



# LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS

The public sector delivery specialists



## DELIVERING WASTE EFFICIENCIES IN YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER

## Contents

Introduction	3
Context	3
The authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber	4
Performance	4
Delivering efficiencies	5
Success in partnership working	6
Good practice in delivering efficiencies	7
Lessons learnt	13
Summary	17
Appendix 1: completed profile for each authority	20
Appendix 2: waste management profile	37
Appendix 3: performance data	39



### North East Centre Council

---

#### *Disclaimer*

*This report has been produced and published in good faith by Local Partnerships and Local Partnerships shall not incur any liability for any action or omission arising out of any reliance being placed on the document by any organisation or other person. Any organisation or other person in receipt of this document should take their own legal, financial and other relevant professional advice when considering what action (if any) to take in respect of any initiative, proposal or other involvement with a public private partnership, or before placing any reliance on anything contained herein.*

Copyright © Local Partnerships LLP 2015

For further information contact John Enright, Head of Joint Working,  
Local Partnerships

[John.Enright@local.gov.uk](mailto:John.Enright@local.gov.uk), 07824 371 720.

February 2015

## Introduction

There are 22 authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber, a mixture of Unitary (5), Metropolitan (9), District (7) and County (1) councils. Like all authorities across the UK they continue to face testing times as resources are reduced but service expectations remain high. Over the next few years delivering efficiencies in budget, whilst trying to protect public services, even enhance them, continues to be one of the biggest challenges local authorities face.

## Context

This is the fourth regional review undertaken by Local Partnerships focusing on efficiencies achieved in waste management. The previous three reviews, focusing on the North East, West Midlands and London provided a wealth of information to decision makers and stakeholders; it is intended that this review will continue to build upon the bank of knowledge being generated in this area. Further details of the previous studies can be found at [localpartnerships.org.uk/publications](http://localpartnerships.org.uk/publications)

Throughout Yorkshire and the Humber authorities have successfully delivered efficiencies in a number of areas. The examples provided throughout this report will enable others to benefit from these experiences; particularly in terms of examining their own services and seeing if the experiences here could be applied to their authority and support them in making their own savings. As with the previous reviews the examples shown by authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber have not just focused on one specific area or aspect of waste management, but have explored a range of options to achieve efficiencies. This is clearly reflected in the wide diversity of examples featured. In addition the report identifies where partnership working has been successful, highlighting where authorities have addressed and overcome the challenges to working more closely together. It also clearly identifies the potential of partnership initiatives to deliver savings.

All 22 authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber were given the opportunity to contribute to the review; a profile was prepared for each authority with a request for further information to highlight the progress made to date and any lessons learnt which can be shared with others. A workshop was also held to provide feedback and the chance for authorities to benchmark themselves and provide any final pieces of data and information. A total of 17<sup>1</sup> responded to the request for further information. These authorities are:

Unitary/Metropolitan Council	County Council	District Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bradford City</li><li>• Doncaster</li><li>• East Riding of Yorkshire</li><li>• Kingston-upon-Hull City</li><li>• Kirklees</li><li>• Leeds City</li><li>• Rotherham</li><li>• Sheffield City</li><li>• Wakefield</li><li>• York City</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• North Yorkshire</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Craven</li><li>• Hambleton</li><li>• Harrogate</li><li>• Richmondshire</li><li>• Ryedale</li><li>• Selby</li></ul>

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the 17 authorities who responded, Calderdale attended the workshop but felt that the timing of the review meant that they could not participate due to a procurement process currently underway.



The individual profiles for these authorities can be found in Appendix 1. Examples of their achievements are given in the main body of the report. The responses from the authorities have not been audited in any way and therefore the information presented in this report is based on the information that the authorities kindly provided.

## The Authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber

Yorkshire and the Humber cover 15,400 sq. km and is the fifth largest region in England. It has an increasing population that is currently around 5.3 million (Office of National Statistics, 2010). Population density varies widely from 36 people per sq km in Ryedale, North Yorkshire to 4,092 people per sq km in Sheffield. This reflects the fact that the north and east of Yorkshire and the Humber are largely rural, while the south and west are more urban. The region's two National Parks, the North York Moors and the Yorkshire Dales, are contained mainly within North Yorkshire. Together they cover a larger proportion of the region's area than National Parks in any other English region.

Of the 22 authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber, there is one single two tier arrangement; North Yorkshire County Council and its 7 district authorities, which largely encompass the two National Parks. The remaining authorities are Unitary or Metropolitan and as such have responsibility for both collection and disposal arrangements.

As with the North East region, 'in-house' dominates the collection services in Yorkshire and the Humber, with only 3 of the authorities who took part in the review having outsourced their collection arrangement. Nearly all provide an alternate week collection service, for residual, dry recyclate and garden waste collection. In terms of the systems in place for collection of dry recyclables at the kerbside, it's fairly split between comingled and kerbside sort. More than two thirds provide a free garden waste collection; the remaining authorities are now charging for this service. Food waste collection is virtually non-existent, with only 2 of the 17 authorities collecting food with their garden waste and only 1 offering a separate weekly food waste collection to a small number of households. Refer to Appendix 2 for further information.

In terms of partnerships, the two tier arrangement has an active waste partnership in place that also includes York City Council; referred to as the York and North Yorkshire Waste Partnership. In addition East Riding Council and Kingston-upon-Hull City Council have a history of working together and recently took part in a joint procurement exercise. There is also a treatment and disposal partnership between Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham, referred to as the BDR. There have also been a number of attempts by other authorities at joint working in the past, not all of which were successful.

## Performance

According to the latest figures from Defra for 2013/14, four of the authorities in this review are achieving over 50 per cent recycling rate, however the majority (11) are achieving rates in the early 40 per cent range so still have some work to do to achieve the national recycling target of 50 per cent by 2020. Many feel that the extra percent will only be possible if separate food waste is added to the kerbside collection service, however there is little appetite for this at present largely



due to capital and revenue costs required and/or availability of treatment and processing options within the region. There are two authorities who are achieving a 30 per cent recycling rate; both utilise energy from waste as the main treatment option and as a result are sending significantly less than 10 per cent to landfill. One of the authorities is currently reviewing its whole collection service and the implementation of changes to the working practices will start in 2015/16. 11 of the 17 authorities in the review have experienced a drop in their recycling rates from 2012/13, and some have indicated privately that budget cuts may further impact on their performance. However, all say they are working hard to build on the successes they have achieved to date in terms of realising efficiencies to protect and potentially extend the service they are providing. For further information on performance data refer to Appendix 3; the tables includes all authorities in the region, those who participated in the review are highlighted.

### Delivering Efficiencies

All authorities continue to deliver good quality waste services, building on current levels of performance, such as recycling rates, whilst at the same time delivering significant financial savings. Budgets have been cut and look set to continue to decrease over the coming years and all departments have to demonstrate savings through efficiencies.

A study<sup>2</sup> by the Association for Public Services Excellence (APSE), in response to the question 'What efficiencies are you currently working towards or proposing', found that the main areas identified to deliver savings in relation to the waste service were:

- ▶ Changing working days (e.g. 4 day week), shift patterns (e.g. double shifting), ending task and finish and staff reductions
- ▶ Route optimisation
- ▶ Changes to collections (comingling, communal collections, alternative weekly collections, type of containers)
- ▶ Review of Transport/type of fleet/increasing capacity of vehicles
- ▶ Introduction of income streams (trade waste, bulky waste, green waste, replacement bins, schools/charities)
- ▶ Removal of garden waste collection during the winter
- ▶ Review of bring banks

Depending on the local circumstances of each authority the impact of efficiencies in these individual areas, in terms of the size of the saving achieved, can vary but collectively can equate to a considerable sum. This is reflected by the examples covered in this report where authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber have delivered major savings in waste budgets focusing on the following areas or key issues:

- ▶ Round reconfiguration and route optimisation

<sup>2</sup> State of the Market Survey 2012 – Local Authority Refuse Services. This can be accessed through [apse.org.uk/apse/index.cfm/members-area/briefings/2012/12-29-refuse-services-state-of-the-market-survey.pdf](http://apse.org.uk/apse/index.cfm/members-area/briefings/2012/12-29-refuse-services-state-of-the-market-survey.pdf)

- ▶ Service changes, specifically collection frequency, vehicle design/size/use, outsourcing aspects (e.g. bulky waste collection)
- ▶ Approaches to charging (for garden waste and for bulky waste)
- ▶ Joint procurement, and the internal savings from joint working and also the benefits of economies of scale
- ▶ Operation of HWRCs, specifically in terms of operating hours, working week etc
- ▶ New contracts and incentivising existing contracts
- ▶ Staff engagement
- ▶ Resource (Staff time) savings through improved or more efficient working practices

## Success in Partnership Working

The opportunities presented to deliver efficiencies through joint working have been increasingly documented. The LGA report “Services Shared: Costs Spared?” provides a detailed analysis of five high profile shared service arrangements; clear financial benefits have been achieved with the five shared services saving £30m between them.

