



Equality impact assessment and analysis (EqIAA)

Waste Strategy

Contents

Section 1 – Introduction	1
Section 2 – Research and Consultation	3
Section 3 – Identification and Analysis of Equalities Issues and Impacts	10
Section 4 – EqIAA outcome	20
Section 5 – Actions To Be Taken As a Result of This EqIAA	21
Section 6 – Evidence Informing this EqIAA	22

Section 1 – Introduction

This EqlAA discusses proposals relating to the waste strategy 2015-2020.

Background

The waste service in South Gloucestershire is delivered through a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) partnership contract with Suez (previously SITA). The council has entered its 17th year of a 25 year contract, which ends in July 2025. The contract covers the collection and disposal of household waste material.

The updated waste strategy sets the strategic objectives, policies and plans for 2015-2020 and beyond. It outlines our key drivers, our current performance, the services we provide and the proposed changes to those services.

The strategy is influenced by European, National and Regional drivers as well as our demographics and waste performance. The following are key influences:

- When compared to our statistical neighbour's we produce more waste per person and reducing waste arisings is a high priority.
- The EU has set a recycling target of 50% by 2020, In 2014-15 our rate was 47.5% and so we need to further improve our recycling to reach the 50% target.
- We know from our analysis of the black bag waste that 52% of residual waste could be recycled.

Proposed Changes

In order to make the next step change in the performance of our waste prevention and recycling output, this strategy sets out a number of key changes to the waste collection and disposal service. The changes are designed to:

- Reduce the waste arisings in South Gloucestershire
- Simplify the kerbside service offered to our residents
- Improve the participation in the recycling of waste
- Prevent waste being disposed of at landfill sites

The following changes were proposed pre-consultation:

	Changes	Rationale
1	Targeted campaigns to reduce food waste, help families find alternatives to disposable nappies and help reduce junk mail.	To reduce waste.
2	Raise awareness of the environmental impacts of waste and help residents understand what happens after it is collected.	To minimise waste.

3	Work with local schools and community groups to raise awareness.	To promote waste prevention and minimisation.
4	Promote re-use by providing information on how to give away or sell items.	To promote and encourage re-use.
5	Explore opportunities to open a 2nd reuse shop at Mangotsfield.	To promote and encourage re-use.
6	Explore opportunities for electrical item re-use.	To promote and encourage re-use.
7	Re-energise recycling by increasing frequency of recycling to weekly for all material on the same day.	Increase recycling and make the service easier to understand.
8	Stop collecting engine oil, car batteries and household batteries at the kerbside.	Focus recycling on key stream.
9	Stop using recycling bags and provide additional boxes.	Make the service simpler to understand.
10	Reduce the size of a standard black bin from 240 litres to 140 litre.	Reduce residual waste to only items that cannot be recycled.
11	Reduce the capacity for households receiving extra capacity from 380 litres to 240 litres.	Reduce residual waste to only items that cannot be recycled.

Section 2 – Research and Consultation

Research

To inform the revised strategy the waste team undertook comprehensive research and a summary evidence document can be found at www.southglos.gov.uk/wastestrategy.

Research included:

- Data analysis and demographic mapping of existing tonnages by waste stream.
- Participation studies including demographic mapping to help understand behaviour and barriers.
- Resident focus groups looking at service and containers options.
- Staff focus groups to explore how different options will impact on operations particularly with regard containers and vehicle options.
- Recycling stream analysis to understand which streams are being used and which materials are within each stream.
- Door knocking and surveys to understand resident behaviour including barriers to the existing service.
- Benchmarking/research into other authorities' activities.

From the research we know:

- Residents find our existing service difficult to understand and want a simplified service.
- Residents get frustrated at the number of recycling containers, especially the bags which can easily become damaged and can blow away in bad weather.
- There is low participation in the food recycling service.
- That councils who offer weekly recycling collect more material than those that offer the fortnightly.
- Controlling residual capacity has an impact on recycling.
- Fortnightly black bin collections are important.
- Residents would like to understand more about what happens to the material collected.
- More communication is required on the service.

The research findings influenced the draft waste strategy and proposed service changes (as shown in Section 1 above).

Consultation

A fully compliant public consultation was conducted and a full consultation report produced dated March 2016. A copy of the report can be found at www.southglos.gov.uk/wastestrategy.

