Annexe 1- Possible Waste & Recycling Collection Options

| | Week 1 | Week 2 | Advantages | Disadvantages |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| OPTION 1- | RCV | Kerbsider | -Keeps paper | -Inflexible system- no |
| As now with | -Residual | -Paper | separate (retains | scope for adding |
| separate food | | -Mixed Glass | value) | further materials |
| collection | | -Plastic Bottles/ Cans | -Keeps glass | (card, mixed plastics) |
| | | | separate (avoids contamination) -No capital outlay | -Expensive 'bolt-on' food waste service - Environmentally |
| | | | other than food waste containers | unsound- two weekly visits to each |
| | Farid (9 Rounds) | Farid (9 Rounds) | -Simple to introduce | household doubles |
| | -Food | -Food | and communicate | mileage of service |
| | | | changes- no change other than FW | |
| OPTION 2- | RCV with pod | RCV with pod | -Flexible system- can | -Lose paper value |
| Co-mingled with | -Residual | - Co-mingled paper, glass, | add further | -Contamination |
| food pod | -Food | cans, plastic bottles, | recyclables | aspect of glass- |
| | | mixed plastics (?), card (?) | -Likely to be more | increased gate fees |
| | | -Food | popular with | and poorer quality |
| | | | residents | product |
| | | | -Likely to increase | |
| | | | participation | |
| | | | -Only requires one | |
| | | | fleet of multi-purpose | |
| | | | vehicles - more | |
| | | | versatile | |

Annexe 1- Possible Waste & Recycling Collection Options

| OPTION 3- | RCV with pod | Kerbsider with pod | -Keeps paper | Large recycling |
|------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Kerbside sort | -Residual | -Paper | separate (retains | vehicle- possibly too |
| with food pod | -Food | -Mixed Glass | value) | large for WBC? |
| | | -Plastic Bottles/ Cans | -Keeps glass | -Inflexible system- no |
| | | -Food | separate (avoids | scope for adding |
| | | | contamination) | further materials |
| | | | -No capital outlay | (card, mixed plastics) |
| | | | other than food | |
| | | | waste containers | |
| OPTION 4 | 'Twin Pack' RCV with | 'Twin Pack' RCV with | -Keeps paper | -Large vehicles- |
| Limited co- | pod | pod | separate (retains | possibly too large for |
| mingled, | -Residual | -Co-mingled cans, plastic | value) | WBC? |
| retaining | -Paper | bottles, mixed plastics (?), | -Keeps glass | -Requires capital |
| separate paper | -Food | card (?) | separate (avoids | outlay for co-mingled |
| and glass | | -Mixed glass | contamination) | recyclables |
| collection, with | | -Food | -Flexible 'co-mingled' | -Large number of |
| food pod | | | element leaves | bins/ boxes may be |
| | | | scope for future | unpopular with |
| | | | materials | residents |
| | | | -Only requires one | -Potentially collection |
| | | | fleet of multi-purpose | arrangements are too |
| | | | vehicles more | complicated |
| | | | versatile | |

Annexe 1- Possible Waste & Recycling Collection Options

| OPTION 5 Fortnightly comingled/residual collection, separate weekly food collection with paper or glass | 'Twin Pack' RCV -Residual -Co-mingled cans, plastic bottles, mixed plastics (?), card (?) | | -Keeps paper separate (retains value) -Keeps glass separate (avoids contamination) -Flexible 'co-mingled' element leaves scope for future | -Requires capital outlay for co-mingled recyclables -Large number of bins/ boxes may be unpopular with residents -Potentially collection arrangements are too |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | Farid 'Micro Duo' -Paper -Food | Farid 'Micro Duo' -Mixed Glass -Food | materials | complicated |