

Report to Cabinet

24th November 2016

By the Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and
Cleaving



DECISION REQUIRED

Not Exempt

Appendix 1 Exempt under paragraph 3 Part 1 of
Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act

Changes to Household Waste Collections

Executive Summary

The collection of household waste (residual waste and recycling) is one of the highest profile and highly valued services provided by the Council. Household waste is defined in Part II of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 as waste that originates from private homes and collected by Waste Collection Authorities (Horsham District Council). Legislation requires the Council to take action to increase the percentage of household waste that is recycled to at least 50% within three years, therefore reducing the proportion of waste disposed at landfill. We will not achieve this without implementing the recommendations as detailed in this report.

In addition to this, the Council is facing significant financial pressures with a need to find savings to address a £4.2m projected budget gap in 2019/20. This is combined with the loss of a specific government grant made to the Council to maintain the weekly collection of household refuse which expires in November 2017.

Horsham district currently has the highest recycling rate of any West Sussex authority and the Council has long taken a forward-looking approach to household waste collection. In 2008 the Council took what was then seen as an innovative move to purchase a fleet of side-loading waste collection vehicles. Alongside that, the Council also introduced the simple blue and brown lidded collection system for recycling that has been much praised by residents. Now that those vehicles are rapidly nearing the end of their useful life, becoming expensive to maintain and in need of replacement, the council must turn its attention to future requirements.

In response to this situation the Council commissioned Ricardo Energy & Environment Consultants to undertake a full review of the waste collection service. Their task was to assess the current provision and advise on the way forward suggesting how a high-quality service could be maintained and how financial efficiencies could be generated with a particular focus on increasing recycling rates. Ricardo worked with Members in a series of seminars to develop with them an agreed vision for the Waste & Recycling Service and recommended that the Alternate Weekly Collection of waste, similar to schemes operated successfully in Chichester and Mid Sussex District areas and in over 75% of other local authorities, was the recommended service model for our area.

The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval for the implementation of that vision based on the recommendations below.

Recommendations

That the Cabinet is recommended to:

- i) Agree to the introduction of Alternate Weekly Collections for residual household waste from Spring 2018, and note the estimated financial savings associated with this of approximately £730k per annum compared to the projected budget for 2018/19.
- ii) Agree that a rear-loading vehicle fleet is procured to deliver the revised service and note the estimated financial saving of approximately £270k per annum compared to the projected budget for 2018/19.
- iii) That Cabinet approves the changes to the council's waste policies required to implement the new service as detailed in section 3.16.
- iv) Agree to the draft implementation timetable (Table 3) subject to recommendations i) and ii) being agreed.
- v) Delegate authority to the Director of Community Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Waste, Recycling and Cleansing to make necessary arrangements as required.

Reasons for Recommendations

- i) Legislation requires a reduction in the amount of waste currently going to landfill and an increase in recycling, 50% by 2020. The introduction of AWCs would following assessment from Ricardo encourage additional levels of recycling estimated at 4%; although other councils have observed up to a 9% increase in recycling rates and up to a 16% decrease in residual waste produced. Councils are required to deliver "good quality local services as efficiently as possible within their financial constraints".¹ The council must therefore set that requirement against action to mitigate a forecast funding gap of £4.2m in its medium term financial strategy (MTFS).
- ii) The current ageing waste collection vehicles require replacement.
- iii) Dispensations will ensure the implementation recognises households which will find AWC more challenging due to receptacle capacity.
- iv) Agreement to the approach and key milestones to implement both a revised collections methodology and procure a new fleet of refuse vehicles.

Background Papers

Exempt Ricardo report for Horsham District Council 'Strategic Review of Collection Services' October 2016.

Exempt Ricardo Appendix 1 & 2 Strategic Review of Collection Services' October 2016.