The consultation was open for 14 weeks from 9 November 2015 – 15 February 2016. The

consultation was widely promoted including a dedicated page on the council’s website, roadshows, presentations at Parish and Town councils and promotion on social media including Facebook and twitter. A presentation on the proposals was given at the Waste Forum and at the South Gloucestershire Disability Action Group. In addition, copies of all information was made available from the consultation webpage.

In total the council received 1258 responses, 1179 completed survey responses, 79 emails and 5 letters.

The survey included questions in relation to respondent’s:

- Gender
- Age
- Ethnic Origin
- Disability

in order that results could be disaggregated and analysed in respect of these protected characteristic groups.

The following section considers the responses received and sets out an analysis of protected characteristics and equalities issues.

Ninety nine percent of people completing the consultation survey did so as local residents; there were four responses from town and parish councils and 8 from “other” types. Of the 1,258 responses, 1,092 left a postcode. Responses were received from all electoral wards with Stoke Gifford the area with most responses.

The tables below provide an overview of respondents.

Age:	Under 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	46 to 55	56 to 65	66 to 75	Over 75	Prefer not to say
%	1%	15%	23%	25%	16%	11%	2%	7%

Gender:	Female	Male	Prefer not to say
Percentage	51%	43%	6%

Disability:	Disabled	Non disabled	Prefer not to say
Percentage	8%	85%	8%

Ethnicity:	White British	White - Other	Non White	Prefer not to say
Percentage	80%	9%	0%	9%

The tables below provide a breakdown of the consultation questions and responses as disaggregated by equalities groups. This allows for an analysis of responses.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with our priorities?

To Reduce Waste

	Total	Sex			Age								Disability			Ethnicity			
		Female	Male	Prefer not to say	Under 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	46 to 55	56 to 65	66 to 75	Over 75	Prefer not to say	Yes	No	Prefer not to say	White - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	White - Other	Other	Prefer not to say
Strongly Agree / Tend to Agree	83%	86%	82%	64%	73%	79%	84%	83%	90%	87%	89%	63%	79%	85%	60%	86%	84%	80%	72%
Neither agree or disagree	7%	6%	7%	15%	7%	7%	7%	7%	3%	9%	7%	17%	7%	7%	14%	6%	5%	10%	17%
Strongly Disagree / Tend to Disagree	9%	7%	10%	19%	20%	14%	8%	9%	5%	4%	0%	18%	14%	7%	21%	8%	9%	10%	10%
Most Likely to Agree		Least Likely to Agree								Most Likely to Disagree									
56 - 65 Over 75		Under 25								Under 25 26 - 35 Disabled People									

Overall, there was a high level of agreement across all groups with the priority to reduce waste (e.g. the lowest level of agreement from the Under 25 group was still a 73% agreement level).

To Support Reuse

	Total	Sex			Age								Disability			Ethnicity			
		Female	Male	Prefer not to say	Under 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	46 to 55	56 to 65	66 to 75	Over 75	Prefer not to say	Yes	No	Prefer not to say	White - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	White - Other	Other	Prefer not to say
Strongly Agree / Tend to Agree	84%	87%	84%	63%	80%	81%	87%	85%	88%	87%	85%	67%	83%	86%	64%	87%	81%	80%	74%
Neither agree or disagree	8%	7%	8%	17%	13%	11%	8%	5%	5%	8%	11%	16%	6%	7%	16%	7%	7%	10%	14%
Strongly Disagree / Tend to Disagree	6%	4%	6%	17%	7%	7%	6%	7%	4%	3%	0%	15%	11%	5%	16%	5%	9%	10%	9%
Most Likely to Agree		Least Likely to Agree								Most Likely to Disagree									
-		-								Disabled People									

Overall, there was a high level of agreement across all groups with the priority to support reuse (e.g. the highest level of disagreement from disabled people was at an 11% level).

To Encourage Recycling

	Total	Sex			Age								Disability			Ethnicity			
		Female	Male	Prefer not to say	Under 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	46 to 55	56 to 65	66 to 75	Over 75	Prefer not to say	Yes	No	Prefer not to say	White - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	White - Other	Other	Prefer not to say
Strongly Agree / Tend to Agree	89%	92%	89%	70%	80%	89%	92%	91%	92%	92%	82%	70%	83%	92%	70%	92%	89%	90%	81%
Neither agree or disagree	5%	3%	5%	15%	13%	5%	3%	3%	4%	5%	15%	16%	8%	4%	13%	4%	4%	0%	10%
Strongly Disagree / Tend to Disagree	4%	4%	5%	11%	7%	6%	5%	5%	3%	2%	0%	12%	8%	3%	14%	3%	6%	10%	9%
Most Likely to Agree		Least Likely to Agree								Most Likely to Disagree									

-	Under 25 Over 75	Ethnicity – ‘Other’
---	---------------------	---------------------

Overall, there was a high level of agreement across all groups with the priority to encourage recycling (e.g. the highest level of disagreement from the ‘Other’ ethnicity group was at a 10% level).

