



# LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS



DELIVERING WASTE EFFICIENCIES  
IN THE EAST MIDLANDS

# CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	Context	3
1.2	East Midlands profile	4
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	9
2.3	Success through partnership working	11
3	DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES IN THE EAST MIDLANDS	14
4	LESSONS LEARNT AND ADVICE TO OTHER AUTHORITIES	22
5	SUMMARY	27
	APPENDIX 1: LOCAL AUTHORITY PROFILES	30
	APPENDIX 2: WASTE COLLECTION PROFILE OF THE AUTHORITIES IN THE REVIEW	56
	APPENDIX 3: PERFORMANCE DATA 2016/17	59

---

## **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 2018

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 seventh regional review<sup>1</sup> undertaken by Local Partnerships focusing on efficiencies achieved in waste management in the East Midlands. The previous six reviews were focused on:

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

These reviews have provided a wealth of information to decision makers and stakeholders and the current focus on the East Midlands continues the work of the previous reports in terms of building on the comprehensive knowledge being generated in this area. The report identifies the areas where more than £8 million pounds per annum in savings have been achieved. Evidence from the authorities demonstrates that delivering savings is becoming increasingly harder, as major efficiencies have been extracted by authorities over the last ten years; further savings are becoming more difficult to secure without having an adverse impact on services.

Throughout the region authorities have successfully delivered efficiencies in several areas; as with the previous reviews the examples show the diversity of opportunities explored by authorities to generate efficiencies, performance improvements and financial savings. It is intended that the examples provided throughout this report will enable other local authorities to benefit from these experiences; particularly in terms of examining their own services and seeing if the examples presented here could be applied to their authority and 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 learnt which can be shared 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 any final pieces of data and information.

A total of 19 authorities responded, giving a response rate of 42%, and included district and borough councils, and county councils, as can be seen in Table 1.

As with the previous review in the East of England and also the North West, there were a number of authorities in this region 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

---

<sup>1</sup> All the reviews can be found on the Local Partnerships website: [localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/waste](http://localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/waste)

service changes they were currently delivering or that they had no spare capacity in terms of staff time to pull together the information required. Again, 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 this was not possible.

The individual profiles for the authorities who took part can be found in Appendix 1, and 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 and therefore the information presented in this report is based on the information that the authorities kindly provided.

**Table 1: Authorities featured in the East Midlands efficiency review**

Waste collection authorities		Waste disposal authorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ashfield District Council</li> <li>• Bolsover District Council</li> <li>• Charnwood Borough Council</li> <li>• Chesterfield Borough Council</li> <li>• Erewash Borough Council</li> <li>• Harborough District Council</li> <li>• High Peak Borough Council</li> <li>• Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Melton Borough Council</li> <li>• Newark and Sherwood District Council</li> <li>• Northampton Borough Council</li> <li>• North East Derbyshire District Council</li> <li>• North West Leicestershire District Council</li> <li>• South Northamptonshire Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Derbyshire County Council</li> <li>• Leicestershire County Council</li> <li>• Lincolnshire County Council</li> <li>• Northamptonshire County Council<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Nottinghamshire County Council</li> </ul>

## 1.2 East Midlands profile

The East Midlands covers an area of 15,627 km<sup>2</sup> and has a population of 4.6 million. The region is a mix of urban and rural areas and population density is on average 287 people per km<sup>2</sup> however the range is significant. For example, in West Lindsay there are 77 people per km<sup>2</sup> compared to 4,182 people per km<sup>2</sup> in Leicester. The average population density is less than the English average of 401 people per km<sup>2</sup>, but just above the UK average of 257 (2010 data).

The Peak District National Park accounts for 6% of the region and the Lincolnshire Wolds is designated an area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). Other notable features include Charnwood Forest located north of Leicester, Sherwood Forest located in Nottinghamshire, and the region is part home to the New National Forest. Lincolnshire also has over 50 miles of coastline.

<sup>2</sup> Please note that in February 2018, following significant challenges with the budget, Northamptonshire County Council members agreed to accept a section 114 notice, effectively stopping all non-statutory spending and a significant overhaul of the county is expected and an external review has recommended the formation of two Unitary Authorities to replace the current two-tier set up. However, prior measures taken by the waste team to bring about efficiencies and savings, and lessons learnt by the authority have been submitted and included in this review.

Well served by major road and rail networks, the region is also home to East Midlands Airport, a large passenger and freight airport.

Within the region there are currently four Unitary Authorities, five County Councils and 36 District, Borough, and City Councils. There are examples of shared services in place across the region and there a number of waste partnership arrangements.

### 1.3 Waste management profile

#### Waste services

As with the previous reviews in the East of England, North West, North East and Yorkshire and the Humber alternate weekly collection dominates for residual waste, dry recyclables and garden waste. Two thirds of authorities who took part in the review, currently offer a garden waste collection free of charge; this is higher than national figures which showed 47% of authorities charged for organic collections in England in 2016/17<sup>3</sup>. In terms of food waste collection, over 50% of the authorities who responded do not offer a separate collection for food waste. A small percentage offer a mixed garden and food collection whilst only two authorities who took part provide a separate collection. This contrasts with the national picture where 38% offer separate food waste collection and only 13% collect food mixed with garden waste<sup>4</sup>.

In-house collection dominates in the responses received. For residual collections 240 litre wheeled bins are generally offered as standard, although there are some authorities who have reduced capacity through the issuing of 180 litre wheeled bins, plus one of the more urban densely populated authorities partially uses sack collections.

For dry recyclables, most of the authorities in the review use 240 litre wheeled bins as standard, although 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.

#### Performance

The East Midlands achieved a recycling rate of 45.9% in 2016/17, placing the region mid table compared to other regions, but higher than the national average of 43.7% for England. The percentage of waste to landfill has been reducing significantly over the last few years, and at 15% the region is slightly below the national average of 15.9% for England. The 'kg per household' has remained fairly constant over the last three years, currently at 565 kg per household, placing the region mid table compared to the other regions, and slightly higher than the national average of 557 kg per household for England.

On an individual authority level, according to the latest figures from Defra for 2016/17, virtually all the authorities who took part in this review are achieving recycling rates of over 40%. Three authorities have topped the 50% rate with a further six coming close and one authority, South Northamptonshire District Council, has achieved 61.40%. Only one authority who took part has yet to reach

<sup>3</sup> WRAP data – [laportal.wrap.org.uk/Statistics.aspx](http://laportal.wrap.org.uk/Statistics.aspx)

<sup>4</sup> WRAP 2016/17 data – [laportal.wrap.org.uk/Statistics.aspx](http://laportal.wrap.org.uk/Statistics.aspx)

40%; whilst they collect mixed dry recyclables they do not currently collect glass at the kerbside, nor do they collect food waste and garden waste collection is a charged for service.

In terms of changes over time, for just over half of those authorities who took part in the review recycling rates have continued to increase over the last three years; albeit in small increments in some cases. However, for six of the authorities recycling rates have plateaued and seen little or no change over the last three years; a trend that has been seen in many authorities across the UK. In addition, two of the higher achieving authorities have experienced a decrease in recycling rates over the last three years; it has proved difficult to sustain a high level of recycling. There are a range of different reasons that can impact on this, including reduced staffing and resources, service changes, charging for garden waste services, etc. An overriding concern for many is making significant financial savings from an already depleted budget for waste services.