Waste Consulting – Waste analysis report (West Sussex waste partnership)

House of Commons Library Advice note 'Alternate weekly Collections' 4/2/2013

Waste Framework Directive, 2006, 2015

WRAP Statistics 2015/16

TEEP report Horsham District Council 29 January 2015 Cabinet

Recycling Payment Mechanism Memorandum of Understanding. – 28 January 2016 Cabinet

Wards affected: All wards

Contact: Natalie Brahma-Pearl, Director of Community Services

¹ Alternate weekly collections guidance, WRAP, 13 July 2007

Background Information

1 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 The recommendations in this report follow a strategic review of the waste collection service, and a detailed analysis of available options undertaken by Ricardo Consultants.
- 1.2 Rising national recycling targets of 50% by 2020 require the council to revise its current waste strategy.
- 1.3 In November 2012, the council was given a specific grant from the Government (Weekly Collection Support Scheme) which committed the council to providing a weekly residual household waste collections for a period of five years. Those grant conditions expire in November 2017 and will not apply after that date.
- 1.4 The council needs to make savings of approximately £4.2 million over the next three years due to significant cuts in government funding and increasing demand for services. The report on the Medium Term Financial Plan on this agenda also refers. The decision to change the frequency of residual household waste collections and changing the vehicle fleet will help to meet this shortfall with an estimated total saving of approximately £1m against the budget per annum. As with all other local authorities, this council is under considerable pressure to increase levels of recycling and minimise the volume of waste sent for disposal.
- 1.5 Legislation requires a reduction in the amount of waste going to landfill and an increase in recycling, in order to help address the economic and environmental impacts of waste. At the same time councils are required to deliver “good quality local services as efficiently as possible within their financial constraints”.² As a result, Alternate Weekly Collection (AWC) has been adopted by many councils, as it encourages recycling and can reduce the costs associated with waste collection and disposal. AWC does this as it restrains “the extent to which recyclable waste can be put into residual waste bins”, thereby releasing “money, manpower and equipment to provide high quality recycling services”.³

In 2007 a report produced by WRAP (Waste and Resources Action Programme) found that “well run” AWC schemes not only encourage recycling, but can also reduce the overall amount of waste produced by residents. It said that AWC:

- Raises awareness of the volumes of waste generated, prompting the segregation of materials for recycling and composting; and
- Prompts an overall reduction in residual waste arisings at the kerbside. The reduction is likely to be brought about by residents changing their habits regarding the amount of material they manage via other means (e.g. home composting) or by changing shopping habits to reduce e.g. food and packaging waste.⁴

- 1.6 In 2015/16 over 75% of local authorities⁵ in the UK have been operating a system whereby residents still receive a weekly household waste collection, but this is alternated between the collection of mixed dry recycling one week and residual household waste the following week. Ricardo has proposed that HDC adopts this system.
- 1.7 This alternate weekly collection (AWC) of residual (landfill) waste has been operating successfully in neighbouring district councils of Mid Sussex, Chichester and Mole Valley for a number of years.

