



LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS



DELIVERING WASTE EFFICIENCIES
IN THE SOUTH EAST

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	Context	3
1.2	South East profile	5
1.3	Waste management profile	5
1.4	Waste partnerships in the region	6
2	DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCIES	7
2.1	National picture	7
2.2	Regional comparisons	8
2.3	Success through partnership working	10
3	DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES IN THE SOUTH EAST	12
4	LESSONS LEARNED AND ADVICE TO OTHER AUTHORITIES	21
5	SUMMARY	29
	APPENDIX 1: LOCAL AUTHORITY PROFILES	33
	APPENDIX 2: WASTE COLLECTION PROFILE OF THE AUTHORITIES IN THE REVIEW	69
	APPENDIX 3: PERFORMANCE DATA 2017/18	74

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 report (including any information it contains) by any organisation or other person. Any organisation or other person in receipt of this report should take their own legal, financial and/or other relevant professional advice when considering what action (if any) to take in respect of any associated initiative, proposal or other arrangement, or before placing any reliance on the report (including any information it contains).

Copyright © Local Partnerships LLP 2019

For further information contact

John Enright, Project Director, Local Partnerships
John.enright@local.gov.uk 07824 371 720

Dr Jane Beasley, Beasley Associates
jane@beasleyassociates.com 07946 217 275

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

This is the eighth regional review¹ undertaken by Local Partnerships. The focus of this review is efficiencies achieved in waste and resource management by local authorities in the South East. The previous seven reviews were focused on the following regions:

- ▶ East of England
- ▶ East Midlands
- ▶ London
- ▶ North East
- ▶ North West
- ▶ West Midlands and
- ▶ Yorkshire and the Humber

These reviews have provided a wealth of information to decision makers and stakeholders. Each one has signalled several key messages prevalent across the country at the time. The current focus on the South East comes at a time when local authorities are in their tenth year of trying to deliver major efficiencies in all services. Having done so successfully, they are attempting to secure further efficiencies whilst it is ever more challenging to protect public services. A conservative estimate, based on the authorities who took part in the review and who were able to quantify savings realised, has found that innovation in the South East succeeded in delivering a savings of more than £21.5 million per annum.

As with the previous reviews, the diversity of examples illustrates the range of initiatives and measures that authorities are utilising to produce performance improvements and secure financial savings. For the South East, partnership working and joint delivery, as well as contract management and service reviews and changes play significant roles. In addition, several authorities are keen to explore new collection systems. They are only waiting for the final outcome of Brexit negotiations and publication of the Government's Resources and Waste Strategy. On the latter, they are waiting to establish if additional funding will be available to support the development and implementation of these systems.

The examples provided throughout this report will enable other local authorities to benefit from these experiences. This will be the case particularly with those examining their own services and seeing if the examples presented here can support them in making their own savings and, in some cases, improve performance and customer satisfaction rates.

All authorities in the region were given the opportunity to contribute to the review. A pro-forma was sent to each authority with a request for further information to highlight the progress made to date and any lessons learned which can be shared

¹ All the reviews can be found on the Local Partnerships website: localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/waste

with others. A workshop was also held to provide feedback on the information provided, and to offer the chance for authorities to benchmark themselves and provide additional pieces of data and information.

A total of 34 (out of 74) authorities responded including a range of district and borough councils. This number includes all the county councils in the region and a number of unitary authorities, as can be seen in Table 1. There were authorities who expressed a desire to take part in the project but felt that either the timing of the review was not right in terms of service changes they were currently delivering or that they had no spare capacity in terms of staff time to pull together the information required. Whilst every attempt was made to ensure that the data and information required for this review was not too onerous, it is appreciated that for some authorities it was not possible to contribute.

The individual profiles for the authorities who took part can be found in Appendix 1. Examples of their achievements are featured in the main body of the report. Please note that as with the reviews conducted in other regions, whilst a degree of validation and sense checking has taken place, the responses from the authorities have not been formally audited. Therefore, the information presented in this report is based on the information that the authorities kindly provided.

Table 1: Authorities who participated in the South East Efficiency Review

Waste collection authorities		Waste disposal authorities	Unitary authorities
• Ashford Borough Council	• Oxford City Council	• Buckinghamshire County Council	• Bracknell Forest Borough Council
• Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	• Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	• East Sussex County Council	• Portsmouth City Council
• Chichester District Council	• Rother District Council	• Hampshire County Council	• Reading Borough Council
• Crawley Borough Council	• Spelthorne Borough Council	• Kent County Council	• Southampton City Council
• Eastbourne Council	• South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils	• Oxfordshire County Council	• West Berkshire Council
• Elmbridge Borough Council	• Surrey Heath Borough Council	• Surrey County Council	• Wokingham Borough Council
• Guildford Borough Council (awaiting sign off)	• Wealden District Council	• West Sussex County Council	
• Hart District Council	• West Oxfordshire District Council		
• Hastings Borough Council	• Woking Borough Council		
• Lewes District Council			
• Mole Valley Council			

1.2 South East profile

The South East covers an area of 19,096 km² with a population of over nine million. Population density is on average 450 people per km², but the range across the region is significant. Portsmouth and Southampton have the highest population densities (5,146 and 4,810 people per km² respectively). West Oxfordshire has the smallest (152 people per km²).

Within the region there are 74 authorities consisting of 12 unitary authorities, seven county councils and 55 district, borough, and city councils. There are examples of shared services in place across the region and there are several waste partnership arrangements in place (considered in more detail in Section 2).

1.3 Waste management profile

1.3.1 Waste services

Alternate weekly collection dominates residual waste and dry recyclable services. Garden waste collection is offered on a fortnightly basis with some seasonal variations in service delivery. All but two authorities who responded reportedly charge for garden waste collection. This ranges from £30 per annum to £70 per annum. This differs from the national picture which shows that 58% of authorities charged for organic collections in England in 2017/18².

In terms of food waste collection, 50% of the authorities who responded currently offer a separate collection for food waste. This is comparable to the national picture³. Of those that do offer a kerbside service for food waste, only one authority offers a mixed garden and food waste collection. The rest provide a separate collection just for food waste.

Outsourced collection dominates in the responses received. For residual collections 240 litre wheeled bins are generally offered as standard. However, there are some authorities who have reduced capacity through the issuing of 180 litre wheeled bins. For dry recyclables, most of the authorities in the review use 240 litre wheeled bins as standard. A small number of authorities who provide kerbside sort use 55 litre boxes and sacks.

For further information relating to the individual authorities who took part in the review, please refer to Appendix 2.

1.3.2 Performance

The South East achieved a recycling rate of 42.4% in 2017/18. This is just under the national average of 43.2% for England and places the region in the lower half compared to other regions. The recycling rate has dropped by almost four percentage points from last year. However, the percentage of waste to landfill has been reducing over the last few years at 9.7%. The region is below the national average of 12.4% for England. The "kg per household" has remained fairly consistent over the last few years currently at 569 kg per household. This places the region mid table compared to the other regions, slightly higher than the national average of 544 kg per household for England.

² WRAP data: portal.wrap.org.uk/Statistics.aspx

³ WRAP 2017/18 data: portal.wrap.org.uk/Statistics.aspx

On an individual authority level, according to the latest figures from Defra for 2017/18, a significant number of authorities who took part in this review are achieving recycling rates of over 50%. This region has several of the highest performing authorities in England. There are a small number of authorities who have yet to exceed 30%, and have been facing several challenges. However, all these authorities without exception have seen an increase in their recycling rate compared to the previous year.

In terms of changes over time, for just under half of the authorities who took part in the review, recycling rates have increased on the previous year (albeit in very small increments in some cases). However, a small majority have plateaued or experienced a decrease in recycling rates compared to the previous year. There are a range of reasons that can impact this including reduced staffing and resources and service changes. An overriding concern for many is an already depleted budget for waste services which makes it difficult to achieve significant financial savings.

For further information on performance data refer to Appendix 3. The table includes all authorities in the region with those who participated in the review highlighted.

1.4 Waste partnerships in the region

Waste partnerships continue to play an important role in terms of supporting authorities in realising economic savings, improving performance and increasing the sustainability and viability of services in the longer term. Local Partnerships has supported several active local authority waste partnerships across the UK. It has developed a number of case studies which illustrate the opportunities and benefits that can be realised through partnership working⁴.

Across the South East there are several strategic waste partnerships in place, two-tier arrangements between county councils and their constituent districts and boroughs, and partnership arrangements between district and boroughs. Examples of partnership working across the region and success in terms of efficiency savings and performance improvements through joint working arrangements can be found in Sections 2.3 and 3.

⁴ localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/waste

2 DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCIES

2.1 National picture

All authorities continue to strive to deliver good quality waste services building on current levels of performance whilst at the same time delivering significant financial savings. However, budgets have continually been cut and all departments have had to review services and demonstrate savings through efficiencies.

The Association for Public Services Excellence (APSE) carries out regular reviews⁵ of its members refusing services and asks the question “What efficiencies are you currently working towards or proposing?” The last four reports (2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018) identified the different areas where authorities have been focused and continue to focus to generate efficiencies. These are shown in Table 2, below.

Table 2: Areas where authorities are generating efficiencies – APSE members’ surveys

2015	2016	2017	2018
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • route optimisation leading to reduction in crews and vehicles and the introduction of double shifting • increasing income from chargeable services • closing or reducing operational hours of HWRCs • renegotiation of contracts and reduced landfill disposal costs • introducing fuel saving technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • route optimisation/ double shifting of vehicles • increasing income generation opportunities – charging for green waste collections/ wheeled bin replacement/ commercial waste contacts • reducing hours and reviewing provision of HWRCs • moving to alternative weekly collection of recyclables and three weekly collection of residual waste 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • route optimisation/ double shifting of vehicles • increasing income generation opportunities – charging for bulky waste/green waste collections/ wheeled bin replacements and increasing number of commercial waste collection contracts • reviewing provision of HWRCs • moving to alternate weekly collections for recyclables and three weekly collections for residual waste 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • route optimisation/ double shifting of vehicles • increasing income generation opportunities e.g. charging for green waste collections/ wheeled bin replacement/ commercial waste contracts • reducing hours and reviewing provision of HWRCs • moving to alternative weekly collections for recyclables and three weekly collection for residual waste

⁵ State of the Market Survey 2018 – Refuse Collection and Recycling: apse.org.uk/apse/index.cfm/members-area/briefings/2018/18-32-state-of-the-market-2018-refuse

State of the Market Survey 2017 – Refuse Collection and Recycling: [apse.org.uk/apse/assets/File/Wayne\(2\).pdf](http://apse.org.uk/apse/assets/File/Wayne(2).pdf)

State of the Market Survey 2016 – Local Authority Refuse Services, September 2016. This can be accessed through: apse.org.uk/apse/index.cfm/members-area/briefings/2016/16-37-local-authority-refuse-state-of-the-market-2016

State of the Market Survey 2015 – Local Authority Refuse Services, May 2015. This can be accessed through: apse.org.uk/apse/index.cfm/members-area/briefings/2015/15-27-local-authority-refuse-and-recycling-services-state-of-the-market-survey-report-2015

2015	2016	2017	2018
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • merging services with neighbouring authorities to reduce costs, brought about by shared service structures • reductions in management structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • introducing new technologies – big-belly bins, in-cab CCTV • reducing contamination levels and introducing no side waste collection policies • reviewing staffing and fleet levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • introducing new technologies – bin sensors, in-cab CCTV • reducing contamination levels and introducing no side waste policy • reviewing staff and vehicle levels • cross boundary working 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • introducing new technologies e.g. solar compactor bins, in-cab CCTV • reducing contamination levels and introducing no side waste collection policies • reviewing staffing and fleet levels • cross boundary working and joint authority working

The focus is clearly on identifying areas where, for example, services can be optimised, resources can be shared or maximised and opportunities to generate income to offset service costs can be realised. This is all within a climate of ongoing budget cuts which, as noted by the Local Government Association (LGA)⁶, have impacted local authorities significantly. Local authorities are facing a reduction to core funding from the government of nearly £16 billion by 2020 compared to 2010. This is equivalent to losing 60p out of every £1 the government had provided to spend on local services. In its report on funding the LGA estimate that by 2025 councils in England will face a funding gap of £7.8 billion. Therefore, councils are going to have to continue to find new and innovative ways of operating.

2.2 Regional comparisons

The authorities who took part in this review are realising efficiency savings through:

- ▶ contracts: financing, management, changing re-tendering and renegotiation
- ▶ service reviews, changes, additions
- ▶ charges for garden waste
- ▶ communication and engagement
- ▶ joint working
- ▶ route optimisation
- ▶ addressing contamination
- ▶ optimising the value of resources
- ▶ rationalisation of Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) and bring sites
- ▶ staffing optimisation

⁶ www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/5.40_01_Finance%20publication_WEB_0.pdf

- ▶ technology changes
- ▶ vehicle changes

As this is the eighth Local Partnerships regional review, it is useful to retrospectively consider where the focus of efficiency savings has been for the previous studies. This is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Overview of efficiencies across the eight regional reviews

Efficiency areas	West Midlands 2012	London 2013	North East 2014	Yorkshire and the Humber 2015	North West 2016	East of England 2016	East Midlands 2018	South East 2019
Route optimisation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Service changes and additions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Charging for green/bulky			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Joint procurement and partnership working	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Shared/joint services						✓	✓	✓
Operation/rationalisation of HWRCs				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Contracts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maximising recycling	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Maximising income	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Enforcement			✓					
Staffing rationalisation/optimisation		✓			✓		✓	✓
Maximising reuse					✓			
Different finance models						✓		✓
Technology improvements						✓	✓	✓
Changing behaviour						✓		

Efficiency areas	West Midlands 2012	London 2013	North East 2014	Yorkshire and the Humber 2015	North West 2016	East of England 2016	East Midlands 2018	South East 2019
Comms. rationalisation						✓		✓
In-house service delivery							✓	
Design changes							✓	

2.3 Success through partnership working

Partnership working is not without its challenges in terms of successfully bringing authorities together who may have different operational practices, budgets, political leadership and local geography and circumstances. There are a range of examples of partnership working across the South East including:

- ▶ Hart District Council and Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council – currently operate a joint waste contract between the two authorities which is managed by the joint waste client team based in Hart
- ▶ Elmbridge, Mole Valley, Surrey Heath and Woking Councils – deliver their collection services through a joint waste services contract, which is managed via a joint waste services team
- ▶ Oxfordshire County Council and the district and borough councils in Oxfordshire – work together as part of the Oxfordshire Environment Partnership, with a focus on coordination of waste initiatives and delivery of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy, which is currently under review
- ▶ Project Integra – a two tier plus unitary partnership between Hampshire County Council and its constituent districts and boroughs, Southampton City Council, Portsmouth City Council, and Veolia Environmental Services as the long-term waste disposal contractor

Examples of joint delivery can be found in Section 3. Three specific case studies which illustrate the diversity of partnership working to overcome specific challenges or build on specific opportunities can be seen below.

2.3.1 Partnership case studies

re3 Partnership

re3 is a waste management partnership between Bracknell Forest, Reading and Wokingham Borough Councils. The partnership has resulted in a joint working arrangement and shared waste management contract with FCC Environment (UK) Ltd. The partnership has two HWRCs located in Bracknell and Reading. Both are accessible to all residents across the three authorities. Treatment and disposal are done principally via recycling, composting, Energy from Waste (EfW) and landfill.

As an example of working together to overcome a specific challenge in 2018, the re3 partnership worked with the Contractor FCC to make amendments to the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) to facilitate the processing of mixed plastics

(pots, tubs and trays) and cartons. Extra material was brought in over a six month period to test different concentrations of mixed plastics and model the product that would be placed on the market. When confident in the outputs a commitment was made by the partnership to investment in the amendments and this cost was shared proportionately based on inputs between the councils and the Contractor. Early results show that following the amendments made, Polytrimethylene terephthalate (PTT) and Polyethylene terephthalate (PET) combined have increased by 33%, PET Clear has increased by 44% and HDPE is up by 52%. The contractor has estimated that annual sales revenue and avoided disposal benefits of £200,000 can be realised.

Kent Resource Partnership

Kent County Council and the 12 district/borough/city councils in Kent form the Kent Resource Partnership (KRP). The key activities of the KRP are to ensure delivery of the Kent Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy and act as a single voice for strategic waste issues for Kent local authorities.

There are currently three joint waste contracts in place across Kent which are designed to maximise efficiency, incentivise and reward partners for increasing recycling rates and providing the best value services for Kent residents. They are the East Kent Waste Partnership, the Mid-Kent Waste Partnership and the South-West Kent Partnership.

Working together and initiating savings from joint contracts, sharing good practice and delivering joint projects focused on a range of different priority areas, has led to improved performances and a reduction in disposal costs. The benefits are demonstrable. In 2016/17 the total cost of resource management for all authorities across the KRP was just under £98 million compared to just over £95 million in 2017/18. This reduction in costs by almost £3 million has been realised through the implementation and delivery of a range of initiatives made possible through closer working practices.

Surrey Waste Partnership

The Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP) is made up of Surrey County Council and its 11 district and borough councils. The SWP works together on several projects focusing on communication, engagement, and other joint performance improvement projects. A significant project for the partnership in 2017/18 is focused on improving recycling in flats. A dedicated team of four SWP officers has been trialling recycling improvements at major blocks of flats across all 11 district and borough authorities. The team has taken good practice developed by individual partner authorities and is rolling this out county wide. Working together delivers improvements to the partner authorities through increased recycling and reduced contamination of recycling bins.

Always looking at new ways to develop the partnership and maximise the opportunities joint working can bring, the SWP has developed a programme of work to improve the way partner authorities manage waste together within the constraints of a two-tier system. As part of this the SWP will be looking at evolving the governance arrangements associated with joint working.

3 DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES IN THE SOUTH EAST

As already highlighted in Section 2 and as demonstrated in the other seven regional reviews, the way efficiencies can be delivered varies, as does the financial saving which can be achieved. The range of examples of what authorities have successfully achieved in delivering efficiencies in the South East are broad. Details of their successes are given below.

Contracts: financing, management, changing, re-tendering and renegotiation

Financing

The Energy from Waste Contract for **Buckinghamshire County Council** is delivering in excess of **£5 million** of savings each year for the council compared to the cost of the previous disposal arrangements. It is therefore on track to deliver more than £150 million in total over the 30 years of the contract. A large portion of these savings can be linked to financing decisions made regarding the contract. The authority has directly financed the capital cost of the infrastructure which is around £180 million. Thereby it greatly reduced debt repayment costs and the gate fees that would have been effect if privately financed. This approach of injecting capital into contracts is a significant means of reducing overall contract costs. Buckinghamshire is not alone in taking this approach.

