Integrated impact assessment (IIA) Template

Complete as a record of your assessment.

Read the IIA guidance before completing this template.

Title of proposal

Changes to siting guidelines for communal bins under the Communal Bin Review

Purpose of proposed work

Elected members have made a number of changes to the siting guidelines for communal bins on street. Some of these changes have been made at Committee without reference to the IIA process and as such have not been tested. This assessment seeks to address this and consider what further input is required from specific groups.

In November 2024 Transport and Environment Committee made a decision to relax several criteria previously set out for the siting of bin hubs. Relevant changes included:

- Walking distance: Relaxed from 100 metres to 120 metres
- Hospitality: Bin hubs should not be sited directly adjacent to an outdoor area currently used for tables and chairs by a hospitality venue
- Resident amenity: Bin hubs should be sited in locations which minimise any negative impacts on resident amenity (if possible)

Additionally, Councillors agreed that the framework is a set of 'best case' guidelines. With agreement and collaboration between residents, councillors, and officers, discretion can be applied to the siting of a hub in such a way that may not conform with the framework due to the variations and requirements within different streets. (i.e. we can dismiss parts of the framework in some circumstances).

In June 2025 Transport and Environment Committee made the decision to approve a 'Non-pavement side' bin hub design requiring a road crossing, prompting road safety concerns. This report includes the Road Safety Audit with a list of recommendations (Suspending parking opposite the bin hub, installing dropped kerbs etc) on how the non-pavement side (NPS) design could be introduced in the safest way possible. The main report outlined the associated costs of making the design as safe as possible and Officer recommendation **not** to use the NPS design (based on cost and timeline impact). The discussion and printed minutes show what decisions Cllrs made re the NPS design.

Lead officer, name, job title, service and department
Angus Murdoch, Technical Coordinator, Neighbourhood Environmental Services (NES)
Additional colleagues: name, job title, service and department
Michael Richardson, Project Delivery Manager – Communal Bin Review Anne Christie, Project Officer - Communal Bin Review Team Melissa Campbell, Senior Neighbourhood Environmental Services Officer
Date
Process started: April 2026 Process completed: October 2026
Briefly describe public involvement in this proposal to date and planned
Feedback from members of the public has led to requests for updated bin hub siting criteria. Some of the changes have been circulated previously to The Access Panel for comment however some changes were made by elected members at Committee and have not been. Generally, therefore, the changes have been made at Committee, following discussion there, but a briefing in January 2026 to Community Councils did clarify specifics of non-pavement side design, including extra bull bars to provide safe space for residents to stand and use bins.

Impacts

1 Equality impacts

We want to ensure our proposals are fair for everyone. Consider potential positive and negative impacts of your proposal on groups/people with protected characteristics. Assessment of impact means we consider the needs of everyone with an “intersectional lens.” This means looking at the impact that different protected characteristics and other factors can have on people.

Consider if your proposal will help:

- prevent discrimination
- advance equal opportunities by reducing disadvantage and meeting different needs, and
- foster good relations by encouraging inclusion and understanding.

Consider if your proposal could impact on groups/people with protected characteristics. Tick all that apply

	Negative impact	Positive impact	No impact
1. Age	x		
2. Disability	x		
3. Gender reassignment			x
4. Marriage and civil partnership			x
5. Pregnancy and maternity	x		
6. Race			x
7. Religion or belief			x
8. Sex			x
9. Sexual orientation			x
10. Care experienced children and young people			x

Use the text box below to describe the differential impacts you have identified on each of the groups/people with protected characteristics. Consider any intersectional impacts.

Relaxation of the walking distance

The original target maximum walking distance was no more than 50 metres. This was initially relaxed to 100 metres and the IIA was updated. This most recent change is to 120 metres.

As well as the potential requirement to cross the street to access the service, increasing the walking distance could result in a greater number of customers becoming or feeling unable to use the service. This would mean that more people need to receive tailored support such as assisted collections as set out in the existing IIA.