² Alternate weekly collections guidance, WRAP, 13 July 2007

³ Alternate weekly collections guidance, WRAP, 13 July 2007

⁴ Alternate weekly collections guidance, WRAP, 13 July 2007

⁵ WRAP Statistics 2016

- 1.8 The change to AWC will encourage higher recycling rates and reduce the amount of waste sent to more expensive treatment facilities. It is well documented that AWC is a proven method for achieving increased levels of recycling with recycling rates increasing on average by 5-6%⁶. Recycling is increased by restricting the frequency and capacity of residual household waste collections. Currently we operate the service with 140-litre bins which would not require replacement unless households meet the Exceptions Policy criteria (see section 3.16). There is evidence that residents become more conscious of what is thrown away and what can be recycled⁷. Nearly all of the 20-top performing recycling Local Authorities operate AWCs. The Local Government Association has been particularly robust in offering this figure as evidence that AWC is essential to improved recycling.⁸ In order to further encourage recycling the council will provide an additional 140L blue lidded recycling bin for free (with a £5 delivery charge) for householders requiring more recycling capacity.
- 1.9 The top 10 performing recycling councils in 2014-15, in terms of household and recycling rates, all provided AWC. In addition, 9 out of 10 of the local authorities with the most improved recycling rates from 2010-2011 had introduced AWC⁹. 8 of 10 of the lowest performing councils have weekly domestic waste collections.
- 1.10 Waste composition analysis, carried out in December 2015 for the West Sussex Waste Partnership by Waste Consulting, showed that just under 20% of Horsham District's waste placed in residents' residual household waste bins could theoretically be recycled using existing recycling facilities (blue lidded bins).
- 1.11 **Vehicle Fleet- Side** loading refuse vehicles were introduced in Horsham in 2008/9 and were phased in over a year. These have been used to collect three household waste streams from residential properties (residual household waste, dry mixed recycling, and garden/green waste).
- 1.12 At the time this model was highlighted as the future in waste collection particularly in areas without Transfer Station access such as Horsham district. However, although used on the Continent, it never came into wide use in the UK, save a couple of authorities in Scotland and Bromsgrove which have since ceased using the system. As a consequence, purchasing/leasing similar new vehicles is now expensive compared with buying rear loading vehicles. This is compounded by high maintenance costs and limited access to specialist parts. In addition, very specific Heavy Goods Vehicle driver training is required to operate the system which often becomes challenging when covering holiday periods and absenteeism. Their roles are impossible to fill with Agency staff, often present operational challenges to service delivery.
- 1.13 Rear End Load Compaction (REL) vehicles are the conventional methodology for collecting household waste and they have been used since the 1960's. They offer a simple solution to collection and compaction of waste. A general comparison of side-loading vehicles and standard rear loading vehicles is provided in Appendix 2.
- 1.14 The benefits of these systems are clear; they are simple to operate and maintain; and offer greater control of operating and infrastructure costs with payload tonnages that are superior to the de-mountable side loader system currently in use. The cost per ton to collect and transport waste is cheaper to the tax payer.

⁶ Waste data flow (DCLG)

⁷ WRAP 2011 Literature Review -Relationship between food waste collection and food waste prevention

⁸ Local Government Association, press release, 26 April 2007

⁹ Battle of the bins: Defra stats show fortnightly refuse collections INCREASES recycling, The Independent, 31 December 2012

- 1.15 The savings by moving to RELs are estimated at £270k pa compared to the projected budget of 2018/19. Fewer vehicles are required due to increased tonnages RELs are able to accommodate. However, if side loading vehicles are chosen an additional £292k will be required on the 2018/19 projected budget as the cost to support this system – additional vehicles, tugs and pods has increased and we require more vehicles to carry out the service due to growth in housing since the scheme was launched in 2008/9.
- 1.16 The choice of a demountable side loading vehicle is understood to have been made in part due to the lack of transfer station within the District. At present, Horsham does not have a dedicated transfer station within its boundary. This is presently undergoing consideration by West Sussex County Council (WSSCC).
- 1.17. **Route optimisation-** In order to optimise operational efficiencies, collection rounds will need to be reviewed and re-modelled. This will result in reduced mileage, fuel savings, crew and fleet vehicle reduction. The current side-loader system requires refuse vehicles, tugs and de-mountable waste containers to be moved around and out of the district. REL's will stick to specific rounds and tip directly at Transfer sites. Some of these assumptions have been made in the Ricardo modelling work- however a specific in depth piece to work needs to be commissioned on route optimisation to ensure that the service operates as efficiently as possible. This will also take into account recent and future housing growth.

2 Relevant Council policy

- 2.1 The change to AWC will contribute to delivering the following corporate priorities:
Corporate plan priorities 2016-2019
Efficiency- great value services by transforming our waste collection service.
Environment - Review waste services to maximise the efficiency of the Service.
- Plan to reach 50% recycling of household waste by 2020.

3 Details

- 3.1 In June 2015, the Council commissioned Ricardo Energy & Environment Consultants following a procurement exercise to undertake a waste review. The purpose of which was to assess our current service and advise how efficiencies could be generated which focussed on increasing recycling rates. Ricardo's Consultants have been working with councillors in a series of workshops which all Members were invited to participate, over the last ten months. Members developed an agreed a vision for the Waste & Recycling Service and established what key issues are considered important in improving and taking the service forward.

Waste vision statement:

"Horsham District Council will deliver a cost-effective Recycling & Waste Service which is easy to use, protects the environment and achieves future recycling targets within budget".