A capital injection by **Surrey County Council** funded by Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) borrowing enabled their contractor Suez to repay £12 million corporate debt on non-Eco Park assets. This provided a net savings from the refinancing of approximately **£2.26 million**. In addition, **West Berkshire Council** made a payment to their waste contractor as a contract specific contribution towards the costs of certain fixed assets (for example, civil works and access roads). As a result, it will receive reductions in the unitary charge payments for the rest of the contract period.

Open book

By moving **Portsmouth City Council** waste collection contract from a schedule of rates type contract into a more transparent and efficient, open book, costs plus type contract, Portsmouth City Council's contract costs dropped. It did so by **£1.5 million per year**, from £4.5 million down to less than £3 million per year. Furthermore, due to the way the annual contract target price is built by using exact up to date costs, plus a small profit, the contract price has been maintained around the £3 million mark for the past seven years. This allowed for considerable savings: under the old contracting model based on the previous schedule of rates with its RPI % inflation escalator, the annual price would be closer to £5.2 million.

Retendering and renegotiation

Hart Council and Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council retendered their collection contract as a joint contract again. This has provided the councils with efficiency savings and cross boundary working which has improved and optimised collections. Retendering the contract has also allowed the authorities to transfer two services which were previously undertaken by in-house teams to being within the main contract for waste services.

Another authority that has benefited from retendering a contract is **Oxfordshire County Council**. In 2017, the council retendered the contract for the management of six out of seven of its HWRCs. The tender introduced service changes designed to produce savings through the contractor taking responsibility for the management of non-household waste including a revised charging scheme. It also included several priced options for reducing opening hours by approximately 25% and managing difficult waste streams (mixed wood, bulky waste and asbestos). The new contract was awarded in 2017 to the incumbent contractor. Savings of approximately **£400,000** per year were achieved without the need to reduce opening hours or close sites.

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils have realised the benefits of contract renegotiation. The original waste collection contract was awarded in 2008 on a seven plus seven year basis. A major component of the contractor's fixed costs is fleet purchase. It was therefore unlikely to be economically viable to negotiate the contract extension to cover a notably shorter period. As the contract was running well – the two districts consistently achieved recycling rates in the top three of English authorities and satisfaction rates were high – an early decision was taken to award the full extension in 2014. The renegotiation (excluding indexation) reduced annual contract costs by **£60,000**, equating to a £600,000 saving for the remaining term. It also avoided possible re-procurement costs which can be significant.

Management

How contracts are managed, and the decision taken by authorities in relation to the market place and availability of treatment options can generate significant savings. **Buckinghamshire County Council** recognised that the market for food waste treatment through anaerobic digestion is changing and evolving with several outlets competing for feedstock. Realising the opportunities this presented, the authority decided to procure contracts on a short-term basis to deliver competitive gate fee costs. In doing so, it realised significant contract savings likely to be in excess of **£200,000** per year.

Kent County Council took a proactive position in its management of its long-standing energy from waste contract. Recognising that it was achieving the minimum tonnage commitment in 2016, the opportunity arose to tender for the additional waste above this commitment. The result has been savings against the core gate fee of **£900,000** per year (against a £37 million contract).

Changes

Changing aspects of contracts can generate a saving providing there is the capacity and resources elsewhere to deliver the service. In a change to the Education, Service Promotion and Waste Minimisation service provided within the contract, **West Berkshire Council** has achieved an annual saving of **£150,000**.

Whilst the contractor retained responsibility for the delivery of service notices and support in planning, the council was responsible for the design and production of all promotional materials and social media.

Surrey County Council are benefiting from better deals for green waste as a result of aggregating all green waste from kerbside collections and HWRCs under one contract and securing a better deal for wood waste by using the Suez contract. These changes in addition to improvements in materials management generate projected savings of £1.146 million from 2016/17 to 2018/19.

Service additions

Extending a service or building on what is already in place can bring performance improvements and savings. It can do so if it impacts on tonnage requiring disposal and maximising the value extracted from resources. **Southampton City Council**, for example, further developed its collection service to provide the opportunity to collect glass separately. Households were issued with a 40 litre box or for those in communal properties access to a communal wheeled bin for glass or provision of a pod. In total 100 pods were put in place.

Optimising collection from the pods has enabled the vehicle to be used two days a week to pick up street sweepings from the cleansing service which are also recycled. Using the same vehicle in this manner has meant that the glass collection service is **cost neutral** despite fluctuations in market price for glass. This has generated savings in the region of **£34,000** per year for the collection of street sweepings when compared to outsourcing the collection of this material.

Oxfordshire County Council worked with the city and districts councils and the food waste contractor to roll out a food waste project to increase food waste collected for recycling and divert it from residual waste. This included the distribution of free plastic liners to residents with WRAP designed leaflets and “no food waste” residual bin stickers supported by a communications campaign. It was subsequently agreed with the contractor to introduce an “any plastic bag” policy for food waste caddies to remove a potential barrier to participation. Food waste tonnages have increased and residual tonnage decreased. However, due to operational changes carried out at the same time and a staggered roll out arising from several unforeseen delays, it has been difficult for the authority to quantify the savings impact and directly attribute it to the project.

Other authorities are also expanding the range of products collected within specific waste streams. For example, **West Sussex County Council** has introduced pots, tubs and trays as an input material for the Ford MRF, thereby opening up the potential to divert these products from disposal.

Wider service changes

Chichester District Council has taken a broader look at its waste services and implemented an improvement programme aimed at modernising the existing provision. This has included process re-design, implementing online service provision and business development. To date, it has achieved savings of **£63,000**. In addition, a specific focus has been on the garden waste recycling service and, following a rebrand, back office processes have been streamlined to eliminate manual entry and double handling of data. This had sped up the processes, increased productivity and ensured that customer growth could be met within existing back office resources.

An online application process has been introduced resulting in 80-90% of applications now being completed online. Along with initial promotional offers, these changes have led to a 22% increase in the customer base over the last two years and increase in tonnage collection by 30%, with **£130,000** additional income achieved over budget. Chichester District Council has also been working very closely with West Sussex Council to review the high costs associated with processing business waste. Service changes to be implemented are expected to generate savings of approximately **£180,000** for first full year of operation.

Crawley Borough Council has also focused on modernising its provision, introducing on-line access to services including real time progress tracking for collections. It is anticipated to save on contact centre costs and communications budget, giving an approximate saving of **£20,000** per year. The authority's focus has also been on trialling service changes for recycling at flats and low performing areas. These include new lockable communal bins with clear windows, new signage at sites, working with landlords and managing agents and implementing a door stepping team to interact with residents. Results from the trial showed increasing quality to grade A, an increase in weight from 820kg to 1,520kg with no contaminants. The extra 700kg of recycling means an improvement in the recycling rate in this area from 9.5% to 17.6%.

Wokingham Borough Council has also focused on flats, ensuring that the council policy of 120 litre weekly allowance for residual waste is as standard regardless of the property type. This has led to the removal of 70,000 litre additional capacity and improvements in facilities for recycling. This is estimated to save the authority **£6,500** per year.

For some authorities implementing service changes can mean a significant overhaul of the existing collection schemes in place in an effort to considerably improve performance or generate efficiencies to offset budget cuts. **Ashford Borough Council**, for example, implemented an alternate weekly collection service including a garden waste scheme. This has resulted in the authority achieving 55% recovery of recyclable materials and moving from one of the worst performing authorities to being one in the top 10%. Approximate savings on services through efficiencies is **£5 million**.

Portsmouth City Council has addressed capacity issues in its service changes, rolling out 140 litre wheeled refuse bins, collected weekly, to six trial areas replacing the previous unlimited black bag collection. By reducing weekly residual capacity and promoting recycling, there was a 15% to 20% drop in the tonnage of refuse collected along with a 5% rise in the quantity of recyclables collected within the trial areas. As Portsmouth is a unitary authority the direct benefits of a reduced tonnage for disposal and thereby a reduction in disposal charges, and an increase in recycling and subsequent income from the additional tonnages, have been directly realised.

Garden waste charges

Implementing a charge for garden waste as a means to support service delivery is an area of efficiency savings that has been widely reported across the regions and the South East is no exception.



Reading Borough Council, for example, had offered a free to use fortnightly collection of garden waste but in 2017 budget pressures meant that a charge was required to continue this service. One of the concerns when implementing a charged for scheme is that the number of users will fall significantly. However, the prediction of a 25-50% drop out rate was not realised. Instead it was just 6%, which has meant the service is generating **£740,000** in gross income.

Similarly, **West Berkshire Council** has introduced a charge for the garden waste element of the garden and food waste collection service. Charges are £50 per green bin, and those who do not subscribe still get their food waste collected. The take-up projection of 45% of suitable properties has been exceeded and the net projected income is estimated to be **£900,000**. The impact on landfill and overall recycling rate has yet to be determined as the service change was introduced in 2018/19.

West Oxfordshire District Council experienced similar results when they changed from a free to chargeable collection in April 2017 with 58% of all properties signed up to. The charge wholly covers the cost of service delivery saving the council approximately **£600,000** per year.

Eastbourne Council is another authority that has recently introduced a charge for the kerbside collection of green waste. Previously it was a free to use service and to date 12,000 residents have signed up, which represents around 50% of previous service users.

Staffing optimisation

Systems thinking can support staff optimisation. **Portsmouth City Council** has improved staff efficiency by cutting tasks and outputs deemed to be unnecessary or inefficient and new ways of working with a reduced staff base had been found. This has led to a staff efficiency saving of around **£170,000**.

Communications and engagement

Effective communications and engagement are essential to motivate, inform and challenge residents in terms of how they use existing services. **Lewes Council** has recognised that tonnages for the food waste collection service have been reducing since the scheme was introduced in 2013. Their aim is to focus on communications in this area to reinvigorate interest and drive up participation. The council will be introducing tonnage targets to measure/monitor the effectiveness of the communications in coming months.

Joint working

Elmbridge, Mole Valley, Surrey Heath and Woking Councils have a joint waste services contract for 10 years plus the option to extend by up to 14 years. This covers all aspects of waste collection, street cleaning and associated activities and is predicted to save around **£2.5 million** a year and has been procured in such a way that Surrey's other authorities can join as it progresses. To provide effective management of the contract and services, a new organisation called Joint Waste Solutions (JWS) has been set up and includes staff from the four districts and boroughs as well as the staff from the county council. Further work is planned to combine the governance from the joint contract authorities and Surrey Waste Partnership and create a single team for delivering all joint work across all 12 Surrey councils (in 2019/20).



Hastings, Eastbourne, Rother and Wealden Councils and East Sussex County Council have worked together to deliver a joint contract which has generated a range of savings. Hastings Borough Council has achieved budget savings of **£640,000** per year. Rother District Council has achieved budget saving of **£50,000** per year. Wealden District Council has achieved budget savings of **£874,000** per year. Each council also contributes £50,000 per year to the East Sussex Waste Partnership costs. It should also be noted that Rother holds the central client/lead authority role for the partnership. In addition, the joint contract includes Kier holding the responsibility/ownership of dry mixed recycling.

The councils are benefiting from recycling credits until the contract ends in late June 2019. The benefit for Hastings is £260,000 per year, for Rother it is £600,000 per year and for Wealden it is £1.1 million per year. From July 2019, Hastings, Rother and Wealden will continue in partnership and have procured a new collection contract for the same style of collection services, but with glass to be included in the collection of dry mixed recyclables.

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council and **Guildford Borough Council** have worked together since 2009 on the joint sale of recyclables to achieve greater economies of scale. From the initial three year contract agreed in 2009, it is estimated that an additional revenue of £1 million each has been generated. The authorities have continued to work together. Whilst it proved harder to quantify, it is estimated that they are achieving 10-20% better rates than other deals in the region. In addition, savings are realised from having a single procurement exercise across both authorities.

Guildford Borough Council have also been delivering joint working with Surrey University and the British Heart Foundation on an annual basis to maximise reuse and recycling of bulky goods during student departure from their rented accommodation. In addition, Guildford have worked throughout the year with Surrey University. To get the recycling message out, they have produced student focussed communication material, briefings and attending student information events. They have also worked closely with the university facilities and engagement teams.

Route optimisation

Following the introduction of alternate weekly collection in 2017, **Southampton City Council** optimised its rounds and reduced the residual collection rounds from 12 to eight and implemented seven recycling rounds. The tonnage of residual waste decreased by 4-5% and avoided costs of **£800,000** were achieved. An essential part of the process was a waste audit to identify potential problem areas and ensure all residents had the appropriate container capacity.

Reading Borough Council addressed a significant imbalance in rounds that had occurred over 10 years due to the construction of new properties, through implementing route optimisation software. This resulted in one round being taken out saving **£110,000** plus reduced fuel costs overall.

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council and **Spelthorne Borough Council** have also undertaken route optimisation to improve efficiencies. In addition, as a result of route optimisation at **Oxford City Council**, 28.5 hours of employee time every week and the use of one vehicle one day a week has been saved and has allowed these resources to be used elsewhere, which has prevented incurring additional

collection costs. Also, bulky household waste collections were a five day a week service and following review have moved on to a four day week with area working, saving **£10,000** per year in fuel alone and much more in working time.

Addressing contamination

Ensuring quality of recyclate remains a concern for most authorities. Some like **Bracknell Forest Borough Council** have taken a proactive approach to ensure it remains a high priority. As part of its collection contract, there is a requirement for the contractor to work with the authority to reduce contamination. Targets were set and a procedure for crews to sticker contaminated containers and leave a clear bag for any surplus recycling. To build on this further, two recycling assistants were recruited to target areas with the highest levels of contamination. Intense door knocking campaign efforts have been more targeted, and telephone conversations and face to face visits with residents have been carried out. The outcome of this approach has been that, in almost all cases, bins have gone from being more than half contaminated to being virtually all targeted recyclables, which has a positive impact on performance and potential value of the recyclables.

Optimising the value of resources

As councils strive to secure additional income or reduced costs to offset the local government budget cuts there is increased focus on optimising the value of resources. **East Sussex County Council** has turned its focus to street sweepings. As a result, 6,500 tonnes of street sweepings in East Sussex and Brighton and Hove that were previously incinerated are now being recycled to produce a soil product for use in landfill remediation. The process also results in recycling/reuse of metals, plastic and stones. As well as boosting recycling performance, this has freed up space at Newhaven Energy Recovery Facility that can be backfilled to generate additional royalty payments. Other authorities have taken a similar approach. **Kent County Council** currently diverts street sweepings from one of its districts from disposal to aggregate recycling, delivering an annual saving of **£375,000**, compared to the pre-existing disposal methods. In addition, **Hampshire County Council** is diverting street sweeping from landfill and maximising its recycling. Together with a suite of other projects focused on improving services and generating efficiencies, this has contributed to saving just over £8 million from the waste and resource management budget over the last five years. Similarly, **West Sussex County Council** is sending street sweepings and similar material to an aggregate treatment and recycling facility, diverting from landfill and increasing recycling.

Other material streams are being targeted too. **Kent County Council**, for example, has procured a new contract to deal with bulky waste, such as mattresses, that was previously being sent to landfill. The new contracts were won by Veolia and Countrystyle who shred and treat this waste to create refuse derived fuel. This provided a modest saving and helped to reduce the amount of Kent's waste going to landfill to less than 1%. In addition, **Lewes Council** is trialling recycling-on-the go in locations with high footfall with an aim to maximise recycling from this material stream.

There are occasions where it has proved not to be viable when authorities have implemented initiatives to increase recycling of a certain material stream. In such cases, it is important to recognise the challenges faced and share the experiences

with other authorities. For example, **Southampton City Council** installed mixed recycling banks as a trial across the city to meet the demand from residents for increased opportunity to recycle a wider range of plastics. Whilst the banks proved very popular with residents, the contractor announced a lack of availability for an end market for the collected material. Subsequent stockpiling started to affect both collections and costs and the authority had to make the decision to withdraw the service. In this case the authority had delivered a means to meet public demand and divert additional material from disposal. However, current market failure means that at present this solution is not viable.

Rationalisation of HWRCs and bring sites

Rationalisation and changes to the management of HWRCs is an area that has increasingly been explored by county and unitary authorities. **Surrey County Council** has realised efficiencies as a result of implementing several changes. These include reduced hours/days of operation, introduction of charging for construction waste and enforcing against trade waste abuse. They have also introduced reuse shops at some of the sites.

Estimated savings from 2016/17 to 2018/19 are **£3.2 million**. Similarly, **East Sussex County Council** are currently implementing a HWRC savings plan that will involve the closure of two HWRCs, the introduction of charges for non-household waste, changes to opening times and redevelopment of one site to maximise diversion from landfill and meet demand from future housing growth. These changes will deliver savings of **£720,000**. Similarly, **Hampshire County Council** has implemented changes linked to a new contract in 2016, including reduced opening hours and non-household waste charges. This had led to savings of approximately **£1.5 million per annum**.

Other authorities, such as **West Sussex County Council** have also responded to budget cuts by reducing site hours and days open, as well as charging for the disposal of tyres and introducing more segregation of materials.

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils took the decision to remove the majority of bring sites as all the material collected by the banks is now included in kerbside services. Seven Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) banks have been retained over the two districts. This has reduced contract costs in the region of **£50,000** per annum across the two districts and eliminated historical problems of fly-tipping at these sites.

Technology changes

Technology changes go hand in hand with service development as improvements in delivery systems bring greater efficiencies. **Guildford Borough Council** has adopted in-cab technology to improve communication with residents and between the crews and the back office. Providing real-time reporting of issues such as contaminated recycling and facilitating a channel shift in the way that residents contact the authority. One of the key benefits has been the ability to use the crew reports to automatically generate letters to residents addressing key issues. This has significantly contributed to low contamination and increasing recycling rates. The authority is currently working to deliver an upgrade to this system which will allow further improvements in operational data management, crew reporting and round efficiencies as well as improving facilities for residents to self-report any issues.



Oxford City Council has also experienced benefits from implementing similar technology changes and automating several processes. These have saved officer time and brought financial benefits. The system is still being monitored with the hope that the benefits can be clearly quantified.

Vehicle changes

Spelthorne Borough Council has generated savings through its leasing of a new set of vehicles in 2017 which have electric bin lifts thereby reducing fuel costs. In addition, a new three-in-one service has been introduced for collecting food waste, textiles and small electricals. This one purpose-built vehicle provides a more efficient service to residents.

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils have generated fuel efficiencies through fleet changes. The councils opted to take the full seven year collection contract extension in 2014, in advance of the expiry of the initial seven year term.