This represents an opportunity for the service to reinforce the training and expectations among its officers and supervisors in terms of the expected service standards to ensure that requests are correctly managed and addressed.
The decision of Councillors to amend the siting guidelines to relax the maximum walking distance to 120 metres (from 100m) would potentially reduce the accessibility of the service to older people and disabled people, as well as possibly for people who are pregnant.

It is recognised that any distance is essentially arbitrary and will not suit everyone. However, the initial maximum walking distance of 50 metres was based on a published standard used by the UK Government. The relaxation to 100 metres in May 2023 doubled the previous length and this change to 120 metres involves a further relaxation.

Non-pavement side design
It's not clear what steps the service could take to offset any risks arising from the new layout or design of bin hubs on the non-pavement side of a street. The risks raised via a Road Safety Audit were included in a report to the Transport and Environment Committee however, Committee voted to dismiss Officer recommendations. Their approval contained the following note on placing bins on the "non-residential side of a residential street with bins arranged in such a way that allows a resident to stand in the safe space between two bins"

Potentially the Council could look at measures such as proximity to existing crossing to provide a safe route but those would be site-specific and person-specific (in the event they make a disabled person walk further with reduced mobility, they may not help at all).

On one hand people safely cross streets all the time. Nevertheless, this does appear to make the statutory service less accessible and potentially hazardous to *some* people, in particular people who are older or disabled, either as a result of reduced mobility or visual impairment.
It's assumed that the previous objections to users having to stand in between bins to use them related to the risk of bins being moved during use and service users crushed as a result. This seems to be relatively unlikely but does present some risk e.g. in the event of a traffic accident, and there could potentially be a danger that service users could walk into the path of traffic.

Overall, as far as possible, therefore, the service should be aiming to site bins using the standard criteria which seeks to avoid these scenarios, except in situations such as those where the bins have already been sited in a similar manner historically, or where there is clear local community demand for this outcome AND there is also no data suggesting that there is a significant risk of accident. Essentially this arrangement should only be used in exceptional circumstances.

No other impacts are foreseen.

Evidence

Use the text box below to summarise what evidence you have used to inform this IIA. Where possible, include links if the documents are published. Show how you have used your evidence in making your assessment of potential impacts.

Example: A proposal to increase charges will impact women more than men as we know women are more likely to be vulnerable to poverty. The Gendered Nature of Poverty briefing note provides an overview of this issue and why it matters.

Evidence could include the results of any relevant consultation/engagement. If further evidence is required, please note how it will be gathered.

The original siting guidelines were developed in consultation with The Access Panel, which was able to raise particular issues with regard to disability related issues, acknowledging that disabilities take a variety of forms and may not necessarily be visible.

The issues captured here were reflected in these discussions at the time.

Please record any mitigating actions for any negative impacts identified, at Section 9 of this template

2 Human Rights impacts

The Council must act compatibly with Human Rights legislation. Think about what kind of impact the proposal may have on people in terms of Human Rights. Use the text box below to describe which Human Rights Articles are relevant, which groups are affected and what the potential impacts are.

Some of the changes which Councillors have imposed do make the service less accessible to some groups, as highlighted above, and need to be supported by training for staff to ensure that mitigations are delivered appropriately.

In terms of the specific articles related to Human Rights, the following are noted:

Article 8 protects your right to respect for your private and family life
Protocol 1, Article 1 protects your right to enjoy your property peacefully

These articles are sometimes quoted by people objecting to bin hubs, but this appears to be based on a misinterpretation of the articles.

For example, Article 8 protects your right to respect for your private and family life. What it actually states is that public authorities should not stop you entering or living in your home without very good reason, and they should not enter without your permission, neither of which is something the communal bin review would cause.