- 3.2 The main principles and criteria identified by councillors were:

Principle 1: Ease of use
Principle 2: Improve recycling performance
Principle 3: Public satisfaction
Principle 4: Value for money
Principle 5: Good communication
Principle 6: Waste hierarchy

- 3.3 The Council is also required to meet the requirements of the European Commission's Waste Framework Directive as transposed by the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 in relation to recycling collections and material streams. If the Waste Regulations or other waste legislation is repealed following Brexit, the UK Government will

need to develop a similar waste policy in order to underpin any new legislation. This is explained in more detail in section 8 of this report.

- 3.4 Using the principles and criteria agreed with councillors, Ricardo Consultants developed a series of options which reflected how these criteria could be implemented. This resulted in a long list of 10 options (Table 1) which an all member seminar filtered to those more suitable options for Horsham district.

Table 1. Long Listed Options considered by Members.

Option		Vehicle Type	Recycling Collection Frequency	Residual Collection Frequency	Description
1	Business as Usual (BAU)	Side loading vehicles (SLVs)	Fortnightly	Weekly	Current service, fortnightly recycling collections and weekly residual using side loading vehicles
2	BAU + fortnightly residual collections	Side loading vehicles (SLVs)	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	BAU service but the residual collection is changed to a fortnightly service.
3	Rear loading vehicles (RLVs)	Rear loading vehicles (RLVs)	Fortnightly	Weekly	This option retains the same collection frequencies as the BAU option but replaces the current demountable side loading vehicles with standard rear loading vehicles.
4	RLVs + Alternate Weekly Collections (AWC)	Rear loading vehicles (RLVs)	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Similar to Option 3 with standard RLVs. However, the residual waste is moved to fortnightly collections.
5	RLVs + dry recycling weekly	Rear loading vehicles (RLVs)	Weekly	Weekly	Similar to Option 3 with standard RLVs, but the dry recycling moves from a fortnightly collection to weekly.
6	RLVs + dry recycling weekly & residual fortnightly	Rear loading vehicles (RLVs)	Weekly	Fortnightly	Dry recycling moving from a fortnightly collection to weekly and residual moves to fortnightly.
7	Kerbside sort	Kerbside sort vehicles	Fortnightly	Weekly	Collection frequencies remain the same as present (residual weekly and dry fortnight) but the dry recycling moves to a kerbside sort system. Different containers will be provided to the householder (typically boxes) for the crew to then sort into separate compartments on a specialist kerbside sort vehicle.
8*	Kerbside sort + residual fortnightly	Kerbside sort vehicles	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	As Option 7, but residual waste moves to a fortnightly collection, reducing the resources required.
9	Kerbside sort + residual fortnightly & dry recycling weekly	Kerbside sort vehicles	Weekly	Fortnightly	Kerbside sort with dry recycling collected weekly and residual fortnightly.
10**	RLVs + Food waste & 3-weekly residual & dry recycling fortnightly	Kerbside sort vehicles	fortnightly	3 weekly including separate weekly food collection	Kerbside sort with dry recycling collected fortnightly, food weekly and residual every three weeks.

*A kerbside sort option was included to assess feasibility under TEEP regulations.

**Food waste and 3-weekly collections were initially excluded from the long list. However, Horsham District Council still wishes to understand the implications of such an option and be prepared should any steer come from West Sussex County Council to introduce food collections. Therefore, a 3-weekly option with food waste will be taken forward to the detailed modelling phase in order to provide future insight.

3.5 Six shortlisted options were then subject to detailed technical, financial and operational modelling, with and without a district transfer station. See Table 2.

Table 2. Proposed options for modelling

Option	Without transfer station	With transfer station in District
Option 1 - Current service BAU (to calibrate model)	✓	
Option 3 - Rear Loading Vehicles (RLVs) + dry recycling fortnightly & residual weekly	✓	✓
Option 4 - RLVs + Alternate Weekly Collections (AWC)	✓	✓
Option 6 - RLVs + dry recycling weekly & residual fortnightly	✓	✓
Option 8 - Kerbside sort + residual fortnightly		✓
Option 10 - RLVs + Food waste & 3-weekly residual & dry recycling fortnightly	✓	✓

3.6 The detailed shortlist of options was presented back to Members in July 2016. It was concluded that the preference which provided both significant efficiency savings to the council and encouraged an increase in recycling rates reducing the environmental impact of the service was to move to an already tried and tested system i.e. AWCs for collecting residual household waste and using rear loading vehicles.