The original term of the contract used a refuse collection vehicle with a separate food pod to allow a single pass collection to be made for the wheeled bin product (refuse or recycling) and food waste. The expected operational benefits of the single pass system were realised from day one of the contract. However, over time and due mainly to the locations of the tipping points for refuse, recycling and food waste, the contractor sought permission to service the seven year extension period slightly differently by providing separate vehicles for wheeled bins (refuse and recycling) and food waste.

On first glance, the proposal to add vehicles to the fleet appears counter-intuitive. This is especially the case when the focus is on increasing efficiency particularly as it also resulted in a 50% increase in the number of LGV drivers required to run the service (one new food round covers two existing combined refuse/recycling and food rounds). However, the interdependency of the two collection services using a single vehicle created significant operational challenges and the change to add vehicles has improved operational efficiency significantly. Whilst the fleet change per se did not produce any direct financial savings for the council, overall fuel use has reduced by around 10% since the fleet was replaced. It is difficult to specifically evaluate how much of this reduction is down to the change in collection mode, recognising that new vehicles have more efficient engines than the original fleet. However, the council is confident that it can attribute fuel savings to the change in collection methodology, with a projected reduction in fuel use by over a litre per household per annum.

Incentivising recycling

Bracknell Forest Borough Council has seen the continued positive impact of its Recycling Incentive Scheme, which originally began life as a two year trial scheme funded by Defra in 2013. The scheme uses the authorities existing technology and residents earn points for their recycling which can be redeemed on line to pay for activities or items. There are opportunities throughout the year to earn bonus points through recycling specific waste streams such as WEEE or textiles. Over 14,600 residents are scheme members and participation in recycling has increased from 75% to 88%. The cost of maintaining the scheme is low and the contractor contributes 50% of the cost to good causes.

4 LESSONS LEARNED AND ADVICE TO OTHER AUTHORITIES

This report highlights several areas where authorities in the South East 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 many lessons have been learned along the way, and the authorities have been very open in identifying key considerations which others can learn from. These lessons learned and advice for other authorities include:

Contract funding, management and negotiation

Buckinghamshire County Council advise that with large scale projects, providing a capital injection of funds wherever possible can make a positive impact on long term savings, due to lower local authority borrowing costs. However, they recognise that it is dependent on individual authorities' ability to source this funding and, in the current financial climate, this may not always be possible.

Hampshire County Council found that an open, but commercial, approach from both client and contractor to delivering mutual benefits helped during in-contract negotiations. In addition, building flexibility into long-term contracts enables processing facilities to take advantage of new technologies or breakthroughs in material processing. This is important in ensuring that opportunities from new developments in resource management can be fully realised.

A move to open book contracts by **Portsmouth City Council**, as opposed to simpler schedule of rates contracts, has been seen as a positive move. They found that this approach can offer authorities the opportunity to deliver huge savings, whilst keeping full transparency and flexibility of control. This has worked well to date.

Whilst contractual negotiations can be challenging, **Kent County Council** has learned that when discussions are held in good faith, all organisations develop a deeper understanding of each other's pressures. As a result, stronger contractual relationships have materialised.

The partnership of **Hart and Basingstoke and Deane Borough Councils** found that when retendering they ensured all the main areas are represented. For example, customers service, including the contact centre, are part of the project group and they are responsible for writing their area of work within the tender document. This was useful and ensured that the authorities have the right information for the tenderers to price correctly.

Oxfordshire County Council was faced with a significant amount of complexity in the tender evaluation process as a result of including priced options in the HWRC contract tender for reducing opening hours and managing difficult waste streams. This meant they had to develop a sophisticated evaluation matrix to assess the various combinations of options. However, whilst complex, this gave them the flexibility to choose the options that provided the best value for money and avoided unnecessary service reductions.

Undertaking contract reviews can be invaluable in identifying savings and working with others to undertake those reviews can be a significant benefit. Following a Defra review of the management of the Integrated Waste Management Services contract, **East Sussex County Council** and the waste collection authorities worked with Local Partnerships to undertake a more comprehensive review of the contract. This approach identified areas where the authorities could work with Veolia to achieve further efficiencies within the contract.

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils found that renegotiating and extending contracts (where services are running well) at an early opportunity enables saving opportunities to be maximised.

Technology improvements

When **Guildford Borough Council** implemented technology improvements, they found that the in-cab units posed more of a challenge than initially considered to those operatives with English as a second language or those with limited reading and writing skills. This required new ways of training for those crews, including the teaching of “patterns” as a means to allow crews with limited reading skills to correctly enter the information. Rather than actual words being a barrier, the aim was to equip crew with the skills to recognise keys/tabs/messages in a pattern to enable correct data entry. It has also meant that there is a need for ongoing support and training to ensure that confidence levels are maintained. In response there has been an increase in the availability of English courses for those who speak English as a second language and for those who want to improve their reading and writing skills. This has secondary benefits to both the workforce individuals and to the residents conversing with the crews on the street.

Implementing technology improvements can present unexpected challenges which need to be addressed. For example, during the roll-out of the new “Bartec” system (waste collection management system), **Oxford City Council** found that there were problems with other departments’ interactions with the system. They are now working hard to ensure these interactions all work. However, they recognise that these could have been included in the consultation phase. The key lesson here is to involve representatives from all stakeholders, no matter how small, right from the start to ensure that every consideration is taken on board. As one example, the council are still completing work to make this system work with the call centre’s “Lagan” system when this could have been carried out before the system went live.

Crew adaptations

Involving crews and taking their guidance on operational changes can be invaluable. Guildford Borough Council found that while changing the collection service to allow previously fortnightly materials to be collected weekly, the crews adopted a simple way of separating the materials that was very different to all the options the council investigated for the segregation. WEEE and textiles were originally collected fortnightly in alternative weeks and placed into a cage on the underside of the vehicle. Batteries were placed into the carrier bags of one of the others and then removed when the vehicle was emptied. This space had to be shared when the crews were collecting the materials on the same

day. The crews simply made additional checks on the WEEE/Textile bags (which there was no issue in storing together for the short time they were on the vehicle) and they used a lidless food waste caddy within the cage to store batteries. This simple and effective solution avoided the need for investment from the council in storage containers and facilitated the mixed collections while remaining operationally effective.

Targeted service changes

Crawley Borough Council undertook a targeted programme focusing on flats. They found that whilst this targeted approach can be considered resource intensive, expensive and potentially high risk, through effective coordination and management it is possible to realise and maintain increases in quantity and quality of recycle. A partnership support officer, door stepping manager and lead contact at the authority were needed to facilitate and co-ordinate the project. Funding was in place to cover costs (which when arranged as a partnership can be cost efficient). Crawley Borough Council found that whilst individual WCAs can be co-ordinated and provided resource and funding, if methodology is not followed, project results will be affected. In addition, full crew training can be provided, and crews can be informed of their responsibilities throughout the project, but crew checks need to take place after collections in isolated areas to ensure, for example, the locking of bins.

Market awareness and understanding

Buckinghamshire County Council have found that understanding your local/ regional market has significant benefits. One example being realising the potential benefit in using short term contracts to gain competitive prices (in their case in relation to food waste treatment). Whilst this might mean more resource cost to undertake additional re-procurement activities, benefits can be significant.

Undertaking market engagement prior to procuring for new services gives a greater understanding of what is available and may present opportunities not previously considered. **Kent County Council** spoke to the market prior to extending their existing agreement for the treatment of soil, rubble and hardcore waste and found they could make significant savings by going out to a new provider rather than simply extending the existing agreement.

Partnership and joint working

Hampshire County Council is experienced in joint delivery and recognises the challenge of true partnership working in terms of finding an agreed whole system cost approach that is of mutual benefit for all authorities involved. Achieving a saving without cost shunting can be difficult. Their advice is that it only works if there is support for the outcome from the top of every organisation and a collective willingness to embrace change and work differently. Local Partnerships consider this is key advice. Savings may be different for authorities. It is important to ensure that an authority is not driving forward savings at the expense of another. The best approach is a whole system cost approach.

Elmbridge, Surrey Heath, Mole Valley and Wokingham Councils experience of partnership and joint working has generated several lessons learned and advice to others. Firstly, joining up waste services is most effectively done around areas where consistency or commonality already exists. This could be around a shared asset or similar existing services. Having things like this in common

creates potential operational efficiencies from combining services or service elements with other authorities. The commonality in this case was very similar core collection services and some shared borough boundaries, which made for an attractive case for joint collection services.

Secondly, they found that a joint contract is managed most efficiently through a joint team. As well as operations management, the four authorities involved in this partnership also had staff involved with data and service development. Combining the back-office teams of these organisations became the next logical step.

Thirdly, they said do not be afraid to go for a “big bang” change rather than an iterative one as they did, going from sharing a contract to sharing contract management to sharing all waste service management. There was a perception that if they went for a “big bang” change, they might be pushing things too far and too fast for the partners. However, in hindsight, there is a view that a “big bang” change would have been more efficient and avoided the pitfalls of creating multiple and constantly-evolving inter-authority agreements and the difficulty of proceeding without a clear vision of the final state. Finally, a degree of time pressure can help to get decisions made faster, saving colleagues’ time and helping to keep the pace up.

The delivery of savings is a complex task for any client. Contractor relationship, but business-like co-location has proven helpful for some partnerships, most notably in relation to the re3 Waste PFI Contract and the associated authorities of **Bracknell Forest, Reading and Wokingham**. Co-location with contractors helps to promote recognition and understanding. Put another way, it helps moderate different perspectives which might otherwise become hardened positions. The re3 councils have found that partnership is a virtuous circle and have worked together successfully on several complex issues where the commitment to the partnership has been critical in securing successful outcomes. Even where an issue may not impact on one party to the same extent as others, the commitment that is investment across re3 feeds further and provides reciprocal, commitment elsewhere.

During the development of Kent’s waste disposal strategy officers from **Kent County Council** worked with their members through a Cross-Party Members Group (CPMG), to inform and discuss the objectives and ambition for the service. This work has been invaluable in supporting formal decision-making processes and highlighting to members the pressures and issues facing the waste service. These issues are now more widely understood. The CPMG has continued to run past strategy development, working with waste officers to undertake its implementation.

Hastings, Rother, and Wealden Councils, who have been part of the East Sussex Waste Partnership, consider that trying to forecast and deal with all possible scenarios in a Partnership Agreement (and accompanying cost-sharing arrangement) can have the effect of “entrenching” partners. It can make reaching mutual resolution of a problem more difficult. Establishing only some basic cost sharing principles has allowed the East Sussex Waste Partnership to deal flexibly with problems they have faced without a Partnership Agreement.

There were concerns about the risks faced by Rother (as the lead administrative authority responsible for paying the contractor centrally and recharging the partners) that the other partners would not pay for services provided. However,

the concerns proved groundless. Instead, it is believed that a stronger working relationship between councillors, directors and officers is in place. In some cases inflammatory matters can ruin partnership working deals at the final stage of any project, i.e. something relatively “small” with low value or service impact, but which historically partners have handled differently, or had different policies in place. But, it was found that they can be overcome where all known sensitive/ political matters are tabled and resolved early.

Hastings, Rother, and Wealden Borough Councils also advise that working for mutual benefit is fairly easy when there are overall savings to be made. It is only how benefits are shared between each party that needs agreement. However, partnership between councils becomes much more difficult when increased costs need to be faced and each party is trying to minimise the impact for themselves (because the obvious consequence is that another party must face a bigger impact). The relative advantages and disadvantages for each partner need to be forecast early so a good quality “project management” approach is essential (i.e. all-party approval to proceed is gained at initiation stage).

Guildford Borough Council found that one of the challenges of joint working with the university is working with the student community to ensure that their impact on the town is positive. This involves ensuring collections are appropriate and integrated into meeting the needs of the local community. There needs to be recognition of key events within the student calendar. Council response to this ensures their, and other local residents’, collection services are not adversely impacted.

Clear and effective decision making

When implementing a change to the current service, in this case moving from a freely available garden waste collection to an opt-in charged for scheme, clear decision-making was important for **Eastbourne Council**. Key facts for delivery were strong communications and close contract management.

Effective risk planning

Whilst the food waste project has been successful in terms of an increase in food waste tonnage collected, **Oxfordshire County Council** recognise that delays to the roll out would have been avoided if liners sourced from China had not been delayed. This delay had implications for the timing of implementation in different districts. Considering this risk in the planning stages could have enabled mitigating solutions to have been put in place.

Access to data

Southampton City Council advise that it is essential to get data right and resolve issues quickly. More time spent on data cleansing and making sure they had the skills to set up complex spreadsheets would have been beneficial.

Effective project delivery

Ashford Borough Council experienced some issues with demand exceeding supply in relation to the roll out of a new service. They advise that if introducing a service change (in this case of garden waste collection), be sure that it is managed in a staged approach to avoid this problem.

Evidence based approach

In **East Sussex County Council**, the savings review programme is supported by extensive cost, risk and legal modelling and forecasting to quantify the opportunity and inform business case development. This includes looking at the collection and disposal cost implications in the same analysis to ensure that the taxpayer is better off overall. Whilst this may have significant time and resource implications, elected members in particular appreciated that the evidence base was in place before being asked to consider sensitive issues.

Information sharing and effective communication

East Sussex County Council has found that it is essential that collection staff understand how their role is directly linked to performance, costs and operational impacts on the disposal side. An example of this is the sharing of recycling quality analysis so that operational teams can take action to deal with issues on the ground. For instance, issues with contamination in communal recycling bins, which can then have an impact on the facilities and contractual arrangements of the disposal authority. It is essential that local authority officers and contractors work effectively across organisational boundaries.

Lewes Council found that strong communications are key to improving dry recycling rates and ensuring high purity of materials, and target communications based on monthly contamination reports. For example, if textiles are being found in the kerbside recycling, then social media is used to remind people that these materials can't be recycled through the kerbside collection and should be diverting them to bring sites.

Ashford Borough Council recognised the importance of communications when rolling out a service change and ensuring that effective information systems are developed for requests and contract management. This is not just in terms of engagement at the household level. A business to business request/task system, for example, is considered essential for closing the loop.

For **Southampton City Council**, it's the means of communication that has changed as they have seen an increasing tendency of residents to use social media to report issues and not use the online or telephone processes set up. In addition, there is a greater focus on emails to contact centre rather than telephone calls.

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council has found the need for constant messaging to prevent contamination and deliver quality target materials to MRFs.

Spelthorne Borough Council has found that it is important to provide regular communications in various media about service changes as some residents remained unaware of the new services provided, despite several communications.

Surrey County Council found that the timing of information is important as good publicity and phased introduction of changes to the HWRCs during the less busy winter period have resulted in the smooth introduction of significant changes.

HWRC rationalisation

Whilst rationalisation of HWRCs has become more common practice across waste disposal and Unitary authorities, there is increasing evidence of its impact on waste. For example, **Surrey County Council** has found that introducing

efficiency measures at household recycling centres can have significant reductions in waste volumes. In their efficiencies included charging for construction waste, reduced opening times, enforcing against trade waste abuse and introduction of reuse shops (over a three year period from 2016/17 to 2018/19) they have seen tonnages processed through the community recycling centres drop. This decrease has been from 140,000 tonnes per year to 90,000 tonnes per year projected for 2018/19. It is worth noting that tonnages of fly tipped waste and kerbside collected waste have remained static during this period.

Rationalising HWRCs does not come without its challenges in terms of public responses. For example, **Hampshire County Council** advise not to underestimate the power of political pressure. Facilities like HWRCs which are very important to the public can be a vote winner for members. Therefore, be aware when recommending changes to services of the potential political impact.

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils found that provided materials are all collected kerbside. Removing bring banks did not result in the anticipated wave of complaints. Instead, it saved contract costs and eliminated previous fly-tipping problems and associated expense.

Effective project delivery

Chichester District Council found that effective interdepartmental working was essential for the improvement programme to meet objectives and timescales. This importantly ensured the project team was established with the right skills and resources. From the outset, both the improvement programme and recycling action plan received full buy in and support from the senior management team and members. This ensured that expectations were clearly defined and vision remained outcome focused. This was supported by regular reporting to the council's strategic Business Improvement Programme Board. In addition, learning opportunities were increased by evaluating each project of the improvement programme before moving to the next stage. This also ensured that the day to day needs of core service delivery were not ignored.

Route optimisation and round capacity

Spelthorne Borough Council learned the importance of ensuring existing data is "clean" before rerouting and changing to new software system. It is more time consuming to ensure that data is clean after changing to a new system.

Southampton City Council advise to keep remodelling collection rounds in order to ensure they are increasingly productive and efficient. They also found it important to take into account population and household growth. Route optimisation software proved invaluable, but they also recognise that it will not work effectively without crew input.

Building on this further, **Oxford City Council** has adopted a new pro-active approach to collection round capacity. Previously a collection round would not be reviewed until it had already reached 100% capacity. This caused sizeable overtime payments to staff and increased pressure on operatives. Now, if a round reaches 90% capacity, it is automatically reviewed. This allows for better forward planning and a reduction in employment costs, drastically reducing overtime payments and reducing pressure on staff.

Effective engagement

West Berkshire Council recommend engagement with the contractor at the earliest opportunity, particularly when considering any changes which impact on the performance and finances of the contract. In addition, it is important to ensure political commitment to service changes and keep members involved at all the key implementation stages.

West Oxfordshire District Council have clear advice to “collaborate, collaborate, collaborate.” Engaging with all stakeholders in a timely manner ensures their involvement, whether this is using their technical expertise and advice or gaining their support to assist in championing the changes.

West Sussex County Council are also very clear about the need for early engagement and openness, involving the contractor and the authority from the start and ensuring that everyone in the authority at all levels understand the principles when savings are agreed from the outset. They also recommend to always be honest and realistic when discussing savings and never be over optimistic with what can be achieved or how the service may be impacted.

Benchmarking

Oxford City Council recognise the value of benchmarking to bring about improvements to services. They are in the process of conducting a full-service review and benchmarking against other local authorities and have found several inefficiencies and inconsistencies. As one example of a lesson learned, they identified that they are one of the very few collection authorities nationwide who do not charge for bin deliveries. This means a potential loss of revenue of over £100,000 per year. Introducing a charge for wheelie bin deliveries is anticipated to drastically reduce the work load from applications for bin replacements which are unnecessary (i.e. where residents have reported a missing bin only for council staff to locate the bin following brief local inspection).



5 SUMMARY

As seen in this report authorities throughout the region have successfully delivered efficiencies in a wide range of areas. It is evident that the priority has been to not only realise savings through efficiencies and improved ways of working, but also to maintain or improve upon current services.