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 a number of active local authority waste partnerships across the UK and has developed a number of case studies which illustrate the opportunities and benefits that can be realised through partnership working<sup>5</sup>.

Across the East Midlands there are several strategic waste partnerships in place, specifically two-tier arrangements between the County Councils and their constituent districts and boroughs, and also two-tier plus Unitary authority arrangements. However, the degree or extent of partnership working varies and for some is limited to strategic discussions and early stage identification of potential opportunities for close working.

For others the partnership is increasingly focused on exploring more advanced opportunities through standardisation and harmonisation of services and systems at the local authority level.

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.

---

<sup>5</sup> Refer to [localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/waste](http://localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/waste)

## 2 DRIVE FOR EFFICIENCIES

### 2.1 National picture

All authorities are required to continue to deliver good quality waste services, building on current levels of performance, whilst at the same time delivering significant financial savings. 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 reviews<sup>6</sup> of its members refuse services and asks the question 'What efficiencies are you currently working towards or proposing?'. The last four reports (2013, 2015, 2016 and 2017) identified the different areas where authorities have been, and continue to, focus on to generate efficiencies. These are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Areas where authorities are generating efficiencies – APSE member's surveys**

2013	2015	2016	2017
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route optimisation and rationalisation</li> <li>• Changing working days, shift patterns and staff reductions</li> <li>• Introduction of income streams (trade waste, green waste, replacement bins, developer contributions and maximising material re-sale)</li> <li>• Review of bring banks and HWRCs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route optimisation leading to reduction in crews and vehicles and the introduction of double-shifting</li> <li>• Increasing income from chargeable services</li> <li>• Closing or reducing operational hours of HWRCs</li> <li>• Renegotiation of contracts and reduced landfill disposal costs</li> <li>• Introducing fuel saving technologies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route optimisation/ double-shifting of vehicles</li> <li>• Increasing income generation opportunities – charging for green waste collections / wheeled bin replacement / commercial waste contacts</li> <li>• Reducing hours and reviewing provision of HWRCs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route optimisation/ double-shifting of vehicles</li> <li>• Increasing income generation opportunities – charging for bulky waste / green waste collections / wheeled bin replacements and increasing number of commercial waste collection contracts</li> <li>• Reviewing provision of HWRCs</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> 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](http://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](http://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)

2013	2015	2016	2017
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to collections (comingling, alternate weekly collections, types of containers, side waste policy and reduced frequency collections e.g. on green waste in the winter)</li> <li>• Review of transport, vehicle utilisation, extending the life of vehicles and in-cab technology)</li> <li>• Joint working, partnerships and joint procurement</li> <li>• Waste prevention and education to encourage participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Merging services with neighbouring authorities to reduce costs, brought about by shared service structures</li> <li>• Reductions in management structures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moving to alternative weekly collection of recyclables and three weekly collection of residual waste</li> <li>• Introducing new technologies – big-belly bins, in-cab CCTV</li> <li>• Reducing contamination levels and introducing no side waste collection policies</li> <li>• Reviewing staffing and fleet levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moving to alternate weekly collections for recyclables and three weekly collections for residual waste</li> <li>• Introducing new technologies – bin sensors, in-cab CCTV</li> <li>• Reducing contamination levels and introducing no side waste policy</li> <li>• Reviewing staff and vehicle levels</li> <li>• Cross boundary working</li> </ul>

The focus is clearly on identifying areas where, for example: services can be optimised and changed to generate savings through crews, vehicles, and time; resources can be shared or maximised; existing services can be used better; and, opportunities to generate income to offset service costs can be realised.

In 2014 the Chartered Institution of Wastes Management with Ricardo AEA undertook research<sup>7</sup> into local authority austerity measures and found similar results, with savings and efficiencies being realised through:

- ▶ Finding innovative ways to deal with capacity issues as a result of reducing staff numbers, such as shared posts, increase in automation of administrative processes, increase in use of technology, use of secondments to plug skills gaps
- ▶ Delivery of more targeted and focused communications and engagement, with budgets in this area being severely restricted, and consulting with the public on the cuts required so they are brought into the decision-making process
- ▶ Route optimisation and asset sweating in terms of vehicles and staff
- ▶ Service changes including changes to frequency of collection, reducing capacity of residual, implementing more efficient collection policies
- ▶ Charging for garden waste collections and bulky waste collections. In addition, outsourcing bulky waste to third sector providers

<sup>7</sup> CIWM & Ricardo-AEA, Waste on the Front Line – Challenges and Innovations, The impacts of austerity across local authority waste, recycling and street cleansing services, February 2015

- ▶ Reviewing HWRCs including number of facilities, optimising their use, daily and seasonal opening times, permitting requirement, contract conditions and incentives, reuse opportunities, and potential to implement charges for specific waste streams
- ▶ Reviewing and renegotiating contracts and contract conditions and managing risk effectively
- ▶ Maximising recycling and diverting from more costly treatment and disposal options
- ▶ Increased partnership working, including joint delivery of services, joint procurement, sharing resources and skilled personnel

The research found that the biggest savings delivered to date have resulted from major changes, such as re-letting contracts or making material changes to services, changing opening hours for household waste recycling centres (HWRCs) and charging for garden waste collections.

## 2.2 Regional comparisons

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

- ▶ Partnership working and joint service delivery
- ▶ Generating income from other services
- ▶ Rationalisation of HWRCs and bring sites
- ▶ Capacity changes for residual waste
- ▶ Introduction of charging for services
- ▶ In-house service delivery
- ▶ Contract management and renegotiation
- ▶ Changing collection systems and service reviews
- ▶ Changing treatment and disposal systems
- ▶ Addressing contamination
- ▶ Improvements in technology
- ▶ Staffing changes
- ▶ Joint procurement
- ▶ Design changes

As with the previous review in the East of England, there is clearly a lot of parity between the focus of efficiencies in the East Midlands and the findings of both the regular APSE surveys and the CIWM/Ricardo-AEA research.

As this is the seventh 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.

There is clearly a significant overlap between the regions with a number of constant areas identified across all reviews. However, it is also clear that as with the most recent reviews, the range of efficiency areas under consideration by authorities is broadening.

**Table 3: Overview of efficiencies across the seven regional reviews**

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

## 2.3 Success through partnership working

The opportunities presented to deliver efficiencies through joint working have been increasingly documented. The LGA report “Services Shared: Costs Spared?”<sup>8</sup> provides a detailed analysis of five high profile shared service arrangements; clear financial benefits have been achieved with the five shared services saving £30 million between them.

Lessons learnt from this LGA study include:

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

Partnership working is not without its challenges in terms of successfully bringing authorities together who may have different operational practices, budgets, political preferences and local geography and circumstances. There are a range of examples of partnership working across the East Midlands, several of which are referred to in Section 3 and in the individual authority profiles in Appendix 1. In addition, a more detailed case study on partnership working and the benefits that can be realised for the authorities through joint working practices can be seen below.