3.7 The full Ricardo report is attached as Exempt Appendix 1.

3.8 AWC is not a new concept; over 75% of local authorities across the UK¹⁰ have introduced them over the last ten years for household waste collections. The underlying principle of an AWC is that residents still receive a weekly collection, but these are alternated between residual household waste one week and the collection of mixed dry recycling the following week. The garden waste collection scheme (brown lidded bin) this will continue unchanged; so many households will in fact receive three collections a fortnight.

3.9 It is noted that every new scheme goes through a period of transition as the arrangements bed in and residents become familiar with collection cycles. The introduction of an AWC scheme needs to be managed with adequate support aligned to project delivery, publicity and communication with the public.

3.10 An increase in the quality of recycle material will generate not only a higher district recycling rate, but also deliver an additional income stream for the council under the Recycling Payment Mechanism Memorandum of Understanding.

Implementation plan

3.11 The proposed implementation of the AWC service will commence with pre-launch communication in September 2017, in preparation for a scheduled start of AWCs in early

¹⁰ WRAP statistics 2016

2018. The draft implementation timeline with indicative dates is detailed in Table 3 below. AWC will be 'phased', in for a smoother transition.

Table 3. Outline of implementation activity

Activity	Date
Waste Review - All Member seminars	24 November 2015 29 February 2016 4 July 2016
Cabinet member Policy Development Advisory Group meetings (PDAG) Clean & Tidy Advisory Group) (CATAG)	15 February 2016 (25 April 2016 (CATAG) 29 September 2016 3 November 2016
Cabinet Recommendation approval	24 November 2016
Communications activity commences and continues through to implementation	16 November 2016 24 November 2016
Fleet specification for tender /procurement using either a framework agreement or OJEU.	December 2016 to January 2017
Capital and revenue budget approval at Cabinet and Council	26 January 2017 Cabinet 15 February 2017 Council
Round Design / Route Optimisation	March to June 2017
Changes to service resources / staff structure	February 2017 to January 2018
Launch Publicity for new Service / Request Applications for larger Bins (criteria met)	September 2017
Provision of additional Contact Centre Resource	February 2017 to May 2018
Carry out Waste audits / education	Commence September 2017
Deliver larger bins where necessary (dispensation criteria)	January and February 2018
Phased implementation of new Service (including day change)	February 2018 to end May 2018
Ongoing support to residents	September 2017 to Summer 2018
Monitor impact/review implementation/refine	Summer 2018

Policy changes

3.12 In selecting AWC with RELs as the preferred option, it is considered that some of the Council's waste collection policies need to be amended as follows:

3.13 The Standard Service for the collection of domestic waste from individual properties will become an alternate weekly service using as illustrated in the graphic below:

- 140 litre wheeled bins for residual waste (green lid).
- 240 litre wheeled bins for dry recycling (blue lid).
- 240 litre wheeled bins for garden waste collected fortnightly (brown lid).



- 3.14 The correct bin must be used for the right type of waste. The bins provided must not be used to dispose of business waste.
- 3.15 Under the proposals, households will continue to use their 240-litre blue lidded (mixed dry recycling) bin and their 140-litre green lidded (residual waste) bin. Residents can request additional capacity for residual waste based on the criteria set out below in 3.16. When such additional capacity is agreed, the existing residual waste wheeled bin will be exchanged for a larger/additional wheeled bin free of charge. All households that request additional capacity will be asked to complete a declaration to show how they meet the criteria. Checks are likely to be made on any application and may include:
- A waste audit to ensure the household is utilising the recycling bins as much as possible.
 - A check on the names listed permanently residing at the property.
 - Site visits to provide education and advice and ensure the information is still relevant.
 - Additional capacity will only be approved on the agreement that the household makes full use of the recycling service. Additional capacity will be supplied on a conditional basis, which will be reviewed periodically. If circumstances have changed, the additional capacity may be removed.
- 3.16 A new exceptions policy (similar to that used by other councils where AWC is the methodology) will also provide additional bin capacity for those households that meet one of the criteria below:
- Medical needs.
 - Households with six or more permanent residents.
 - Households of five residents with one child in nappies.
 - Households with three or more children in nappies.
- 3.17 Issuing larger bins to qualifying properties will reduce the level of savings that can be delivered, due to the capital cost of providing the bins. This cannot be quantified until implementation is complete.
- 3.18 As a key driver of this collection change is to increase recycling rates and encourage more waste out of the residual waste bin, some residents may require more recycling capacity. Either this can be achieved through the issue of robust bags for recycling which can be left alongside the blue lidded wheelie bins or additional 140L blue lidded recycling bins can be provided free (with a £5 delivery charge) for householders requiring more recycling capacity.