To Promote Waste Prevention

	Total	Sex			Age								Disability			Ethnicity			
		Female	Male	Prefer not to say	Under 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	46 to 55	56 to 65	66 to 75	Over 75	Prefer not to say	Yes	No	Prefer not to say	White - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	White - Other	Other	Prefer not to say
Strongly Agree / Tend to Agree	80%	85%	78%	57%	87%	79%	79%	82%	87%	84%	78%	61%	74%	82%	66%	84%	74%	60%	67%
Neither agree or disagree	10%	7%	11%	21%	7%	10%	12%	8%	5%	9%	11%	17%	12%	9%	13%	9%	11%	30%	14%
Strongly Disagree / Tend to Disagree	8%	6%	9%	17%	7%	11%	8%	7%	4%	2%	4%	19%	12%	6%	16%	6%	12%	10%	17%

Most Likely to Agree	Least Likely to Agree	Most Likely to Disagree
Female Under 25 56 - 65	Disabled People White - Other Ethnicity – ‘Other’	-

Overall, there was a high level of agreement across all groups with the priority to promote waste prevention (e.g. the lowest level of agreement from the ‘Other’ ethnicity group was still a 60% agreement level).

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the proposal to stop using the plastic, cardboard and paper bags and instead provide additional green boxes?

	Total	Sex			Age								Disability			Ethnicity			
		Female	Male	Prefer not to say	Under 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	46 to 55	56 to 65	66 to 75	Over 75	Prefer not to say	Yes	No	Prefer not to say	White - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	White - Other	Other	Prefer not to say
Strongly Agree / Tend to Agree	52%	55%	50%	44%	73%	62%	56%	50%	48%	42%	52%	43%	51%	53%	42%	53%	57%	40%	49%
Neither agree or disagree	19%	19%	19%	22%	13%	19%	21%	18%	22%	17%	22%	17%	14%	20%	19%	18%	22%	10%	26%
Strongly Disagree / Tend to Disagree	27%	24%	29%	31%	13%	19%	22%	30%	28%	37%	19%	36%	33%	26%	35%	26%	21%	50%	26%

Most Likely to Agree	Least Likely to Agree	Most Likely to Disagree
Under 25 26 - 35 White - Other	66 - 75 Ethnicity – ‘Other’	66 – 75 Disabled People Ethnicity – ‘Other’

It is clear to see that older people and disabled people were least likely to wish to see a switch to additional green boxes. This is borne out by feedback received from the South Gloucestershire Disability Action Group during the group presentation given within the consultation period.

It is also noted that younger people and the White – Other ethnicity group were most in favour of a switch to additional green boxes.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with changing the criteria for receiving extra-large capacity from 5 to 6 members of a household and from 2 to 3 children in nappies?

	Total	Sex			Age								Disability			Ethnicity			
		Female	Male	Prefer not to say	Under 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	46 to 55	56 to 65	66 to 75	Over 75	Prefer not to say	Yes	No	Prefer not to say	White - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	White - Other	Other	Prefer not to say
Strongly Agree / Tend to Agree	33%	36%	32%	25%	40%	29%	35%	29%	33%	45%	56%	24%	29%	34%	27%	37%	40%	20%	28%
Neither agree or disagree	17%	19%	16%	15%	13%	13%	16%	19%	23%	15%	19%	17%	20%	17%	19%	16%	16%	10%	17%
Strongly Disagree / Tend to Disagree	48%	44%	51%	58%	47%	58%	49%	50%	42%	38%	19%	55%	49%	47%	53%	46%	44%	70%	55%

Most Likely to Agree	Least Likely to Agree	Most Likely to Disagree
Under 25 66 – 75 Over 75 White - Other	Ethnicity – ‘Other’	26 - 35 White - Other

This proposal received the highest level of disagreement overall. The issue of having children in nappies and therefore requiring a good level of capacity was raised during consultation and this question shows that the 26 – 35 age group was the least likely to agree (the group most likely to have children in nappies).