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).

Table 4: Summary of overall savings identified in the South East

Area of saving	Local authority	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)
Contracts: financing	Buckinghamshire County Council	£5 million per annum
	Surrey County Council	£2.26 million net saving in total
	West Berkshire Council	<i>unspecified</i>
Contracts: management	Buckinghamshire County Council	£200,000 per annum
	Kent County Council	£900,000 per annum
Contracts: changes	West Berkshire Council	£150,000 per annum
	Surrey County Council	£1.146 million over a two year period
Contracts: open book	Portsmouth City Council	£1.5m per annum
Contracts: retendering	Hart, Basingstoke and Deane Councils	<i>unspecified</i>
	Oxfordshire County Council	£400,000 per annum
	South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils	£60,000 per annum
Service additions	Southampton City Council	£34,000 per annum
	Oxfordshire County Council	<i>unspecified</i>
	West Sussex County Council	<i>unspecified</i>

Area of saving	Local authority	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)
Wider service changes	Chichester District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £63,000 to date • £130,000 additional income over budget • £180,000 expected in first full year of operation
	Crawley Borough Council	£20,000 per annum
	Wokingham Borough Council	£6,500 per annum
	Ashford Borough Council	£5 million (from all service changes)
	Portsmouth City Council	<i>unspecified</i>
Garden waste charges	Reading Borough Council	£740,000 (gross income)
	West Berkshire Borough Council	£900,000 (net income)
	West Oxfordshire District Council	£600,000 (income) per annum
	Eastbourne Council	<i>unspecified</i>
Staffing optimisation	Portsmouth City Council	£170,000
Communications and engagement	Lewes Council	<i>unspecified</i>
Joint working	Elmbridge, Mole Valley, Surrey Heath and Woking Councils	£2.5 million per annum
	Hastings, Rother and Wealden Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £640,000 • £50,000 • £874,000
	Reigate and Banstead and Guildford Borough Councils	Additional revenue of £1 million each since 2009
Route optimisation	Southampton City Council	£800,000
	Reading Borough Council	£110,000 per annum
	Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	<i>unspecified</i>
	Spelthorne Borough Council	<i>unspecified</i>
	Oxford City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>unspecified</i> • £10,000

Area of saving	Local authority	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)
Addressing contamination	Bracknell Forest Borough Council	<i>unspecified</i>
Optimising the value of resources	East Sussex County Council	<i>unspecified</i>
	Kent County Council	£375,000 per annum
	Hampshire County Council	£8 million (combined savings over last five years)
	West Sussex County Councils	<i>unspecified</i>
	Lewes Council	<i>unspecified</i>
Rationalisation of HWRCs and bring sites	Surrey County Council	£3.2 million over a two year period
	East Sussex County Council	£720,000
	Hampshire County Council	£1.5 million
	West Sussex County Council	<i>unspecified</i>
	South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils	£50,000 per annum
Technology changes	Guildford Borough Council	<i>unspecified</i>
	Oxford City Council	<i>unspecified</i>
Vehicle changes	Spelthorne Borough Council	<i>unspecified</i>
	South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils	<i>unspecified</i>
Incentivising recycling	Bracknell Forest Borough Council	<i>unspecified</i>

The estimated savings and avoided costs given in the examples provided by the authorities who took part in this review for the South East, are in excess of **£21 million per annum**⁷. It should be noted that several authorities have not been in a position to quantify the individual savings so this figure is a very

⁷ In most cases, unless otherwise stated (for example Hampshire County Council which reported combined savings over a period of time), it is assumed that savings are per annum. Where a different time frame is given the savings are annualised. There are a number of exceptions. Ashford Borough Council reported savings as a result of all the changes made and it was unclear over which time period this took place, therefore an assumption of a five year period was made. The net saving in total for Surrey County Council of £2.26 million cannot be annualised; therefore it has not been included in the estimated annual saving. Income generated from garden waste charges have not been included in the total as it is not always clear what costs are still associated with the service.

conservative estimate. However, this is a significant sum and reflects the good practice that is being delivered across the participating authorities in the South East.

This is the eighth of Local Partnerships' regional studies. Previous reports covering authorities in the East Midlands, East of England, North West, North East, Yorkshire and the Humber, West Midlands and London, plus a number of authority specific case studies can be found on the Local Partnerships website⁸. 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.

⁸ localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/waste

APPENDIX 1: LOCAL AUTHORITY PROFILES

Ashford Borough Council

Background

Ashford Borough Council provide and alternate weekly collection for residual waste and dry recyclables using a 240 litre bin as standard. Food is collected weekly and there is an optional garden waste service using 240 litre wheeled bins collected fortnightly except Christmas and New Year. Garden waste collection is currently charged at £37.50 per annum.

The current waste service is contracted to Biffa through the Mid-Kent joint waste partnership. The length of the contract is 10 years with five years remaining. There are no bring sites in Ashford. Bulky waste service is available (£24 for the collection of up to four items of which only one item in four can be white goods, and a maximum of up to eight items at a charge of £48 in which only two items may be white goods). Textiles can be presented in clear sacks or boxes during the same weeks that dry recyclables are collected. WEEE can be presented for collection during the same weeks that residual waste is collected. The contract also provides cleansing services for Ashford which includes fly tip clearances.

Current status

- ▶ improved recovery of recyclable materials moving from worst in country 2010/11 to top 10% achieved through implementation of AWC and garden waste collection
- ▶ achieving 55% recovery of recyclable materials
- ▶ approximate saving on services through efficiencies of £5 million

Lessons learned

- ▶ provide clear communication on what is required in recycling and as part of roll out use clear sacks initially, then roll out wheelie bins for recycle. This enables viewing of the sacks for education of residents
- ▶ ensure that if introducing garden waste collection, it is managed in a staged approach to avoid demand exceeding the supply of bins
- ▶ ensure that effective information systems are developed for requests and contract management. A business to business request/task system is essential for closing the loop

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

Background

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council provide a weekly collection of residual waste using a 140 litre wheeled bin as standard with additional capacity of 240 litre and 360 litre wheeled bins on a need/approval basis. Dry mixed recyclables are collected fortnightly (paper, cardboard, steel and aluminium cans and plastic bottles), using a mixture of 120 litre, 240 litre, 360 litre and 660 litre wheeled bins and some clear plastic sacks. Additional recycling bins can be requested. A chargeable garden waste collection service is available using 90 litre reusable sacks (£35 for two sacks, plus £17.50 for additional sacks). Currently there are 22 fortnightly collections between mid-February and December. However, from February 2019 a new 50 weeks service is being introduced.

A separate kerbside glass collection is in place on a fortnightly basis using a 48 litre box and/or red 140 litre bin. Some communal areas have 240 litre or 1,100 litre blue bins with apertures. There is a network of 27 bring banks collecting glass and mixed recycling. The service is currently provided by third party contractors. However, an option is included within this contract for the service to be incorporated within the main waste and recycling service. A scheduled chargeable bulky waste collection service is currently provided in-house. However, an option is included within this contract for the service to be incorporated within the main waste and recycling service.

A joint waste contract is in place with Hart District Council, managed by the joint waste client team based in Hart who is the administering authority. The contract was originally agreed in October 2011 with Veolia and recently came to an end (September 2018). The authorities are currently mobilising a new eight year plus eight year contract with Serco which started on 1 October 2018.

Hart and Basingstoke and Deane Councils are working with WRAP and Serco to increase education and promotional work to reduce the recycling contamination rate.

Current status

- ▶ efficiencies have been achieved through a joint waste client team which was set up in 2011
- ▶ retendering the contract as a joint contract again has provided the councils with efficiencies and allowed cross boundary working which improves the collections as well as possibly reducing the number of rounds and vehicles and staff required
- ▶ retendering the contract has also allowed the council to transfer two services which were currently undertaken by in-house teams to being within the main contract for waste services

Lessons learned

- ▶ when retendering, ensure that all your main areas, i.e. customer service including the contact centre, are part of the project group and actually write their area of work. This was useful and ensured the right information for the tenderers to price correctly

Bracknell Forest Borough Council

Background

Bracknell Forest Borough Council is an outsourced service delivering an alternate weekly collection for residual waste using a 240 litre wheeled bin as standard and mixed dry recycle (paper/card/cartons/plastic bottles and tubs/tins and cans/aerosols) using a 240 litre wheeled bin as standard. Garden waste is collected fortnightly using 240 litre/140 litre wheeled bin as standard (£50 per annum for 240 litre bin or £46 for 140 litre bin, plus one-off charge of £35 for bin in either size). A bulky waste service is available (1-3 items: £43, 4-7 items: £54).

Bracknell Forest is part of a waste management partnership with Wokingham and Reading, known as re3. This has resulted in a joint working arrangement and shared waste management contract with FCC. The partnership has two HWRCs. One is located in Bracknell Forest, but both are accessible by residents.

Current status

- ▶ when the waste collection contract was written for 2011, a clause was included about contamination of kerbside recycling, requiring the contractor to work closely with the council to help reduce contamination. Targets were set and a procedure for crews to sticker contaminated containers and leave a clear bag for any surplus recycling over the next fortnight. To build on this, two recycling assistants were recruited in 2015 to door knock, targeting areas with the highest levels of contamination and follow up on stickered bins. This approach has been very effective and contamination levels are now negligible
- ▶ the Recycling Incentive Scheme began in April 2013 as a two year trial funded by DEFRA to drive up recycling participation and improve quality. The scheme uses the council's existing technology – the e+ smart card, coupled with on-board computing technology. Each bin emptied with the correct recyclable materials earns residents 200 points which can be redeemed online to pay for activities at council run leisure centres, libraries, or items such as composters, water butts etc. In addition, two annual recycling days are held where residents can gain 500 bonus points by recycling unwanted small electrical items and recently bags of textiles. Typically, over a tonne of small WEEE is collected at these events. In total 19 million points have been redeemed with surplus points donated to worthwhile causes. Over 14,600 residents are scheme members and participation in recycling has increased from 75% to 88%. The cost of maintaining the scheme is low and the contractor contributes 50% of the cost for good causes

Lessons learned

- ▶ the delivery of savings is a complex task in any client: contractor relationship but business-like co-location has proven helpful, most notably in relation to the re3 waste PFI contract and the Bracknell Forest waste collection contract
- ▶ Co-location helps promote recognition and understanding
- ▶ the re3 councils have worked together successfully on several complex issues and the commitment to the partnership has been critical. Where an issue may not impact on one party to the same extent, the investment across re3 feeds further and reciprocal commitment elsewhere

Buckinghamshire County Council

Background

Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC), as the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA), provides a number of treatment contracts. Greatmoor EFW facility (contractor is FCC) accepts approximately 110,000 tonnes of residual waste per annum and is supported by one Waste Transfer Station handling circa 70,000 tonnes per annum. 10 Household Recycling Centres (contractor is FCC) handles around 80,000 tonnes per annum.

They handle two contracts for food waste treatment, one for north of County (Contractor is Olleco) which handles around 6,500 tonnes per annum and one for the south of the County (Contractor is Agrivert) which handles around 9,000 tonnes per annum. They also handle two contracts for garden waste treatment. Again, one for the north of County (Contractor is FCC) which handles around 8,500 tonnes per annum and one for the south of County (Contractor is CRL) which handles around 32,000 tonnes per annum. There is a bulky waste shredding contract with CRL which processes around 9,000 tonnes per annum and a clinical waste disposal contract with Grundons, which manages around 100 tonnes per annum.

WCAs collect and retain dry recyclable materials, circa 45,000 tonnes per annum, against which BCC pay recycling credits at £54 per tonne. Waste partnership are in place with an aspiration to reach 60% recycling/composting rate by 2020. The focus is currently on food waste diversion. Until early 2018 BCC, the district councils employed a jointly funded partnership officer to help co-ordinate and deliver this project. Funding for this position was from a grant which has now ended.

Current status

- ▶ EFW contract – this is currently delivering well in excess of £5 million of savings to BCC each year. It is on track to deliver more than £150 million in total, over the 30 years of the contract. A large element of these savings is as a result of BCC directly financing the capital cost of the infrastructure (circa £180 million), greatly reducing debt repayment costs (and therefore the gate fees). BCC was one of the first local authorities to entirely fund the capital cost of the residual waste treatment contract up front. This was before service commencement and the injection of capital into residual treatment contracts was recognised as a core element of reducing costs
- ▶ anaerobic digestion (food waste) treatment contracts – BCC recognised that the market place for anaerobic digestion treatment is changing and evolving at a rapid pace. Recent years saw several anaerobic digestion treatment outlets opening in the south east of England, all competing for feed stock. BCC therefore took an active decision to procure contracts on a short-term basis to deliver very competitive gate fee costs. It has thus realised significant contract savings. These savings are likely to be in excess of £200,000 per annum

Lessons learned

- ▶ capital injection of funds for large-scale projects where possible. This is clearly only relevant to long-term contracts and is also dependent on the authority's ability to source its funding. The current financial climate might mean this is not always possible
- ▶ understand your local/regional market, i.e. is there a benefit in using short term contracts to gain competitive prices. Whilst this might mean more resource cost to undertake additional re-procurement activities, benefits can be significant

Chichester District Council

Background

Chichester District Council provides an alternate week collection of residual and dry mixed recyclables using 240 litre wheeled bins as standard. Garden waste is collected fortnightly and is a chargeable service using 240 litre wheeled bins (charge is currently £51.50 per bin per year when paying by annual direct debit or £59.50 by credit/debit card). Bulky waste is also collected on a chargeable basis, at a rate of £26 for the first item and £15.50 for each additional item (up to eight in total). Food waste is not currently offered. The collection service is in-house.

A commercial collection service is available for residual, mixed dry recyclables and card/paper. The West Sussex Waste Partnership is exploring the feasibility of separate food waste and AHP collections whilst also delivering a major food waste minimisation communication campaign. In addition, following successful trials across West Sussex, Chichester District Council is rolling out recycling bags for properties with communal bins focused on recycling performance and quality.

Current status

- ▶ the council's improvement programme is focused on modernising the service through re-designing its processes, a greater reliance on online service provision and has achieved savings of £63,000
- ▶ improvement programme also focused on expanding the garden recycling service. In 2016 the service was rebranded and back office processes streamlined to eliminate manual entry and double handling of data. This sped up back office processes, increased productivity and ensured customer growth could be met within existing back office resources. Online application process was introduced achieving 80-90% of applications completed online. A promotional summer offer was introduced in 2016 where new online customer sign ups received the equivalent of three months off their annual subscription charge. Over the past two years the customer base has increased by 22% (previous annual growth around 3-5%), garden waste tonnage increased by 30% and £130,000 additional income over budget was achieved
- ▶ together with West Sussex County Council, the high costs associated with processing business waste was identified. This motivated the waste collection authority to secure an alternative disposal route. New contract (yet to be finalised) will generate savings of approximately £180,000 for the first full year of operation

Lessons learned

- ▶ effective interdepartmental working is essential for the improvement programme to meet objectives and timescales. This ensures that the project team is established with the appropriate skills and resources
- ▶ from the outset, both the improvement programme and recycling action plan received full buy in and support from the senior management team and members. This ensured that expectations were clearly defined, and vision remained outcome focused. This was supported by regular reporting to the council's strategic Business Improvement Programme Board
- ▶ learning opportunities were increased by committing to evaluate each project of the improvement programme before moving to the next stage. This also ensured that the day to day needs of core service delivery were not ignored

Crawley Borough Council

Background

Crawley Borough Council provide weekly residual refuse collections using 140 litre wheeled bins as standard (240 litre for five or more in the household or where other circumstances require it), fortnightly co-mingled recycling 240 litre wheeled bins collecting glass bottles, jars, aluminium, steel cans, aluminium foil, paper, card, plastic pots, tubs and trays. Small electrical items are collected if left in a carrier bag by the residual bin and textiles are collected if left in a carrier bag by the recycling bin.

Garden waste service is chargeable (£57.50 per bin per year with £2.50 discount offered for payment by direct debit) and runs for 50 weeks per annum. Bulky waste is collected with a minimum charge of £26. There is one bring site which is an underground system at Langley Green shopping parade although there are textile banks at various locations. Waste and recycling collections are undertaken by Biffa Municipal Ltd, using vehicles provided by the council, under a contract from February 2014 (contract is for seven plus three years). There are no commercial collections. The council is currently part of the West Sussex Waste Partnership.

Current status

- ▶ customer self-service: on-line "My Crawley" service provides residents with instant access to services including real time progress tracking for collections. This provides a more cost-effective method of interaction than mediated channels. It is anticipated to save on contact centre costs and could also have the potential to allow the council to cease its annual Christmas waste and recycling mailer which details collection dates. Approximate saving of £20,000 per annum
- ▶ recycling at flats and "low performing area" (LPA): increased quality and quantity of recycling provides more income and reduced disposal costs within the West Sussex Waste Partnership. This is an expansion of the LARAC and National Recycling "Awards for Excellence" award winning WSWP project to approximately a further 4,000 flats. Includes new lockable communal bins with clear windows, new signage at sites, working with landlords and managing agents and a door stepping team interacting with residents and giving out recycling bags. Results from the trial showed increasing quality to grade A, weight almost doubled from 820kg to 1,520kg with no contaminants. The extra 700kg of recycling meant an improvement in the recycling rate in this area from 9.5% to 17.6%
- ▶ expansion and extension of garden waste collection service; providing two garden waste vehicles running the service for 50 weeks per annum

Lessons learned

- ▶ Flats Project: resource intensive, expensive and high risk but despite these factors, when co-ordinated and managed efficiently can achieve and maintain increases in quantity and quality of recycle. partnership support officer, door-stepping manager and lead contact at WCA were needed to facilitate and co-ordinate the project. Funding needs to be in position to cover costs and is cost efficient when arranged as a partnership. Whilst individual WCA's can be co-ordinated and provided resource and funding, if methodology is not followed, project results will be affected. Full crew training can be provided, and crews can be informed of their responsibilities throughout the project, but crew checks need to take place after collections in isolated areas to ensure the locking of bins

Eastbourne Council

Background

Eastbourne Council provides a weekly residual and fortnightly dry recyclables collection, using 240 litre wheeled bins as standard. The collection service is currently outsourced to Kier Services in partnership with the other districts and boroughs in East Sussex with the exception of Lewes. However, following early exit of the contract in June 2019, Eastbourne will then run its waste and recycling services through a local authority controlled company. There is no food waste collection service, but garden waste is a charged for service (currently £52 per year). There is a bulky collection service available (minimum charge for bulky waste collections is £50 for up to three items, additional items are £10 per item).