Communications Plan

- 3.19 A communications plan will support the implementation of the new service to ensure a successful rollout across the district. The plan will aim to ensure that all residents are well informed about what the collection changes mean for them.
- 3.20 Different household types will be impacted by the service change in different ways. The communications plan will therefore seek to ensure that each household will receive the right information at the right time.
- 3.21 The Council will use a broad range of channels throughout the campaign. The most significant activity will be a direct mail communication with a calendar to all affected households. This will be supported by an extensive media advertising and editorial campaign; engaging through the full range of social media platforms; website updates; face to face door-stepping engagement and work with parishes and partners.
- 3.22 The audience groups will be carefully segmented and detailed consideration will be given to each.
- 3.23 At the same time, the communications plan will recognise that different groups within the population will have different motivations and recycling behaviours. Carefully tailored messages will seek to engage with and influence particular groups and re-inforce the value of positive behaviours.
- 3.24 A detailed and updated communication plan will be prepared and agreed in consultation with the Portfolio Holder based on this outline plan.
- 3.25 A draft Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document (Appendix 4) has been developed to provide initial information about the introduction of an AWC scheme. This will be further developed as the implementation of the waste collection system develops.

4 Next Steps

- 4.1 If the recommendation is approved to introduce AWCs the council will produce detailed implementation plans for key elements of delivering the new service. The main tasks are referred to in Table 3. Key project areas consist of:
- Operational changes
 - Round and route optimisation
 - Fleet Procurement
 - Communication and awareness/education
 - Human Resource/employment arrangements
- 4.2 In delivering the project the council will continually seek to minimise inconvenience and disruption to our residents. A communications campaign which will ensure all households are well informed of the new arrangements, including any change to their scheduled weekday collection is proposed in 2017/18. A large part of this will also involve offering reminder information and advice about what can be recycled and how to reduce household waste.

5 Views of the Waste, Recycling and Cleansing Policy Development Advisory Group and Outcome of Consultations

- 5.1 The Cabinet Member's Waste, Recycling and Cleansing PDAG has been consulted through the options assessment work. Three PDAGs have specifically discussed the emerging preferred option and general support was received for the proposal to move to AWC and to procure REL vehicles. Members have stressed the importance of properly resourcing the communications strategy, preparation and transition work to ensure disruption to residents is minimised.

6 Other Courses of Action Considered but Rejected

- 6.1 The options work undertaken by Ricardo Consulting considered ten options as referred to in Table 1 of this report. This included carrying on with existing weekly collections for residual household waste and the continued use of side loader vehicles.
- 6.2 The council could continue to use side-loader vehicles and weekly collection of residual waste. However, further investment is required to make the existing side loader collection methodology work, which is estimated to cost an additional £290k per annum to the projected 2018/19 budget, due to increase in fleet vehicles and cost.
- 6.3 The council could change to use RELs and continue with weekly residual waste collections. Whilst this would save an estimated £270k per annum in 2018/19, additional savings of £730k would not be achieved, so this has been rejected in favour of the preferred option.

7 Resource Consequences

- 7.1 The implementation of AWC using RELs will deliver an estimated saving of circa £1m per annum. The actual saving will be dependent upon several factors including:
- The use of Rear Loading Vehicles (REL's) to carry out the operation and the impact this will have on the structure of our workforce.
 - Route optimisation and re-modelling to quantify the number of rounds required to deliver the new service and incorporate new housing growth.

Actual savings will not become clear until the end of 2018/19 when the new service has bedded in.

