical. The principle of using underground storage is therefore established, even though it has yet to be tested in Rugby.
The development of the radio station site will take about 15 years, and technology is likely to change during that time. The task group has therefore not looked in detail at the pros and cons of different types of underground storage because whatever it recommends is likely to become out of date. Moreover, the recommendations of this review will not have the power to make enforceable directions on this.

It is, however, not unreasonable to question the operational and environmental implications of underground storage

- **Is it sufficiently well tested on a non-continental public?**

  United Kingdom households have no tradition of going out into the street to dispose of waste. However, underground storage is becoming more common.

  Examples of locations where such systems are successfully being operated in the UK are Peterborough, Edinburgh, Cambridge and Tower Hamlets.

- **What about bigger items that will currently fit comfortably in a bin but not in a chute? Won’t people just fly-tip by the chutes?**

  As these facilities are placed in high trafficked prominent locations the risks from fly tipping and other forms of inappropriate waste disposal is reduced. It is also worth noting that these facilities are seeking to replace bin stores, which are subject to the inappropriate use (as highlighted earlier) that this type of infrastructure is seeking to obviate.

  Tower Hamlets’ experience was that users did leave boxes next to chutes if they would not fit in. All systems can have issues such as large items of waste being left alongside underground bins but ways to deal with these, should they occur, would be found.

- **Will contamination of recyclables increase because the perpetrator can’t be identified?**

  The advocates of underground storage argue that its success depends on the shared interests of the users, and also the proximity of the other users. This shared interest may not be purely social in nature: it may also be financially motivated if the residents contribute to the operation of the system. Some schemes could also be operated by “fob” access so only authorised users can access the system. This may be very relevant where mixed commercial and domestic users share a facility.
• Are there any particular street design requirements for underground storage?

Tower Hamlets' experience is that It is important to allow space for refuse vehicle access, including space for putting down stabilisers. Resident parking can also create problems, particularly as there needs to be space to manoeuvre bins without lifting them over cars.

• Miscellaneous observations

Peterborough's experience is that underground systems in current use demonstrate the claims of the systems in being:

- unobtrusive in the street scene
- large capacity
- of strong modular construction with a low risk of pollution to the environment
- good at containing odours
- reasonably quiet in use

3.10 Responsibility for waste storage

Although it is recognised that the three-bin system will continue to be the norm, underground storage could become a feature of the denser parts of new developments. The cost of setting up such communal waste storage systems will rest with the developer and, in common with the present storage arrangements for private blocks of flats, the ownership of such systems will not pass to the council. The equipment will be maintained by a management company.

Householders are responsible for storing their waste and presenting it for collection. Although it would clearly not have been possible for the council to charge existing householders for the provision of recycling bins when the three-bin system was set up, householders had been responsible for providing dustbins prior to the introduction of black sack or wheeled bin collection systems. Since the introduction of wheeled bins in the late 1980s, the council has borne the cost of new bins for new properties. This is becoming decreasingly sustainable financially.

The average amount of council tax retained by Rugby Borough Council each year is approximately £180 per band D property. For the three-bin system, the provision of a full set of new bins is about £80 per property but, when the cost of delivery and setting up the round is taken into account, the true cost is nearer £150. As the first full year's council tax only covers the cost of providing each household with a set of bins, all other services are in effect subsidised by the rest of the borough’s population.

The Core Strategy has an annual target of 540 property completions per year, so the annual cost of bins will approach £81,000. With this repeating every year, this places a serious financial burden on the council. It is recommended therefore that the council should no longer bear the cost of providing bins for each new property, and this cost should be borne by a developer in same way as the cost of communal facilities is.

This principle has been implemented by many other councils including North Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon, Bromsgrove, Eastleigh and Wirral.
4. CONCLUSIONS

Local recycling centres

1. The closure of the local recycling centres has been carried out in accordance with the action plan of phase 1 of the review and has not resulted in an increase in fly-tipping either at the former sites or elsewhere.

Hunters Lane Recycling Centre

2. Residents are not aware that they can apply for permits, or of the times and arrangements for the use of bigger vehicles. They find out if they are stopped at the site, or from the WCC website. There is a need for improved communication of information.

3. Warwickshire County Council should have regard to the amount of housing being built close by, particularly in respect of a possible increase in the number of pedestrian users.