Lessons learnt from this LGA study include:

- ▶ The set up and integration costs for merging services are modest with less than a two year payback period for all the shared services analysed
- ▶ The shared services have succeeded in providing the same or better levels of performance at less cost
- ▶ These initial benefits are typically delivered rapidly with strong top-down leadership
- ▶ Baseline financial and performance information is essential to make the case for change and track the benefits of shared services in terms of efficiencies and service improvements
- ▶ Expanding established shared services to provide services for other public sector partners in a locality is a useful way to generate income and ensure efficiencies through greater economies of scale. In addition to the efficiencies which can be achieved, other advantages to joint working at this level include the opportunity for partners to harmonise best practice across their services, making adjustments where practicable and sharing best practice to a greater extent. In addition, coming together as a partnership and delivering the service ‘as one’ may make the addition of a particular material or change in a service more affordable and appropriate than when acting alone

Partnership working is not without its challenges in terms of successfully bringing two authorities together who have may have different operational practices, budgets, political preferences and local geography and circumstances. However there are a number of success stories in Yorkshire and the Humber where joint working has realised efficiency savings and performance improvements. These include:

- **Hull City Council and the East Riding of Yorkshire Council**

Hull and East Riding are neighbouring Unitary authorities, with very different geographical and demographic characteristics. Despite these differences they have a history of joint working, sharing expertise and resources, and they



recently worked in partnership to deliver a multiple lot procurement exercise for treatment and disposal. Working together, to ensure the best overall solutions for the 2 authorities could be assessed, the required services for the authorities were split into 15 individual lots. This structure allowed for comparison between integrated bids and a combination of bids for the individual elements of the service. In addition, the Councils have entered into a risk sharing arrangement around revenue share for dry recyclables sorted via the MRF and segregated at the HWRC. The revenue share is split 80:20 in favour of the Councils. As a result of the procurement exercise, a joint contract, with Hull and East Riding, for the management of TLS and HWRC has been awarded and individual contracts for the treatment or processing of organics, recyclables and residual waste have been awarded.

A key lesson learnt was whilst this was a complex procurement process, working in partnership enabled the best outcome to be achieved with **significant savings in excess of £1 million per annum** being made by each authority.

- **York and North Yorkshire Waste Partnership (YNYWP)**

A two tier plus unitary authority Partnership with 9 members, covering a wide geographical area, the YNYWP has achieved success in relation to joint strategy development, joint procurement, improvements in performance across partner authorities, and significant success through joint working at the sub partnership level. With a partnership manager in post (3 days per week on a secondment basis from Ryedale DC), an annual work plan and a rolling three year fully costed business plan in place, the focus of the partnership is: waste prevention and minimisation campaigns and events; joint procurement; joint operational working; and, joint policy, strategy and best practice sharing. Whilst many of these activities are partnership wide, there is an acceptance that for a partnership of this size, there will be some activities focused around clusters of partners. This is demonstrated by the success achieved when four partner authorities from the partnership came together to jointly procure the sale of recyclate. By joining together to increase available tonnage the four partners have **generated an income increase of £1 million** per annum. In addition, four partner authorities took part in a joint procurement exercise for waste vehicles which saw **savings of £264,000**. 7 of the 9 partners also signed up to a green waste processing framework contract that enables different start dates, but a common end date (March 2017) which will then allow a joint procurement to realise economies of scale. Finally, discounted access to WebAspx route optimisation software by partners has resulted in changes to rounds which will generate **savings in the region of £250,000** per year for those partner authorities who accessed this opportunity.

A key lesson learnt is the need to have a dedicated waste partnership manager or identified resource to take joint work forward. It is the view by the YNYWP that many things would not have happened without a designated person working on behalf of all partners.

### **Good Practice in Delivering Efficiencies**

As already discussed and as demonstrated in the other three regional reviews, the manner in which efficiencies can be delivered varies as does the financial saving which can be made. No authority will work in isolation when developing



efficiencies; engaging with stakeholders and with contractors is an essential part of streamlining and reviewing processes.

The range of examples of what authorities have successfully achieved in delivering efficiencies in Yorkshire and the Humber are broad and details of their successes are given below.

### **Route optimisation & round efficiencies**

Ensuring rounds are fully optimised in terms of the time it takes to collect the waste or recycle and number of vehicles required has been a priority for a lot of authorities. To accomplish this, many have introduced fleet tracking software in vehicles to ensure that efficiencies are maximized and maintained in terms of fuel usage. In **York** a major reorganization of front line rounds using route optimisation software is planned to **save £300,000 of annual revenue** through fleet and staff reductions. For **Rotherham**, the use of telematics in the waste collection fleet will provide real time data in terms of service operations and allow for better customer access / interface with the service. Initial capital costs for the project of £110,000 have been met through a capital fund programme and **over the next three years it is expecting to deliver savings of £162,000** through improved customer service management. If the system exceeds initial expectations and the number of contacts to the service cut to 50 per cent of current levels, then there is the **potential for savings to reach £225,000**. **Ryedale** has also been making use of webaspx and fleetmatics to optimize its service delivery, although the efficiencies as a consequence of this work have not yet been fully quantified, as the work is still in progress. To date, **operational savings of £20,000** have been achieved by reduced vehicle idling and introducing enhanced dry recycling kerbside collections, with no increased resource requirement.

### **Service Changes (including collection frequency, vehicles,**

There are a number of ways that changing the service can impact positively upon performance and/or revenue costs of delivering a service. In the **East Riding**, a move to alternate weekly collections led to a reduction in the refuse collection fleet by 8 vehicles, **saving £1 million**. It also **saved £3.3 million** in landfill tax from the decrease in waste to landfill from 63,784t in 2012/13 to less than 56,000t in 2013/14. Harrogate moved to alternate week collection for residual (to match recyclable collection) following the move to 240 litre wheeled bin from black sacks plus a free garden waste collection. **Savings of around £724k per annum** have been generated. In **Leeds** the first three phases of alternate weekly collections (AWC) have been rolled out (first phase to approximately 56,000 households, the second phase to approximately 118,000 households, the third phase to approximately 32,000 properties). The remaining 60,000 suitable properties will be brought into the scheme during spring 2015. This change of service is expected to generate **£1.4 million of disposal savings** by the end of next year. In **Hull** a combination of optimising the collection service using waste collector software and implementing a fortnightly refuse collection service (excluding flats) to match the dry recyclables and organic collection has resulted in **savings of £1 million/year** through reduced fleet, staff & disposal costs. Similarly in **Sheffield** significant service reductions have been rolled out including move from weekly to AWC black bin collections. Seasonal collection of garden waste – put in with collection frequency. In addition to a move to alternate week collection, the other



issue related to frequency of collection is the provision of a seasonal service for garden waste. In **Ryedale**, stopping the service during winter months and thereby avoiding vehicle and staff costs is generating **savings estimated to be around £15,000 per annum**.

All areas of collection are being examined in an effort to increase efficiency, including the size and type of vehicle. The less 'travel' time during collection, including frequency of emptying vehicles, the less fuel use and downtime of the vehicle and crew. **Ryedale** has introduced two larger, 8-wheeled RCV's to the fleet to support collections in rural areas. These larger sized vehicles have effectively increased the payload from approximately 11 tonnes to 15 tonnes which has enabled rural rounds to be completed without a time consuming changeover. Annual fuel **savings worth £10,000-15,000 are being realised**. In **Bradford** ongoing operational reviews of recycling and waste collection rounds have recently seen a reduction of a recycling vehicle. This is part of a much wider review of all council services within the authority where service changes have been realized as a consequence of successfully benefiting from £4.68 million DCLG funding to retain weekly residual waste collections. This has allowed improvements to the recycling service to be made, including a change in frequency from 4 weekly to fortnightly, but also the addition of more materials to the collection service such as plastic bottles. A 240 litre brown bin has also been introduced for garden waste in place of a green sack. Early indications are that these service changes have resulted in an increased in tonnages of recyclables, and a reduction of residual waste; both of which will realise significant savings for the authority.

Other service changes include the reduction of the working week in **Wakefield**, following the implementation of alternate week collection, avoiding overtime payments to staff having to cover catch up work in relation to bank holidays. In addition, **Hambleton** has enhanced its service by providing larger bags for paper collection to capture more material and also to increase the range of material allowed; this has **increased income by £50,000 per annum**. Finally, **Harrogate** made the decision to change its existing service provision by externalizing the bulky waste collection service; this has generated a **saving of approximately £16,000 per annum**. In Leeds, the bulky waste collection service has been reduced from thirteen to three free collections of up to four items per year.

### **Charging for collections**

One area where we have seen an increase in activity, not just in Yorkshire and the Humber but across all the regions that have been reviewed, is charging for collection (where this is legally allowed; specifically garden and bulky waste collections). The general aim for most authorities when introducing a charge for garden waste collection is for this aspect of the service to be self-financing. However other benefits reported have been reduced levels of contamination within the garden waste. **Ryedale** replaced its free service on 1st June 2014 and 47 per cent of residents opted-in; it was found that 70 per cent of material was still coming through, and **subscriptions to the service generated £250,000**. **Richmondshire** have had similar success with their subscription scheme, with a current take up of 42 per cent and **income of £171,000**. In **Craven** charges for the collection of garden waste has resulted in a cost neutral service; previously the service cost in the region of £180,000 and this has largely been covered with the subscription charges. Sheffield has also introduced a charge for garden waste



collections and York has introduced a subscription service for additional bins (which is planned to contribute to **£250,000 of savings**). Bulky waste collections have been politically easier to charge for and have been in place for some time, largely because it is a request service, rather than an entrenched kerbside service. Nevertheless bulky charges can support the collection, as experienced in Wakefield where the cost of delivery are support by approximately **£70,000 income per annum**.

### **Joint procurement**

Procurement costs can be high and negotiating with the market place can be a challenge in terms of securing a good deal. Therefore working together, to jointly procure a service or a product, reduces overall procurement costs and also has the potential to attract a better market price as a result of economies of scale. **Craven, Harrogate, Hambleton and Richmondshire**, all members of the YNYWP, jointly procured a three year recyclate contract for the sale of recyclate. The contract has been a success, with Craven reporting the value of the contract in terms of additional income to be around **£50,000 per annum** and Harrogate estimating it to be **£145,000 per annum**. All four authorities are looking to repeat the procurement when the contract comes to an end, but to increase the level of joint working in terms of procuring a single joint contract at the end of the process.

The joint procurement between **City of York Council** and **North Yorkshire County Council** of a PPP waste treatment contract will generate a modeled saving of ~£280 million for the two partners over a 25 year period.

