

Community consultation event Summary – Simpler Recycling

Across the **8 consultation events**. There are **122 people recorded as having been spoken to** in the separate totals sheet, while the Results sheet contains **118 individual response records**. Of those, **107 recorded a clear bin-size preference**

Overall bin-size preference

Across the **107 records where a preference was recorded**:

- **140L**: 38 selections — approximately **36%**
- **180L**: 34 selections — approximately **32%**
- **240L**: 35 selections — approximately **33%**

There are a few records where more than one size appears to have been selected, so these percentages should be treated as indicative rather than a strictly mutually exclusive vote.

The overall picture is therefore balanced, with no single bin size dominating across all events. Preferences appear to be strongly influenced by household size, recycling volume and available storage space.

Main themes from residents' comments

1. Storage space is the biggest concern.

This came through repeatedly, particularly among residents in terraced and closely packed properties. Comments included concerns about having nowhere to store bins, existing bin stores needing alteration, bins affecting garden space, and bins being stored in communal/back lanes.

2. Household size and recycling volume matter.

Residents who live alone or in small households tended to favour **140L**, with concerns that larger bins would not be filled. Larger households and people who recycle heavily, particularly those producing lots of cardboard/paper, tended towards **180L or 240L**.

3. There is genuine support for replacing boxes with bins.

A significant number of comments were explicitly positive, including residents saying bins were “much better” or that they were happy/supportive of the change. The strongest support was evident at the 4 August Gateway event.

4. Some residents want to retain boxes.

There were explicit objections at several events, generally because of lack of space rather than opposition to recycling itself. This was particularly noticeable at the 28 July, 30 July and 7 August events. (Clifton/ Hull Road & Foxwood)

5. More capacity is wanted by high recyclers.

Residents who recycle heavily generally viewed the move to bins positively but wanted sufficient capacity. There were several references to cardboard, paper and existing boxes/bins being too small or overflowing.

6. The number of bins is a concern.

Some residents felt that adding another wheelie bin would create too many bins, particularly where storage is already difficult.

7. Collection arrangements need to be considered.

There were questions/concerns about collection frequency and the practicalities of bins becoming heavy over a longer collection interval

8. There are wider operational questions.

A small number of comments raised issues beyond bin size, including contaminated recycling, misuse of communal bins, overflowing communal bins, cardboard being left on the floor after collection, and requests about surplus black-bag waste.

Overall conclusion

The consultation feedback suggests broad acceptance of moving from recycling boxes to wheelie bins, but with significant practical concerns about space and getting the bin size right.

The strongest overall message is that a “one size fits all” approach may not suit residents. The preference varies considerably by location and appears closely linked to property type, household size, recycling output and storage arrangements.

- **140L** is particularly attractive to smaller households and properties with restricted storage.
- **180L** appears to be a reasonable middle-ground and was the most popular choice at several of the earlier events.

- **240L** is particularly attractive to larger households and high recyclers and was strongly preferred at the 4 and 6 August events (Acomb Front Street & Sanderson House, Chapelfields)
- **Terraced properties** generated the greatest number of space/storage concerns.
- **Detached and bungalow residents** generally appeared to have fewer storage concerns and were more able to accommodate larger bins.

Residents generally seem open to the change, but the consultation indicates that bin capacity and property/storage constraints need to be considered carefully, with household size and recycling levels potentially useful factors in determining the most appropriate bin size.

Summary per event

Date / event	Re sp on se s	140L	180L	240L	Main feedback
27 July Gateway Centre, Front Street	19	6	8	4	180L was most popular. Several residents raised concerns about limited storage space, particularly terraced/semi-detached properties. Some felt the existing recycling boxes were too small. A few were reluctant to change because of space. One flat resident with communal bins wanted additional recycling capacity because the existing bins overflow.
28 July Clifton / Burton Stone Lane / MWC	16	6	3	3	140L was most popular. Strong emphasis on space and storage constraints, including residents saying they had no room for bins and preferred larger boxes instead. Smaller bins were preferred by people producing little recycling/single-person households. Other issues included misuse of communal recycling bins and problems with presentation/collection of cardboard.

Date / event	Re sp on se s	140L	180L	240L	Main feedback
30 July Hull Road shops	9	1	5	2	180L was clearly preferred. Mixed views on the change: some residents were happy to move to bins, while others explicitly preferred to retain boxes or did not want bins. A shop-related respondent noted that an existing wheelie bin was already overflowing and suggested additional capacity.
31 July Hull Road Park café	9	1	5	1	180L was preferred. Residents who recycle a lot, particularly households using significant amounts of paper, wanted greater capacity. There were also questions about why recycling is separated and concerns about how contaminated recycling is handled if materials ultimately go to the same place. One household strongly preferred bins over boxes.
4 August Gateway Centre, Front Street	16	4	1	9	240L was overwhelmingly preferred. This was the most supportive event overall. Most comments were positive about replacing boxes with bins, particularly because residents wanted more recycling capacity. Some concerns remained around having too many bins, collection frequency, storage, and the weight of bins for elderly residents. A few preferred smaller bins or one bin rather than two.
5 August	22	8	9	4	180L was marginally preferred, with 140L also popular. Space was the dominant issue. Residents described existing storage arrangements for boxes and concerns that larger bins would not fit. Some would need to alter bin stores. Conversely, larger households and high recyclers wanted greater

Date / event	Re sp on se s	140L	180L	240L	Main feedback
Door 84, The Groves					capacity. There was also a suggestion that 240L bins should be collected fortnightly and that bins should be returned to the correct property.
6 August Sanderson House, Chapelfields	14	4	2	8	240L was preferred. Several residents said they recycle a lot or generate significant amounts of cardboard and therefore need more capacity. There were repeated suggestions that bin size should be allocated according to household size. Smaller capacity was acceptable for people who recycle less.
7 August Foxwood Community Centre	13	8	1	4	140L was clearly preferred. This reflects several smaller households, including single- and two-person households, who were concerned they would not fill a larger bin. Space was again a concern, particularly where bins are stored at the front of properties. Some residents explicitly preferred boxes, while others were supportive of the proposed change.

*Some residents did not express preference for a specific bin for number to tally