### **Partnership case study: Strategic Alliance between North East Derbyshire Council and Bolsover District Council**

#### **Context**

*North East Derbyshire Council and Bolsover District Council formed a Strategic Alliance in 2011, resulting in sharing of senior and middle management posts and delivering shared efficiency savings of approximately £750,000. This joint working extended to establishing joint Streetscene Services management and administrative arrangements, delivering further shared savings of approximately £200,000. To achieve this, services have been jointly reviewed across parks and grounds maintenance, waste collection and street cleansing, resulting in harmonised service delivery policies and performance management systems.*

<sup>8</sup> [www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/services-shared-costs-spa-61b.pdf](http://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/services-shared-costs-spa-61b.pdf)

The extent of the partnership working has been built up over time and a systematic approach has been taken to allow changes to be embedded.

#### **Joint working: Parks and Grounds Maintenance Service**

The Parks and Grounds Maintenance Service has improved efficiency and income generation by:

- ▶ Developing a joint policy to set standards of environmental maintenance arrangements, reviewing parish and town council agreements and rechargeable works, and reviewing maintenance arrangements undertaken on behalf of the Council's Social Housing Landlord
- ▶ Establishing joint working arrangements between the two Councils to negate need to buy-in services from external suppliers and reduce service delivery costs through economies of scale and sharing of resource
- ▶ Increasing income from external customers through marketing and advertising grounds maintenance and arboricultural services to increase income from external customers
- ▶ Bringing a grounds maintenance arrangement back in-house resulting in 20% cashable savings and improved service standards

#### **Joint working: Waste Collection Service**

The Waste Collection Service has improved income generation by:

- ▶ Establishing a Joint Waste Collection & Recycling Policy to set like standards of waste collection arrangements across the two Councils which share common boundaries
- ▶ Introducing charges for supply of waste bins for new build properties and bins requiring replacement at no fault of the Council
- ▶ Reviewing commercial waste collection rates to ensure full cost recovery of service delivery whilst remaining competitive with other external service providers and market the service to increase income
- ▶ Reviewing maintenance arrangements undertaken on behalf of the Council's Social Housing Landlord
- ▶ Establishing joint working arrangements between the two Councils to negate need to buy-in services from external suppliers and reduce service delivery costs through economies of scale and sharing of resource
- ▶ Delivering joint procurement of kerbside recycling collection service 'opt-in' facility for a third (neighbouring) local authority partner resulting in potential shared efficiency savings of approximately £100,000 to £350,000
- ▶ Establishing joint skip cleansing, bulky waste collection and clinical waste collection arrangements

#### **Joint working: Street Cleansing Service**

The Street Cleansing Service has improved income generation by:

- ▶ Establishing its Joint Streetscene Policy to set like standards of environmental maintenance and cleanliness standards across the two Councils which share common boundaries

- ▶ *Reviewing Parish and Town Council maintenance arrangements and rechargeable works undertaken on their behalf*
- ▶ *Reviewing maintenance arrangements undertaken on behalf of the Council's Social Housing Landlord*
- ▶ *Establishing joint working arrangements between the two Councils to negate need to buy-in services from external suppliers and reduce service delivery costs through economies of scale and sharing of resources*
- ▶ *Marketing and advertising of street cleansing services to increase income from external customers*
- ▶ *Reviewing street cleansing arrangement undertaken by third Sector Partner; further to which, the service was in-sourced resulting in 20% cashable savings and improved service standards for Bolsover District Council*

### **Concluding comments**

*From the onset, the Councils' Strategic Alliance received full support from leading Members which was considered to be essential in providing clear vision, direction and support to achieve the outcomes set out above.*

*The introduction of 'joint manager roles' greatly assisted the development of the process of joint working and played a significant role in mitigating risks of silo thinking and protectionism. In addition, close working relationships with trade unions were seen to be essential in objectively meeting needs of the Councils and staff within what can be a challenging local government landscape.*

*Finally, the harmonisation of service delivery policies and performance management systems was identified as essential in facilitating closer/joint working. Specifically, this rationalised customer relationship management systems and ensured seamless standards of service across the partnership.*

## 3 DELIVERING EFFICIENCIES IN THE EAST MIDLANDS

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

### **Partnership working and joint service delivery**

Alliance Environmental Services Ltd (AES) is a joint venture company owned by **High Peak Borough Council**, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council and ANSA Environmental Services Ltd. Formed in August 2017 AES took over service delivery of the High Peak waste and recycling collection service from Veolia (following a natural contract expiration). During 2018 it is anticipated that AES will also deliver the waste collection service at Staffordshire Moorlands, alongside the delivery of street cleansing and horticultural service functions for both Councils. The anticipated savings in year one is approximately **£100,000**, increasing to an annual saving of **£1.215 million** by year four.

Shared services with **South Northamptonshire** and Cherwell has allowed efficiencies in staff numbers and, importantly, provided much needed resilience for the future. The shared services have resulted in significant savings and efficiencies for the partners and is part of a longer-term partnership with Cherwell for other services. Most management, supervisor and officer posts are now shared between the two authorities and flexible working hours and locations have helped ensure resilience for the future. It is worth noting that although the service is jointly managed the collection services provided to the residents of each authority remains different. Keeping the collection services in house has produced extremely high satisfaction levels and are regarded as representing 'good value for money', with the authorities committed to retaining in-house services.

**Newark and Sherwood** are working in partnership with neighbouring authorities Rushcliffe Borough Council and Mansfield District Council, to deliver garden waste collection across their district; without this arrangement a garden waste collection service would not be viable. Newark and Sherwood found some capacity within current operations to utilise existing vehicles/staff initially then further expanded the area covered with an additional vehicle and additional staff. This service is now raising over **£100,000** per annum so is expected to become cost neutral in the near future.

### **Changing collection systems and implementing service reviews**

**North West Leicestershire** undertook route optimisation of all rounds resulting in **£150,000** savings through the reduction of one recycling round, and one loader on the rural round. Zonal collections were also introduced to help absorb additional housing growth with minimal round changes, making it easier to manage wintry weather events, and ensure any missed bin reports are dealt with in the same area the next day.

**High Peak** was involved in a review of the Healthcare Waste Policy across Derbyshire in 2014. This was undertaken by all partners of the Derbyshire Waste partnership and included a re-assessment of all referrals to each local authority to ensure that waste was being correctly categorised and facilitating a refresh

of potentially historic collection lists. This review identified many patients across the county that had been referred for a separate collection but who generated offensive waste (which does not require specialised treatment), rather than hazardous clinical waste. In High Peak tonnages of clinical waste reduced from 12.48 tonnes in 2014/15 to 5.51 tonnes in 2016/17 thus reducing disposal costs for the Waste Disposal Authority. In addition, the cost of providing clinical waste collections fell by approximately **£3,000** per annum for High Peak Borough Council.

In 2012, **Harborough** changed from the source separated recycling collection service to a co-mingled service with an insert for paper. The changes were designed to increase capacity to allow the authority to collect more material types such as juice cartons and plastics and also reduce costs on the service collections by changing the fleet from 'kerbsiders' to RCV's. This has allowed for a more unified approach and wider use of the fleet across the services.