### **Operation of HWRCs**

A number of authorities have reviewed the operational costs associated with running HWRCs and made a number of decisions to improve the overall cost and efficiency of these sites. **Rotherham** has taken a very comprehensive approach to its HWRCs and introduced a raft of changes to its sites. This includes: reduced operational hours; closure of each site for a day a week; reduction in the number of permitted visits from 12 to 6 per annum. They allow one-off discretionary visits only in exceptional circumstances; banning all sign written vehicles or vehicles registered to a business from the site; and, allowing only small quantities of rubble (2/3 bags in boot of car) onto the site. As part of this negotiation and to support obtaining a reduction on the management fee the period of the contract was extended by a term of three years to allow partner to spread capital costs over a longer contract term. **Savings in the region of £125,000** have been achieved by these measures. Following a similar exercise undertaken by partner Authorities **Barnsley and Rotherham, Doncaster Council** with effect from 6th January 2014 varied the HWRC contract with FCC and reduced the operating hours. There was a great deal of work undertaken to establish the most effective way of reducing hours whilst ensuring minimal impact on service users; traffic counters, skip movements and tonnage data was used. Savings achieved through reduced operating hours are expected to be **£100,000 per annum**. In **East Riding** they have also adopted reduced opening hours. Data had shown that between 5pm and 6pm the number of users was significantly lower than any other time during the day; closing the sites at 5pm has **saved £70,000** across all 10 HWRS over a year. **Sheffield** has adopted a similar approach, reducing household waste recycling centre opening times/days. In **Kirklees** they have focused on residents



& commercial vehicle permit schemes. Working with their contractor, the Council administers these two permit schemes and Sita has responsibility for operational aspects. Significant reductions in waste arisings at the five HWRCs following the introduction of these two schemes resulted in reductions in both gate fees and landfill tax payable by the Council, equivalent to net **savings of circa £30,000 per annum**. **Leeds** has also focused on permitting at its sites, with a permit scheme introduced across all household waste sorting sites for vans, cars with trailers, 4x4 pickups and minibuses. The aim was to reduce the amount of construction and demolition type waste and prevent trade waste being disposed of at the sites. 12 permits are issued per household for a 12 month period, 6 of which are for construction and demolition waste (up to 5 x 25kg bags only). In the initial year of operation over **£100,000 of savings** has been made through reduced waste (specifically C&D) at the sites. **North Yorkshire County Council** has introduced hardcore and rubble charges which will **save £300,000 per annum**. In addition large vehicle restrictions and vehicle registration has reduced usage of HWRCs by 25 per cent; this equates to a tonnage saving in the region of 25,000 tonnes, worth **£2.5 million per annum**.

#### **Securing new contracts or incentivising existing ones**

Securing new contracts provides a major opportunity for reviewing service delivery, securing new and additional income and making considerable savings on the cost of delivery as a result of more favourable conditions. In addition reviewing existing contract terms and conditions and negotiating changes or extensions with the contractor also provides an excellent opportunity to reduce costs and deliver efficiencies in the immediate to long term. Engaging and working with the contractor is key to ensure beneficial results for both parties.

In terms of new contracts, **Hull**, when tendering for its service, adopted a multiple lot procurement structure in partnership with East Riding. As a result, a joint contract for the management of TLS and HWRC has been awarded with the Council awarding individual contracts for the treatment or processing of organics, recyclables and residual waste. An estimated **saving of £1.3 million per annum** will be realised by Hull CC from 2015/16 onward. In **Wakefield** the waste management contract with Wakefield Waste PFI Ltd included market testing provisions for landfill upon the expiry of the contract in 2014 (the contractor is responsible for managing all waste disposal and off-take contracts). Leading up to the end date the contractor carried out a market testing exercise. A range of tenders were received, including from the incumbent supplier, which resulted in a significant reduction in the landfill gate fee. This will lead to projected disposal **savings of £250,000-300,000 in 2014/15**. For **Selby**, the award of the environmental contract achieved approximately **£200,000 annual saving**. Further efficiencies have also been delivered through streamlined contract management aligned to an outcome based performance specification.

With regard to incentivizing contracts **Kirklees**, has benefited from the implementation of a landfill savings incentives scheme, generating **net savings of circa £300,000 per annum**. Under the terms of the waste disposal contract landfill tax is a direct 'pass through' payment whereby the Council pays the full tax on any of its waste that is landfilled. An opportunity to generate budget savings for the Council was identified through which Sita is given a financial incentive to increase the diversion of waste from landfill. Whilst the costs of the additional diversion



routes are borne by Sita, the savings in landfill tax payments that would otherwise have been made are shared between the council and the Contractor.

Contract extensions can also lead to very favourable outcomes for the authority. **Doncaster** was advised by its HWRC Contractor that if the contract was to be extended by 3 years, the assets including vehicles could be depreciated over a longer period of time and result in a 10 per cent reduction in the Management Fee paid. **Savings equate to £556,000** to the end of the extension period.

Making the most out of existing contracts is another means by which efficiencies can be realised. Garden waste reprocessing is provided by 2 contractors for **Doncaster, Barnsley and Rotherham** (BDR Partnership) to ensure sufficient capacity is available across the 3 authorities. As a consequence of one of the contractors exceeding the minimum tonnage required, Doncaster could make the decision as to which contractor they would deliver their garden waste to. There was significant difference in the gate fee costs and because of the proximity of both green waste facilities to Doncaster the decision would not impact on transport. Choosing to send all their garden waste to the contractor with the cheaper gate fee has resulted in **savings of £300,000** in 2013/14.

#### **Staff and Stakeholder engagement**

Better communication and engagement with staff and stakeholders can bring about positive change, even in a situation that has pay scales at the heart of it. In **Rotherham**, following a request for refuse collectors (Loaders) to have their pay grade brought up to the Living Wage, Trade Unions supported this process to the satisfaction of both the council and the employees in terms of roles, responsibilities, service outcomes, and importantly operational savings to deliver a cost neutral situation. **Savings of £172,000 per annum were required over a three year period** with savings of £111,000 being made in Year 1. This was achieved and the outcome was extremely positive both in terms of meeting the demands of the employees but also in terms of improving the efficiency of the service.

#### **Resource (staff time) saving**

There are many ways that savings can be made when in terms of staff time, including procuring a different product and managing a system in a different way. The **East Riding of Yorkshire** provide corn starch caddy liners free of charge to residents and distribute them from customer service centres, libraries and leisure centres. Previously the authority provided vouchers in the rolls of liners and residents filled in their address and postcode, and this information was then input by support services into a database so the uptake of caddy liners could be seen and they could be audited (due to the value of the liners). The procurement of new liners has seen a large reduction in costs so the 'value' of the liners has reduced. This in turn has meant there is no longer a need to track the caddy liners to addresses for audit purposes; they are just monitored from the liners being received by the authority, with an end destination – so how many boxes of liners are going to each depot etc. This has **saved £5,328 for support services and £2,450 for the Customer Service Network**. **Ryedale** is currently looking at an 'AllOnMobile' solution for supervisors and for use by operatives in collection



vehicles. The purpose of this is to cut down on unnecessary paperwork, by allowing collection staff to receive instructions for, and sign jobs off electronically, as soon as they are completed. This is hoped to reduce staff time and associated costs.

## Lessons Learnt

This report highlights a number of areas where authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber have successfully taken on the challenge of delivering better value in waste services in this very difficult economic climate. The experience of the projects featured in this report shows that significant savings can be achieved, whilst continuing to deliver high and in some cases improved performance. However, it is fair to say that a number of lessons have been learnt along the way, and the authorities have been very open in identifying key considerations which hopefully others can learn from. These lessons include:

### Managing the Client/Contractor relationship

One of the big challenges facing authorities is being able to directly attribute specific benefits of a service change in terms of efficiency savings, particularly when services have been contracted out. **Sheffield**, like many authorities in this situation, found that the way in which the cost of change and impact to revenue costs can be calculated is not explicit in the Contract Project Agreement; each party has different interpretation. This is particularly the case for service reduction i.e. taking things out of the contract. Therefore they have found that it is essential to ensure contract terms are clear and apply both to growth and reduction. In addition, it is important to fully understand the financial performance of the Contractor in calculating what should be revised service costs etc; transparency is needed in relation to profit and margin in service/contract.

It is also important to ensure Contract obligations for updates to Financial Model and provision of accounts or other management information are upheld and analysed when received. A transparent relationship from start of Contract is key so the Contractor understands any obligations to share/benefit service efficiencies by the Contractor back to Authority are upheld and these are easier to track and monitor on year by year basis. **Wakefield** also emphasise the need to effectively manage the Client/Contractor relationships, ensuring contractual processes are adhered to, service data and information is regularly checked and challenge is made where appropriate. It is important to have a system to keep full records of all contractual correspondence and seek advice from procurement colleagues where necessary.

### Working in Partnership

Working in partnerships clearly has benefits in terms of sharing resources, expertise, and enjoying the opportunities realised through economies of scale. **Hambleton** found that procurement costs were reduced significantly when working with others and **Richmondshire** agreed that joint contract terms maximized income. **Craven** concurred with this and went on to say that working together helped put the authority in a more commercially advantageous position. Recognising the benefits, **Harrogate** supports working with other authorities but advises that it is important to have a clear and defined timetable to work to.



**Selby** go on further to say that for a successful outcome the culture of both organizations should be aligned to deliver the expected goals.

From a two tier perspective, **North Yorkshire County Council** raise that view that WDAs need to be clear that a lot of the savings attributed to service changes delivered jointly by two tier authorities will be realised by WCAs rather than the WDA itself, but it is right to support this type of work. For example, it is easier for WCAs to see savings from route optimisation, recycle sales, vehicle procurement etc. To address this challenge a mechanism to reimburse the WDA for any investment it is making in staff time and resources could be a consideration at the outset.

### **Seize opportunities**

Ensure all efficiency opportunities are considered when making wider service changes is the advice from **Wakefield**; do not be closed off to any ideas and be open minded as to what can be achieved as a result of the service changes. This points to the principle of ensuring business and financial aspects of decision making are integrated into any waste/environmental considerations; something that is increasingly the norm, born out of necessity in the current financial climate.