4. Improved communication is needed regarding:
   - the limitations on access to the recycling centre
   - materials and substances that cannot be accepted
   - alternative sites where prohibited substances can be disposed of

5. The possibly of setting up a paint recovery scheme similar to the WCAVA one at Stockton should be investigated. Alternatively, the possibility of receiving paint at Hunters Lane and then transporting it to one of the existing licensed paint receiving sites should be considered.

6. The WCC strategy of improving kerbside recycling rates through educating householders is unlikely to result in sufficient reduction in residual waste to counteract the increased demand resulting from urban expansion.

Waste disposal strategy

7. See the comments of the Head of Environmental services in 3.4.

8. For operational and environmental reasons, waste disposal sites for Rugby Borough should be kept under review.

The Waste (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2012

9. Comingled collection of recyclable materials should continue on the grounds that kerbside sorting is not necessary in order to produce high quality recyclate and is not economically practicable.
Household waste collection services in new developments

10. The Refuse and Recycling Design Guide for Developers represents a sound basis for negotiation with developers, particularly in respect of its emphasis on the streamlining of refuse storage, including underground storage.

11. It is not realistic for this review to make prescriptive recommendations on the type of waste storage that should be used for any given type of development. It is however important that, at the earliest possible stage, planning officers consult environmental services officers on estate layout and provision for storage of household waste.

12. Developers should pay for the provision of wheeled bins or other receptacles for waste.
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DESIGN GUIDE FOR DEVELOPERS
Recycling & Refuse Collection Policy

Introduction
Rugby Borough Council operates a 3 bin alternate week refuse and recycling collection service. The service consists of three bins per property. One bin (blue lid) for dry recycling, the second (green) for ‘bio’ waste consisting of both garden and cooked / uncooked food waste and a third (black) for residual waste (that which can be neither recycled nor composted). Green and black bins are collected on alternate weeks with the recycling bin collected on either the same week as residual or green waste depending on the area.

Collection
Bins should be presented at the kerbside by 7.30am on the day of collection

Assisted Collections
An assisted collection is available whereby the collection crew collect a resident’s bin from an agreed position within the property boundary, take it to the collection vehicle, empty it and return it to the collection point. Assisted collections are only available to residents that are unable to take the bin to the appropriate collection point themselves and where there is no-one else available at the property to take the bin out on collection day.
This may include:
- People with disabilities
- The elderly or infirm
- The visually impaired
A completed form is required for this service. Residents should call 01788 533335 or visit www.rugby.gov.uk/recycling

Stolen Bins
In the event that a bin is stolen the householder is required to report the theft to the police and obtain an incident number before a new bin will be provided.

Lost & Damaged Bins
In the event that a bin is lost or damaged beyond use, the householder may be charged the cost of a replacement bin, depending on the circumstances.

Additional capacity – Recycling
Residents (as standard) receive a 240 litre blue lid wheeled bin however they may request larger / smaller bins appropriate to need. Residents may request a second recycling bin should they regularly have insufficient capacity in one bin to accommodate their recycling.
**Additional capacity – Composting**
Residents (as standard) receive a 240 litre green wheeled bin for food and garden waste. Should a resident require a smaller bin a 140 litre is available, should an additional green bin be requested the Client Monitoring Team will first confirm the residents are already home composting. Should residents be able to show they are already home composting in addition to using the existing green bin and still have insufficient capacity then an additional green bin would be delivered.

**Additional capacity – Refuse**
All residents retain their current (black) 240 litre bin for refuse collection. Replacement refuse bins and those for new developments will have a capacity of 180 litres. Any resident experiencing ongoing difficulty in reducing their waste to fit into a single bin may request an additional bin. Additional bins will only be issued following a waste audit and any additional refuse bin will be supplied on a conditional basis which will be reviewed periodically. Spot inspections may be made on collection day to ensure that additional bins provided for refuse do not contain any materials that could be recycled or composted.

**Waste Audit**
A waste audit will be required prior to any additional refuse bin being sanctioned. An audit entails the residents refuse bin being collected and brought into the Depot where the contents would be examined. The audit would be scheduled to take place the day before their next regular black bin collection to ensure that a resident has a full two weeks worth of residual waste.

All the waste that the resident has produced during the period will be sorted through and separated into dry recyclables, garden waste and residual waste.