Current status

- ▶ the authority introduced a charged-for green waste service in April 2018. This was previously a free service. Around 12,000 have signed up to date

Lessons learned

- ▶ clear decision-making, strong communications and close contract management on charged for garden waste were key



East Sussex County Council

Background

An Integrated Waste Management Services Contract (IWMSC) covers the disposal of waste from East Sussex and Brighton and Hove and the operation of 14 HWRCs. The IWMSC was originally a 25 year contract but was extended in 2008 and will now end in March 2033. The key infrastructure delivered through the IWMSC include: Newhaven Energy Recovery Facility, Hollingdean Materials Recovery Facility, Woodlands In-vessel Composting Facility, Waste Transfer Stations in Brighton, Hastings and Uckfield and HWRCs at Crowborough, Hastings and Uckfield. In 2017/18, the councils delivered over 325,000 tonnes of waste into the IWMSC. This does not include 44,000 tonnes of dry mixed recycling retained by waste collection authorities in East Sussex and processed through their own arrangements, although this arrangement will change at the end of June 2019 and will be delivered into the IWMSC.

Current status

- ▶ changes to HWRCs – East Sussex is implementing a HWRC savings plan that will involve the closure of two HWRCs, the introduction of charges for non-household waste, changes to opening times and redevelopment of one site to maximise diversion from landfill and meet demand from future housing growth. These changes will deliver savings against budget reduction of £720,000
- ▶ third party and electricity income sharing – the councils are benefiting from additional income from contract facilities following a renegotiation of the contract in 2008. Electricity income share varies from year to year according to market trends and can be significant
- ▶ recycling of mechanical street sweepings – 6,500 tonnes of street sweepings in East Sussex and Brighton and Hove that was previously incinerated – is now being recycled to produce a soil product for use in landfill remediation. The process also results in recycling/reuse of metals, plastic and stones and as well as boosting recycling performance. This has freed up space at Newhaven Energy Recovery Facility that can be backfilled to generate additional royalty payments

Lessons learned

- ▶ full contract review – following a Defra review of the management of the contract, the councils worked with Local Partnerships to undertake a more comprehensive review which identified areas where the councils could work with Veolia to achieve further contract efficiencies
- ▶ evidence based approach – the savings review programme is supported by extensive cost, risk and legal modelling and forecasting to quantify the opportunity and inform business case development. This includes looking at the collection and disposal cost implications in the same analysis to ensure that the taxpayer is better off overall. Whilst this may have significant time and resource implications, elected members appreciated that the evidence base was in place before being asked to consider sensitive issues
- ▶ effective sharing of performance information – it is essential that collection staff understand how their role directly links to performance, costs and operational impacts on the disposal side. An example of this is the sharing of recycling quality analysis so that operational teams can take action to deal with issues on the ground. For instance, contamination in communal recycling bins can have an impact on the facilities and contractual arrangements of the disposal authority. It is essential that local authority officers and contractors work effectively across organisational boundaries

Elmbridge Borough Council

Background

As of 5 June 2017, Elmbridge has been delivering its waste collection and street cleansing services via the contractor Amey, through a joint waste services contract involving Mole Valley, Surrey Heath and Woking councils. The contract is 10 years plus the option to extend by up to 14 years and involves alternate weekly collections of comingled dry recyclables and residual waste, plus weekly collections of food waste, textiles and small electricals. Garden waste is collected fortnightly as a charged for service (£45 per annum). Bulky waste collection is also available: £30 for a single item, plus £10 for each additional item (up to 10 items). Elmbridge provides some bring banks, which are managed in-house. Elmbridge is an active member of Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP).

Current status

- ▶ the joint contract has been the major focus of Elmbridge and the other participating authorities over recent years. The contract covers all aspects of waste collection plus other services including street cleansing. It will save around £2.5 million a year and has been procured so that other authorities can join as it progresses
- ▶ a new organisation called Joint Waste Solutions (JWS) has been setup to manage the joint contract and the wider waste services of these four authorities. JWS includes staff from the four districts and boroughs and staff from the county council that are involved in county-wide recycling improvements. By setting up this single integrated team, it is possible to share skills, knowledge and experience and overcome organisational boundaries to deliver further savings
- ▶ further work is planned to combine the governance from the joint contract authorities and Surrey Waste Partnership and create a single team for delivering all joint work across all 12 of Surrey's councils (in 2019/20). It is expected that this closer, more integrated approach to partnership working will help the partnership to continue to reduce waste, increase recycling, minimise landfill and cut costs. The idea of joining up waste services was first explored by SWP, which also contributed significantly towards to costs of the joint contract procurement

Lessons learned

- ▶ joining up waste services is most effectively done around areas where consistency or commonality already exists. This could be around a shared asset, or similar existing services. Having things like this in common creates potential operational efficiencies from combining services or service elements with other authorities. The commonality in this case was very similar core collection services and some shared borough boundaries, which made for an attractive case for joint collection services. A joint contract is managed most efficiently through a joint team, and as well as operations management the four authorities also had staff involved with data and service development. Combining the back-office teams became a logical step
- ▶ don't be afraid to go for a "big bang" change rather than an iterative one. The participating authorities took the iterative path when establishing the joint service, going from sharing a contract to sharing contract management to sharing all waste service management. There was a perception that if they went for a "big bang" change, they might be pushing things too far and too fast for the partners. In hindsight, a "big bang" change would have been more efficient and avoided the pitfalls of creating multiple and constantly-evolving inter-authority agreements
- ▶ if you leave too much time to talk through what the new service will look like it can encourage a lack of urgency in decision making. A degree of time pressure can help to get decisions made faster, saving colleagues' time and helping to keep the pace up

Guildford Borough Council

Background

Guildford Borough Council provide an in-house collection service for fortnightly residual and recyclable waste using 240 litre bins as standard. There are weekly collections of food waste using a 23 litre caddy, WEEE using a carrier bag placed next to the bins, batteries from a sandwich bag placed next to the bin and textiles from a carrier bag placed next to the bin. Garden waste is a charged for service (£35 per annum) using a 240 litre bin and collected fortnightly. There are 34 bring banks in place. Commercial collection of residual, recycling, glass and card is available with a food waste service to be introduced. Guildford has entered into an MOU with a local re-use network to provide bulky waste services in the local area. Guildford is a member of the Surrey Waste Partnership.

Current status

- ▶ in-cab technology has been implemented to allow real time reporting of issues, improving the efficiency and overall operation of the service as well as facilitating a channel shift in the way residents contact the authority. Improvements have also been made in how the authority contacts and responds to issues with residents. Implemented in 2013 the technology is being upgraded to improve data management, crew reporting and round efficiencies
- ▶ joint working with Surrey University has also been focused on ensuring students can access information easily and problems can be addressed quickly. This includes student focused communication material, briefings and student information events, closer working with the university facilities and engagement teams. In addition, a joint project with the BHF is delivered annually to encourage students to use the kerbside service and additional BHF banks are temporarily located during changeover period. The result has been a decrease in fly tipping in student areas and an increase in the amount of material reused or recycled from student properties, removing the requirement to put on an extra vehicle and crew during changeover
- ▶ as part of the Surrey Waste Partnership the council has delivered consistent, cross boundary message and recognisable communications across the whole county

Lessons learned

- ▶ the challenge for those with English as a second language or with limited reading and writing skills was more significant than initially considered in relation to the implementation of the in-cab technology. It required new ways of training including the teaching of patterns to allow crews with limited reading skills to correctly enter the information, plus ongoing support and training to ensure crews' confidence levels are maintained. This has benefited both the workforce individuals and the residents conversing with the crews on the street
- ▶ one of the challenges of joint working with the university is around how students are received in the community. Over time the council have introduced a number of strategies to manage the potential impact of students in the local area, for example acknowledging that having bins out for collection the morning after the students "big night out in the town" is not ideal. A better day could be scheduled to reduce the impact on the residents' collections. The council recognise the sensitivities of ensuring that students are seen by the town in a positive light, and the council is not seen as having to take specific action to manage the impacts of this group
- ▶ though very simple, changing the council's collection service to allow previously fortnightly materials to be collected weekly allowed the crews to adopt a simple way of separating WEEE, textiles and batteries. Using the existing underside cage structure by adding a food waste caddy to segregate the batteries, alleviated the need for investment in onboard storage containers. It also facilitated the mixed collections while remaining operationally effective

Hampshire County Council

Background

Hampshire County Council is a Waste Disposal Authority receiving kerbside collected waste from 11 district/borough authorities. The authority also works in a tripartite partnership with its neighbouring unitary authorities of Southampton and Portsmouth. Treatment and disposal are contracted to Veolia UK and the contracted services are delivered through a network of facilities. They include two MRFs, three Energy Recovery Facilities, two open-air composting sites, and 12 waste transfer stations. The contract covers all kerbside collected material such as residual waste, green garden waste, glass and dry mixed recyclables. All authorities collect the same mix of recyclables to ensure quality and consistency and economies of scale. Hampshire provides 24 HWRCs which are managed through a seven plus seven year (2016-2030) contract with Veolia. Southampton and Portsmouth each provide one additional HWRC which are also part of this contract.

Current status

- ▶ negotiated extension of the Waste Disposal Service Contract to ensure co-terminus of end date which achieved a saving through reduction in the annual fixed fee payments for the remainder of the contract
- ▶ HWRC operational changes linked to the new contract in 2016. Letting a new HWRC management contract and other operational changes such as reduced opening hours and non-household waste charges have realised savings of approximately £1.5 million per annum
- ▶ developing and delivering innovative projects to realise significant savings in associated disposal costs. Namely, recycling street sweepings diverted around 17,500 tonnes of street sweepings from landfill in 2017/18 as a result of the above initiatives and other projects over the last five years a total of just over £8 million has been saved from the Waste and Resource Management Budget

Lessons learned

- ▶ an open but commercial approach from both client and contractor to delivering mutual benefits helps during in-contract negotiations. Building flexibility into long-term contracts enable processing facilities to take advantage of new technologies and breakthroughs in material processing
- ▶ do not underestimate the power of political pressure. Facilities like HWRCs are very important to the public and can be a vote winner
- ▶ the challenge of true partnership working is finding an agreed whole system cost approach with mutual benefit in a two-tier structure. Achieving a saving without cost shunting is difficult and only works if there is support for the outcome from the top of every organisation and a collective willingness to work differently and embrace change

Hart District Council

Background

Hart District Council provides an alternate weekly collection of residual waste using a mixture of 140 litre, 240 litre and 360 litre wheeled bins, and an alternate weekly collection of dry mixed recyclables (paper, cardboard, steel and aluminium cans and plastic bottles). The council uses mainly 240 litre wheeled bins with some 140 litre and 360 litre bins. Garden waste is a chargeable service utilising 140 litre and 240 litre. £47.24 for 140 litre bin with initial year charge of £78.73 to include £31.49 bin charge and £70.86 for 240 litre bin with initial year charge of £102.35 including £31.49 bin charge.

Concessionary rates are available. Garden waste sacks have been phased out and will only be used in exceptional circumstances. Glass is collected separately on a fortnightly basis using a 48 litre box and/or red 140 litre bins. There is a network of 18 bring banks collecting glass and mixed recycling. This service is currently provided by third party contractors. However, an option is included within this agreement for the service to be incorporated within the main waste and recycling service. A scheduled chargeable bulky waste collection service is currently provided in-house. However, an option is included within this agreement for the service to be incorporated within the main waste and recycling service.

A joint waste contract is in place with Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council managed by the joint waste client team based in Hart who is the administering authority. The contract was originally agreed in October 2011 with Veolia and recently came to an end (September 2018). The authorities are currently mobilising a new eight year plus eight year contract with Serco which started on 1 October 2018.

Hart and Basingstoke and Deane Councils are working with WRAP and Serco to increase education and promotional work to reduce the recycling contamination rate.

Current status

- ▶ efficiencies have been achieved through a joint waste client team which was set up in 2011
- ▶ retendering the contract as a joint contract again has provided the councils with efficiencies and allowed cross boundary working which improves the collections as well as possibly reducing the number of rounds and therefore vehicles and staff required
- ▶ retendering the contract has also allowed the council to transfer two services to the main contract for waste services which were undertaken by in house teams

Lessons learned

- ▶ when retendering ensure all your main areas, i.e. customers service including the contact centre, are part of the project group and actually write their area of work. This was useful and ensured the council had the right information for the tenderers to price them correctly

Hastings Borough Council

Background

Eastbourne Borough Council (EBC), Hastings Borough Council (HBC), Rother District Council (RDC) and Wealden District Council (WDC) together with East Sussex County Council (as the waste disposal authority) formed the East Sussex Waste Partnership (ESWP) in 2012. The WCAs have been party to an outsourced joint collection (and street cleansing) contract with Kier Services Ltd since 2013. Residual waste and dry recyclables are collected using 180 litre wheeled bin and 240 litre wheeled bin plus 45 litre glass box on an alternate weekly basis. There is a chargeable garden waste collection (£60 per annum), fortnightly, using 240 litre wheeled bin. There is no food waste collection. Bring sites are serviced under the joint contract. Bulky collection services are provided under the joint contract: up to three bulky items are charged at £21.

From July 2019, HBC, RDC and WDC will continue in partnership and have procured a new collection contract for the same style of collection services but with glass to be included in the DMR mix.

Current status

- ▶ joint contract has enabled total annual service budget saving of £640,000 per annum (compared with 2012 expenditure and allowing for £50,000 per annum contribution to ESWP costs)
- ▶ joint contract includes Kier responsibility/ownership of DMR so benefit of recycling credits maintained to July 2019 at £260,000 per annum
- ▶ internal staff re-structure (2014/15) enabled "client team" savings as job roles/functions were allocated differently. All savings are considered corporate rather than specific to waste management

Lessons learned

- ▶ working for mutual benefit is fairly easy when there are overall savings to be made and it's only the extent/level of benefits for each party that needs agreement. Partnership between councils becomes much more difficult when increased costs need to be faced and each party is trying to minimise the impact for themselves (because the obvious consequence is that another party must face a bigger impact). The relative advantages and disadvantages for each partner need to be forecast early so a good quality "project management" approach is essential (i.e. all-party approval to proceed is gained at initiation stage)
- ▶ inflammatory matters can ruin partnership working deals at the final stage of any project. Namely something relatively "small" (with low value or service impact) but which historically each partner has handled very differently or had a very different policy concerning, can be a stumbling block to final approvals. Ensure all known sensitive/political matters are tabled and resolved early
- ▶ trying to forecast and deal with all possible scenarios in a partnership agreement (and accompanying cost-sharing arrangement) can have the effect of "entrenching" partners and can make reaching mutual resolution of a problem more difficult. Establishing only some basic cost sharing principles has allowed the partnership to very flexibly deal with all the problems they have faced without a partnership agreement at all. The risks faced by the lead admin authority (that the other partners wouldn't pay what they owe) proved groundless. As a result, all partners have a stronger working relationship between councillors, directors and officers

Kent County Council

Background

Kent County Council (KCC) currently operates a network of 18 HWRCs receiving approximately 185,000 tonnes of waste and 3.5 million visits, managed and operated by four private waste management companies. Co-located at six of these sites are waste transfer stations. These services cost £15.3 million per year to manage. KCC has numerous contracts in place with recycling outlets to maximise reuse, recycling and composting activities. The cost to manage these is almost £53 million per year.

Where possible this waste is sent to facilities within Kent. KCC is part of the Kent Resource Partnership (KRP) alongside the 12 district/borough/city councils in Kent. There are currently three joint waste contracts in place across Kent which are designed to maximise efficiency, increase recycling rates and provide the best value services for Kent residents, They are the East Kent Waste Partnership, the Mid-Kent Waste Partnership and the South-West Kent Partnership.

Current status

- ▶ energy from waste contract: KCC has a long-standing energy from waste contract with Kent Enviropower Limited. Upon meeting the minimum tonnage commitment in 2016, an opportunity presented itself to tender for the additional waste for the volume above the minimum tonnage. This was competitively tendered, with the result in savings against the core gate fee. Overall savings realised are circa £900,000 per annum against a £37 million contract
- ▶ recycling of highway mechanical arisings: Biffa working with CDE Enviro have developed a street sweeping recycling facility near Horsham which treats these to produce recycled aggregate. KCC now diverts the district collected street sweepings to this recycling facility thereby avoiding landfill and EfW. The annual volumes of highway mechanical arisings being recycled was 10,500 tonnes in 2017/18. Not only does this deliver higher levels of recycling, it represents an annual saving of £375,000 when compared to the pre-existing disposal methods
- ▶ waste to final disposal: in 2017, KCC procured a new contract to deal with bulky waste that was being sent to landfill such as mattresses. The new contracts were won by Veolia and Countrystyle who shred and treat this waste to create refuse derived fuel. This provided a modest saving and helps reduce the amount of Kent's waste going to landfill to less than 1%

Lessons learned

- ▶ whilst contractual negotiations can be challenging, KCC has learned that when discussions are held in good faith, all organisations develop a deeper understanding of each other's pressures and as a result, stronger contractual relationships have materialised
- ▶ during the development of Kent's Waste Disposal Strategy Waste, Officers worked with KCC councillors through a Cross-Party Members Group (CPMG) to inform and discuss the objectives and ambition for the service. This work has been invaluable in supporting formal decision-making processes and highlighting to members the pressures and issues facing the waste service, which are now more widely understood. The CPMG has continued to run past strategy development, working with waste officers to undertake its implementation
- ▶ undertaking market engagement prior to procuring for new services gives a greater understanding of what's available and may present opportunities not previously considered. KCC spoke to the market prior to extending its agreement for the treatment of soil, rubble and hardcore waste and found significant savings could be made by going out to a new provider

Lewes Council

Background

Lewes council provides an in-house weekly residual waste collection using black sack, a food waste collection, and a fortnightly dry recycling collection service using 240 litre wheeled bins as standard. A contract is in place with Viridor for management of co-mingled dry mixed recyclables until June 2019 – to fit with new arrangements across the districts and boroughs in East Sussex from June 2019 – after which all WCA's will deliver dry mixed recyclables to East Sussex County Council as the waste disposal authority. Garden waste collection is provided on a fortnightly basis and is currently charged at £70 per bin per year. Bulky services are available (1-5 bulky items or 10 bags of small assorted household items is £55, or 5-10 bulky items or 20 bags of small household items is £85).