### **Be aware of the planning process**

When making changes that require infrastructure development, planning is a key consideration and in the case of **North Yorkshire County Council**, the need to take into account the timescales involved in securing planning is essential when considering service changes.

### **Tackling the issue of frequency**

**Hull** was keen to implement a change to the waste collection frequency, with the support of its local residents; however there were concerns about the local acceptability of fortnightly residual collection. Therefore the authority opted to introduce a simple and comprehensive fortnightly kerbside collection service for recycling in the first instance. The success of this service gave the authority the confidence that a change to fortnightly refuse collection would be supported by a majority of residents and the change was successfully implemented.

### **Be open to new ways of working with Contractors**

In **Kirklees** the waste disposal contract is a joint venture contract with the Council having one non-executive Director on the contractor's Board. The joint venture arrangement has proved effective in producing a good overall contractual relationship and an effective joint approach to issues as they arise. Not only has this arrangement contributed to the achievement of past savings for the Council but is also helping now as they examine a wide range of future options to address the significant financial pressures that they currently face. Therefore it is important to be open to different ways of working with contractors.

### **Be aware of the risks**

Acknowledging the risks is an essential consideration when thinking about any service change, regardless of the potential benefits that the changes could bring. In **Bradford**, maintaining and regularly reviewing risk registers linked to waste projects, has become a standard aspect of good practice.

### **Be clear on specification and contract documentation**

Getting the contract specification right can be a hard (and sometimes expensive) lesson for authorities. To avoid the pitfalls and maximise the beneficial outputs of the procurement exercise, **Harrogate** advise taking the time to really consider what it is that you want to procure before going out to the market. In addition if procuring comprehensive service delivery, **Selby** advise authorities to ensure that the full suite of contract documents are aligned and support the delivery of performance outcomes and delivery of service efficiencies.

### **Know your data**

When proposing service changes, particularly with the specific remit of making efficiency savings and/or improving performance, it is essential that the baseline is established. **York** is currently undertaking detailed service reviews and has stressed the need to start with accurate data, to test it to make sure it is accurate and keep measuring progress against it. They go on to advise that any savings proposals should be accompanied by detailed delivery plans; it is not advisable to guess, or estimate, levels of savings then hope to plan to achieve them. This is definitely the case where resources are constrained and time is of the essence.

### **Value resident feedback & engagement**

Effectively engaging with residents and securing feedback is an integral part of implementing service change; **Bradford** supports this view and urges authorities not to underestimate the importance of good communications when changing any aspects of the waste service. In the **East Riding**, prior to rolling out any service change, the authority holds trials of the service and records all feedback from residents. Various methods of communication and feedback are used, including: text messages; wastewatchers (an email address that is checked daily by waste and recycling officers), 'Your East Riding' (a quarterly magazine which is sent to every household in the authority), door stepping and direct phone calls. The key is using a range of different approaches to ensure all stakeholders have the opportunity to engage and feedback back into the process if desired. In **Leeds**, the use of a team of waste recycling advisors accompanying collection crews during the roll out of the new alternate weekly collection service has been effective at dealing with resident's issues and concerns.

### **Engage with staff effectively**

It is not just the residents that need to be effectively engaged with, but also the staff; from front line collection personnel to back office staff, all are important. When reviewing the service, **York** found that getting staff, at all levels, on board at the start, was invaluable and found that some of the best ideas come from those who know their jobs best. In **Rotherham**, when dealing with a potentially challenging issue, effective communication with the staff, including recognition of the issues, honesty and openness, involvement of all stakeholders, maintaining an open book policy when considering financial issues, selling your message, were essential in working together to achieve a solution that everyone was happy with. Similarly in the **East Riding** the inclusion of front line staff in the decision making process is seen as essential, as is ensuring that they remain fully informed of changes prior to implementation. Maintaining good links between front line staff and back office staff also ensures the smooth running of a service once



implemented, providing that link between the resident and the authority and ensuring channels of communication are open and in place. **Leeds**, when planning the implementation of the AWC, recognized that greater consultation with the refuse crews and their supervisors would benefit the realization of collection efficiencies. In addition, consulting with wider colleagues in the council, such as those managing the housing stock, would also have aided the realising of these efficiencies.

### **Approach to charging**

Charging for garden waste collections and bulky waste collections is permissible and can be determined by individual authorities. Increasingly imposing a charge to effectively render the garden or bulky service as cost neutral has been a means to sustain the delivery of this service. For example, the collection costs for the service in **Sheffield** are fully recovered from the charge to customers; the Council does not subsidise or supplement the service. This ensures its long term viability. **Craven** recognises that the non-statutory nature of garden waste collections does allow for a charge to be levied, and based on its recent experience would urge any authorities to seriously consider implementing this service change. **Wakefield** does offer a note of caution to take a reasonable approach to passing service charges on to residents.

### **Be realistic about capacity & capability**

Authorities may be keen to change a service or implement a new approach in order to realise efficiency savings but they need to be realistic about their capacity and capability to deliver. In **Ryedale**, when recently making changes to the service, a key lesson learnt was to be realistic about having the necessary staff resource to successfully implement the changes, especially if it involves new electronic or web based technology, as expertise from officers in other Council departments (such as IT) will also be required.

### **Learn from others**

Using the experience of others to support your authority in moving forward is invaluable; learning from others reduces the risk of making costly and/or time consuming mistakes. **Ryedale** advise authorities to look at what others have done, and gather as much information as possible before making any change. **Harrogate** concur with this view and go further to recommend securing feedback and peer reviews of the work you are doing on the basis that usually someone else has done the same work (or similar before) and can help you achieve your aims.

### **Awareness of broader impacts of service changes and also service inter relationships**

When making a change to a service it is essential that consideration is given to broader operational consequences. For example, when rolling out their chargeable garden waste collection service **Ryedale** found that if a resident living in a remote rural area of the District chooses to opt-in to the service, it may prove costly and potentially environmentally damaging to service these properties using a traditional RCV. Therefore there may need to be consideration given to imposing a boundary limit, instead of offering an authority wide service or alternatively, consider using a bag system (instead of wheeled bins) for remote properties, allowing different vehicles to collect that material. Movement of waste as a

consequence of one authority's actions is also a good example of the wider impact of decisions. In **Rotherham**, they found that decisions made by one authority to achieve financial objectives can increase pressure on other neighbouring authorities. For example, decisions made regarding the operation of HWRCs, in terms of opening hours, number of HWRCs available, types of material collected on site, material restrictions, permit systems, can put pressure on other authorities' facilities within the sub region. Whilst waste may reduce at one HWRC as a result of operational changes imposed, it may cause an increase in waste managed at HWRCs in neighbouring authorities, and can also lead to frustration of the users due to the fact there are no common approaches within sub regions. **Doncaster** shares this view and urges all authorities to understand that decisions they make have the potential to impact upon other authorities.

## Summary

As seen in this report authorities throughout the region have successfully delivered efficiencies in a wide range of areas. In all cases not only have savings been realised but services have been maintained or improved upon. There is evidence of strong partnership working, both formally and on an ad hoc basis. In addition virtually all authorities are open to the possibility of further engagement and joint working if the opportunities arise.

In terms of the value of the savings being realised to date, the table below provides a summary of the area of saving and financial value achieved (as identified by the individual authority).

### Summary of overall savings identified in Yorkshire and the Humber

Local Authority	Areas of saving	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)
<b>Bradford City MDC</b>	Service changes	
<b>Craven District Council</b>	Charging for collection	£180k per annum
	Joint procurement	£50k per annum
<b>Doncaster MBC</b>	Operation of the HWRCs	£100k per annum
	Incentivising contracts	£556k over 3 years £300k per annum
<b>East Riding of Yorkshire Council</b>	Service changes	£1m per annum £3m per annum
	Operation of HWRCs	£70k per annum
	Resource saving	£7.7k per annum
<b>Hambleton District Council</b>	Service changes	£50k per annum
	Joint procurement	

Local Authority	Areas of saving	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)
<b>Harrogate Borough Council</b>	Service changes	£724k £16k per annum
	Joint procurement	£145k per annum
<b>Kingston-upon-Hull City Council<sup>3</sup></b>	Service changes	£1m per annum
	New contract	£1.3m per annum
<b>Kirklees MBC</b>	Operation of HWRCs	£30k per annum
	Incentivising contracts	£300k per annum
<b>Leeds City MBC</b>	Service changes	£1.4m per annum
	Operation of HWRCs	£100k per annum
<b>North Yorkshire County Council</b>	Operation of HWRCs	£330k per annum £2.5m per annum
	Charging for collection	£171k per annum
<b>Richmondshire District Council</b>	Joint procurement	
	Route optimisation & round efficiencies	£162k – £225k
<b>Rotherham</b>	Operation of HWRCs	£125k per annum
	Staff engagement	£172k over 3 years
	Route optimisation & round efficiencies	£20k per annum
<b>Ryedale District Council</b>	Service changes	£15k per annum
	Charging for collection	£250k per annum
	New contract	£200k per annum
<b>Selby District Council</b>	Service changes	£1.6m (plus) per annum
	Charging for collection	£1.5m per annum
	Operation of HWRCs	£150k per annum (circa)
<b>Wakefield City MDC</b>	Service changes	
	Charging for collection	£70k per annum
	New contract	£250k – £300k per annum
<b>York City Council</b>	Route optimisation & round efficiencies	£300k
	Charging for collection	£250k

<sup>3</sup> This excludes the significant saving potentially to be realised through the joint treatment and disposal contact under development for North Yorkshire CC and York City Council; this equates to hundreds of millions of pounds.



The estimated savings given in the examples provided by the authorities, who took part in this review for Yorkshire and the Humber, are in the region of £18 million per annum. It should be noted that a number of authorities have not been in a position to quantify the individual savings so this figure is expected to be a conservative estimate. This is a significant sum and reflects the good practice that is being delivered across the participating authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber.