If there appears to be large amounts of dry recyclables or garden / food waste within the bin then the resident is offered an additional recycling or green / food waste bin accordingly, should this be required.

If there is more refuse than can be contained in the current bin a second smaller bin will be delivered out. The second bin will be reviewed on an annual basis and returned when no longer required.

**Contaminated recycling / green bins**
If a recycling or green waste bin contains materials that cannot be recycled / composted the following procedure will be carried out:
The collection will be refused and a label attached to the bin advising the resident of this fact. If the resident wants the bin emptying they will be required to remove all the contamination before the next scheduled emptying, and place it in the black bin, so that it can be emptied on the next waste collection day.

If a resident persistently contaminates either the blue lid recycling or green waste bin a visit will be made to the property by an Officer from the Client Monitoring Team who will provide advice and support. Should this not be successful the resident will receive a warning that the relevant bin will be removed on the next occasion it is found to be contaminated. As a last resort the recycling / green waste bin will actually
be removed and the resident will still only receive a fortnightly collection of the remaining bins.

**Closed bin lid / Side waste**
The Council operates a strict ‘no side waste’ and ‘closed bin lid’ policy; this requires householders to place all waste into the correct wheeled bins. Any material which lies outside or on top of the wheeled bins will not be collected.
RECYCLING & REFUSE SERVICES
A DESIGN GUIDE FOR DEVELOPERS
Introduction

This guide provides information on Rugby Borough Council’s recycling and refuse collection policy. It includes details of the storage and collection requirements for refuse and recycling facilities across the Borough, whilst providing an indication of the implications that could arise when planning and designing new developments. It is intended that the guide be referred to by both Planning Officers and developers when agreeing the design and layout of a proposed development to ensure that issues with refuse collection are addressed at an early stage.

Section 1 provides guidance relating to the following forms of waste collection systems:
   a. Refuse and recycling facilities for single dwellings (three bins system)
   b. Communal refuse and recycling facilities
   c. Underground waste storage systems

Section 2 provides guidance on the collection requirements for each system and section 3 details the waste collection vehicles specifications. A developer’s checklist has been included at the end of this guide. Developers should refer to this checklist for specific considerations and storage requirements.

1. Storage Requirements for waste collection systems

Developers should provide adequate off-street storage space for wheeled bins to serve all new residential properties, including conversions. This requirement is particularly important in designated Conservation Areas where the visual importance of the street scene has been acknowledged and there is a duty for the area's character and appearance to be protected and enhanced.

Provision can be in the form of storage space integral to the design of the property, dedicated space externally, in a communal storage area, or in underground waste storage systems. All bin stores provided by developers should be convenient for both residents and collectors to access.

If any additional information is required, advice can be sought from the planning case officer or from a waste management officer.

   a. Refuse and recycling facilities for single dwellings (three bins system)

This system is applicable for the majority of new developments, with the exception of high density and apartment blocks. Each dwelling will require an adequate area of hard standing, large enough to accommodate one standard 240ltr wheeled bin for residual, one standard 240ltr wheeled bin for dry recycling and one standard 240ltr wheeled bin for bio waste within the private garden space of each dwelling. All bin stores should be convenient for both residents and collectors to access and if covered of sufficient height to permit the opening of the bin lids. Wheeled bins can have a capacity of either 140ltr 180ltr or 240ltr (the dimensions of which are detailed below), although preference will be given for the maximum size of three 240ltr wheeled bins to be provided. The size of bin required for each dwelling should be agreed with the planning officer and a waste management officer within the application process.
In areas where three standard wheeled bins cannot be accommodated within the private garden space of each dwelling, sufficient space must be provided in the form of a communal store to accommodate three standard wheeled bins from each dwelling (again, preference will be given to three 240ltr wheeled bins to be provided per dwelling). Sufficient space should be left for residents to access their bins easily, and for the bins to be able to be removed individually from the store for presentation at the back of footway for collection. Where bin stores are covered, there should be sufficient height to open and close the bin lids easily. It is not acceptable for refuse collectors to service wheeled bins from private paths or lanes. Further guidance on collection requirements can be seen in section 2.

b. Communal refuse and recycling facilities

It is recognised that within flats, apartments and some high density housing developments, including courtyard terraced dwellings individual provision is not always practical, resulting in the need for communal refuse and recycling facilities to be provided. In these cases an underground waste storage system would be preferable. Details of the requirements for this system are still to be agreed. Until such details have been agreed and adopted, and/or if an underground waste storage system is not considered practicable for the individual development, households should be provided with a communal refuse store designed to accommodate communal residual waste, dry recycling and green/bio waste Euro bin style refuse containers.