- 7.2 The capital costs of the new fleet are already in the Capital Programme in a £3.8m allocation for vehicle replacement. Because RELs are cheaper than side loaders and we will need fewer vehicles by moving to AWC, we will recalculate this estimate in preparing the 2017/18-2019/20 Capital Programme. If Cabinet approve the recommendations in this report, we will create a separate line in the capital programme, specifically for REL refuse vehicles, and reduce the general vehicle replacement budget line. Council will consider the 2017/18-2019/20 Capital Programme in February 2017. We will not know the final cost of these vehicles until we have received tenders following a competitive tendering process.

Implementation Costs

- 7.3 The implementation costs arising from this project as referred to in Table 4 below. These costs do not include all general officer time and resources.

Table 4

Activity	Cost	Comments
Providing additional communications	£90k	
Providing additional Contact Centre support	£ 4k	Additional resource required during implementation phase officers for 16 weeks (4 months)
Delivery of additional/replacement bins for larger families meeting dispensation criteria or purchase of additional recycling bins	£100k	Needs quantifying if we supply larger bins
Providing additional front line resource to facilitate the transition of the service change	£36k	Additional REL Crew to deal with any operational issues plus additional 2 x staff to problem solve educate as roll out progresses
Additional HR costs	£20k	Reviewing and potentially amending 70 staff's T&Cs and contracts, in consultation with Trade Unions, including re-configuring rotas, training and the skill mix.
Total	£250k	

7.4 We will fund the implementation costs from the Transformation Reserve. The scale of these costs is containable within the reserve but the Accounts, Audit and Governance Committee may need to consider a top up when closing the accounts for 2016/17 to fund other transformation projects to address the Council's underlying budget deficit.

Staffing implications

7.5 The main impact of the shift to RELs will be to change the structure of the workforce in this service to fewer drivers and more loaders. At this stage we cannot fully rule out that some posts may be at risk of redundancy, until we are clear on route optimisation, crew numbers, and skill mix required. We do not anticipate that this would affect many posts and potentially voluntary measures, re-training/ re-deployment and transition/ protection periods would apply to limit the impact on staff, subject to full consultation with individuals and trade unions.

Overall there will be an increase in the number of posts. Impact on staff will be mitigated by early workforce planning and early consultation on proposed changes. Management are already covering any gaps in staffing through the use of fixed term contracts and agency staff.

7.6 Transitional arrangements will also require temporary resources to support the implementation of the new service as detailed in Table 4. Adequate HR resources will be identified to support establishing the new arrangements, including collective and individual consultations on changes to working practices and rotas, potentially contractual arrangements, redundancies, new skill mix and recruitment activities.

- 7.7 All staff that may be affected by these proposals were informed w/c 14 Nov 2016. Any changes to the service affecting staffing structures will follow the processes set out in the Council's Organisational Change Framework.

8 Legal Consequences

- 8.1 Section 45 of the Environmental Protection Act 1980 places a duty on the Council to collect household waste. There is nothing in the Act or any other regulation relating to it imposing any particular frequency of waste collection. In addition, the Council is able to specify the size and nature of containers that can be used by residents for the presentation of their waste under Section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act. The proposed AWC service complies with these duties.
- 8.2 The Council must meet the requirements of the European Commission's Waste Framework Directive (WFD) and Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 – Recycling Collections and Material Streams. In particular, if the Council does not carry out separate kerbside collections of papers, glass, cans and plastic, it must prove that:
- The co-mingled collection service delivers material to the equivalent quality of a separate kerbside collection (the Necessity Test) or;
 - That it is not Technically, Environmentally and/or Economically Practicable (TEEP) to do so.
- 8.3 Any proposed change of service must be TEEP compliant. The current proposal only affects the frequency of residual household waste collections (blue lidded bins) and not the recycling service although it is anticipated that the recycling rate will increase as a consequence of these changes.