This is the fourth of LP's regional studies. Previous reports covering authorities in the North East, West Midlands and London plus a number of authority specific case studies can be found at [localpartnerships.org.uk/publication](https://localpartnerships.org.uk/publication). The objective of all these studies is to disseminate information on how authorities are using innovative approaches to deliver efficiencies while protecting, and where possible, enhancing public services.

## Appendix 1: Completed Profile for each authority

### City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

#### Background

Residual waste is collected weekly using a 240L wheeled bin. Dry recyclables are collected fortnightly using a 240L bin with insert (collecting paper, cardboard, glass, cans, and plastic bottles). Residents can have separate bins for glass/cans and plastic bottles and paper/cardboard if required. Garden waste is collected 4 weekly using a 240L wheeled bin (there has been a recent change of service from green sacks to brown bin). All waste services are conducted in-house. There are 8 Household waste recycling centres and over 60 local recycling centres (bring sites). The treatment / disposal contract runs to 2017 – a new procurement tender about to commence in 2015. A number of small contracts are in place for various waste types i.e. glass/cans, paper cardboard and plastic bottles, WEEE etc. Bradford Council is not a partner of a waste partnership but has previously worked with Calderdale Council on a waste project.

#### Current status

- ▶ Recently benefitted from £4.68 million DCLG funding to retain weekly residual waste collections, this allowed improvements to the recycling service which changed from 4 weekly to fortnightly, and to add more materials such as plastic bottles. In addition it supported the introduction of a 240 litre brown bin for garden waste in place of a green sack
- ▶ The full effect of the change of service in financial terms will not be realised until late 2015. Early indications of an increase in tonnages of recyclable waste, and the reduction of residual waste sent for treatment will realise significant savings
- ▶ On-going operational review of recycling and waste collection rounds has led to the rationalisation of the fleet. This is part of a much wider review of all council services within the authority

#### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Always have regular reviews of the risk register when introducing major projects
- ▶ Do not underestimate the importance of good communications with stakeholders, when introducing and changing services



## City of York Council

### Background

York collects waste from over 85,000 properties servicing some 200,000 residents. Collections are alternate week with residual waste one week and recycling and garden waste collections the next. Wheeled bins are the standard collection method though around 10,000 properties still receive collection via sack (terraced and city centre areas). 180 litre is the standard bin size though there are a large number of properties still using 240's following LGR in 1996. Recycling is collected using a 'three box' system. Materials collected are paper and card (mixed in one box), glass (three colours mixed in the second box) and cans and plastic bottles (mixed in the third box). Garden waste collections are made to 68,000 properties between March and November each year. There is no charge for the first green bin but any additional bin required by a household is subject to a charge of £35 per year. All collections are undertaken in house. Disposal is handled by Yorwaste, recycling material is taken to a MRF at Hessay in York and residual waste taken to landfill at Harewood Whin. There are two HWRCs – one in the city centre which also accepts trade waste and one in a rural area that does not accept trade. The rural site closes every Wednesday; the city centre site opens 7 days a week. Both sites operate reduced daily opening during the winter period. The HWRCs are managed under contract to Yorwaste – this is due for renewal next year. The council also operates a chargeable bulk collection service – again run by Yorwaste under contract.

### Current status

- ▶ Garden waste changes – introduction of subscription service for additional bins and suspension of service over the winter. This was planned to contribute to 250,000 of savings (including subscription revenue)
- ▶ Waste and Recycling round changes – major reorganisation of front line rounds using route optimisation software. Planned to save 300,000 of annual revenue through fleet and staff reductions

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Start with accurate data – test it to make sure it is accurate and keep measuring progress against it
- ▶ Get staff (at all levels) on board at the start. Many great ideas come from those who know their jobs best
- ▶ Make sure that any savings proposals are accompanied by detailed delivery plans – do not guess, or estimate, levels of savings then hope to plan to achieve them



## Craven District Council

### Background

There are kerbside collections of paper and cardboard from all properties on an alternate week collection basis, using reusable blue bags. Glass, cans and plastic bottles are collected every 4 weeks in 240 litre blue wheeled bins. Garden waste is collected fortnightly in a 240 litre brown wheeled bin on a subscription basis. Residual waste is collected fortnightly in green 240L wheeled bins. All collections are in-house. There is also a network of bring sites across the district. The treatment and disposal contract sits with Yorwaste for both residual waste and recycling.

### Current status

- ▶ Joint procurement of recycle contract with 3 other North Yorkshire districts: the contract was a three year contract commencing in April 2012 with an end date of March 2015 (now extended by one year to March 2016). This partnership working brought additional income to Craven of £50,000 per annum. The other authorities benefitted even more
- ▶ Introduction of a subscription based garden waste service: this service change recovered the cost of delivering the service. The service cost in the region of £180,000 when it was free of charge. The service is now revenue neutral. Ryedale DC and Richmondshire DC have also now introduced such a service

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Joint procurement enables a higher unit rate per tonne through increased volumes. Working together helped put the Council in a more commercially advantageous position as well as sharing procurement costs
- ▶ The non-statutory nature of garden waste collections does allow for a charge to be levied. Would urge any authorities to explore this service change

## Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

### Background

The waste and dry recycling collection contract (household refuse collection, domestic bulk bin services (largely for flats), special refuse collection (bulky waste), door to door recycling for both households and flats, clinical waste, commercial waste and recycling and other miscellaneous services including asbestos collections) was let to SITA (UK) Ltd in October 2009 and ends October 2017. Residual waste is collected alternate weekly with green waste collection; both use 240L wheeled bins for the majority of properties. Dry recycle is collected weekly using 55L kerbside boxes (cans and tins, glass bottles and jars, foil and alu food trays, textiles and shoes, printer cartridges, mobile phones, cardboard), reusable blue bag (paper, newspaper and mags, catalogues, envelopes) and clear bag (for plastic bottles). A bulky waste collection service is available. In addition clinical collections, hazardous waste collections and extensive commercial waste and recycling collection services are also available. The HWRC contract to manage 14 HWRCs was let to FCC Environment Ltd in October 2008 and ends October 2018. Doncaster Council was the lead Authority procuring the contract jointly with Barnsley and Rotherham Councils (BDR). There are 170 recycling bring banks. A joint disposal contract with FCC Environment Ltd is in place with Barnsley and Rotherham and runs until August 2015 with the option to extend for a further 3 years.

### Current status

- ▶ HWRC Contract Extension – In 2012/13 FCC advised that if the contract due to end in 2015 was to be extended by 3 years, the assets including vehicles could be depreciated over a longer period of time and result in a 10 per cent reduction for all three Councils in the Management Fee paid. Savings equate to £556,000 to the end of the extension period
- ▶ HWRC Reduced Operating Hours – Following a similar exercise undertaken by partner Authorities Barnsley and Rotherham, Doncaster Council with effect from 6th January 2014 varied the HWRC contract with FCC and reduced the operating hours. There was a great deal of work undertaken to establish the most effective way of reducing hours whilst ensuring minimal impact on service users; traffic counters, skip movements and tonnage data was used. Savings achieved through reduced operating hours are expected to be £100,000 per annum
- ▶ Green Waste – In February 2013 contract conditions meant that green waste could be sent to the contractor with the cheapest gate fee; there was significant difference in the gate fee costs and because of the proximity of both green waste facilities to Doncaster there was no impact on transport. The decision resulted in £300,000 savings in 2013/14

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Establish who the right people are in the partnership to engage
- ▶ Have a clear understanding that decisions and actions taken by one authority can impact upon other Authorities, for example changes to policies and opening times for HWRC's

## East Riding of Yorkshire Council

### Background

Residual waste and dry recyclables (paper, cans, cardboard, plastics, glass and cartons) are collected alternate weekly using 240 litre wheeled bins. Food and garden waste are also collected on a fortnightly basis using 240 litre wheeled bins. All collections in-house. Currently there is a waste disposal contract in place with FCC Environment. A new contract will start from April 2015 which will consist of: FCC Environment for household waste recycling sites and general waste, Biffa for dry recycling, and a Joint Venture Company (J&B and Biowise) for organic waste. There are over 100 bring sites managed in-house (processing contracts with Glass Recycling UK and with Palm Recycling – paper and plastic/can banks). Textile banks, shoe banks and book banks are operated by various charitable organisations. There are 10 HWRCs, all owned by the council, but run through a contract by FCC Environment.

### Current status

- ▶ Collection frequency – AWC reduced the refuse collection fleet by 8 vehicles, saving £1 million and saved £3.3 million in landfill tax savings from the decrease in waste to landfill from 63,784 tonnes (2012/13) to less than 56,000 tonnes (2013/14)
- ▶ Procurement of new corn starch caddy liners (free to residents) – a large reduction in costs has brought down the 'value' of the liners so there is no longer a need to track the caddy liners to addresses for audit purposes; they are simply monitored in terms how many are received by the authority and how many boxes are going to each depot. Support services and Customer Service Network saved £5,328 and £2,450 respectively
- ▶ The HWRS had a reduction in opening hours from 10am-6pm to 10am-5pm. In 2011/12, data showed that between 5pm and 6pm the number of users was significantly lower than any other time during the day. So the decision was made to close the sites at 5pm. This has saved £70,000 across all 10 HWRS over a year

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Close working with the customer service network – rolling out the AWC, the main point of contact was a team of specifically trained customer service staff. This vastly reduced the number of calls having to go through to Officers directly. The staff also had access to a calendar (which the Officers could check each day) for booking home visits for waste and recycling officers to visit residents if they were struggling with capacity
- ▶ Value of resident feedback – prior to rolling out any service change, we hold trials of the service and record all resident feedback. We have used various methods of feedback during trials of service changes such as: text message, wastewatchers (an email address that is checked daily by our officers); Your East Riding (a quarterly magazine which is sent to every household in the authority); door stepping; and, the phone
- ▶ Inclusion of front line staff in decision making process and ensure that they are fully informed of changes prior to implementation – the refuse collectors are the first port of call for a lot of residents and it is essential that they understand why the changes are being made so that they can give a full answer to residents should they be asked whilst delivering the service. Also the communication between Recycling Officers and front line staff is essential so that proactive door knocking campaigns can be undertaken



## Hambleton District Council

### Background

Residual and garden waste is collected from the kerbside on an alternate week basis. Black wheeled bins are for residual and green wheeled bins for garden waste; additional suitable bags for the green waste collection can be purchased from the authority if required. There is no food waste collection. Recyclate is collected at the kerbside via a 55L box and a reusable blue bag, where this is sorted into separate paper and glass, with tins and plastic bottles mixed. All collections are in-house. There are 5 large bring sites managed by Yorwaste (contract to 2016) plus multiple small bring sites serviced in house. HWRC's are provided by North Yorkshire County Council and all disposal contracts are with Yorwaste and expire 2016.