Communal refuse stores must be large enough to accommodate at least three Euro bins per six flats, comprising of one 1100ltr residual Euro bin, one 1100ltr dry recycling Euro bin and one 660ltr green/bio waste Euro bin. Where developments are much larger, sufficient provision should be provided to serve the proposed development. This is to be discussed with the planning officer and waste management officer at the application stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>140 Litre Bin</th>
<th>180 litre</th>
<th>240 Litre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1070 mm</td>
<td>1070mm</td>
<td>1070 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>550 mm</td>
<td>550mm</td>
<td>730 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>480 mm</td>
<td>480mm</td>
<td>570 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height with lid open</td>
<td>1550 mm</td>
<td>1600mm</td>
<td>1640 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>660ltr Bin</th>
<th>1100ltr Bin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1200 mm</td>
<td>1400 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>712.5 mm</td>
<td>1100 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1200 mm</td>
<td>1300 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height with lid open</td>
<td>1912.5 mm</td>
<td>2500 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Internally the bin store must be large enough for residents to gain access to all bins and for each bin to be able to be removed individually from the store i.e. without having to remove any of the other bins first. The height of the bin store must be sufficient to allow full opening of the lid, where a 2 metre minimum working height is required where the compound is covered. A 150mm clearance space between containers must be ensured to allow ease of movement and a 2 metre minimum width of access threshold to the compound must be ensured to allow for removal and return of containers whilst servicing is also required. The layout of the bin stores must allow any one container to be removed without the need to move any other container.

Communal bin stores must be located in a central and convenient location so that both the users and the collection operatives have easy access to it. Where possible, the distance each resident should have to carry their waste to the communal bin store should be consistent within the development. If a central location is not possible then the store should be located at the main entrance to the development or by providing more than one bin store within the site. In developments where the design of the scheme does not support a communal bin store at the main entrance of the development, alternative schemes should be considered, such as underground waste storage systems.

c. Underground Waste Storage Systems

This system is currently not in operation in any area of the Borough. It is, however, an option that is to be encouraged for future developments. Details of the requirements for this system are still to be agreed.

2. Collection requirements: Access for collection crews and refuse collection vehicles

In general terms the foundations and surfaces of any highway should be hardwearing and capable of withstanding the maximum anticipated fully loaded gross vehicle weight. Any covers over manholes, gully gratings and other such infrastructure should also be formed from materials capable of withstanding such weight.

Access and other arrangements for the servicing of, and the loading and unloading of goods for industrial, retail, and other commercial developments will depend on individual operational needs and should be agreed by both the Local Planning Authority and Highway Authority.

Standard Refuse Collection vehicles require a minimum working area of 4 metres in length, 4.5 metres vertical clearance and access roads need to be at least 4 metres wide. Highways should also be designed to accommodate maximum reversing distance of 12 metres. 2 metres minimum width of access threshold to the compound to allow for removal and return of containers whilst servicing should is also required. These standards are not for adoption purposes by the Local Highways Authority but should be a consideration when designing the development for refuse vehicle access.

In addition where access is required onto private land the surface of the road must be constructed to Highway Standards or provide a bin storage area away from the private road that allows safe access by the refuse collection vehicles.

To achieve safe, economic and efficient collections, the following guiding principles should be achieved:

- Collectors should not have to move wheeled bins on gradients exceeding 1:14
- Collectors should not have to move wheeled bins up or down steps
- Overhead service cables / pipes must be at least 6 metres from ground level to allow operation of the lifting gear on the collection vehicle
- Containers should not have to be moved through a building to the point of collection
a. Collection requirements for single dwellings (three bins system)

It is preferred that every dwelling on a new development be capable of being serviced by refuse collection, furniture and other domestic delivery vehicles. Vehicles should be capable of being parked either adjacent to each dwelling, or adjacent to a public highway to facilitate kerbside collections. The distance between the collection vehicle and the bin should not exceed 10m. If the distance between the truck and the bin is greater than 10m reasonable justification should be provided to the planning officer. If the design of the development does not permit kerbside collections, a collection point for communal refuse is preferred. If this second option is also difficult, then a communal bin store at the entrance to the site may be permitted. It should be noted, however, that in such cases the design of communal bin stores will be an important consideration and high quality design expected. To help alleviate any potential issues, alternative schemes should be explored, such as an underground waste storage system.