**High Peak**, working with **Derbyshire County Council**, also introduced some service changes, on a trial basis, to encourage more residents to divert food waste for composting through their garden waste bins. 7,000 households were involved over an initial six-month period (this was extended a further six months to give a full year, so all seasonal variations could be accounted for) with some issued with compostable food bags (two per week) whilst others received an additional five litre plastic caddy to use in their kitchen. The intention is that through running the two systems side by side it will help better understand their financial cost compared to their impact on disposal savings made by Derbyshire County Council, from food waste being diverted out of the residual waste stream.

In September 2017 **Ashfield** changed their glass collection service from a 44 litre/55 litre blue box collected every four weeks to a 140 litre blue bin which is collected every eight weeks. This has led to operational efficiencies through the reduction of one crew which comprised one waste collector/relief driver and two waste collectors as well as a reduction on the vehicle fleet of one vehicle. This change in the service had an initial outlay of £750,000 for the purchase and distribution of the new 140 litre blue bins and is forecasted to realise a net annual saving of **£50,000**. Anticipated additional benefits are: an increase in glass capture due to a better receptacle; less manual handling issues; less crew rotation required; better service provided due to greater round knowledge; and, potential improvements in absence management.

In **South Northamptonshire**, changing from kerbside sort to co-mingled collections resulted in a 40% increase in the amount collected for recycling, in addition changing to a four-day collection week has resulted in financial savings for the authority.

From April 2017, **Charnwood** stopped providing a doorstep collection of textiles. This was done for several reasons, including; there were many other methods available for recycling clothes and textiles including charity shops, registered doorstep collectors and bring sites; the take up of the service wasn't high; misuse of the system resulted in increased contamination as textiles entered the recycling stream; and, the risk remained that unregistered collectors were taking the clothes on recycling collection day. By ceasing the service, the authority has saved approximately **£24,000** per annum.

**Erewash** provide a kerbside collection of recyclables with flexibility over the receptacle that the householder can use. Essentially residents may use any

number of green recycling bags provided free of charge by the authority or they can choose to purchase a blue wheeled bin, charged at £26.10 for a 140 litre bin or £28.15 for a 240 litre bin. Currently there are 26,879 blue bins in use that have been purchased by residents, representing over 52% of households. The blue bin provides a more convenient option for some residents and the fact that residents must purchase a blue bin has not affected customer satisfaction rates which remain, on average, around 90% for kerbside recycling services.

### Staffing changes

**Derbyshire County Council** undertook a service restructure in April 2017 resulting in a reduction from 14 FTEs to 10 FTEs. Savings were predominantly made in the waste development/communication team realising a total of **£123,000** reduction in staffing costs. Whilst the use of social media has made communicating with residents easier and much less resource intensive, it is worth noting that the staffing reductions has impacted to some degree on activities such as campaign work and external engagement, and the authority has to consider creative ways of resourcing events.

As part of an efficiency review carried out by **North West Leicestershire**, a review of overtime and working practices saving **£100,000** in salaries.

### Joint procurement

**Chesterfield** worked with **Erewash** in Derbyshire, to procure wheelie bins for the collection services. Erewash led the procurement and enabled sharing of resources in terms of the procurement process. Chesterfield eventually found a cheaper supplier elsewhere, but the unit price per bin that is being paid by Erewash worked out less than the framework agreement previously used.

### Introduction of charging for services

**Derbyshire County Council** introduced charges at HWRCs for construction and demolition waste in April 2017. However, a change in administrative control in May 2017 following the local elections led to the withdrawal of the charges. In the first month of operation there was a 64% drop in rubble tonnages compared to the previous month and a 67% drop compared to the same month in 2016. They were forecast to generate approximately £160,000 per annum in income. However, it is worth noting that the input through the HWRCs of construction and demolition waste has continued to be lower than it was before the charge was temporarily imposed.

**Hinckley and Bosworth** introduced a garden waste charge in April 2016. This is an opt out service and requires residents to sign up to direct debit payments. £768,000 in income was generated with 73% of previous users subscribing to service.

**Charnwood** introduced a subscription garden waste service in 2006 having not previously provided a free service. Subscribers were allocated a bin upon sign up, with the bin being collected back if the service was cancelled, or the subscriber failed to renew. In the time since the introduction of the service, there has been an increasing disparity between the number of subscribers and the number of bins in circulation because of problems retrieving bins from former customers. During 2017/18 the Council introduced a permit sticker system for subscribers. The stickers have resulted in a large increase in the number of subscribers and

a net increase in income of approximately £70,000 per annum. Therefore, one key feature of the service needs to be robust monitoring methods in place to ensure that the service recipients have paid to receive the service.

After a two-year free garden waste collection scheme from 2015–2017, which was subsidised by Nottinghamshire County Council, **Ashfield** will be reintroducing the subscription-based delivery model from the 2018 fiscal year onwards.

The aim of the two-year free scheme was to increase participation in the garden waste service with the two years acting as a trial period. Ashfield's pricing strategy has meant that for those paying by direct debit the service is one of the cheapest at £28; one off payments are priced at £34. Having forecasted the subscription levels based on the experience of Mansfield District Council who went through a similar scheme in 2010, it is anticipated that once the subscription based delivery model is re-introduced there will be a reduction of 18.5% – equivalent to around 7,084 tonnes in the weight of garden waste collected. This tonnage equates to 22,680 subscribers if a weight per subscriber of 0.31 tonnes is collected (as has been the case for the current garden waste service). It has been assumed that 10,000 of these subscribers will pay by direct debit at £28 and the remaining 12,680 will select the one-off payment at £34, therefore an annual income of £711,120 is anticipated. However due to the anticipated increase in subscriptions this means that there will also be an increase in operational costs to meet the increase in weight collected; this has been calculated as approximately £560,000, associated to four garden waste crews and vehicles, which will mean a net benefit of **£151,000** per annum. If the authority continued to achieve 7,000 tonnes of garden waste collected, then the recycling rate would likely be sustained at 38-40% (an increase of 6-8% compared to before the campaign).

Garden waste was also the focus for **Harborough** who introduced a charge for garden waste collections in 2016. This followed a consultation period which looked at the future delivery of waste, recycling, street cleaning and grounds maintenance services, and in particular the ways which costs could be reduced whilst continuing to provide a high level of services to residents. The service has just over 50% of households subscribed to it, and the charge is £40 for a seasonal based collection. In 2016/17 the service generated an income of £756,640 which increased to £817,760 in 2017/18.

**Hinckley and Bosworth** also introduced a trade waste service in 2011. £125,000 profit is forecast this year and the authority will be increasing capacity to collect this waste throughout 2018. The authority has found the service to be the most efficient where the trade waste is collected alongside household waste.

### **Changing treatment and disposal systems**

**Lincolnshire County Council** are expecting to achieve significant savings through diverting residual waste from landfill to their Energy from Waste; owned by Lincolnshire County Council and operated by FCC Environment; the facility is anticipated to save local taxpayers around £30 million compared to landfill, over its 25-year lifespan.

### **Capacity changes**

In 2014, **North West Leicestershire** reviewed its Refuse and Recycling Policy and as part of the review included a reduction in the size of the refuse waste wheeled bin from a standard 240 litre bin to a 180 litre wheeled bin for all replacement and new build properties.