Which of these statements best describes your attitudes to and opinions on recycling at home?

	Total	Female	Male	Prefer not to say	Under 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	46 to 55	56 to 65	66 to 75	Over 75	Prefer not to say	Yes	No	Prefer not to say	White - English / Welsh / Scottish / Northern Irish / British	White - Other	Other	Prefer not to say
I recycle even if it requires additional effort	77%	78%	78%	67%	47%	69%	81%	79%	86%	79%	78%	59%	72%	79%	64%	81%	74%	90%	69%
I recycle if it does not require additional effort	17%	16%	19%	18%	40%	26%	20%	15%	10%	13%	11%	24%	16%	17%	23%	15%	20%	0%	24%
I find it easy	36%	39%	34%	26%	13%	36%	37%	39%	36%	41%	30%	24%	34%	38%	23%	39%	42%	50%	28%
I find it convenient	20%	22%	19%	18%	20%	19%	19%	21%	23%	22%	15%	18%	15%	21%	15%	22%	25%	30%	14%
It fits into my normal routine	39%	45%	34%	29%	20%	41%	43%	37%	38%	42%	41%	30%	34%	41%	22%	41%	43%	60%	32%
It's important to recycle to help the environment	58%	63%	55%	47%	40%	66%	64%	56%	59%	52%	48%	45%	47%	60%	50%	61%	68%	60%	45%
It's too time consuming	7%	6%	8%	7%	13%	11%	9%	6%	4%	2%	7%	8%	6%	7%	11%	6%	6%	10%	10%
I can't be bothered	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	3%
I recycle when I remember	3%	3%	3%	4%	20%	6%	2%	2%	1%	2%	0%	5%	4%	3%	5%	3%	3%	0%	4%

I do not recycle	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
I find all the containers difficult to store/unsightly	37%	35%	38%	46%	47%	45%	41%	30%	35%	28%	30%	47%	36%	35%	51%	35%	37%	30%	46%
I don't understand the recycling system	4%	2%	6%	3%	0%	6%	5%	5%	1%	5%	0%	3%	2%	4%	4%	3%	5%	10%	6%
I don't see why I should recycle	1%	0%	1%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	5%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	10%	1%
I can't see the benefits of recycling	1%	1%	1%	3%	0%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%	2%	1%	5%	0%	3%	10%	1%
I should be able to recycle a wider range of material	28%	29%	28%	22%	53%	35%	32%	30%	19%	25%	11%	20%	30%	28%	22%	28%	26%	20%	27%
I find it convenient	10%	12%	9%	3%	20%	12%	9%	9%	11%	12%	0%	3%	6%	11%	5%	10%	12%	10%	10%

Age

- The younger age groups (Under 25 and 26 – 35 years) were least likely to recycle and Under 25s were least likely to find it convenient or to fit in with their normal routine.
- In contrast, both Under 25s and 26 – 35 years felt that they should be able to recycle a wider range of materials.
- The younger age groups (Under 25 and 26 – 35 years) were most likely to find all the containers difficult to store/unsightly.
- Under 25s were the least likely to feel that it is important to recycle to help the environment.
- The 26 – 65 years have the highest levels of interest in the environment
- The older age groups (66 years and over) were least likely to find all the containers difficult to store/unsightly.
- People aged 66 and over were less likely than average to feel that it is important to recycle to help the environment.
- Over 75s were the least likely to find recycling convenient.
- Over 75s were the least likely to feel that they should be able to recycle a wider range of materials.

Gender

- Females were more likely than average and Males less likely than average to feel that recycling fits into their normal routine.

Disability

- Disabled People were least likely to find recycling convenient.
- Disabled People were less likely than average to feel that it is important to recycle to help the environment.

Ethnicity

- The “White – Other” group were more likely than average to find recycling easy and convenient and to feel that it is important to recycle to help the environment.
- People who declared their ethnicity as “Other” were most likely to recycle, most likely to find recycling easy, convenient and fit into their normal routine. In contrast, this group was most likely to state that they do not understand the recycling system and not see the benefits of recycling.

The analysis also highlights the following:

Proposed changes to recycling containers

- Disabled people and over 66 were the least likely to support changes to boxes from the current bags.

Reducing the capacity offered to larger families

- The 25 – 36 age group has the highest level of disagreement to changing the criteria for large families receiving extra capacity.
- The youngest age group Under 25 and oldest Over 66 years were more likely to agree.