### Current status

- ▶ A Waste Strategy Review started in July 14, looking at all aspects of the service – nothing has been delivered as yet as part of this process; it is timed to coincide with 2016 contracts
- ▶ Enhanced paper collection started May 13 (larger bag extra materials such as light card collected); this increased income by £50,000
- ▶ Partnership procurement of dry recyclate with three other authorities increased income and reduced costs, and there are plans to revisit this exercise in 2015

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Working in partnership on procurements for dry recyclate reduces procurement costs significantly and maxims income



## Harrogate Borough Council

### Background

Residual and dry recycling is collected alternate weeks using a 240 litre wheeled bin for waste and 2 x 55 litre boxes/35 litre sack for dry recyclates (glass, mixed cans, foil, aerosols & plastic bottles in the boxes, with mixed paper/grey card in the sack). Plus 43,000 households have access to a 9 month fortnightly service for green garden waste, collected using a 240 litre wheeled bin. The collection is in-house. Bring sites are a mixture of small sites serviced by HBC, with material sent for processing via our recyclates contract (see below). There are also merchant banks at supermarkets (glass, mixed cans, foil & aerosols & mixed paper banks are via the recyclates contract), the other banks are charity banks and serviced directly by them. There are six beverage carton recycling banks – five are currently serviced and paid for by ACE, one is paid for by us. Waste disposal contracts are a North Yorkshire County Council function. Dry recyclates have been procured jointly with other North Yorkshire partners and is currently contracted until Jan 16. The partners are currently working towards procuring the next contract (the joint procurement exercise last time involved each of authority letting lots which related to their range of materials/type of service at the individual LA but this time the partners are going out jointly for the overall contract terms). Green waste is currently treated through the North Yorkshire contract but the authority is undertaking its own procurement exercise through a North Yorkshire framework with an aim to let the contract from Oct 14.

### Current status

- ▶ Partnership working: recyclates contract (let April 12), achieved savings which supported an overall saving on waste services of £724,000 per annum (please note that the saving relating to the recyclates contract is difficult to quantify as there was also increased recycling due to change in service but is assumed around £145,000)
- ▶ Saving and better service for the collection of bulky articles: the service was externalised in 2012 generating approximately £16,000 savings
- ▶ Revised waste & recycling service implemented in 2012/13: efficiencies as noted in bullet point 1 above at around £724,000 per annum saving

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Get the contract specification right – take the time to really consider what you want to procure before going out to the market
- ▶ Work with other organisations but ensure you have a clear and defined timetable and stick to it
- ▶ Do get feedback and peer reviews of the work you are doing – usually someone else has done the same work (or similar before) and can help you achieve your aims



## Kingston Upon Hull City Council

### Background

Three 240 litre wheeled bins are used for the fortnightly collection of mixed organics (food and garden waste), mixed dry recyclables (paper, card, cans, mixed plastics and glass) and residual waste. Around 19,000 properties without gardens have a weekly food waste collection service rather than the fortnightly commingled organics. The collection service is all in house and operates on a four day working week. In terms of disposal there is a joint integrated waste disposal contract with East Riding of Yorkshire Council due to terminate in March 2015. Current contractor is FCC. Approximately 120,000 tonnes per annum waste is managed through 1 waste transfer station and 3 household waste recycling centres. FCC has subcontract arrangements in place for MRF and IVC facility provision. Residual waste is processed into RDF which is sent to EfW in the UK and European export.

### Current status

- ▶ Fortnightly refuse collection: Following the introduction of fortnightly recycling and organic collections, residual waste was still being collected weekly. The success of the new recycling service combined with a household survey illustrated that around 70 per cent of residents thought a fortnightly or monthly refuse collection was the most appropriate frequency of collection. In 2013, the collection service was re-optimised using waste collector software and a fortnightly refuse collection service (excluding flats) was introduced across the city from May 2013. This generated savings of around £1 million/year through a reduced fleet, staff and disposal costs
- ▶ Waste disposal contract procurement: With the existing waste disposal contract due to terminate in March 2015, new waste contracts have recently been procured. To maximise value for money, a multiple lot procurement structure was adopted working in partnership with East Riding of Yorkshire Council such that the best overall solution for the 2 authorities could be assessed. The required services were split into 15 lots. As a result of the procurement exercise, a joint contract for the management of TLS and HWRC has been awarded with the Council awarding individual contracts for the treatment or processing of organics, recyclables and residual waste. An estimated saving of £1.3 million per year will be realised by Hull CC from 2015/16 onward

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Through the introduction of a simple and comprehensive kerbside collection service for recycling, public opinion towards fortnightly refuse collection changed significantly and gave confidence that a change to fortnightly refuse collection service was supported by a majority of residents
- ▶ Adopting a multiple lot approach to the procurement allowed for comparison between integrated bids and a combination of bids for the individual elements of the service. In addition, the Councils have entered into a risk sharing arrangement around revenue share for dry recyclables sorted via the MRF and segregated at the HWRC. The revenue share is split 80:20 in favour of the Councils

## Kirklees Metropolitan Council

### Background

Residual and comingled dry recyclate (paper, card, plastic bottles, food tins & drinks cans) are collected alternate weekly using 240L wheeled bins. Garden waste is available as a charged for collection and bulky waste collections (including separately collected electrical items) and clinical waste collections are also available. All collections are in-house. There are approximately 180 bring sites, the majority collecting glass with multi-material sites mainly on supermarket and council car parks. A variety of informal arrangements/agreements exist for the sites with the provision and servicing of glass banks by contract, paper and cans mainly in-house, textiles / shoes and books by charities. There are five HWRCs all with facilities for the disposal of residual wastes, a wide range of recyclables, soils & rubble and green waste. There is an integrated 25 year PFI waste disposal contract in place with Sita Kirklees Ltd which commenced in 1998, with up to 5 years extension possible. Facilities include the Energy from Waste Plant and Materials Recycling Facility in Huddersfield, the Waste Transfer Station in Dewsbury and the five HWRCs across the district.

### Current status

- ▶ Landfill tax savings incentives scheme – An opportunity to generate budget savings for the Council was identified through which Sita is given a financial incentive to increase the diversion of waste from landfill. Whilst the costs of the additional diversion routes are borne by Sita, the savings in landfill tax payments that would otherwise have been made are shared between the council and Sita. This has generated net savings of circa £300,000 per year
- ▶ Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) Residents & Commercial Vehicle Permit Schemes – Significant reductions in waste arisings at the five HWRCs following the introduction of these two schemes resulted in reductions in both gate fee and landfill tax payable by the Council. This has generated net savings of circa £30,000 per year
- ▶ Clinical Waste Disposal – Clinical waste had previously been treated through the waste disposal contract using a third party contractor. Discussions between the Council and Sita resulted in modifications being made to operational practice, and to the permit for the Energy from Waste Plant, enabling clinical waste (excluding sharps) to be disposed of there and a consequent reduction in the additional gate fee for this waste stream. This has generated net savings of circa £20,000 per year

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ The waste disposal contract is a joint venture contract with the Council having one non-executive Director on the contractor's Board. The joint venture arrangement has proved effective in producing a good overall contractual relationship and an effective joint approach to issues as they arise. Not only has this arrangement contributed to the achievement of past savings for the Council but is also helping now as we examine a wide range of future options to address the significant financial pressures that we currently face

## Leeds City Council

### Background

Majority of households receive a kerbside, alternate weekly collection of residual and recyclable waste using a 240 litre wheeled bin. By mid 2015 this service should cover 80 per cent of the City. The remaining properties will continue to have a weekly collection of residual waste and a 4 weekly collection of recyclable waste. A free fortnightly seasonal garden waste collection service, using a 240 litre brown wheeled bin, operates to approx. 210,000 properties. A weekly food waste collection service operates in the south of the City, covering approximately 12,300 households using a 23 litre outside bin, 7 litre kitchen caddy and free biodegradable liners. All these collections are operated in-house. There are 350 bring sites, with existing sites serviced by a contractor sourced through Leeds' procurement process and new bring sites managed in-house. There are 8 Household Waste Sorting Sites (HWSS), managed in house. Disposal is through a framework contract and a range of disposal methods are available – dirty MRF, RDF and landfill. Food waste collected at the kerbside is delivered to IVC processing. Recyclable waste collected at the kerbside is delivered to a MRF.