b. Collection requirements for communal refuse and recycling facilities

Communal stores must also be located in such a position to allow direct access for the refuse collection vehicle. Consideration needs to be made for the provision of “Keep Clear” markings in front of bin stores and at the designated vehicle access/loading point to prevent cars parking and inaccessibility for collections. The location of bin stores should be easily accessible for collection vehicles, preferably adjacent to a public highway. Again, if the design of the development does not permit this option, the developer should consider an alternative collection location that is accessible for the collection vehicle. This could be at the entrance to the development or in the form of an underground waste storage system. In consideration of the design considerations of the development the underground waste storage system may prove to be the most feasible option. This should be discussed with the planning officer and a waste management officer.

3. Waste Collection Vehicle Specifications

A typical waste collection vehicle has the following specifications:

- 26 tonnes gross vehicle weight (GVW);
- Length of 11m;
- Width of 2.55 metre (2.9 metre including wing mirrors);
- Operating height of 4.4 metre; and

There needs to be enough clear space around the vehicle to allow efficient operation. A minimum working area of 4 metres width and 4 metres in length should be available where the containers are emptied.
## Developer’s checklist

### Refuse and recycling facilities for single dwellings (three bins system)

- Minimum external storage capacity large enough to accommodate one standard 240ltr wheeled bin for residual, one standard 240ltr wheeled bin for dry recycling and one standard 240ltr wheeled bin for bio waste within the private garden space of each dwelling
- Capacity of wheeled bins can be either 140ltr 180ltr or 240ltr although preference will be given to the maximum size of 240ltr wheeled bins to be provided
- Bin stores should be convenient for both residents and collectors to access
- Bin stores should be hard floored
- If covered bin stores should be of sufficient height to permit the opening of the bin lids

In areas where three standard wheeled bins cannot be accommodated within the private garden space of each dwelling, communal bin stores are to be provided to store three standard wheeled bins from each dwelling.

- Communal stores should provide sufficient space to accommodate three standard 240ltr wheeled bins from each dwelling
- Sufficient space should be left for each resident to access the bins easily
- All bins should be able to be removed individually from the store for presentation at the back of footway for collection

### Communal refuse and recycling facilities

- Communal refuse stores must be large enough to accommodate at least three Euro bins per six flats, comprising of one 1100ltr residual Euro bin, one 1100ltr dry recycling Euro bin and one 660ltr green/bio waste Euro bin
- Internally the bin store must be large enough for residents to gain access to all bins and for each bin to be able to be removed individually from the store i.e. without having to remove any of the other bins first
- Covered bin stores must allow sufficient clearance to allow full opening of the lid (with a 2 metre minimum working height where compound is covered)
- 150mm clearance space between containers to allow ease of movement
- Communal bin stores must be located in a central and convenient location so that both

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storage Requirements</th>
<th>Standard Minimum Requirements</th>
<th>Achieved Y/N?</th>
<th>Developer's Document Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Refuse and recycling facilities for single dwellings (three bins system) | - Minimum external storage capacity large enough to accommodate one standard 240ltr wheeled bin for residual, one standard 240ltr wheeled bin for dry recycling and one standard 240ltr wheeled bin for bio waste within the private garden space of each dwelling  
- Capacity of wheeled bins can be either 140ltr 180ltr or 240ltr although preference will be given to the maximum size of 240ltr wheeled bins to be provided  
- Bin stores should be convenient for both residents and collectors to access  
- Bin stores should be hard floored  
- If covered bin stores should be of sufficient height to permit the opening of the bin lids  