**Charnwood** has also been gradually moving towards 180 litre bins from 240 litre bins, for all new properties and also replacement requests.

### **Addressing contamination**

**Hinckley and Bosworth** introduced Project Recycle Right in June 2014 following a claim from their contractor that contamination was increasing their costs. A partnership between Hinckley and Bosworth and the contractor to inform residents of what materials could/could not be recycled was agreed and Project Recycle Right was put in place. Contamination is now reported to be around 2-5%, which is much lower than previous figures.

### **Design changes**

**Chesterfield** is considering options in relation to its trade bins. These are currently painted green and maintaining the bins is an ongoing cost for the authority. Therefore, options to change to other styles of bins, such as galvanised containers, in order to reduce associated maintenance costs, are being reviewed.

### **Rationalisation of HWRCs and bring sites**

Service changes at HWRCs including reduced opening hours across all sites, and the closure of one site achieved savings of **£400,000** per annum for **Northamptonshire County Council**. This has made the operation of the sites more efficient in terms of the same amount of waste and visitors within shorter operational hours but has meant that the performance management of the contract is more challenging.

**Lincolnshire County Council** have achieved a reduction to both the number and the opening hours of HWRCs; two sites have closed (13 became 11), the hours per day shortened at all remaining sites, and the days per week reduced at all but the main Lincoln site. Savings are recognised to have been realised but the specific figures have proved difficult to quantify.

In January 2016 **High Peak** made the decision to remove their network of bring sites. The service had seen a significant fall in collected tonnages since the introduction of a comprehensive kerbside recycling service in 2012 and the sites all suffered from fly tipping and abuse. The impact of this decision was monitored for a period of 12 months, and it was found that there had been a reduction in fly tipping incidents, no loss of tonnage from recycling, an increase in commercial recycling customers as a result of the removal of bring sites, and savings were generated of approximately **£42,000** per year.

For **Harborough** a change in collection system led to a removal of bring sites for the materials the authority collected at the kerbside. The intention was to increase participation on dry recycling within the district and a **£29,000** saving was reported for removal of bring sites.

### **In-house service delivery**

In 2017/18, **Leicestershire County Council** took the operation of 13 HWRCs, one Waste Transfer Station and container haulage in-house at the end of the contract. This has delivered a saving of **£600,000** per annum and provided greater flexibility to undertake future changes. The decision followed an assessment of various options as part of a commissioning cycle which culminated in a recommendation to Cabinet in June 2016. To effect this change, the Authority worked with the outgoing provider to transfer 77 employees to the local authority

under TUPE regulations. A fleet of eight hook loaders was purchased and a new Health & Safety Management System was produced and rolled out to all transferring employees.

The original configuration of the service prior to insourcing created a favourable environment to make this change. The authority owned all 13 sites, had retained responsibility for the Environmental Permits and had ownership of the compaction equipment and majority of waste containers on each site. The authority continues to operate one site and a Waste Transfer Station under a contract with another provider, which allows for a level of resilience within the service.

For **North West Leicestershire**, following a waste services efficiency review, the decision was made to bring the Bring Bank collections back in-house. The aim was to reduce operational costs and maximise sales income.

### **Improvements in technology**

In 2016, **Harborough** worked closely with FCC to identify what technology was available to make the systems and processes more efficient, such as vehicle tracking and real time data regarding operational issues. A system called Whitespace was adopted, allowing FCC and the authority to track all of the collection fleet, viewing each collection round and recording any anomalies against individual properties. Each crew has an in-cab system for their specific round, which records in real time issues such as: a bin being too heavy; not presented; or, incorrect bin put out for collection. Any issues with access, delays to vehicle movement etc. are also recorded in real time. This equips the Customer Service Team and Waste Officers with data to respond to customer queries. The whitespace system has also been connected to the local authority website, allowing residents to view the crews feedback on line and visually see what bins were collected and what are due next collection. As part of channel shift this tool allows self-service for residents without the need to contact someone through the Call Centre or Waste Management Team.

In addition to this technological advance, 360° cameras have been fitted on the vehicles which can view any issues on the ground, and provide video evidence of bins incorrectly or not presented. This can help speed up the process on both sides for the Customer/Council/Contractor.

In terms of savings, the change has allowed the Call Centre and back office to operate more efficiently with less calls to the back office and more dealt with at first point of contact. It also allows the back office to monitor the contract and deal with higher level work as the Customer Services Team can respond to the day to day work.

**North West Leicestershire** undertook a detailed service review in 2011 and as a result have introduced a range of technological changes over five or six years. GPS tracking technology has been installed onto all waste collection vehicles to improve collection efficiencies. This was followed by the introduction of Whitespace waste management software and also in cab technology using iPads in domestic waste collection vehicles. This resulted in a number of efficiencies from eliminating the need for a multitude of excel spreadsheets, secure storage of round and customer information, real time reporting to provide live info to Customer Services and reduced missed bin rates by 25%. 360° cameras have been fitted to all waste collection vehicles and the footage is downloadable over WIFI, improving standards of service, reducing costs, and improving

safety. Management software has been introduced to trade waste collections which enables more detailed analysis including location of customers and route optimisation capability and has resulted in more reliable collections. In addition, a more flexible payment system including direct debit was introduced. Technology improvements were also introduced to material sorting capabilities, comprising conveyor belts, magnets and eddy current separators to maximise the value of plastic bottles, steel cans and aluminium cans. £110,000 of investment was paid back in 1.8 years.

**Newark and Sherwood** are moving to 'digital by default' systems to reduce the requirements for manual data entry via the customer service centre. For waste management and street cleansing this has resulted in the development of online booking and payment systems for the collection of excess and electrical goods waste. Customers can also report a variety of routine matters via the website and this information is passed straight to frontline supervisors who can then direct the job to the relevant personnel. The same system is now being further developed to manage the trade waste contracts. This includes integration with the authority payments and accounting software to facilitate the automation of direct debits and online payments. In addition, associated paperwork can be issued via electronic means rather than issuing paper documents.

#### **Contract management and negotiation**

For **Northamptonshire County Council**, contracts for the treatment and disposal of residual waste using merchant capacity in existing facilities have achieved savings estimated in excess of **£1 million** a year compared to what the authority would have spent if the status quo was maintained. Constant and robust contract management and renegotiation is reported to be achieving on-going savings of the order of an additional **£200,000** per annum.

**Northampton** has achieved similar success with its contract; it has proved to be very financially beneficial and any issues with quality have been outweighed by the level of savings generated as a result of the contract.

**Harborough** has been receiving waste management, street cleansing and ground maintenance services from FCC since 2009. In 2016 the authority agreed a seven year extension whilst renegotiating some aspects of the contract, including: reducing the number of vehicles collecting on the refuse and recycling service overall, using more 32 Tonne RCV's where practically possible; implementing a chargeable green waste collection service; removing the insert from the recycling bin, allowing paper to be mixed with the other dry recycling and use one compartment RCV's, therefore, removing the split body RCV's enabling increased flexibility of use across the services; and, reducing the frequency of street cleansing in areas which would not affect the overall standards, rural roads and main roads. In making these changes to the contract, savings of **£261,512** have been realised.