The consultation received a significant number of comments and those shown below are particularly relevant to raise as part of this EqlAA:

Stopping collection of household batteries

- “will be a problem for people without cars as Sort It centres are inaccessible to pedestrians”
- “Is not a problem as long as disabled and very old etc who cannot get to the Sort It Centre can be catered for”

Replacing bags with boxes

- “I personally as a disabled lady cannot carry the big bulky containers”
- “Bags are easier to lift by people with limited mobility or of advancing age”

Changes to extra capacity

- “We have two new born and the nannies alone would come close to filling”
- “I think only allowing a large bin for large families or those with three or more kids in nappies is not fair”

Reducing the size of the black bin

- “I recycle everything I can and with a household of 4/5 adults my black bin is full”
- “I found that even one young child in nappies caused significant volume of waste from nappies and wet wipes”
- “Your proposals are not suitable for families”

Section 3 – Identification and Analysis of Equalities Issues and Impacts

Section 2 of this EqIAA shows that the research and consultation information has provided a wealth of information regarding protected characteristic groups, needs, attitudes and issues emerging. As a result of this information, the changes proposed have been amended in order to ensure the advancement of equality of opportunity – this means meeting the needs of our diverse residents more closely in order to ensure equality of access to services for all. These changes are highlighted in the table shown below along with explanation and rationale. It is noted that all protected characteristic groups as detailed by the Equality Act 2010 formed part of the analysis and the key characteristics identified were ‘Disability’, ‘Age’ and ‘Pregnancy & Maternity’ (it is not anticipated that there would be a likelihood of people being proportionately more or less impacted by any of the proposals as a result of the other protected characteristics of ‘Sex’, ‘Sexual Orientation’, ‘Gender Reassignment’, ‘Religion or Belief’, ‘Marriage or Civil Partnership’, or ‘Race’).

	Change proposed Pre-Consultation	Change Now Proposed	Explanation of Proposal	Equalities Impact and Rationale
1	Targeted campaigns to reduce food waste, help families find alternatives to disposable nappies and help reduce junk mail.	Targeted campaigns to reduce food waste, help families find alternatives to disposable nappies and help reduce junk mail.	To reduce waste communication campaigns will be targeted: 1. at reducing food waste 2. providing alternatives to disposable nappies including offering discounted birth to potty washable nappy kits. 3. Provide information so residents can opt out of junk mail.	Proposal Unchanged It is anticipated that this activity will result in a positive impact for all and will support awareness of waste and environmental issues and specifically help to reduce waste. All communications activities are subject to the Council's established Equality and Diversity in Communications procedures.

2	Raise awareness of the environmental impacts of waste and help residents understand what happens after it is collected.	Raise awareness of the environmental impacts of waste and help residents understand what happens after it is collected.	To minimise waste we will continue to raise awareness of the environmental impacts of waste and provide information on what happens to the waste collected in South Gloucestershire.	<p>Proposal Unchanged</p> <p>It is anticipated that this activity will result in a positive impact for all and will support awareness of waste and environmental issues and specifically help to reduce waste. All communications activities are subject to the Council's established Equality and Diversity in Communications procedures.</p>
---	---	---	--	---

3	Work with local schools and community groups to raise awareness.	Work with local schools and community groups to raise awareness.	To promote waste prevention and minimisation we will continue to work with local schools and community groups. We are committed to undertaking at least 2-3 targeted school campaigns a year.	<p>Proposal Unchanged</p> <p>It is anticipated that this activity will result in a positive impact for all and will support awareness of waste and environmental issues and specifically help to reduce waste.</p> <p>All communications activities are subject to the Council's established Equality and Diversity in Communications procedures.</p> <p>This activity is particularly important given the consultation findings which showed that the younger age groups (Under 25 and 26 – 35 years) were least likely to recycle and Under 25s were least likely to find it convenient or to fit in with their normal routine; and that Under 25s were the least likely to feel that it is important to recycle to help the environment. The consultation also found that, In contrast, both Under 25s and 26 – 35 years felt that they should be able to recycle a wider range of materials.</p> <p>This information can be used to inform our work with schools as well as community groups in order to maximise impact of this identified priority.</p>
---	--	--	---	--