Protocol 1, Article 1 protects your right to enjoy your property peacefully, and

- “Property can include things like land, houses, objects you own, shares, licences, leases, patents, money, pensions and certain types of welfare benefits. A public authority cannot take away your property, or place restrictions on its use, without very good reason.”
- “Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.”

Protocol 1 does not, however, imply that someone living in a city can expect to live free from any noise.

In practice, many of the recent changes to the framework are to prioritise resident amenity and site bin hubs away from residential properties where possible. This should have a positive impact on residents in terms of amenity and any perceived or actual impacts from noise, odours etc.

The changes to the siting guidelines covered under this IIA would therefore not be expected to impact negatively on these articles unless a situation arose where a bin hub was moved to reduce noise at one property and simply caused it at another. In reality, the project team would be aiming to avoid this scenario.

The following categories were identified from the previous checklist template, all of these in the context of making the service less accessible to people who have some disabilities or other reduced mobility, e.g. resulting from pregnancy or age:

- Eliminate discrimination and harassment;
- Advance equality of opportunity eg improve access / quality of services / digital access;
- Enable people to have more control of their social/work environment;
- Reduce differences in status between different groups of people;
- Promote participation, inclusion, dignity and control over decisions;
- Protect vulnerable children and adults.

Evidence

Use the text box below to summarise what evidence you have used to inform this IIA. Where possible, include links if the documents are published. Show how you have used your evidence in making your assessment of potential impacts.

Evidence could include the results of any relevant consultation/engagement. If further evidence is required, please note how it will be gathered.

These comments are based on those raised in Section 1.

Please record any mitigating actions for any negative impacts identified, at Section 9 of this template

3 Children's Rights impacts

The Council must act compatibly with Children's Rights legislation. Think about what kind of impact the proposal may have on children and young people in terms of Children's Rights. Use the text box below to describe which Children's Rights Articles are relevant, which groups are affected and what the potential impacts are.

It's worth noting that the project more widely has sought to re-site bins away from junctions and off footways, which does serve to improve safety and accessibility of

public footways. This could potentially be seen as beneficial in terms of Articles 3 and 6.

However, the changes to the framework made by Councillors allow more flexibility in terms of crossing the road to use a bin hub, particularly with the 'non-pavement design'. This may be expected to increase road safety risks to children associated with crossing the road, as parents may bring their children to help take out waste, or children may help on their own. They may choose not to use official safe crossing points or there may not be one available.

Evidence

Use the text box below to summarise what evidence you have used to inform this IIA. Where possible, include links if the documents are published. Show how you have used your evidence in making your assessment of potential impacts.

Evidence could include the results of any relevant consultation/engagement. If further evidence is required, please note how it will be gathered.

No specific data is held regarding these matters. These comments are based on experience of providing these services over a number of years, with communal bins having first been introduced as far back as the 1990s.

Please record any mitigating actions for any negative impacts identified, at Section 9 of this template

4 Socio-economic disadvantage impacts

The Council has a duty to consider how it can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socio-economic disadvantage, when making strategic decisions. However, to support the Council's Business Plan priorities, the Council considers it best practice to consider the potential impact that all relevant proposals may have on people experiencing socio- economic disadvantage and how inequalities of outcome can be reduced.

Consider if your proposal could impact on any of the below groups? Tick all that apply.

	Negative impact	Positive impact	No impact
Low income – cannot afford to maintain regular payments such as bills, food, clothing			x
Low/no wealth – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with unexpected spends and no provision for the future			x
Material deprivation – being unable to access basic goods and services, ie home contents			x

	Negative impact	Positive impact	No impact
insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm winter coat			
Area deprivation (including communities of interest and communities of place) – where you live, where you work, visit or spend a continuous amount of time can all have an impact ie rural areas, accessibility of transport, education and employment impact, people who have experienced homelessness and/or the asylum system, those who share an identity and/or protected characteristic			x
Socio-economic background – disadvantage that can arise from parents' education, employment and income, social class in other words.			x

Use the text box below to describe the impacts you have identified on each of the groups above, and how you can reduce inequalities of outcome?