**Charnwood** negotiated a contract extension with its environmental services provider to follow on from the initial seven-year term. The fleet costs had been depreciated over the initial seven-year term of the contract allowing for a significant discount throughout the extension period. The savings equate to approximately **£500,000** per annum. The authority appreciates that the fleet costs will need to be built back into the budget once the extension period expires but recognise the value of depreciating RCV's over 10 years going forward thereby allowing for future savings.

**Melton** has operated an outsourced service through Verdant from April 2003; originally a seven plus seven contract that could extend to 2017, absorbed by 'Greenstar' in 2008, absorbed by current contractor Biffa in 2010. In 2012 the authority renegotiated the service and achieved a reduced core cost for the service by around **£400,000** by agreeing to change from kerbside sort to co-mingled recycling collections and agreeing an agency agreement with Biffa for them to operate and manage a subscription based green waste collection service. Then in 2017 an agreement was made to extend the contract with Biffa for a further 18 months, which resulted in a negotiated saving of **£180,000**. Melton is currently at the end of a competitive dialogue tender process with contract award made known to the preferred bidder but challenge from the runner up still to be resolved. The new Service on offer is little changed from the existing but savings of around **£300,000** are likely to be achieved. The only changes are the introduction of digital platform (Whitespace), expected with the commencement of the new service, removal of the bring site service, and batteries and textiles to be added back into kerbside collections.

### **Generating income from other Services**

In April 2017 **Ashfield** implemented a Trade Recycling service, which involved reorganising the way in which trade waste is currently collected in order to realise financial efficiencies. This involved changing weekly general waste collections to alternating collections of general and recycling, so that recycling could be fully incorporated into the service with no additional resources required. By replacing weekly general waste collections with alternating collections of general and recycling, the disposal costs which are paid to Nottinghamshire county council are halved. It is anticipated that by launching the service, the council will generate a bottom line increase of **£38,000** for 2017/18 and **£45,000** for 2018/19. To implement the service there was an initial outlay of £32,060 for 350 770 litre trade recycling bins as well as £600 for stickers to label the bins as Trade Recycling giving a total cost of £32,660. Customer feedback has showed that there was a significant interest in recycling.

In 2017, **North West Leicestershire** bid for and were successfully awarded the contract following waste disposal authority procurement for the treatment and disposal of dry recyclable material. The contract is for a period of seven years with an option to extend up to 10 years and is worth **£500,000** per year to the authority.

## 4 LESSONS LEARNT AND ADVICE TO OTHER AUTHORITIES

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

### **Contract/contractor relationships**

**Harborough** have found that building good working relationships with your contractor is vital; they report that they have worked hard to achieve this, understanding both parties' issues and how they can maximise what is in the contract to mutually benefit all concerned. Having this good working relationship has allowed Harborough and the contractor to identify and carry out additional works for other parties, for example, maintaining school grounds, football pitches, Parish Council work etc. The authority benefits as they can keep staff employed on the contract increasing the resources available to the authority. In addition, the contractor receives additional works where they can utilise their staff and both parties receive income from this. It also uses equipment that may stand idle if not on scheduled works.

Relationships also matter internally within an authority. **Nottinghamshire County Council** identified that it is important to ensure all essential parties within an authority are on board from the very beginning of a Contract variation process (e.g. Legal, finance, technical, senior management, Members). This will ensure that timescales and resources are minimised.

**Northamptonshire County Council** advise that care should be taken when making efficiency savings via contract renegotiation. To avoid any breakdown of relationship with the contractor, it is important to be very clear how performance will be managed and against what targets, following the changes.

For **Melton**, experience has shown through negotiations at various stages that Contractors are open to and can find cost reductions in order to retain or extend contracts. Waste contractors have to absorb or consider changes and increasing costs associated with legislation, regulation, wages, fuel and vehicles frequently within the term of a contract, however reduced costs to clients does appear to be achievable. Ensuring that the authority works collaboratively with contractors in negotiating variations and efficiency savings, is good value; however, over reliance or extensive use of consultants to secure the changes could impact on any immediate savings.

### **Partnership working**

**South Northamptonshire** believe that sharing services with other councils results in savings and makes the authorities more resilient for the future. They also found that maintaining services in house allows for better service adaptability (which is a positive aspect when developing partnership arrangements) and customer satisfaction.

For **High Peak**, they recognise that partnership working should be considered at all levels including internal service areas within authorities i.e. waste and street cleansing, working with neighbouring or like-minded authorities or other organisations and across two tier areas i.e. WCA's and WDA's. This will help to generate the biggest efficiencies be they operational or financial.

**Northamptonshire County Council** recognise that partnership working to secure efficiencies is not without its challenges and securing agreement on what is to be delivered can be a significant issue; it can be time consuming and resource intensive and can put relationships under pressure. Therefore, a lesson learnt is to identify as early as possible if savings are realistic and achievable and if they are not, then focus efforts on what is within control and is achievable.

**South Northampton** have found that there are challenges in providing a joint service when the collection systems are not the same. They consider that partnerships within the same county/disposal authority and those with the same collection system are likely to be the most efficient.

When procuring with others **Erewash** have found that there must be commitment from all parties and to recognise that joint procurement takes longer to complete. From Erewash's point of view a single supplier model has proved to be more economically advantageous than a framework agreement.

#### **Clear communication and engagement**

**Derbyshire County Council** found that the public can respond very positively and reasonably to service changes if communicated with openly, effectively and with sufficient notice. They found that there was very little negative reaction to the implementation of rubble charges when introduced by the authority. Public consultation on the proposals was undertaken, a healthy response was received, and it's considered this was an effective method of raising initial awareness and understanding of the issues.

**Derbyshire County Council** also recognise the importance of explaining the unintended consequences of service changes not being implemented e.g. if charges for non-household waste are not implemented in a worst-case scenario a HWRC site could be closed. They consider that many householders would rather pay a small charge for certain waste streams that are generated infrequently rather than a site closing completely.

**High Peak** also agree that communication is critical; get the right messages across as to why changes are needed and success will follow, however get the message wrong and the aspirations or outcomes will be severely affected.

#### **Transition**

**Leicestershire County Council** found there were a few key pointers which helped with the smooth transitioning back to an in-house service. These included:

- ▶ Having a full-time project manager, supported by a project board: this provided an additional resource and ensured that issues were highlighted and managed in an appropriate and timely way. It also helped navigate some of the Authorities' own systems and processes which were not necessarily geared to easily allow the bulk transfer of nearly 80 staff, so bespoke approaches had to be agreed for several aspects
- ▶ Staff engagement and communication: this was considered invaluable, particularly in helping to reassure staff

- ▶ The TUPE list is not finalised until 28 days before transfer, and there were some on-going issues around the accuracy of information
- ▶ Ensure there are interim arrangements in place for mobile plant, bulk haulage and sale of materials: operationally the transfer was very successful, the work did not stop on the transfer date. The authority needed to allow a further 12 to 18 months to resolve legacy issues and ensure that the back-office systems are robust
- ▶ Build in plenty of time to allow for ordering new vehicles: a few last-minute delays can unnecessarily increase anxiety levels
- ▶ Records for equipment and plant were not always easy to come by which resulted in the authority needing to replace some equipment or do more maintenance than expected
- ▶ Records for equipment and plant were not always easy to come by which resulted in the authority needing to replace some equipment or do more maintenance than expected
- ▶ Preparation of staff: as a means to prepare staff for the transfer a closure day at each site was planned for staff induction and training
- ▶ Independent verification of the business case and assumptions: this was valuable in ensuring savings were kept on track throughout the process

The authority worked to a key principle of no noticeable adverse change to service users in terms of the type and quality of service provided. To test this at the end of the process of implementation, over 3,500 customers were surveyed on-site by an external organisation, with satisfaction levels remaining extremely high at 99% overall. Whilst the service has continued to operate to a high standard, the Authority continues to make improvements to internal processes in order to fully integrate the service into the existing organisation. There may still be further savings to be found from modifying the service and looking for synergies and efficiencies going forward.