### Current status

- ▶ Alternate Weekly Collections (AWC) – AWC has been rolled out in phases (first phase to approx. 56,000 households, second phase to approx. 118,000 households, third phase to approx. 32,000 properties). The remaining 60,000 suitable properties will be brought into the scheme during spring 2015. This change of service is expected to generate £1.4m of disposal savings by the end of next year
- ▶ Recycling and Energy Recovery Facility – a long term contract with Veolia Environmental Services will provide a Recycling and Energy Recovery Facility (due to come online late 2015 early 2016) for residual waste. A mechanical pre-treatment process will recover at least 10 per cent of recyclable material. The remaining waste will be burnt to supply electricity to power around 20,000 households. Leeds has been allocated £68.6 million of PFI credits by Defra equating to an estimated £134 million of income to Leeds City Council over the life of the contract. The facility is estimated to save the Council around £200 million over the life of the 25 year contract
- ▶ Household Waste Sorting Site Permit Scheme – August 2013 a permit scheme was introduced across all household waste sorting sites for vans, cars with trailers, 4x4 pickups and minibuses. The aim was to reduce the amount of C&D type waste and prevent trade waste being disposed of at the sites. 12 permits are issued per household for a 12 month period and in the initial year of operation over £100,000 of savings have been made through reduced waste (specifically C&D) at the sites

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ When planning the implementation of the AWC it was recognised that greater consultation with refuse collection crews and their Supervisors would benefit realising collection efficiencies. Consulting with wider colleagues, such as those managing the council housing stock, would have also aided in realising these efficiencies
- ▶ Supporting the roll out of AWC with a team of Waste Recycling Advisors (WRAs) has led to a better introduction of the new service to residents, with fewer complaints. As the advisers accompany collection crews as the new service is rolled out, they are able to provide advice and support to residents and help with any concerns or issues



## North Yorkshire County Council

### Background

North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) makes arrangements for the disposal of residual waste collected by the 7 WCAs. NYCC manages green waste for some districts but not all. No food waste is separately collected at the kerbside in North Yorkshire. NYCC provides 20 HWRCs across the county. All are operated under contract with the current one expiring on April 2017. Eighteen sites are operated by Kier and 2 are provided and operated by Yorwaste. A commercial waste disposal and recycling service has been rolled out across all 20 HWRC making the service more easily accessible. Treatment and final disposal is currently carried out using contracts that run to 31 March 2015. These utilise a number of waste transfer stations, 3 landfill sites and some waste is delivered to Sita's EfW facility at Teesside through a sub-contract arrangement. 20 sites have been awarded a place on a 4 year framework contract for the treatment or disposal of waste from 1 April 2015. NYCC have signed a PPP contract for waste treatment and recovery with AmeyCespa. Treatment processes will include EfW, MBT and AD. It is a 25 year contract – likely to begin receiving waste in 2017-18. NYCC delivers waste prevention activity across the county on behalf of the waste partnership.

### Current status

- ▶ HWRC restrictions – savings realised from hardcore, rubble and plasterboard restrictions, large vehicle restrictions and vehicle registration. The introduction of hardcore and rubble charges from August 2014 will save £330,000 per year
- ▶ Large vehicle restrictions and vehicle registration reduced usage of HWRCs by 25 per cent leading to a tonnage saving of 25,000 tonnes at £100 tonne average
- ▶ HWRC Wednesday closures – by closing 1 day per week at all 20 sites achieved a saving of 7 per cent of the management fee
- ▶ Teckal – NYCC and CYC jointly own Yorwaste Ltd, a waste management company. In March 2014, NYCC's Executive decided to agree the principle of awarding relevant contracts to Yorwaste without competitive procurement where conditions for the Teckal exemption are satisfied. North Yorkshire County Council is currently reviewing the benefits of this approach. Savings are anticipated through the Teckal process but the value of these savings is not yet known. However the Teckal also presents opportunities to the Council and other councils in the waste partnership, and these will be explored as well

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Restrictions at HWRCs and changes to practices can realise significant savings
- ▶ Planning permission takes a long time – plan for longer rather than a shorter application period
- ▶ In 2-tier partnership areas, it is often the case that more savings are realised by the WCAs than the WDA. Examples include route optimisation, recyclate sales, vehicle purchasing etc. Whilst it is accepted by NYCC, it is worth pointing out that any effort invested in a project by the WDA or other partners should be considered as part of the overall scope of the project



## Richmondshire District Council

### Background

- ▶ In-house service of alternate weekly collection of residual and garden waste/dry recycling to all 22,720 households
- ▶ No food waste collections
- ▶ Garden waste collections charged since February 2014 – £17 per year for 140 litre bin and £12 per year for each additional 140 litre bin
- ▶ Dry recycling is sorted at kerbside – separate paper/light card, separate glass and mixed cans/plastic bottles
- ▶ 24 bring bank sites serviced in house with banks for glass, cans, paper, cardboard and plastic bottles
- ▶ RDC is WCA only – HWRCs are provided by WDA (North Yorkshire County Council)
- ▶ Dry recycling contract is with Yorwaste and expires January 2016
- ▶ Garden waste contract is with Yorwaste and expires July 2015
- ▶ Residual tipped as directed by North Yorkshire County Council

### Current status

- ▶ Waste strategy review of service started October 2014 – research currently being undertaken. Results will decide waste service offered to residents from 2016 onwards
- ▶ Subscription charge for garden waste collections introduced in February 2014. Currently 42 per cent take up and £171,000 income
- ▶ York & North Yorkshire Waste Partnership procurement of dry recycling contract in 2011 increased income and reduced costs. This exercise will be repeated for new dry recycling contract from January 2016

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ The opportunities through working in partnership with other local authorities to achieve increased income from recycling contracts

## Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

### Background

Residual waste and dry recyclate are collected alternate weekly using 240 litre wheeled bin (residual), 55 litre box (glass, cans and textiles) and 60 litre bag (paper and card). Garden waste is collected fortnightly (seasonally) using a 240 litre wheeled bin. There is a charge for bulky waste collection and a hazardous clinical waste collection. A commercial waste collection is available. Collections are in-house. 41 bring sites (supported by a number of different contractors and charities) and 4 HWRCs (operated by FCC Environmental until October 2018). Residual treatment/disposal is under contract with Veolia Environmental Services and Viridor Waste Management until the BDR facility is up and running in 2015. Green waste is handled by Yorkshire Aggregates (Yorkshire Horticulture Ltd) until 2016 (option to extend to 2019). Glass cans, textiles are managed by Beatson Clark (contract until July 2017), paper and card are managed by Newport Paper (under contract until May 2017). Residual waste from HWRCs is managed by Viridor, recyclates by various processors.

### Current status

- ▶ Working Together – following a request through the Trade Unions for refuse collectors to have their pay grade brought up to the Living Wage, negotiations between Operational Managers, Trade Union Representatives and Workforce Reps were successfully undertaken, resulting in a number of positive actions being agreed to deliver a cost neutral solution
- ▶ Telemetric's – installation of telemetric's into the waste collection fleet to provide real time data in terms of service operations and allow for better customer access/ interface with the service. This supports a streamlining of current operations within the customer service centre and improves the inter-relationship with back office based in the Operational Depot. Initial capital costs for the project of £110,000 have been met through a capital fund programme and over the next three years savings of £162,000 are expected (potential for savings to reach £225,000)
- ▶ Review Operation of HWRCs – Operational hours have been reduced, with sites closing one date per week, the contract extended to allow contractor to spread capital costs over a longer period, the number of permit visits being reduced from 12 to 6 per annum, and restrictions on trade vehicles and rubble have been imposed. Savings approx. £125,000

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ A potentially serious industrial relations issue could have had significant service implications; however by working together and communicating effectively a solution has been achieved that meets the objectives of both Employer and Employee. A number of excellent principles were adopted including honesty and openness; stakeholder engagement; and, an open book policy
- ▶ Service Inter-relationships – The operation of HWRCs is a clear example of where actions and decisions within one Council area can have an impact within a sub region in terms of diverting waste streams into other Council areas, increasing pressure on sites and frustrating the public due to a lack of common approaches within sub regions. It's important to understand the objectives of each Council, the extent of each others problems, to reach common ground and consider opportunities working together

## Ryedale District Council

### Background

Residual Waste is collected fortnightly using 180 litre wheeled bins (being phased in to replace all existing 240 litre containers). Dry Recyclables are collected fortnightly via kerbside sort, using 2 x 55 litre box (plastic bottles & cans, plus mixed glass), and a 55 litre re-usable bag (paper & cardboard). There is an opt-in, chargeable, fortnightly (seasonal) garden waste collection using 240 litre wheeled bins. Collection is in-house. Recyclate is managed by Yorkwaste until 31st March 2017 (with a further 2 year option to extend). Ryedale DC is working with other North Yorkshire Local Authority partners to pursue options for procuring a future joint contract. Garden waste is windrowed anaerobically, using a network of local farms. There are a dozen Bring Sites, mixture of Ryedale DC and Private Contractor run banks.

### Current status

- ▶ Chargeable scheme for garden waste collections. Cost to residents works out to just under £2 per collection. 47 per cent of residents opted-in to the scheme and there is still 70 per cent of material coming through, compared to pre-charging tonnages. Previously the scheme cost the authority £285,000 per annum to operate. Charges have generated around £250,000 income, and the service is expected to be self financing in 2015/16. In addition running a seasonal scheme saves around £20,000 per annum. Additionally contamination levels are now almost non-existent. In addition, the current contract for the treatment of garden waste benefited from an EU procurement exercise, saving £28,000. This resulted in a new Framework Agreement comprising local farmers, which led to a reduction in gate fees and reductions in miles travelled by collection vehicles
- ▶ Two larger, 8-wheeled RCV's (increased payload from approx. 11 to 15 tonnes) have been introduced to the fleet to support collections in rural areas. These larger sized vehicles have enabled rural rounds to be completed without a time consuming changeover required. This has resulted in fuel savings and tip time/staff savings estimated to be £10,000 and £15,000
- ▶ Round optimisation (webaspx) and vehicle tracking (Fleetmatics) have also been introduced, resulting in savings through fuel use and resource requirements. Savings to date are estimated to be in the region of £20,000. However this is work in progress and further operational efficiencies are projected

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ When making a change to a service broader operational consequences need to be considered. For example, if a resident living in a remote rural area of the District chooses to opt-in to chargeable garden waste collections, it may prove costly and potentially environmentally damaging to service these properties using a traditional RCV. Considering a boundary limit, or using a bag system for remote properties, allowing different vehicles to collect that material, may increase the viability
- ▶ Look at what other authorities have done and gather as much information as possible before making any change
- ▶ In the light of budget cuts, be realistic about having the necessary staff resource to deliver the project, especially if expertise from other departments will also be required



## Selby District Council

### Background

There is an outsourced contractual arrangement in place with Amey PLC, which commenced on the 1st October 2009 and runs for 7.5 years. This contract is for all waste collection streams (residual, dry recycling, green, bulky, clinical, commercial) plus street cleansing and ground maintenance. Residual waste is collected on an alternate weekly basis via a 240 litre bin plus a limited number of bag collections. Dry recycling is also collected alternate weekly but using three 55 litre plastic boxes. There is an alternate weekly green waste collection via a 240 litre wheeled bin. Disposal of residual waste is via North Yorkshire County Council, green waste is via 4 re-processors and materials from the dry recycling collection are sold to re-processors.