Communal bins are sited in relation to the type of property (generally larger blocks of flats which are designed in such a way as to make traditional kerbside collections impractical). As such they are not sited with respect to socio-economic status. Within Edinburgh, properties of this type exist widely across the city (and across different socio-economic groups).

Evidence

Use the text box below to summarise what evidence you have used to inform this IIA. Where possible, include links if the documents are published. Show how you have used your evidence in making your assessment of potential impacts.

Evidence could include the results of any relevant consultation/engagement. If further evidence is required, please note how it will be gathered.

As above, communal bins are sited in relation to the type of property (generally larger blocks of flats which are designed in such a way as to make traditional kerbside collections impractical). As such they are not sited with respect to socio-economic status. Within Edinburgh, properties of this type exist widely across the city and are not specific to any particular socio-economic group.

Please record any mitigating actions for any negative impacts identified, at Section 9 of this template.

5 Climate and nature impacts

The Council has a duty to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, adapt to the impacts of climate change, incorporate the principles of sustainability into decisions and actions, and ensure a just transition (just transition only applies to climate mitigation or adaption projects).

Consider if your proposal could impact on any of the below? Tick all that apply.

	Negative impact	Positive impact	No impact
Climate Mitigation - opportunities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions	x		
Climate Adaptation - opportunities to prepare for future changes in our climate			x
Just Transition – opportunities to ensure a fair shift to a low carbon economy that doesn't disadvantage people or increase inequality	x		
Nature Recovery Impacts	x		
Overall Sustainability	x		

Use the text box below to describe the impacts you have identified on each of the sections above and then consider how you can reduce greenhouse gas emissions, adapt to the impacts of climate change, incorporate the principles of sustainability into decisions and actions, and ensure a just transition. Also consider any cumulative effects of climate change on people.

The previous service guidelines sought to ensure that it was equally easy to recycle as not and sought to take a balanced approach to walking distances. Making the service more difficult for some people to use undermines this as it carries a risk of reducing the percentage of the population who are going to correctly segregate their different waste streams.

In terms of wider sustainability there is also a potential for an increase in road accidents resulting from some of these decisions.

Not recycling waste is expected to result in an increase in climate change emissions (and globally in other forms of pollution related to the resource use and extraction of materials which could have been avoided).

However, in the overall context of both the household waste for which the Council is responsible, and the waste managed as a result of this specific service, it is to be hoped that the negative impact will be limited. As a whole the project is increasing recycling capacity throughout the city and making recycling more convenient for residents. Based on the framework changes, the instances where

bin hubs have/are being located to a location which is further from properties for reasons such as prioritising amenity is expected to have minimal impact overall.

Use the text box below to describe the impacts you have identified on nature.

As above, on a global scale, the potentially negative impacts on recycling performance would be expected to feed back to result in an increase in avoidable resource extraction which would then impact negatively on nature.

Evidence

Use the text box below to summarise what evidence you have used to inform this IIA. Where possible, include links if the documents are published. Show how you have used your evidence in making your assessment of potential impacts.

Evidence could include the results of any relevant consultation/engagement. If further evidence is required, please note how it will be gathered.

These comments are based on experience of trying to ensure recycling waste is as easy as not.

Please record any mitigating actions for any negative impacts identified, at Section 9 of this template

6 Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA)

Could your proposal result in significant environmental effects? If yes, you may need to complete a Strategic Environment Assessment? Information is available on the Scottish Government SEA website.

No	While the wider project does seek to improve environmental outcomes by improving the accessibility of recycling services, this would result from reorganising the existing service rather than fundamentally changing the recycling and waste collection service provided to people living in flats. While there is some risk that the changes to siting guidelines made by elected members could impact negatively on this objective, in the context of all the City's household waste, and even the waste collected through the specific

	service, these impacts should be limited.