### Implementing technology and IT changes

**North West Leicestershire** have found that IT projects take longer than anyone seems to expect and require extra resources at least up to the implementation. Therefore, additional resource needs to be built into the process. In addition, someone has to operate the systems going forward; one suggested solution is to hire a waste apprentice with a proclivity towards computer systems.

With regard to what is considered to be a 'must have' technology, **North West Leicestershire** consider that on-board camera technology is one of the best ways to get to the bottom of almost all customer service, conduct, safety, and insurance issues and is therefore a crucial part of any IT requirements.

Finally, **North West Leicestershire** also noted that in terms of route optimisation, using the software really does work, but it needs a lot of resource to create the model and requires the buy in of frontline staff and Supervisors.

**Harborough** has found that through investing in technology and implementing a channel shift has enabled staff to carry out more functions rather than dealing with simple daily tasks. The authority has been able to work on other projects and increase operational management of the contracts in place as a result of receiving less telephone calls and e-mails.

For **Melton**, their experience is that digitisation is being introduced as a matter of course by contractors so they remain competitive, and can better remotely manage the services they provide. Contractors appear to recognise the value of

technology in not only driving efficiencies, but also to fully record and be assured of adequate compliance with ever increasing health and safety requirements.

### **Impact of charging on round organisation**

For **Ashfield** it's still early days in terms of the implementation of the chargeable garden waste service; it will not be fully implemented until spring 2018.

However, one issue that has been identified is that under the free garden waste service the authority has been running five garden waste crews which mirrors the residual collections meaning that residents have a consistent collection.

With the chargeable service there will be four crews due to the anticipated fall in subscriptions which means that the fifth round will be lost and will have to be divided up into the remaining four rounds. Ashfield have acknowledged that care needs to be taken to ensure that rounds do not become fragmented and less efficient in terms of time and fuel used.

### **Accurate information and data**

The main lesson **Newark and Sherwood** have learnt is to ensure that existing records are as accurate and up-to date as possible. They recommend that authorities run as many error and integrity checks as possible before transporting legacy data into new systems.

### **Export markets and currency challenges**

A key piece of advice from **Nottinghamshire County Council** is to always be aware of who takes the currency risk in the RDF/SRF export markets when negotiating contracts. This will help to build in financial resilience and allow for any risk to be factored in to service costs etc.

### **Role of Members**

For **High Peak**, a key lesson it to never underestimate the value of remembering to keep elected members involved at key stages, their support is invaluable.

### **Implementing behaviour change**

For **Hinckley and Bosworth** action at kerbside is considered to be the most effective way to change people's recycling behaviour. For example, rejecting bins that contain incorrect materials.

### **Unintended consequences of a service change**

When **Ashfield** introduced a trade recycling scheme the whole trade collection service changed to alternate week collection to accommodate the addition of recycling. This has had a big impact on the food trade waste customers as a lot of these customers wanted to maintain a weekly collection due to the amount of waste that the nature of their business produces. This has resulted in the loss of some of the food establishments that wanted to maintain a weekly collection, some of which were high value contracts. In addition, for some customers, on occasion the bins have been too heavy for the lift mechanism and a consequence these customers have been reverted to a weekly collection. This has had a knock-on effect as an additional vehicle is required during one of the weeks and this is only available Tuesday–Thursday meaning that some of these customers will have inconsistent weekly collections.

Introducing a trade waste recycling has also introduced a new issue that Ashfield now has to manage, and that is contamination of recycling bins. Clearly contamination was never an issue when a residual service was the only trade service previously offered, but now management systems are having to be built into the service and action plans to deal with customers who present contaminated recycling bins is required.

### **Being open with others**

**Harborough** has found that sharing experiences with other Local Authorities is crucial in saving time and money. The “lessons learnt” from others avoids making similar mistakes and encourages good practice. Harborough has been proactive in sharing its experiences of a wide range of issues including: alternate weekly collections; food waste; co-mingled collections and service changes; introduction of a chargeable garden waste service; round configurations; and, joint campaigns.

### **Health & Safety benefits of service changes**

For **Ashfield**, with regards to the glass bin change it is a bit early to consider any lessons learnt as at the time of reporting it has only been a few weeks since the new collections have started. However, general feedback from residents has been positive and importantly the scheme has reduced the need for manual handling with the introduction of new bin receptacles. This means that there is no longer the need for the rotation of employees due to health and safety; regular employees can be retained on rounds, enabling them to get to know their collection areas in more detail, and generally increasing efficiency through knowledge.

## 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 3: Summary of overall savings identified in the East Midlands**

Area of saving	Local authority	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)
Partnership working and joint service delivery	High Peak	£100,000, increasing to £1.215 million by year four
	South Northamptonshire	unknown
	Newark and Sherwood	£100,000 per annum
Changing collection systems and implementing service reviews	North West Leicestershire	£150,000
	High Peak	£3,000 per annum
	Harborough	unknown
	Ashfield	£50,000
	South Northamptonshire	unknown
	Charnwood	£24,000
	Erewash	unknown
Staffing changes	Derbyshire County Council	£123,000
	North West Leicestershire	£100,000
Joint procurement	Chesterfield	unknown
	Erewash	unknown

Area of saving	Local authority	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)
Introduction of charging for services	Derbyshire County Council	<i>(was forecast to generate approximately £160,000 per annum)</i>
	Hinckley and Bosworth	<i>£768,000 income (savings not identified)</i>
	Charnwood	<i>unknown</i>
	Ashfield	<i>net benefit of £151,000 per annum</i>
	Hinckley and Bosworth	<i>£125,000 profit</i>
	Northamptonshire County Council	<i>£100,000 per year</i>
	Harborough	<i>£817,760 income (savings not identified)</i>
Changing treatment and disposal systems	Lincolnshire County Council	<i>£30 million over contract life</i>
Capacity changes	North West Leicestershire	<i>unknown</i>
	Charnwood	<i>unknown</i>
Addressing contamination	Hinckley and Bosworth	<i>unknown</i>
Changing design to reduce maintenance costs	Chesterfield	<i>unknown</i>
Rationalisation of HWRCs and Bring Sites	Northamptonshire County Council	<i>£400,000 per annum</i>
	Lincolnshire County Council	<i>unknown</i>
	High Peak	<i>£42,000 per annum</i>
	Harborough	<i>£29,000</i>
Bringing services back in-house	Leicestershire County Council	<i>£600,000 per annum</i>
	North West Leicestershire	<i>unknown</i>

Area of saving	Local authority	Value of saving or avoided cost (if identified)
Improvements in technology	Harborough	<i>unknown</i>
	North West Leicestershire	<i>unknown</i>
	Newark and Sherwood	<i>unknown</i>
Contract Management and Negotiation	Northamptonshire County Council	in excess of £1 million a year £200,000 per annum
	Northampton	<i>unknown</i>
	Harborough	£261,512
	Charnwood	£500,000
	Melton	£400,000 £180,000 £300,000
Generating income from other Services	Ashfield	£45,000
	North West Leicestershire	£500,000

The estimated savings and avoided costs given in the examples provided by the authorities who took part in this review for the East Midlands, are in excess of **£8 million per annum**. It should be noted that several authorities have not been in a position to quantify the individual savings, so this figure is a very conservative estimate. However, this is a significant sum and reflects the good practice that is being delivered across the participating authorities in the East Midlands.