Current status

- ▶ trialling "recycling on the go" bins in locations with high footfall, monitoring contamination rates
- ▶ will increase its promotion of the food waste collection as rates/tonnage have halved since its introduction in 2013

Lessons learned

- ▶ very challenging to keep the momentum going with resident participation in food waste collection
- ▶ strong communications are key to improve dry recycling rates and achieve high purity of materials
- ▶ communications are based on monthly contamination reports. Social media should be used to remind people that materials such as textiles can't be recycled through the kerbside collection. This allows the materials to be diverted and brought to the appropriate sites

Mole Valley District Council

Background

As of 1 August 2018, Mole Valley has been delivering its waste collection services via the contractor Amey, through a joint waste services contract also involving Elmbridge, Surrey Heath and Woking councils. The contract is 10 years plus the option to extend by up to 14 years and involves alternate weekly collections of comingled dry recyclables and residual waste, plus weekly collections of textiles and small electricals, and food waste.

Garden waste is collected fortnightly with a charge of £56 per annum. Bulky waste collection is available: £40 per single item, and variable pricing thereafter. Mole Valley provides a network of bring banks managed in-house. Street cleansing services will come under Amey from 01/04/19 when the Veolia contract expires. Mole Valley is a member of Surrey Waste Partnership.

Current status

- ▶ the joint contract has been the major focus of Mole Valley and the other participating authorities over recent years. The contract covers all aspects of waste collection plus other services including street cleansing. It will save around £2.5 million a year once it has been procured. Other authorities can join as it progresses
- ▶ a new organisation called Joint Waste Solutions (JWS) has been setup to manage the joint contract and the wider waste services of these four authorities. JWS includes staff from the four districts and boroughs and staff from the county council that are involved in county-wide recycling improvements. By setting up this single integrated team, it is possible to share skills, knowledge and experience and overcome organisational boundaries to deliver further savings
- ▶ further work is planned to combine the governance from the joint contract authorities and Surrey Waste Partnership and create a single team for delivering all joint work across all 12 of Surrey's councils (in 2019/20). It is expected that this closer, more integrated approach to partnership working will help the partnership to continue to reduce waste, increase recycling, minimise landfill and cut costs. The idea of joining up waste services was first explored by SWP which also contributed significantly towards costs of the joint contract procurement

Lessons learned

- ▶ joining up waste services is most effectively done around areas where consistency or commonality already exists. This could be around a shared asset or similar existing services. Having things like this in common creates potential operational efficiencies from combining services or service elements with other authorities. The commonality in this case was very similar core collection services and some shared borough boundaries which made for an attractive case for joint collection services
- ▶ a joint contract is managed most efficiently through a joint team. As well as operations management the four authorities also had staff involved with data and service development. Combining the back-office teams became a logical step
- ▶ don't be afraid to go for a "big bang" change rather than an iterative one. The participating authorities took the iterative path when establishing the joint service, going from sharing a contract to sharing contract management to sharing all waste service management. There was a perception that if they went for a "big bang" change they might be pushing things too far and too fast for the partners. In hindsight, a "big bang" change would have been more efficient and avoided the pitfalls of creating multiple and constantly-evolving inter-authority agreements
- ▶ if you leave too much time to talk through what the new service will look like, it can encourage a lack of urgency in decision making. A degree of time pressure can help to get decisions made faster, saving colleagues' time and helping to keep the pace up

Oxford City Council

Background

Oxford City Council provide a fortnightly collection of dry mixed recycling, an alternate fortnightly collection of residual waste, a weekly collection of food recycling and an optional yearly subscription service for the fortnightly collection of garden waste. Oxford City Council's waste collection services were kept in-house and managed by Oxford Direct Services. Six months ago, Oxford Direct Services was reformed as a Local Authority Trading Company (LATCo) which is wholly owned by the council and manages the recycling and waste service for the council. A 25 year contract is in place to collect kerbside recycling and residual waste.

Oxford Direct Services has a four year contract with Viridor to process dry mixed recycling with an option included for a four year contract extension. Oxford Direct Services also houses the recycling team which works closely with the recycling and waste operations team to provide advice to residents. They also lead numerous projects to increase recycling participation, reduce waste and encourage the re-use of materials and make prevention and reuse part of their core message.

Current status

- ▶ implementation of a new system "Bartec", which automates many processes, was procured to save officer time and to save money for Oxford Direct Services. The savings of this system are still being monitored and are not currently quantified
- ▶ some collection rounds have recently been re-optimised to ensure the fastest collection schedule possible. This has saved around 28.5 hours of employee time every week, the use of one vehicle one day a week and has allowed these resources to be used elsewhere, which has prevented incurring additional collection costs
- ▶ bulky household waste collections were a five day a week service. This service was reviewed and moved on to a four day week with area working saving £10,000 per year in fuel alone and much more in working time

Lessons learned

- ▶ currently a full service review and benchmarking against other local authorities is being conducted. So far, several inefficiencies and inconsistencies have been found. As one example of a lesson learned, this council is one of the very few collection authorities nationwide who do not charge for bin deliveries. This means a potential revenue of over £100,000 per year is being lost, which is a notable figure in these times of austerity
- ▶ many requests from residents to replace missing bins are received which on a brief inspection are often found to be at the end of the street. Introducing a charge for wheelie bin deliveries is likely to drastically reduce the work load from these kinds of applications
- ▶ a new, pro-active approach has been taken to collection round capacity. In the previous approach, a collection round would not be reviewed until it had already reached 100% capacity. This caused sizeable overtime payments to staff and increased pressure on operatives. Now, if a round reaches 90% capacity, it is automatically reviewed. This means better forward planning and a reduction in employment costs. Doing this has drastically reduced overtime payments and reduced pressure on staff
- ▶ during the roll-out of the new "Bartec" system there were problems with other departments' interactions with the system. Efforts are being made to ensure these interactions work, which could have been included in the consultation phase. The key lesson here is to involve representatives from all stakeholders, no matter how small, right from the start to ensure that every consideration is taken on board. As one example, the council is still completing work to make this system work with the call centre's "Lagan" system. This could have been carried out before the system went live

Oxfordshire County Council

Background

Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) provides waste treatment and processing infrastructure through several contracts. Residual waste is processed at the Ardley Energy Recovery Facility under a 25 year PPP contract with Viridor. Waste is transported to the ERF via three transfer stations provided and operated by Oxfordshire's bulking and haulage contractors or delivered directly. Oxfordshire also has contracts for food and green waste processing with Agrivert and uses two AD facilities, one IVC facility and three open window composting sites all in county.

There are seven HWRCs all managed under contract. Oxfordshire works in partnership with the WCA's through the Oxfordshire Environment Partnership (OEP), the successor to the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership. Building on previous success the OEP continues to enable county wide coordination of waste initiatives and is reviewing the Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

Current status

- ▶ the contract for the management of six of seven HWRCs was retendered in 2017. The tender introduced service changes designed to produce savings, particularly through the contractor taking responsibility for the management of non-household waste including a revised charging scheme for non-household waste. It also included several priced options for reducing opening hours by approximately 25% and managing difficult waste streams (mixed wood, bulky waste and asbestos)
- ▶ the new contract was awarded in 2017 to the incumbent contractor. Savings of approximately £400,000 per year were achieved without the need to reduce opening hours or close sites
- ▶ in 2017 OCC worked with WCA's and Agrivert to roll out a food waste project to increase food waste collected for recycling and divert it from residual waste. This included the distribution of free plastic liners to residents (whose food waste is sent to AD) with WRAP designed leaflets and "no food waste" residual bin stickers, supported by a communications campaign
- ▶ subsequently the council agreed with Agrivert to introduce an "any plastic bag" policy for food waste caddies to remove a potential barrier to participation. The council has seen food waste tonnage increase and residual tonnage decrease. Although due to operational changes carried out at the same time and a staggered roll out arising from several unforeseen delays, it has been difficult to quantify this and attribute it to the project

Lessons learned

- ▶ including priced options in HWRC contract tender for reducing opening hours and managing difficult waste streams introduced a significant amount of complexity in the tender evaluation process. The council had to develop a sophisticated evaluation matrix to assess the various combinations of options. While complex this gave the flexibility to choose the options that provided the best value for money and avoided unnecessary service reductions
- ▶ the food waste project has been successful in that food waste tonnages have increased. Delays to the roll out would have been avoided if liners sourced from China had not been delayed (including due to a typhoon) which had knock on implications for the timing of implementation in different districts. Considering this, risk in planning could have led to a different outcome and more quantifiable results

Portsmouth City Council

Background

Portsmouth City Council provides waste collection services through Biffa Municipal Ltd under a 10 year (eight plus two year) contract which runs from 1 October 2011 until 30 September 2021. For most properties, there is weekly residual collection using 140 litre wheeled bins as standard, although most flat fronted properties present their refuse in black bags. Communal properties receive refuse collections from communal bins ranging in size from 360 litre up to 1,100 litre. Most receive a once per week collection, but some larger blocks, with multiple bins, are collected up to three times per week. Mixed dry recyclables (paper, card, cans, aerosols and plastic bottles) are collected fortnightly using 240 litre wheeled bin as standard. Communal properties receive recycling collections from communal bins ranging in size from 360 litre up to 1,100 litre.

Most receive a once per week collection, but some larger blocks are collected more often. Garden waste is collected by Biffa as part of their "Green Waste Club". The standard charge for the fortnightly collection of a 240 litre wheeled bin is currently £42. Bulky waste is collected one day per week on a Tuesday. All collections are chargeable and prices start from £30 for up to one cubic metre of waste, rising by £15 per cubic metre thereafter. PCC also run a network of 78 on-street glass collection sites and 106 textile bank collection sites. Textile banks are provided, serviced and emptied by SOEX. There is one HWRC managed under a contract with Veolia Environmental Services Ltd.

Current status

- ▶ by moving PCC's waste collection contract from a schedule of rates type contract onto a far more transparent and efficient open book, costs plus type contract, PCC's contract costs dropped by £1.5 million per year, from £4.5 million down to less than £3 million per year. Furthermore, due to the way the council now builds the annual contract target price by using exact up to date costs, plus a small profit, it has been able to keep its contract price around the £3 million mark for the past seven years. Based on the previous contract values, with its RPI % inflation escalator, if we'd kept the old contracting model, we'd now be paying an annual price closer to £5.2 million
- ▶ Portsmouth rolled out 140 litre wheeled refuse bins, collected weekly, to six trial areas, replacing the previous black bag collection where capacity was unlimited. By restricting the amount of refuse households could put out each week and encouraging residents to recycle more, there was a 15% to 20% drop in the tonnage of refuse collected along with a more modest 5% rise in the amount of recyclables collected within the trial areas. Being a unitary authority, the drop in refuse tonnage means a significant drop in refuse disposal charges. The rise in recycling has led to an increase in income from the sale of materials
- ▶ systems thinking review of waste management has led to a staff efficiency saving of around £170,000 per annum. Tasks and outputs deemed to be unnecessary or inefficient were cut and new ways found to secure more from less staff by introducing new ways of working

Lessons learned

- ▶ a move to open book contracts, as opposed to simpler schedule of rates contracts can offer authorities the opportunity to deliver huge savings, whilst keeping full transparency and flexibility of control
- ▶ PCC would recommend that other authorities carry out "systems thinking" type reviews to all large strategic contracts and service areas to highlight and eradicate financial and operational inefficiencies

Reading Borough Council

Background

Reading Borough Council provides an in-house collection service on an alternate weekly basis for residual waste. A 240 litre wheeled bin is used as standard for mixed dry recyclate (plastic pots, tubs and trays, food and drink (Tetra Pak) cartons, clean foil and foil trays, plastic bottles (no lids), paper and card, tins and cans, empty aerosol cans, shredded paper. Garden waste is a charged for service collected fortnightly (£50 per annum for 240 litre green bin plus £51.50 for supply of bin or £15 per annum for green bags plus £11.35 for supply of bags). Small WEEE is placed in a plastic bag alongside the mixed dry recycling bin. Bulky waste service is available (charged at £33 – one item, £38 – two items, £44 – three items and so on). Reading is a partnership referred to as re3, with Bracknell and Wokingham Councils for the joint delivery of treatment and disposal.

Current status

- ▶ the waste collection rounds, which were established in 2006, were reviewed in 2016 as there was a significant imbalance in the number of properties serviced by each round due to new properties coming on stream. Crew time on each round was fluctuating significantly which was causing friction and increasing overtime costs. Using Webaspx, the rounds were reconfigured and one round was taken out saving £110,000 plus a saving in fuel costs due to rounds being localised. The change was successfully introduced in February 2017
- ▶ prior to 2017 a free fortnightly kerbside green waste collection service was used by 16,700 subscribers. Budget pressure meant that a charge for this discretionary service was introduced in April 2017. Initial modelling suggested a drop-out rate of 25-50% and revenue projections were made based on these figures. However, the drop-out rate was 6% and at the end of the first year there were 15,700 subscribers, generating £740,000 in gross income. The first renewal date for the service was April 2018 and numbers have been maintained at 16,000

Lessons learned

- ▶ the delivery of savings is a complex task in any client-contractor relationship but business-like co-location is helpful in promoting recognition and understanding. Put another way, it helps moderate different perspectives which might otherwise become hardened positions
- ▶ partnership is a virtuous cycle. The re3 councils have worked together successfully on a number of complex issues and it is the commitment to the partnership that has been critical in successful outcomes. Even where an issue may not impact on one party to the same extent as others, the commitment that is invested across all three feeds further reciprocal commitment elsewhere

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

Background

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council provide an in-house collection service for fortnightly residual using a 140 litre wheeled bin as standard and mixed dry recyclables (glass, plastic and cans) using a 140 litre wheeled bin as standard. There is a weekly collection of food waste using a 23 litre caddy as standard and a weekly collection of paper, card and cardboard using a 55 litre box as standard. Garden waste is a charged for service (£65 annual membership, 23,000 customers) and is collected fortnightly using a 240 litre wheeled bin as standard. There is a commercial collection service for residual waste paper/card/cardboard. There are also 23 recycling bring sites and 32 textile banks which are outsourced provisions. Bulky waste collection is available and is a charged for service and clinical waste collections are outsourced. Reigate and Banstead are a member of the Surrey Waste Partnership.

Current status

- ▶ use of in-cab technology to deliver "live" reporting linked to CRM
- ▶ rounds rescheduling to delivery optimum rounds efficiencies
- ▶ joint sale of material for recycling with Guildford Borough Council to achieve greater economies of scale

Lessons learned

- ▶ separate paper collections achieve higher value recycling sale/processing costs
- ▶ flexibility of "in-house" services
- ▶ constant messaging to prevent contamination and deliver quality target materials to MRFs

Rother District Council

Background

Eastbourne Borough Council (EBC), Hastings Borough Council (HBC), Rother District Council (RDC) and Wealden District Council (WDC) together with East Sussex County Council (as the waste disposal authority) formed the East Sussex Waste Partnership in 2012. The WCAs have been parties to an outsourced joint collections (and street cleansing) contract since 2013. The Contractor is Kier Services Ltd. The joint contract delivers the same service requirements to households in each council area. There are three service exceptions – weekly (rather than AWC) residual collection frequency in EBC, charged garden waste subscription systems in RDC and WDC and evening/weekend street cleansing requirements in HBC and EBC.

There is no food waste collection in any of the ESWP council areas. Bring sites are serviced under the joint contract. Bulky collection services are provided under the joint contract: up to three bulky items are charged at £38.

From July 2019, HBC, RDC and WDC will continue in partnership and have procured a new collection contract for the same style of collection services but with glass to be included in the DMR mix.

Current status

- ▶ joint contract has enabled total annual service budget saving of £50,000 per annum (compared with 2012 expenditure and allowing for £50,000 per annum contribution to ESWP costs)
- ▶ joint contract includes Kier responsibility/ownership of DMR so benefit of recycling credits maintained to July 2019 at £600,000 per annum
- ▶ RDC holds the central client/lead authority role for the partnership which generates £150,000 income per annum

Lessons learned

- ▶ working for mutual benefit is easy when there are overall savings to be made and it's only the extent/level of benefits for each party that needs agreement. Partnership between councils becomes much more difficult when increased costs need to be faced and each party is trying to minimise the impact for themselves (because the obvious consequence is that another party must face a bigger impact). The relative advantages and disadvantages for each partner need to be forecast early so a good quality "project management" approach is essential (i.e. all party approval to proceed is gained at initiation stage)
- ▶ inflammatory matters can ruin partnership working deals at the final stage of any project i.e. something relatively "small" (with low value or service impact) but which historically each partner has handled very differently, or had a very different policy concerning, can be a stumbling block to final approvals. Ensure all known sensitive/political matters are tabled and resolved early
- ▶ trying to forecast and deal with all possible scenarios in a partnership agreement (and accompanying cost-sharing arrangement) can have the effect of "entrenching" partners and can make reaching mutual resolution of a problem more difficult. Establishing only some basic cost sharing principles has allowed the partnership to deal flexibly with all problems without a partnership agreement at all. The risks faced by the lead admin authority (that the other partners wouldn't pay what they owe) proved groundless. As a result, the partnership believes it have a stronger working relationship between councillors, directors and officers

Southampton City Council

Background

Southampton City Council provides an in-house service for the alternate weekly collection of residual waste, mixed dry recyclables and glass using 240 litre wheeled bins and a 40 litre box for glass as standard. Garden waste is a fortnightly chargeable service for 25 collections per annum (disposable sacks £47.50, 140 litre bin £42.50, 240 litre bin: £45). A bulky waste service is provided with a charge of £10 standard item. Approximately 3,900 collections were made in 2017/18. There are chargeable commercial waste services for residual, dry mixed recyclables, glass and garden waste.

Most flats with communal bins have a weekly collection service. There is one HWRC managed as part of contracts that include Hampshire County Council and Portsmouth City Council. There are 14 bring sites. Southampton City Council is a member of Project Integra, a partnership arrangement with Hampshire County Council, its constituent districts/borough, Portsmouth City Council and Veolia environmental services.