In areas where three standard wheeled bins cannot be accommodated within the private garden space of each dwelling, communal bin stores are to be provided to store three standard wheeled bins from each dwelling.  
- Communal stores should provide sufficient space to accommodate three standard 240ltr wheeled bins from each dwelling  
- Sufficient space should be left for each resident to access the bins easily  
- All bins should be able to be removed individually from the store for presentation at the back of footway for collection | | |
| Communal refuse and recycling facilities | - Communal refuse stores must be large enough to accommodate at least three Euro bins per six flats, comprising of one 1100ltr residual Euro bin, one 1100ltr dry recycling Euro bin and one 660ltr green/bio waste Euro bin  
- Internally the bin store must be large enough for residents to gain access to all bins and for each bin to be able to be removed individually from the store i.e. without having to remove any of the other bins first  
- Covered bin stores must allow sufficient clearance to allow full opening of the lid (with a 2 metre minimum working height where compound is covered)  
- 150mm clearance space between containers to allow ease of movement  
- Communal bin stores must be located in a central and convenient location so that both | | |
the users and the collection operatives have easy access to it
- The location of the communal bin store should be positioned so that the distance for each resident to carry their refuse is consistent across the development
- If a central location is not possible then the store should be located at the main entrance of the development or by providing more than one bin store within the site
- If a bin store located at the main entrance of the development does not comply with the design characteristics of the development, alternative schemes could be considered, such as an underground waste storage system. This system is currently not in operation in any area of the Borough. It is, however, an option that is to be encouraged for future developments. Details of the requirements for this system are still to be agreed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refuse and recycling facilities for single dwellings (three bins system)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Low Rise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Storage locations should be at the kerb side adjacent to the public highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Containers should not have to be moved through a building to the point of collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Refuse collectors cannot service wheeled bins from private paths or lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collectors should not have to move wheeled bins up or down steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overhead service cables / pipes must be at least 6m from ground level to allow operation of the lifting gear on the collection vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communal stores must allow direct access for the refuse collection vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The distance between the collection vehicle and the bin should not exceed 10m. If the distance between the truck and the bin is greater than 10m reasonable justification should be provided to the planning officer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communal refuse and recycling facilities Residential Flats/Apartments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Consideration needs to be made for “Keep Clear” markings in front of bin stores and at the designated vehicle access/loading point to prevent cars parking and inaccessibility for collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Layout should be such that any one container may be removed without the need to move any other container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overhead service cables / pipes must be at least 6 metres from ground level to allow operation of the lifting gear on the collection vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communal stores must allow direct access for the refuse collection vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- When the details of the requirements have been agreed, underground waste storage systems will be preferred and should be provided where practicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Highways and Access Requirements |
For standard waste recycling collection services, highways should adhere to the below criteria:
- Gradients over which containers must traverse should not exceed 1:14
- Be of a minimum 4 metres in width
- Designed to accommodate maximum reversing distance of 12 metres
- Allow a minimum of 4.5 metres vertical clearance
- Minimum working area of 3.5 metres width and 4 metres in length should be available where the containers are emptied
- 2 metres minimum width of access threshold to the compound to allow for removal and return of containers whilst servicing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gradients over which containers must traverse should not exceed 1:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be of a minimum 4 metres in width</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed to accommodate maximum reversing distance of 12 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow a minimum of 4.5 metres vertical clearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum working area of 3.5 metres width and 4 metres in length should be available where the containers are emptied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 metres minimum width of access threshold to the compound to allow for removal and return of containers whilst servicing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommendations and Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommendations and Actions</th>
<th>Managed by</th>
<th>Assigned to</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The emphasis in the Refuse and Recycling Design Guide for Developers on streamlining of refuse storage, including underground storage, be supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the earliest possible stage in the planning process for each residential development, Planning consult Environmental Services on estate layout and provision for storage of household waste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Anna Rose</td>
<td>Sarah Fisher</td>
<td>31/03/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree procedure and inform planning officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That the cost of providing bins or other receptacles for waste be passed on to developers in the first instance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Sean Lawson</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31/03/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include in schedule of fees and charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations and Actions</td>
<td>Managed by</td>
<td>Assigned to</td>
<td>Due date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire County Council be encouraged to work in partnership with Rugby Borough Council to continually review opportunities involving waste disposal facilities for residual waste.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Lawson</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire County Council be encouraged to expand the services, accessibility and information regarding the county council recycling centres in order to meet current and future demands of the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sustainable Environment Portfolio Holder send a letter to Warwickshire County Council, as attached at Appendix 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Lawson</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Draft and send letter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Ansell</td>
<td>31/03/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kerbside collection of comingled recyclable materials shall continue</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Continuing existing practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>