4	Promote re-use by providing information on how to give away or sell items.	Promote re-use by providing information on how to give away or sell items.	To promote and encourage re-use we will provide information to residents on how to donate and give or sell items so that they can be reused by others. We will collect items that have been taken to the Sort It centres but could be reused and offer them to charities including providing children's bikes to Bikeability to distribute to local schools in the area.	<p>Proposal Unchanged</p> <p>It is anticipated that this activity will result in a positive impact for all and in particular, residents on low incomes.</p>
5	Explore opportunities to open a 2 nd reuse shop at Mangotsfield.	Explore opportunities to open a 2 nd reuse shop at Mangotsfield.	To promote and encourage re-use we will look to open a 2 nd reuse shop in the south of the county close to the existing Mangotsfield Sort it Centre.	<p>Proposal Unchanged</p> <p>It is anticipated that this activity will result in a positive impact for all and in particular, residents on low incomes. It is also noted that the proposed location supports priority neighbourhoods.</p>
6	Explore opportunities for electrical item re-use.	Explore opportunities for electrical item re-use.	To promote and encourage re-use we will investigate opportunities for electrical items in our existing and proposed re-use shop. Including PAT testing for electricals and making spare parts available.	<p>Proposal Unchanged</p> <p>It is anticipated that this activity will result in a positive impact for all and in particular, residents on low incomes.</p>

7	Re-energise recycling by increasing collection frequency of recycling to weekly for all materials on the same day.	Re-energise recycling by increasing collection frequency of recycling to weekly for all materials on the same day.	Increase recycling and make the service easier to understand by offering a weekly collection of all recycling material on the same day, collected by the same vehicle.	<p>Proposal Unchanged</p> <p>This offers an improvement in service offering with positive benefits for residents and the environment. There are no specific equalities issues identified in relation to this proposal, however, please see item 9 below for additional information regarding recycling containers.</p>
---	--	--	--	---

8	Stop collecting engine oil, car batteries and household batteries at the kerbside.	Stop collecting engine oil and car batteries at the kerbside.	We will focus recycling on key streams of paper, cardboard, glass, metals, plastic, textiles and food. We will continue to collect household batteries but will stop collecting engine oil and car batteries. These can still be taken to the Sort It centres.	<p>Proposal Changed</p> <p>It is not envisaged that there would be any negative impact for any protected characteristic group in relation to this amended proposal. The changes have taken account of feedback regarding household batteries which stated that ceasing this service may result in an issue for those without vehicles (i.e. if household batteries are not collected at the kerbside, then those without a car would find greater difficulty in recycling these items at Sort It centres). We know from our EqIAA in 2015 covering the review of Sort It centres and Transfer Stations that disabled people and older people are potentially less likely to have a vehicle and utilise the Sort It centres. As such, the new proposal to retain kerbside collections of household batteries acknowledges this issue and will ensure that those without a vehicle to access Sort It centres will continue to be able to recycle household batteries at the kerbside. This will ensure continued benefit to older people, disabled people and people on low incomes (i.e. persons proportionately less likely to have a vehicle for entry to Sort It centres).</p>
---	--	---	--	---

9	Stop using recycling bags and provide additional boxes	Offer residents the choice to either continuing using the white plastic and green cardboard bags or to just use boxes.	To make the service simpler to understand we will reduce the number of bags and containers used for storing recycling. We will also enable residents to choose containers that best suit their needs.	<p>Proposal Changed</p> <p>As part of consultation, issues relating to the heavier nature of boxes in comparison to bags were raised – particularly by disabled and older residents. As a result of this, it is anticipated that the amendment to offer residents a choice of containers to suit their needs would ensure a continued positive impact for all.</p> <p>It is also noted that the reduction in the overall number of containers used for storing recycling will provide benefit for all residents as this will make the service easier to understand. In particular, it is anticipated that this will offer benefits for more vulnerable residents who may struggle with understanding the details of the current service.</p> <p>Additionally, the younger age groups who reported being most likely to find all the containers difficult to store/unsightly would be positively impacted by this proposal.</p>
---	--	--	---	---

10	Reduce the size of a standard black bin from 240 litres to 140 litre	Reduce the size of a standard black bin from 240 litres to 140 litre	We will reduce residual waste to only items that cannot be recycled by restricting the volume of residual waste from 240 litres to 140 litres. The black bins will still be emptied fortnightly.	<p>Proposal Changed in Part – also see item 12 below</p> <p>It is not envisaged that this would result in any negative impact for any protected characteristic group for the following reason: Concerns were raised as part of the consultation by those with young families where children are in nappies. In response to this, it is proposed that the introduction of a separate nappy capacity for disposable nappies would result in a continued positive impact in respect of the protected characteristic of ‘Pregnancy and Maternity’, and further, for families with young children.</p>
----	--	--	--	--