### Current status

- ▶ The award of the environmental contract achieved approximately £200,000 annual savings for the authority
- ▶ Further efficiencies have also been delivered through streamlined contract management aligned to an outcome based performance specification
- ▶ Service changes since the contract award have helped deliver a further £20,000 per annum savings

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Ensure the full suite of contract documents are aligned and support the delivery of performance outcomes and delivery of service efficiencies
- ▶ Ensure the culture of both organisations is aligned to deliver the expected goals



## Sheffield City Council

### Background

There is currently a PPP Integrated Waste Management Contract with Veolia signed in 2001 for 30 years, extended in 2005 to 2036. This incorporates all aspects of waste services including; waste and recycling collection, management of household waste recycling centres (5), bring sites, treatment of waste and recyclables, design and build of a new Energy Recovery Facility (combined heat and power), customers services (including call centre) and communications. Currently an alternate week collection of residual waste (using a 240 litre bin) and dry recyclates (using 140 litre blue bin and 55 litre box) is in place. Paper and card is collected together, separate from mixed glass, cans and plastic bottles – customers may choose which container to present these two streams in. Garden waste collection is a chargeable service operating on an alternate weekly collection basis for 15 collections between Apr – Nov. No separate collection of food waste is provided this is collected with residual waste.

### Current status

- ▶ Significant service reductions rolled out including, move from weekly to AWC residual waste collections, ceasing funding for garden waste collections (only the cost of disposal is paid by the Council), reduction to household waste recycling centre opening times/days
- ▶ Long list of potential savings drawn up. These will be evaluated, consulted upon, with the financial value and timescale for implementation used as criteria to prioritise and focus efforts
- ▶ Income share opportunities are being evaluated to maximise service revenue savings

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ How to calculate cost of change and impact to revenue costs is not explicit in the Contract Project Agreement. Each party has different interpretation. This is particularly the case for service reduction/ taking things out of the contract. Therefore ensure contract terms are clear and apply both to growth and reduction
- ▶ Understanding financial performance of Contractor is necessary in calculating what should be revised service costs etc, transparency is needed in relation to profit and margin in service/ contract. Therefore ensure Contract obligations for updates to Financial Model and provision of accounts or other management information must be upheld and analysed when received
- ▶ Ensuring any obligation to share/ benefit service efficiencies by the Contractor back to Authority are upheld. Transparent relationships from start of Contract are important so Contractor understands any such obligations and these are easier to track and monitor on year by year basis

## Wakefield Council

### Background

Residual waste is collected fortnightly using 240 litre wheeled bin. Dry recyclables are collected fortnightly using a 55 litre box (plastic bottles, glass bottles, cans) and 240 litre wheeled bin (paper/card). There is a seasonal garden waste collection, fortnightly, using 240 litre wheeled bin. All collections are in-house. Waste treatment and disposal is managed through a 25 year semi-integrated waste management contract with Wakefield Waste PFI Ltd. Once the contract is up and running in Sept. 2015, waste will be sent to a residual waste treatment facility which will divert over 95 per cent of waste from landfill. A composting facility for the treatment of garden waste and a MRF for the sorting of mixed dry recycling is also part of the contract. HWRCs will come under the contract; an existing network of 7 will be modernised and replaced with 4 new HWRCs. 33 bring Sites will come under the contract.

### Current status

- ▶ Market testing of waste disposal contracts – the waste management contract includes market testing provisions for landfill upon the expiry of existing contracts (the contractor is responsible for managing all waste disposal and off-take contracts). The disposal contracts expired on 19 May 2014 and prior to this the contractor carried out a market testing exercise. A range of tenders were received, including from the current supplier, resulting in a significant reduction in the landfill gate fee. Equates to projected disposal savings of £250,000-£300,000 in 2014/15
- ▶ Modernisation of refuse collection service - the main purpose of the phased implementation of alternate weekly collections was to deliver increased recycling and maximise landfill diversion. However this also led to the waste collection service operating on a four day working week to provide capacity for the work programme for collections not made on bank holidays. This avoided overtime payments to staff. These efficiencies were encapsulated within the wider implementation of the project and it is not possible to explicitly state a savings figure
- ▶ Bulky waste collections – Bulky waste is collected by two collection teams that operate across the District. Historically no charge was levied for these collections, however recently the Council introduced a charge for each collection, where up to three bulky items can be collected for a fixed price, and subsequent bulky waste collections made within the same year are charged at a slightly higher price. Service costs supported by approximately £70,000 income per annum

### Lessons learnt

- ▶ Ensure contractual processes are adhered to and challenge the contractor where appropriate. Keep full records of all contractual correspondence and seek advice from procurement colleagues. Check figures and workings provided by the contractor
- ▶ Take a reasonable approach to passing service charges on to residents
- ▶ Consider efficiency opportunities when making wider service changes

## Appendix 2: Waste Management Profile

Local Authority	Residual		Dry Recyclable		Garden			Food	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged		
<b>Bradford City MDC</b>	Weekly	240L bin	Fortnightly	240L bin with insert	4 weekly	240L bin	Free	No	In-house
<b>Craven District Council</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly – bag, 4 weekly – bin	Reusable bag (paper & card) 240L bin (glass, cans, plastic)	Fortnightly	240L bin	Charged	No	In-house
<b>Doncaster MBC</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Weekly	55L box, 2 x reusable bags	Fortnightly	240L bin	Free	No	SITA UK
<b>East Riding of Yorkshire Council</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	240L bin	Free	Yes – with garden	In-house
<b>Hambleton District Council</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	55L box & reusable bag	Fortnightly	240L bin (plus bags if required)	Free (charge for the bags)	No	In-house
<b>Harrogate Borough Council</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	2 x 55L box, reusable bag	Fortnightly	240L bin	Free	No	In-house
<b>Kingston-upon-Hill City Council</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	240L bin	Free	Yes – with garden	In-house
<b>Kirklees MBC</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	240L bin	On demand	None provided	Charged	No	In-house
<b>Leeds City MBC</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	240L bin	Free	Weekly (12K hh)	In-house
<b>Richmondshire District Council</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	55L box, reusable bag	Fortnightly	140L bin	Charged	No	In-house

Local Authority	Residual		Dry Recyclable		Garden			Food	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged		
<b>Rotherham MBC</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	55L box, reusable bag	Fortnightly	240L bin	Free	No	In-house
<b>Ryedale District Council</b>	Fortnightly	180L bin	Fortnightly	2 x 55L box, reusable bag	Fortnightly	240L bin	Charged	No	In-house
<b>Selby District Council</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	3 x 55L box	Fortnightly	240L bin	Free	No	Amey PLC
<b>Sheffield City Council</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	140L bin, 55L box	Fortnightly	240L bin	Charged	No	Veolia
<b>Wakefield City MDC</b>	Fortnightly	240L bin	Fortnightly	240L bin, 55L box	Fortnightly	240L bin	Free	No	In-house
<b>York City Council</b>	Fortnightly	180L bin	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	Fortnightly	240L bin	Free (2nd bin charged)	No	In-house

## Appendix 3: Performance Data

### Local Authority<sup>4</sup> Waste Management Performance in Yorkshire and the Humber (2013/14)

Authority	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting	Total tonnage Household Waste Collected	Collected household waste per person (kg)	Residual household waste kg/household	Percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill
Calderdale MBC	60.1%	78,623	382.38	335.03	17.06%
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	57.2%	167,901	499.49	472.73	29.25%
Ryedale District Council	52.7%	23,770	455.99	453.97	(WCA)
Barnsley MBC	51.6%	98,408	420.17	443.60	8.16%
Bradford City MDC	50.8%	194,859	370.16	454.43	23.14%
Kingston-upon-Hill City Council	50.2%	102,235	397.12	432.44	33.31%
North Yorkshire County Council	46.9%	303,436	499.46	580.01	49.81%
Hambleton District Council	46.9%	36,083	399.21	479.72	(WCA)
North Lincolnshire Council	44.5%	80,609	476.68	604.51	50.21%
Leeds City MBC	43.7%	306,155	401.22	503.78	48.91%
York City Council	43.6%	85,595	424.56	558.72	55.83%
Selby District Council	42.9%	36,012	424.74	554.4	(WCA)
Craven District Council	42.6%	21,113	377.12	454.62	(WCA)
Richmondshire District Council	41.4%	19,127	354.06	493.06	(WCA)
Rotherham MBC	40.9%	108,025	417.83	557.78	33.88%
Harrogate Borough Council	40.3%	56,810	355.22	480.85	(WCA)
Doncaster MBC	40.2%	136,521	449.39	617.21	57.85%
Wakefield City MDC	39.0%	146,525	445.78	601.04	65.2%
Scarborough Borough Council	38.8%	47,052	430.49	512.56	(WCA)
North East Lincolnshire Council	31.5%	74,638	467.09	705.79	3.16%
Kirklees MBC	30.9%	170,182	398.11	647.61	6.91%
Sheffield City Council	30.2%	184,166	329.91	534.76	7.39%

<sup>4</sup> The authorities highlighted in lime green are those who took part in this review.



**LOCAL  
PARTNERSHIPS**

Local Partnerships is jointly owned by



HM Treasury

**Local Partnerships: the public sector delivery specialists**

Local Partnerships, Local Government House, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ  
020 7187 7379 | LPenquiries@local.gov.uk | @LP\_localgov | localpartnerships.org.uk