Current status

- ▶ AWC was introduced to properties that have wheeled bin collections on 5 June 2017. This reduced the number of general waste rounds from 12 to eight with seven recycling rounds. Glass is also collected separately and fortnightly on the same day as recycling collections. There has been a reduction in waste tonnages to disposal (approximately 4-5%) and a cost avoidance of £800,000 for 2018/19 in order to replace the £800,000 contribution from the WCSS funding. At the same time, the service took the opportunity to improve the efficiency of collection rounds. A significant part of the planning phase was carrying out a "waste audit" in order to identify potential problem areas and ensure all residents had the recommended capacity. A full communications plan was implemented to support the roll-out of AWC
- ▶ in an effort to meet demand from residents for increased plastic recycling 10 mixed plastic banks were trialled across the city. Installed at the end January 2018, a further three banks were put in place, covering eight different locations. In the first five months the banks proved very popular, collection frequency increased from four weekly to fortnightly to cope with demand. However, during October 2018 the contractor announced a lack of availability for an end market for the collected material. Stockpiling starting to affect both collections and costs. Following the decision by a local district council working with the same contractor to withdraw their mixed plastic banks Southampton withdrew their own banks
- ▶ glass pods provide access to glass recycling for flats and are emptied by a specialist hiab vehicle. Following optimisation work, capacity was reduced to enable the vehicle to be used two days a week to pick up street sweepings from the cleansing service which are also recycled. Streamlining the service and using the hiab to collect other materials ensures that the service is cost neutral, despite market fluctuations of the price for glass. Efficiencies and savings have been made of £34,000 per annum by using the hiab to collect street sweepings rather than contracting out. Recycling the street sweepings, means a further saving on disposal costs as this material would have previously been landfilled

Lessons learned

- ▶ if there are errors in relation to calendars it is important to get data right and resolve issues quickly. More time should be spent on data cleansing and making sure the skill set to set up complex spreadsheets is available
- ▶ it is helpful to use social media enquiries to encourage residents to use social media to report issues (and not use the online or telephone processes set up). Greater focus should be placed on emails to contact centre rather than on telephone calls
- ▶ to ensure they are increasingly productive and efficient, it is important to keep remodelling collection rounds and take into account population and household growth. Route optimisation software has proved invaluable. However, it requires crew input to be effective



Spelthorne Borough Council

Background

Spelthorne Borough Council provides an in-house collection service on an alternate weekly basis for residual and mixed dry recyclables, using 240 litre wheeled bins as standard and 1,100 bulk bins at communal properties. Some difficult to access properties are provided with a weekly waste and recycling collection service.

The council also provides bring sites offering banks for mixed dry recyclables, textiles, small WEEE and books.

Food waste is collected from 25 litre caddies on a weekly basis (and 140 litre caddies from communal properties). The same vehicle also collects textiles and small WEEE which are presented in tied plastic bags.

There is a charged-for garden waste collection service (£54 for a year plus £25 one off cost for a bin), using a 240 litre wheeled bin as standard, collected fortnightly (for 46 weeks a year). Bulky waste is collected on the council's behalf by Surrey Reuse Network at £44 for up to five items. Spelthorne is currently looking at the option of starting a commercial waste collection service.

Our disposal contracts are managed by the Waste Disposal Authority, Surrey County Council. The council is a member of the Surrey Waste Partnership and benefits from joint resources such as communications campaigns and the Surrey Flats Team who work in partnership to tackle contamination and increase tonnage at communal properties.

Current status

- ▶ in 2017 the council leased a new fleet of vehicles fitted with electric bin lifts reducing fuel costs. The new fleet of vehicles are strongly branded with wraps and panels, promoting the various services it offers to residents
- ▶ the council also introduced a new "three in one" service collecting food waste, textiles and small electricals on one purpose-built vehicle. Previously food waste was collected in a pod on its main RCVs. This new vehicle configuration provides a more efficient and wide-reaching service to residents and provides the council with more flexibility going forward enabling it to adapt to potential future changes
- ▶ prior to starting the service the council's collection rounds were rerouted to improve efficiency

Lessons learned

- ▶ it is important to provide regular communications in various media about service changes as some residents are still unaware of the new services the council provides despite several communications
- ▶ before rerouting and changing to new software system ensure existing data is "clean". It is more time consuming to do so after the event
- ▶ signage and communication can work in some communal properties, but the most effective way to cut contamination of recycling is to restrict the bin aperture (to prevent larger items, e.g. rubbish being put in communal recycling bins)

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils

Background

The councils tendered a joint seven plus seven years waste collection service in 2008 which was rolled out in South Oxfordshire in 2009 and Vale of White Horse in 2010. The contract was awarded to Verdant who were later acquired by Biffa. Standard kerbside collection is: weekly collection of food waste in a green 23 litre caddy; fortnightly mixed recycling collection in a green 240 litre wheeled bin; fortnightly collection of non-recyclable waste in a grey 180 litre wheeled bin; fortnightly collection of textiles in tied carrier bags put out alongside the green recycling bin; fortnightly collection of small electrical items in tied carrier bags put out alongside the grey refuse bin; fortnightly collection of batteries in clear plastic bags put on top of the lid of the green recycling bin; fortnightly opt-in, charged collection of garden waste in a brown 240 litre wheeled bin. Properties unsuitable for individual wheeled bins are on a kerbside sack collection service.

Current status

- ▶ fleet change is generating fuel efficiencies. The councils took the option to take the full seven year extension in 2014, in advance of the initial seven year term. The contract now expires in 2024. The original term of the contract used a refuse collection vehicle with a separate food pod to allow a single pass collection to be made for the wheeled bin product (refuse or recycling) and food waste. The expected operational benefits of the single pass system were realised from day one of the contract. However, over time and due mainly to the locations of the tipping points for refuse, recycling and food waste, the contractor sought permission to service the extension period providing separate vehicles for wheeled bins (refuse and recycling) and food waste
- ▶ at first glance, the proposal to add vehicles to the fleet was counter-intuitive to increase efficiency. It also resulted in a 50% increase in the number of LGV drivers required to run the service – one new food round covers two existing combined refuse/recycling and food rounds. However, overall fuel use has reduced by around 10% since the fleet was replaced. The fleet fuel data includes vehicles to run the street cleansing operation which forms part of the overall contract. However, there were no operational changes to this part of the service when the fleet was replaced
- ▶ fuel savings are a direct result of the change to the collection methodology and the higher efficiency of the new fleet. The average figure for the last three full years using the original fleet from 2014/15 to 2016/17 was 8.27 litre per household per annum, falling to 7.73 litres in 2017/18 (the new fleet was rolled out in October/November 2017). Projections from the first two quarters of 2018/19 suggests the annual figure will fall to 7.23 litres per household
- ▶ contract re-negotiation: the contract was awarded in 2008 on a seven plus seven year basis. As the contract was running well – the two districts consistently achieved recycling rates in the top three of English authorities and satisfaction rates were high – an early decision was taken to award the full extension in 2014. The renegotiation (excluding indexation) reduced annual contract costs by £60,000, equating to a £600,000 saving for the remaining term. It also avoided possible re-procurement costs
- ▶ bring bank removal: as all materials are accepted within the kerbside collections, the decision to remove the majority of bring sites was taken, retaining seven WEEE banks over the two districts. This reduced contract costs in the region of £50,000 per annum and eliminated historical fly-tipping at the sites

Lessons learned

- ▶ carefully consider the interactions between the different products, tip locations and how breakdowns will be covered when specifying collection fleet
- ▶ renegotiate and extend contracts (where services are running well) at an early opportunity to maximise saving opportunities
- ▶ provided materials are all collected kerbside, removing bring banks did not result in the anticipated wave of complaints, saved contract costs and eliminated previous fly-tipping problems and associated expense



Surrey County Council

Background

Surrey County Council has a semi integrated waste management contract with SUEZ which commenced in September 1999 and expires in September 2024. The contract covers the management of 15 Community Recycling Centres (CRCs); the design, build, finance and operation of an eco park comprising a gasification facility; an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility, a Community Recycling Centre (CRC) and a Recycling Bulking Facility (RBF); the operation of five waste Transfer Stations (TS); the recycling and disposal of all waste arising from the CRCs; the disposal and treatment of all waste collected by the waste collection authorities in Surrey, including all residual waste, street sweepings fly tipped waste, green waste and food waste (Suez currently deliver waste to energy from waste plants at Allington in Kent, Lakeside at Colnbrook and to AEB in Amsterdam via their Mitcham waste transfer station); the management of dry mixed recyclables (DMR) collected by WCAs which is subject to a direction by the county council. Waste minimisation and prevention campaigns are delivered Surrey wide by the Surrey Waste Partnership. In addition, the Surrey Waste Partnership provides a centralised team working on promoting recycling in flats across the county. Recently Suez has opened reuse shops at four community recycling centres to increase re-use and generate income for the council.

Current status

- ▶ household waste recycling centre efficiencies include the introduction of charging for construction waste, reduced hours/days, enforcing against trade waste abuse and the introduction of reuse shops have a projected saving of £2.32 million from 2016/17 to 2018/19
- ▶ materials management– reduction in residual waste arisings at CRCs, better deals for green waste due to aggregating all green waste from kerbside collections and HWRCs under one contract. Better deal for wood waste by using Suez contract, better deal for sweepings due to market positioning. The projected savings are £1.146 million from 2016/17 to 2018/19
- ▶ capital injection by SCC – Swap Suez £12 million corporate debt for PWLB borrowing on non-eco park asset, generating a net saving as a result of the refinancing of around £2.26 million

Lessons learned

- ▶ introducing efficiency measures at household recycling centres can have significant reductions in waste volumes. In Surrey over the three year period from 2016/17 to 2018/19 tonnages processed through the community recycling centres have dropped from 140,000 tonnes per year to 90,000 tonnes per year projected for 2018/19. Tonnages of fly tipped waste and kerbside collected waste have remained static during this period
- ▶ good publicity and phased introduction of changes to the HWRCs during the less busy winter period have resulted in the smooth introduction of significant changes

Surrey Heath Borough Council

Background

As of 5 February 2018, Surrey Heath has been delivering its waste collection and street cleansing services via the contractor Amey. This has been through a joint waste services (and street cleansing) contract also involving Elmbridge, Mole Valley and Woking councils. The contract is 10 years plus the option to extend by up to 14 years and involves alternate weekly collections of comingled dry recyclables and residual waste, plus weekly collections of textiles and small electricals and food waste. Garden waste is collected fortnightly as a charged for service (£40 per annum). Bulky waste collection is also available: £30 for a single item plus £10 for each additional item (up to 10 items). Surrey Heath provides a network of bring banks which are managed in-house. Surrey Heath is an active member of Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP).

Current status

- ▶ the joint contract has been the major focus of Surrey Heath and the other participating authorities over recent years. The contract covers all aspects of waste collection plus other services including street cleansing. It will save around £2.5 million a year and has been procured so that other authorities can join as it progresses
- ▶ a new organisation called Joint Waste Solutions (JWS) has been setup to manage the joint contract and the wider waste services of these four authorities. JWS includes staff from the four districts and boroughs and staff from the county council that are involved in county-wide recycling improvements. By setting up this single integrated team it is possible to share skills, knowledge and experience and overcome organisational boundaries to deliver further savings
- ▶ further work is planned to combine the governance from the joint contract authorities and Surrey Waste Partnership and create a single team for delivering all joint work across all 12 of Surrey's councils (in 2019/20). It is expected that this closer, more integrated approach to partnership working will help the partnership to continue to reduce waste, increase recycling, minimise landfill and cut costs. The idea of joining up waste services was first explored by SWP, which also contributed significantly towards to costs of the joint contract procurement

Lessons learned

- ▶ joining up waste services is most effectively done around areas where consistency or commonality already exists. This could be around a shared asset or similar existing services. Having things like this in common creates potential operational efficiencies from combining services or service elements with other authorities. The commonality in this case was very similar core collection services and some shared borough boundaries which made for an attractive case for joint collection services. A joint contract is managed most efficiently through a joint team and, as well as operations management, the four authorities also had staff involved with data and service development. Combining the back-office teams became a logical step
- ▶ don't be afraid to go for a "big bang" change rather than an iterative one. The participating authorities took the iterative path when establishing the joint service, going from sharing a contract to sharing contract management to sharing all waste service management. There was a perception that if the councils went for a "big bang" change they might be pushing things too far and too fast for the partners. In hindsight, a "big bang" change would have been more efficient and avoided the pitfalls of creating multiple and constantly-evolving inter-authority agreements
- ▶ if you leave too much time to talk through what the new service will look like it can encourage a lack of urgency in decision making. A degree of time pressure can help to get decisions made faster, saving colleagues' time and helping to keep the pace up

Wealden District Council

Background

Eastbourne Borough Council (EBC), Hastings Borough Council (HBC), Rother District Council (RDC) and Wealden District Council (WDC) – the WCAs – together with East Sussex County Council (as the waste disposal authority) formed the East Sussex Waste Partnership in 2012.

The WCAs have been parties to outsourced joint collections (and street cleansing) contract since 2013. The contractor is Kier Services Ltd. Residual and dry recyclables are collected on an alternate weekly basis, using 180 litre wheeled bins, and 140/240 litre wheeled bins plus 40 litre box. Garden waste is collected fortnightly using 140/240 litre wheeled bins.

There is no food waste collection service. Bring sites are serviced under the joint contract.

Bulky collection services are provided under the joint contract: up to three bulky items are charged at £55.

From July 2019, HBC, RDC and WDC will continue in partnership and have procured a new collection contract for the same style of collection services but with glass to be included in the DMR mix.

Current status

- ▶ joint contract has enabled total annual service budget saving of £874,000 per annum (compared with 2012 expenditure and allowing for £50,000 per annum contribution to ESWP costs)
- ▶ Wealden operated a DSO prior to 2013 so has also realised benefits in terms of the internal corporate resources required to support DSO activities. Internal staff re-structure (2014/15) enabled “client side” savings as client roles/functions were allocated across the council. All savings considered corporate rather than specific to waste management
- ▶ joint contract includes Kier responsibility/ownership of DMR so benefit of recycling credits maintained to July 2019 at £1.1 million per annum

Lessons learned

- ▶ working for mutual benefit is fairly easy when there are overall savings to be made and it's only the extent/level of benefits for each party that needs agreement. Partnership between councils becomes much more difficult when increased costs need to be faced and each party is trying to minimise the impact for themselves (because the obvious consequence is that another party must face a bigger impact). The relative advantages and disadvantages for each partner need to be forecast early so a good quality “project management” approach is essential (i.e. all party approval is gained at initiation stage)
- ▶ inflammatory matters can ruin partnership working deals at the final stage of any project i.e. something relatively “small” (with low value or service impact) but which historically each partner has handled very differently or had a very different policy concerning, can be stumbling blocks to final approvals. Ensure all known sensitive/political matters are tabled and resolved early
- ▶ trying to forecast and deal with all possible scenarios in a partnership agreement (and accompanying cost-sharing arrangement) can have the effect of “entrenching” partners and can make reaching mutual resolution of a problem more difficult. Establishing some basic cost sharing principles has allowed the partnership to deal flexibly with problems without a partnership agreement. The risks faced by the lead admin authority (that the other partners wouldn't pay what they owe) proved groundless. As a result, the partnership believes it has a stronger working relationship between councillors, directors and officers

West Berkshire Council

Background

West Berkshire Council provide an alternate weekly collection of residual waste (with a 240 litre wheeled bin as standard) and comingled garden and food waste (again with a 240 litre wheeled bin as standard). There is a charge for the garden waste collection (£50 annual subscription). Dry recyclables are also collected on an alternate weekly basis using a 90l sack for cans and plastic bottles and two 55 litre boxes for paper and card and glass respectively. Bulky waste is collected as a charged service-standard charge of £41 plus charges of £57 and £68 for specified days.

All waste services are provided by PFI contract with Veolia (2008-2032) including two HWRCs operated under the contract. The contract provides for guaranteed recycling performance (49%) and 25,000 tonnes of residual waste sent to EfW plant.

Current status

- ▶ charging for collection of garden waste: a free garden waste collection service was introduced at the start of the PFI contract and in 2011 this was expanded to include food waste. The introduction of charges for the collection of garden waste was agreed within the council's budget setting for 2018/19 with a full year net income projection of £900,000 and an annual subscription rate of £50. Non-subscribers continue to have food waste only collected in the green bin. The take-up projection has been exceeded but the impact on landfill and on the overall recycling rate has yet to be determined
- ▶ capital contribution: the council has made a payment to the contractor as a contribution towards the costs of certain fixed assets (civil works and access roads). In return for this contract specific contribution, the council will receive reductions in the unitary charge payments for the remainder of the life of the contract
- ▶ communications: an annual saving of £200,000 has been achieved by making reductions in the Education, Service Promotion and Waste Minimisation service provided within the contract. The council has taken on responsibility for the design and production of all promotional material, the annual service promotion and education plan and the service website. The contractor has retained responsibility for the delivery of service notices and assistance to the council in the production of the annual service promotion and education plan

Lessons learned

- ▶ engage with the contractor at earliest opportunity. In the context of a PFI contract, it is essential to engage with the contractor at the earliest opportunity when considering any changes which impact on the performance and finances of the contract
- ▶ ensure enough resource is available within the in-house team, especially to manage negotiations and internal briefings
- ▶ ensure realistic costing of proposals avoiding "optimism bias" and being very clear on the specific budgets and budget holders affected by savings proposals

West Oxfordshire District Council

Background

West Oxfordshire District provide an alternative weekly wheeled bin collection of residual waste, glass, mixed dry recyclables (with separated glass), household batteries, textiles, shoes, small mixed WEEE and engine oil. There is a weekly collection of food waste and cooking oil. In addition, there is a chargeable garden waste service (£30) which 58% of all properties are signed up to. For approximately 5,000 dwellings there is a weekly collection of communal bins or sacks due to limited or no external storage space. There is a chargeable booking service for bulky waste and non-bulky waste items (i.e. carpet) and an FOC booking service for car batteries. Over 20 bring sites across the district collect commingled material excluding glass, separately collected glass, textiles and small mixed WEEE.

To reduce waste, increase recycling and reduce contamination communications campaigns are delivered, such as door knocking, leaflet dropping, direct mail and talks. The contractor for the service provision is Ubico Ltd. Ubico is a jointly owned company by local authorities set up to deliver waste management services. By operating under the Teckal exemption, West Oxfordshire can procure services from Ubico directly without it falling under normal procurement rules.