9 Risk Assessment

- 9.1 There are significant risks involved with the changes to front line services, particularly services that affect every household in the district. The following information highlights risks that have been identified and details how the risks will be mitigated.
- 9.2 Public acceptance: Some residents will view the new service as a reduction in service delivery and may be reluctant to cope with and accept service change. This will be mitigated by support from the waste recycling team.
- 9.3 Concerns over matters such as hygiene/smell, vermin, pests, flies and maggots etc. These are common concerns with the introduction of AWC but positive communications and education will help to mitigate this. Over 75% of local authorities have introduced alternate weekly collections and whilst many of these authorities also provide separate weekly food waste collections from the kerbside, many don't. Rutland Council does not provide separate food collections but still achieves, through AWC, a 60% recycling rate and is ranked in the top ten of all local authorities in the UK (Table 6. Exempt Ricardo report). Initial concerns can be overcome by advising householders to wrap food waste prior to disposal and ensure bin lids are kept closed. The Department of Health and the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health have confirmed that "there is no evidence of increased health risks by implementing AWC, provided food waste is adequately dealt with"¹¹. In 2007 a review by Cranfield University and Enviro¹², found "no evidence that alternate week waste collection will cause any significant health impacts for residents, or that any health impacts are likely to be significantly greater than those associated with weekly

¹¹ Communities and Local Government Committee, Refuse Collection, Fifth Report of Session 2006–07, HC 536i

¹² Health impact assessment of alternate week waste collections of biodegradable waste, Cranfield University and Enviro Consulting Limited, February 2007

collections". More recent research¹³ presents a review of international research into waste collections commissioned by WRAP and the Chartered Institution of Waste Management (CIWM). The report's findings have confirmed existing advice for councils and householders on avoiding risks to public health. No evidence was found that changing to a fortnightly collection creates risks that cannot be dealt with by following the good practice guidance.

- 9.4 Cross Contamination: The capacity for residual waste will reduce, which may lead to an increased risk of cross contamination into the recycling and garden waste streams. Excessive contamination and particularly food waste deposited in the recycling bin can have a significant impact on recycling percentages and costs. In some cases, whole loads can become contaminated and sent to landfill or the MBT plant rather than recycled. Increased communications and collection monitoring using the in-cab technology system will be required to minimise the risk.
- 9.5 Round Reviews: In order to optimise operational efficiencies, collection rounds will be reviewed and re-modelled moving towards area based working. It is anticipated that some households will experience a change to their current collection day. However, if possible we would like to introduce a new scheme which keeps the day of collection the same irrespective of what material is collected. At the start of the new service it is likely a minority of households will place their bins for collection on the wrong day. While this should be a short-term risk, good communications and providing additional Contact Centre resource and scaling up staffing levels during the initial period will help mitigate the risk.
- 9.6 Increased Customer Contacts: During the led up to the implementation of the new service it is likely there will be a significant increase in calls to the Contact Centre and demands for waste audits, with members of the public seeking clarification about the new service and requesting larger bins etc. This risk will be mitigated by recruiting additional temporary Contact Centre staff to deal with these enquiries.
- 9.7 Waste Framework Directive (WFD): There is a minimal risk of legal challenge under the WFD if co-mingled (where all types of recycling plastic, cans, glass, paper) collections fail to comply with the standards required under the TEEP process. Were such a challenge to be successful it would be necessary to introduce kerbside sort collections. However, the detailed options analysis undertaken by Ricardo identified a minimal impact on recycling from co-mingling as all materials are sorted at the MRF. Sorting along many of the rural roads would put staff at serious risk if undertaking such an operation on the roadside. Therefore, we are satisfied that these proposals meet TEEP requirements.
- 9.8 Staff risks – in changing the skills mix of the workforce there are risks that we cannot recruit the right staff at the right time. This risk is mitigated by early consultation with staff and Unions and we will introduce an early recruitment campaign should the likelihood of this risk rise.
- 9.9 Procuring a new vehicle fleet presents risks in terms of ensuring the vehicle specification is correct and lead in procurement times which, given the size of the capital investment, can be lengthy. It essential that this area of work is prioritised and started as soon as possible.

¹³ Scoping study of potential health effects of fortnightly residual waste collection and related changes to domestic waste systems. WRAP and the Chartered Institution of Wastes Management (CIWM). (2009)

10 Other Considerations

10.1 The proposal has no impact on the council's position linked to Crime, Disorder

Sustainability- fewer journeys, reduction in carbon emissions, route optimisation

The move to AWC will bring much wider environmental benefits such as:

- Less kilometres travelled by our refuse collection fleet
- Fuel efficiency savings
- Reducing landfill by increasing recycling
- Reduction in CO² emissions

10.2 Equalities Impact Assessment attached Appendix 3