11	Reduce the capacity for households receiving extra capacity from 380 litres to 240 litres	Reduce the capacity for households receiving extra capacity from 380 litres to 240 litres	Households that have additional needs will be reviewed on a case by case basis and will be provided with capacity that is suitable for their circumstances. For most this will be a 240 litre bin. Households receiving extra capacity for medical needs will be unaffected by the changes.	<p>Proposal Unchanged</p> <p>Capacity for large families will be reviewed on a case by case basis and where families demonstrate they are recycling as much as possible and still require additional capacity it will be provided. It is considered that the proposal to deal with this issue on a case by case basis will offer a fair system which is based on the principle of offering equality of opportunity for all people. It is specifically noted that households receiving extra capacity for medical needs will be unaffected by the changes, thus protected the protected characteristic of 'Disability'.</p>
----	---	---	---	---

12	NA	Supporting families with young children in nappies.	To promote reuse and reduce waste, families with young children still in nappies will be offered a separate nappy sack to present disposable nappies alongside the smaller 140 litre bin. As an alternative, families will also be able to access a discounted birth to potty reusable nappy kit.	<p>New Proposal</p> <p>Concerns were raised about bin capacity as part of the consultation by those with young families where children are in nappies. In response to this, it is proposed that a separate nappy sack for disposable nappies be introduced. It is anticipated that this would result in a positive impact in respect of the protected characteristic of 'Pregnancy and Maternity', and further, for families with young children.</p> <p>In addition, it is considered that there would be a positive impact through the offering of discounted birth to potty washable nappy kits.</p>
----	----	---	---	--

It is confirmed that all existing waste services provided to residents with additional needs including:

- clinical collections, sharps collections, help putting waste out and assisted collections, concessions for those on low income, will continue unchanged.

In regard to this, the following is noted:

Historically, disabled people have been the least satisfied group in South Gloucestershire with Waste and Recycling Services. Over the last 3 years, work has been conducted to promote help putting waste out and in particular the assisted collection service. Informal feedback from disabled people's groups (e.g. the South Gloucestershire Disability Action Group) has been positive. Our EqIAA conducted in 2016 shows that over the last 3 years the satisfaction levels of disabled people have steadily increased and now show parity of satisfaction levels with the wider population.

Section 4 – EqIAA outcome

Outcome	Response	Reason(s) and Justification
<p>Outcome 1: No major change required.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers or to better promote equality have been identified.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This EqIAA has clearly identified that the majority of the options under consideration would provide benefit for all residents.</p> <p>As a result of the feedback from the consultation and the analysis of equalities issues emerging, the following changes have been made to the waste strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional provisions for families with young children in nappies, • Changes to how extra capacity will be provided for large families, • Changes to continue to collect household batteries, • Changes to recycling containers to allow residents to continue plastic and cardboard bags if they wish. <p>These changes ensure the council's proactive work in respect of the advancement of equality of opportunity for all – this means ensuring that the diverse needs of our residents are recognized and met more closely in order to ensure equality of access to services for all.</p>
<p>Outcome 3: Continue despite having identified potential for adverse impact or missed opportunities to promote equality.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>Outcome 4: Stop and Rethink</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Section 5 – Actions To Be Taken As a Result of This EqIAA

Dependent upon Committee decision, the following actions would be required:

1. The updated strategy 2015-2020 is adopted that includes the following changes:
 - The inclusion of a discounted birth to potty reusable nappy kit for families in South Gloucestershire.
 - The addition of a separate nappy sack for the collection of disposable nappies.
 - Offering residents the choice between continuing to use the plastic and cardboard bags or opting to use boxes.
 - The changing of criteria for extra capacity to be on a case by case basis where families are actively recycling but still require additional capacity.
 - The continued collection of household batteries at the kerbside
2. The successful implementation of the 12 priorities detailed within this EqIAA will continue to be monitored as part of our ongoing assessment of the service. This includes equalities monitoring to ensure parity of satisfaction and experience of the waste and recycling service.

Section 6 – Evidence Informing this EqIAA

- Consultation feedback and report
- Review of Sort It Centres and Transfer Stations EqIAA 2015
- Council Revenue Budget EqIAA 2016 (resident research data showing 3 year trends in resident satisfaction levels with council services)