Current status

- ▶ in April 2017 the council withdrew from a FOC garden waste service and implemented a chargeable service of which 58% of all properties are signed up. The charge wholly covers the cost of service delivery saving for the council, approximately £600,000 per annum
- ▶ Ubico Ltd became responsible for the garden waste in April 2017 (and then for all other services in October 2017). In addition, there have been improvements in the efficiency of garden waste sack collections resulting in one vehicle being taken off the road.
- ▶ improvements in the garden waste database have been made and system updates have reduced customer contact requirements
- ▶ review of the clinical waste customers in 2018 identified customers who produce non-infectious healthcare waste (i.e. incontinence pads) and providing them with a larger refuse bin instead. This allowed the service to drop from two days of collections to one
- ▶ as of February 2018, to encourage waste reduction and recycling, changes to capacity and frequency in terms of no longer selling larger refuse bins to households and a move from weekly kerbside sort to fortnightly commingled collections in October 2017. Residents can opt in to reduce their refuse capacity from a 180 litre bin to a 140 litre bin and to increase their recycling capacity from a 240 litre bin to a 360 litre bin
- ▶ in addition to increasing the capacity for recycling and reducing capacity for residual waste, as part of a recycling improvement campaign, door to door canvassing was carried over a six week period across areas producing high refuse tonnage and lower presentation of food caddies for recycling. The campaign aimed to increase household participation in the food waste recycling in addition to increasing awareness of what items can and cannot be placed in the recycling bin. 5,668 homes were visited and engaged with directly or indirectly and approximately 10% improvements in food waste tonnages were made in the areas door knocked

Lessons learned

- ▶ "collaborate, collaborate, collaborate". Engage with all stakeholders in a timely manner to ensure that you have their involvement whether this is using their technical expertise and advice or gaining their support to assist in championing the changes

West Sussex County Council

Background

West Sussex County Council (WSCC) is the waste disposal authority and operates three major contracts for the treatment and disposal of waste from the districts and boroughs. The Recycling and Waste Handling Contract commenced on 1 April 2004 for a 29 year period and is partly financed as a PFI Contract. Viridor West Sussex are responsible for the management of the HWRCs, transfer and bulking stations, as well as the development and operation of the materials recovery facility at Ford in West Sussex.

As part of this contract they are also responsible for arranging transport for all recyclable materials to reprocessors and residual waste to treatment and disposal points. Viridor also have responsibility for marketing all recyclables they reprocess, which includes the composting of all green waste received at their sites and from the district and borough collections. The Materials Resource Management Contract commenced with Biffa (West Sussex) on 28 June 2010 for a 25 year period (plus possible 5 year extension) for the design, build and operation of a Mechanical Biological Treatment Facility in Warnham. This facility receives all residual household waste in West Sussex and treats food waste and other organics by anaerobic digestion, separates the remaining metals and produces Refuse Derived Fuel for which there is an offtake contract, signed on 6 April 2018 for a 5 year period (possible five year extension) with West Sussex Britanniacrest Seneca Partnership.

WSCC has a framework agreement for clinical waste services that provides treatment and disposal services for all district and borough collected waste as well as collection and support services available to the West Sussex Waste Partnership as required. A contract for the collection and disposal of abandoned vehicles is in place and allows joint working with the districts and boroughs, aided by a wider partnership with Sussex Police, all local authorities in East Sussex and Fire and Rescue services for the rapid removal of these vehicles. WSCC has undertaken several projects working with its partners in the West Sussex Waste Partnership to reduce MSW and increase recycling. For example: subsidised home composting bins, EU projects targeting hard to reach residents, HMO projects, inclusion of plastic pots tubs and trays at the kerbside, and regular events and campaigns.

Current status

- ▶ 2016 austerity savings led to a reduction in site hours and days on HWRS sites as well as charging for the disposal of tyres and introducing more segregation of materials at sites
- ▶ the MRMC has had changes to waste treatment. for example sand, grit, glass and stones are now sent to an aggregates treatment and recycling facility (ATRF) plant for processing which has increased the recycling rate and reduced disposal costs. Street sweepings are now delivered to the plant, reducing waste to landfill and increasing the recycling rate
- ▶ introduction of pots, tubs and trays as an input material to the Ford MRF

Lessons learned

- ▶ always ensure that discussions around savings are undertaken by both the contractor and authority from the start. The council have plenty of changes that were agreed by the authority with no discussions with the contractor
- ▶ ensure that everyone in the authority at all levels understand the principles when savings are agreed from the outset
- ▶ always be honest and realistic when discussing savings and never be over optimistic with what can be achieved or how the service may be impacted



Woking Borough Council

Background

As of 1 September 2017, Woking has been delivering its waste collection services via the contractor Amey through a joint waste services contract also involving Elmbridge, Mole Valley, and Surrey Heath. The contract is 10 years plus the option to extend by up to 14 years and involves alternate weekly collections of comingled dry recyclables and residual waste plus weekly collections of textiles and small electricals and food waste. Garden waste is collected fortnightly as a charged for service (£45 per annum). Bulky waste collection is also available: £30 for a single item, plus £10 for each additional item (up to 10 items). Woking provides some bring banks which are managed in-house. Surrey Heath is an active member of Surrey Waste Partnership (SWP). Street cleansing services are delivered by Serco.

Current status

- ▶ the joint contract has been the major focus of Woking and the other participating authorities over recent years. The contract covers all aspects of waste collection plus other services including street cleansing. It will save around £2.5 million a year and has been procured so that other authorities can join as it progresses
- ▶ a new organisation called Joint Waste Solutions (JWS) has been setup to manage the joint contract and the wider waste services of these four authorities. JWS includes staff from the four districts and boroughs and staff from the county council that are involved in county-wide recycling improvements. By setting up this single integrated team it is possible to share skills, knowledge and experience and overcome organisational boundaries to deliver further savings
- ▶ further work is planned to combine the governance from the joint contract authorities and Surrey Waste Partnership and create a single team for delivering all joint work across all 12 of Surrey's councils (in 2019/20). It is expected that this closer more integrated approach to partnership working will help the partnership to continue to reduce waste, increase recycling, minimise landfill and cut costs. The idea of joining up waste services was first explored by SWP which also contributed significantly towards to costs of the joint contract procurement

Lessons learned

- ▶ joining up waste services is most effectively done around areas where consistency or commonality already exists. This could be around a shared asset or similar existing services. Having things like this in common creates potential operational efficiencies from combining services or service elements with other authorities. The commonality in this case was very similar core collection services and some shared borough boundaries which made for an attractive case for joint collection services
- ▶ a joint contract is managed most efficiently through a joint team and as well as operations management the four authorities also had staff involved with data and service development, combining the back-office teams became a logical step
- ▶ don't be afraid to go for a "big bang" change rather than an iterative one. The participating authorities took the iterative path when establishing the joint service, going from sharing a contract to sharing contract management to sharing all waste service management. There was a perception that if the councils went for a "big bang" change they might be pushing things too far and too fast for the partners. In hindsight, a "big bang" change would have been more efficient and avoided the pitfalls of creating multiple and constantly-evolving inter-authority agreements
- ▶ if you leave too much time to talk through what the new service will look like it can encourage a lack of urgency in decision making. A degree of time pressure can help to get decisions made faster, saving colleagues' time and help to keep the pace up

Wokingham Borough Council

Background

Wokingham Borough Council provides a weekly residual waste collection using blue plastic bags (80 bags provided annually as standard); a weekly collection of dry recyclables (paper, card, cardboard, food and drink cans, aerosols, foil and foil tray, plastic bottles and tubs, carton) using a 50 litre black box as standard; a fortnightly chargeable garden waste collection using 240 litre wheeled bin as standard with an option to purchase plastic sacks as an alternative (£60 per annum per bin or £1 per bag). A bulky waste service is available (£32.10 for standard collection of up to five items, or £38.30 for up to five items by appointment).

Wokingham is part of a waste management partnership with Bracknell Forest and Reading, known as re3. This has resulted in a joint working arrangement and shared waste management contract with FCC. The Partnership has two HWRCs, neither are specifically located in Wokingham but are accessible by residents.

Current status

- ▶ Wokingham Borough Council undertook a project to improve waste management facilities in flatted properties. Council waste policy stipulates every household has a weekly allowance of 120 litre per property for residual waste. The focus of the project was to bring in line provision at flatted properties and improve facilities in general
- ▶ every bin store was dealt with on a case by case basis and existing capacities were calculated against the council's allowance. 70,000 extra litres were removed from these properties and recycling facilities improved. Residents were directly informed of the changes plus information was displayed in the bin store and recycling bins stickered. The changes are expected to deliver an annual saving of £6,500

Lessons learned

- ▶ co-location with contractors is essential. The delivery of savings is a complex task in any client: contractor relationship but business-like co-location is helpful. Co-location helps to promote recognition and understanding. Put another way, it helps to moderate different perspectives which might otherwise become hardened positions
- ▶ partnership is a virtuous cycle. If genuine commitment is invested in a partnership, it can generate the scaled-up benefits that partnerships are envisaged for. The re3 councils have worked together successfully on several complex issues and it is the commitment to the partnership that has been critical in successful outcomes. Even where an issue may not impact on one party to the same extent as others, the commitment that is invested across all three feeds further reciprocal commitment elsewhere

APPENDIX 2: WASTE COLLECTION PROFILE OF THE AUTHORITIES IN THE REVIEW

Local Authority ⁹	Residual		Dry recyclable		Garden			Food	HWRC provision	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged			
Buckinghamshire two tier authorities										
Buckinghamshire County Council	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10	FCC
East Sussex two tier authorities										
East Sussex County Council	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	14	Veolia
Eastbourne Council	weekly	240 litre	fortnightly	240 litre	fortnightly		£52 per annum	no	n/a	Kier Services
Hastings	AWC	180 litre	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins plus 45 litre box	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£60 per annum	no	n/a	Kier Services
Lewes District Council	weekly	black sacks	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£70 per annum	weekly	n/a	in-house
Rother District Council	AWC	180 litre wheeled bins	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins plus 45 litre box	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£35 per annum	no	n/a	Kier Services
Wealden District Council	AWC	180 litre wheeled bins	AWC	140/240 litre wheeled bins plus 45 litre box	fortnightly	140/240 litre wheeled bins	free	no	n/a	Kier Services

⁹ Only includes those WCA/unitary authorities who took part in the review

Local Authority ⁹	Residual		Dry recyclable		Garden			Food	HWRC provision	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged			
Hampshire two tier authorities										
Hampshire County Council	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	24	Veolia
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	weekly	140 litre wheeled bin	fortnightly	mix	fortnightly	90 litre reusable sacks	£35	no	n/a	Serco
Hart District Council	AWC	140/240/360 litre wheeled bins	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins (some 140 litre, 360 litre)	fortnightly	140/240 litre wheeled bins	£47.24/ £70.96 (plus £31.49 bin charge)	no	n/a	Serco
Kent two tier authorities										
Kent County Council	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18	outsourced
Ashford Borough Council	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£37.50 per annum	weekly	n/a	Biffa

Local Authority ⁹	Residual		Dry recyclable		Garden			Food	HWRC provision	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged			
Oxfordshire two tier authorities										
Oxfordshire County Council	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7	outsourced
Oxford City Council	AWC		AWC		fortnightly		charged	weekly	n/a	LATCo
South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils	fortnightly	180 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	charged	weekly	n/a	Biffa
West Oxfordshire District Council	AWC		AWC		fortnightly		charged	weekly	n/a	Teckal – Ubico Ltd
Surrey two tier authorities										
Surrey County Council	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	15	Suez
Elmbridge Borough Council	AWC		AWC		fortnightly		£45 per annum	weekly	n/a	Amey
Guildford Borough Council	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£35 per annum	weekly	n/a	in-house
Mole Valley Council	AWC		AWC		fortnightly		£56 per annum	weekly	n/a	Amey

Local Authority ⁹	Residual		Dry recyclable		Garden			Food	HWRC provision	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged			
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	AWC	140 litre wheeled bins	AWC – mixed weekly – paper, card	140 litre wheeled bins 55 litre box	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£65 per annum	weekly	n/a	in-house
Spelthorne Borough Council	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£54 per annum (£25 one-off bin charge)	weekly	n/a	in-house
Surrey Heath Borough Council	AWC		AWC		fortnightly		£40 per annum	weekly	n/a	Amey
Woking Borough Council	AWC		AWC		fortnightly		£45 per annum	weekly	n/a	Amey
West Sussex two tier authorities										
West Sussex County Council	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		Viridor
Chichester District Council	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£51.50/ £59.50 per annum	no	n/a	in-house
Crawley Borough Council	weekly	140 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly		£57.50 per annum	no	n/a	Biffa

Local Authority ⁹	Residual		Dry recyclable		Garden			Food	HWRC provision	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged			
Unitary authorities										
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	140/240 litre wheeled bins	£46/£50 per annum (plus £35 one-off bin charge)	no	2 – in partnership with re3	outsourced
Portsmouth City Council	weekly	140 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£42 per annum	no	1	Biffa – collection Veolia – HWRC
Reading Borough Council	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins/ green bags	£50/£15	no	2 – in partnership with re3	in-house
Southampton	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins plus 40 litre box	fortnightly	sacks/ 140/240 litre wheeled bins	£47.50/ £42.50/ £45	no	1	in-house – collection Veolia – HWRC
West Berkshire Council	AWC	240 litre wheeled bins	AWC	2 x 55 litre box 1 x sack	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£50 per annum	with garden waste	2	Veolia
Wokingham	AWC	single use bags	weekly	50 litre box	fortnightly	240 litre wheeled bins	£60 per annum	no	2 – in partnership with re3	

APPENDIX 3: PERFORMANCE DATA 2017/18

Authority	Residual household waste per household (kg/household)	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting	Percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill	Collected household waste per person (kg)
Adur District Council	505.0	33.8%	–	337.7
Arun District Council	447.0	40.6%	–	350.5
Ashford Borough Council	327.2	56.6%	–	315.3
Aylesbury Vale District Council	343.5	54.1%	–	300.1
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	566.1	28.6%	–	332.9
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	597.7	39.2%	12.4%	398.3
Brighton and Hove Council	575.1	28.6%	5.3%	358.2
Buckinghamshire County Council	476.3	56.6%	3.7%	446.3
Canterbury City Council	470.5	43.5%	–	338.3
Cherwell District Council	424.3	55.6%	–	408.4
Chichester District Council	414.4	44.6%	–	352.5
Crawley Borough Council	516.6	28.4%	–	286.2
Dartford Borough Council	619.2	25.2%	–	340.5
Dover District Council	343.6	47.3%	–	292.8
East Hampshire District Council	468.2	34.2%	–	306.1
East Sussex County Council	576.3	42.8%	4.8%	448.1
Eastbourne Borough Council	465.1	38.9%	–	358.0
Eastleigh Borough Council	450.6	41.6%	–	322.8
Elmbridge Borough Council	434.4	52.9%	–	385.3
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council	467.5	49.9%	–	375.3
Fareham Borough Council	477.3	34.0%	–	306.1

Authority	Residual household waste per household (kg/household)	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting	Percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill	Collected household waste per person (kg)
Folkestone and Hythe District Council	400.2	45.3%	–	331.6
Gosport Borough Council	500.6	23.0%	–	280.7
Gravesham Borough Council	431.7	40.7%	–	293.0
Guildford Borough Council	368.6	58.4%	–	346.5
Hampshire County Council	601.0	41.7%	4.5%	434.3
Hart District Council	488.0	41.6%	–	338.9
Hastings Borough Council	495.3	29.6%	–	328.0
Havant Borough Council	504.4	30.7%	–	318.4
Horsham District Council	432.9	49.8%	–	372.0
Isle of Wight Council	418.4	53.4%	38.4%	449.8
Kent County Council	540.9	46.7%	1.1%	430.2
Lewes District Council	502.1	26.7%	–	299.5
Maidstone Borough Council	403.6	51.1%	–	340.7
Medway Borough Council	616.8	42.8%	9.5%	442.8
Mid Sussex District Council	441.1	41.8%	–	319.8
Milton Keynes Council	544.4	51.7%	13.1%	459.8
Mole Valley District Council	369.2	57.9%	–	380.1
New Forest District Council	472.4	34.1%	–	324.3
Oxford City Council	365.8	50.8%	–	291.1
Oxfordshire County Council	430.9	57.2%	4.7%	419.2
Portsmouth City Council	636.4	24.8%	4.8%	354.9
Reading Borough Council	598.8	30.7%	20.7%	372.6
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	396.8	53.9%	–	353.4

Authority	Residual household waste per household (kg/household)	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting	Percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill	Collected household waste per person (kg)
Rother District Council	400.2	50.2%	–	376.0
Runnymede Borough Council	423.1	43.5%	–	305.3
Rushmoor Borough Council	568.4	29.0%	–	330.1
Sevenoaks District Council	558.9	38.1%	–	374.8
Slough Borough Council	767.4	23.9%	3.0%	359.8
South Bucks District Council	394.6	51.9%	–	337.2
South Oxfordshire District Council	308.7	63.0%	–	354.1
Southampton City Council	600.6	29.5%	9.6%	355.8
Spelthorne Borough Council	427.1	46.4%	–	337.9
Surrey County Council	470.1	54.8%	4.1%	426.6
Surrey Heath Borough Council	318.5	61.4%	–	334.0
Swale Borough Council	490.3	41.2%	–	353.9
Tandridge District Council	362.7	58.4%	–	362.7
Test Valley Borough Council	503.9	36.0%	–	338.6
Thanet District Council	452.5	34.9%	–	328.9
Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	548.3	41.7%	–	387.3
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	471.2	48.4%	–	376.7
Vale of White Horse District Council	304.9	60.4%	–	321.0
Waverley Borough Council	366.5	54.9%	–	342.3
Wealden District Council	432.2	51.3%	–	382.5
West Berkshire District Council	557.5	51.5%	15.0%	483.8
West Oxfordshire District Council	358.1	59.6%	–	385.4
West Sussex County Council	507.1	51.3%	39.2%	457.0

Authority	Residual household waste per household (kg/household)	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting	Percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill	Collected household waste per person (kg)
Winchester City Council	469.5	36.1%	–	304.9
Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Council	572.3	44.8%	0.0%	439.7
Woking Borough Council	371.2	57.1%	–	361.2
Wokingham Council	671.4	38.9%	7.5%	435.4
Worthing Borough Council	503.3	35.8%	–	354.9
Wycombe District Council	403.9	52.1%	–	347.2

 Indicates those authorities who have taken part in the review

Regional household recycling rates	2017/18	Regional percentage of LA collected waste sent to landfill	2017/18	Regional residual household waste (kg/household)	2017/18
Yorkshire and the Humber	49.0	South West	7.0	South West	491
London	49.0	Eastern	7.3	Yorkshire and the Humber	520
North East	46.7	East Midlands	9.0	West Midlands	520
South West	44.7	West Midlands	9.0	London	537
North West	44.0	South East	9.7	North West	541
South East	42.4	London	11.7	Eastern	560
East Midlands	39.9	Yorkshire and the Humber	15.4	South East	569
Eastern	34.5	North West	18.9	East Midlands	593
West Midlands	33.1	North East	21.9	North East	601
England	43.2	England	12.4	England	544

Ref: data.gov.uk/dataset/local_authority_collected_waste_management_statistics/resource/e2f2cd8e-3ab7-42f3-bc8f-1ca9b48cd7a0



JOINTLY OWNED BY



Local Partnerships, 18 Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ
020 7187 7379 | LPenquiries@local.gov.uk | @LP_localgov | localpartnerships.org.uk