*

7 Consumer Duty

The Council has a duty to consider consumers' interests when making strategic decisions. If this applies to your proposal, you may need to complete a consumer duty impact assessment. Information is available on the Consumer Scotland website.

No	This IIA relates to changes made to the siting guidelines followed by officers in providing the communal bin collection service rather than a strategic change to the service itself and as such is primarily an operational change. Impacts on specific service users are captured elsewhere in the IIA (e.g. those on people with disabilities or mobility constraints).

8 Communications

Record how you will communicate information about this proposal change to those with different communication needs using inclusive communications guidance and resources.

The Communal Bin Review webpage and other Council webpages are used to convey key pieces of information. In terms of bin hub relocations, the team keeps plans up to date and publishes updates of bin hub location review changes. All Transport and Environment Committee meeting recordings and associated documents are saved on their public webpage.

9 Contractors

Is any part of this proposal to be carried out wholly or partly by contractors and if so, how will equality, human rights, children's rights and climate and nature issues be addressed?

Project construction will be carried out by contractors under the supervision of a City of Edinburgh Council officer. Also, the contractor will be appointed following

the Council's procurement process which requires to consider all equalities and rights, environmental and sustainability impacts when someone is appointed to undertake work on behalf of the Council. The actual changes to the siting guidelines wouldn't be expected to have any impact.

10 Actions

Record your actions in the table below. Actions may include:

- mitigations to reduce or eliminate negative impacts
- advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations
- addressing cumulative impacts
- collecting additional evidence
- financial implications
- risks
- any other actions.

Actions	**Who will take them forward (name and job title)**	**Deadline for progressing**	**Review date (add name and job title)**
Ensure that front-line officers are aware of their responsibilities with regard to arranging collections for those residents who are unable to access the communal bin service, e.g. as a result of mobility issues, disability, etc	Jordan Walker, Neighbourhood Environmental Services Manager - Waste Services (for Collection Supervisors) Melissa Campbell, Senior Neighbourhood Environmental Services Officer (in relation to NES Officer awareness)	October 2026	Angus Murdoch, Technical Coordinator, October 2027.

11 Monitoring impact

Monitoring ensures that your proposal is effective and any issues are addressed.

Record your actions in the table below. Actions may include:

- how impacts on protected characteristics will be monitored, once the proposal has been introduced and implemented
- how IIA agreed actions will be monitored
- review process and timescales
- officer responsible.

Actions to monitor impact of proposal	**Who will take them forward (name and job title**	**Deadline for progressing**	**Review date (add name and job title)**
No specific actions, beyond receipt of resident feedback and enquiries	Jordan Walker, Neighbourhood Environmental Services Manager	Ongoing, once services implemented	Ongoing once services implemented

12 Next steps

Elected members must have access to IIAs in order to scrutinise them before making decisions. You must:

- share the IIA with them (this can be at draft stage for an APM meeting)
- complete the committee report with:
  - a summary of the identified impacts at section 7 of the committee report template: key policies
  - actions to address them at section 5 of the committee report template: next steps
- provide a link to the published IIA or attach as an appendix.

13 Quality assurance and approval

Complete the quality assurance checklist.

Send the quality assurance checklist and your completed IIA to your Head of Service for approval.

14 Authorisation

Name and title
Andy Williams, Head of Neighbourhood Environmental Services
Date
29 October 2026

15 Publication

Send the approved IIA template to the relevant contact for publication. Ensure the title of the IIA is clear and concise, without acronyms and the content, layout and language style is inclusive and accessible.

The City of Edinburgh Council:

- integratedimpactassessments@edinburgh.gov.uk to be published on the Council website

Edinburgh Integration Joint Board/Health and Social Care:

- sarah.bryson@edinburgh.gov.uk to be published on the EH&SCP website

Keep a copy of your template for a period of at least three years (longer if needed for business reasons).