This is the seventh of Local Partnership's regional studies. Previous reports covering authorities in the 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 website<sup>9</sup>. 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.

<sup>9</sup> [localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/waste](http://localpartnerships.org.uk/our-expertise/waste)

## APPENDIX 1: LOCAL AUTHORITY PROFILES

### Ashfield District Council

#### Background

Ashfield District Council collect residual and dry recyclables in-house on an alternate weekly basis. Glass is collected every eight weeks. Garden waste is currently a free service but will be chargeable from April 2018, collected alternate weekly. Recycling containers are 240 litre wheeled bins. 180 litre wheeled bins are standard for residual waste with a sliding scale in place to provide additional capacity for larger families or those with health issues generating additional waste. A bulky collection service is provided and charged at: first item – £12.50/£17.50 (fridge/freezer), subsequent items – £6.50 each. Trade residual and recycling collection service is available.

#### Current status

- ▶ From 25th September the glass collection service changed from a 44 litre/55 litre blue box collected every four weeks to a 140 litre blue bin collected every eight weeks, leading to operational efficiencies through the reduction of one crew and vehicle (one waste collector/relief driver and two waste collectors). This change in service had an initial outlay of £750,000 for the purchase and distribution of the 140 litre blue bins and is forecasted to realise a net annual saving of £50,000 plus an increase in glass capture, less manual handling issues, less crew rotation required, and potential improvements in absence management
- ▶ Following the roll out of a two-year free garden waste collection scheme from 2015–2017, subsidised by Nottinghamshire County Council, which aimed to increase participation in the garden waste service as well as increasing income coming into the service area, a subscription-based delivery model will be reintroduced from April 2018 onwards. Subscribers paying by direct debit have the cheapest garden waste service in the county at £28 whilst one off payments are priced at £34. Having forecasted subscription levels based on the experience of Mansfield District Council, it is anticipated there will be a reduction of 18.5% to 7,084 tonnes in the weight collected, equating to 22,680 subscribers (based on a weight per subscriber of 0.31 tonnes). Assuming 10,000 of these subscribers pay direct debit and the remaining through one off payment, this equates to an annual income of £711,120 minus operational costs of approximately £560,000, producing a benefit of £151,000, with a sustained recycling rate of 38-40%
- ▶ In April 2017 a Trade Recycling service was implemented, which involved reorganising the service in order to realise financial efficiencies and ensure recycling could be fully incorporated with no additional resources required. By replacing weekly general waste collections with alternating collections of general and recycling, the disposal costs paid to Nottinghamshire County Council are halved. It is anticipated that the council will generate a bottom line increase of £38,000 for 2017/18 and £45,000 for 2018/19. To implement the service there was an initial outlay of £32,060 for 350 770 litre trade recycling bins plus £600 for stickers to label the bins giving a total cost of £32,660

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ With the glass bin change, whilst the changes have only recently been implemented, general feedback from residents has been positive and the scheme has reduced the need for manual handling meaning there is no longer the need for the rotation of employees due to health and safety, leaving regular employees on rounds, increasing efficiency through knowledge
- ▶ With the Garden Waste charge, whilst it will not be fully implemented until spring 2018, it will mean the service will be going down to four crews rather than five. Care must be taken to ensure that when the fifth round which will effectively be lost and divided up into the remaining four rounds, the rounds then become fragmented and less efficient in terms of time and fuel used
- ▶ The introduction of a trade recycling scheme and changing the whole service to AWC has lost some customers who wanted to retain a weekly collection. In addition, for some, a weekly service has had to be retained as the weight of the bins on a fortnightly basis are too heavy to lift, but due to accessibility of vehicles they may have an inconsistent collection day. Another issue that has arisen from changing the service is the need for an action plan to deal with these customers who present contaminated bins



## Bolsover District Council

### Background

Bolsover District Council provides an alternate weekly collection to all households, the provided service is as follows: 240 litre bin for general waste; 240 litre bin for garden and food waste; 240 litre bin for comingled recyclables (paper, card, glass, cans, plastics); Reusable hessian bag for paper. A charge for bulky waste collection is available as is a commercial waste collection services.

### Current status

- ▶ Bolsover District Council and North East Derbyshire Council formed a Strategic Alliance in 2011, resulting in sharing of senior and middle management posts, delivering shared efficiency savings of £750,000 (approximately). This also extended to establishing joint Streetscene Services management and administrative arrangements delivering further shared savings of £200,000 (approximately). Services have been jointly reviewed, resulting in harmonised service delivery policies and performance management systems; throughout which, both Councils Members gave full support
- ▶ Specifically, this has enabled the Councils' Parks and Grounds Maintenance Service to improve efficiency and income generation between 2010/11 and 2015/16 by nearly 700% for Bolsover and 10% for North East Derbyshire, the Councils' Waste Collection Service to improve income generation between 2010/11 and 2015/16 by 20% for Bolsover and 60% for North East Derbyshire, and the Councils' Street Cleansing Service to improve income generation between 2010/11 and 2015/16 by 500% for Bolsover and a 10 times increase for North East Derbyshire

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ From the onset, the Councils' Strategic Alliance received full support from leading Members which was essential in providing clear vision, direction and support in achieve outcomes set out above
- ▶ Introduction of 'joint manager roles' greatly assisted in developing the process of joint working and mitigating risks of silo thinking and protectionism. Close working relationships with trade unions were essential in objectively meeting needs of the Councils and staff within the challenging local government landscape
- ▶ To facilitate closer/joint working, it is 'essential' that service delivery policies and performance management (i.e. productivity/work measurement) systems are harmonised to rationalise customer relationship management systems and engender seamless standards of service across partner LA areas

## Charnwood Borough Council

### Background

Charnwood Borough provides an alternate weekly collection to all households, the provided service is as follows: 240 litre bin for general waste; 240 litre bin for garden waste; 240 litre bin for comingled dry recyclables. There is currently no food waste collection and the garden waste collection is a charged for service priced at £28 per year if paid by annual direct debit or £37 per year if paid by any other method. In addition, there is a separate battery collection operated in cooperation with VALPAK. Residents are entitled to three free bulky waste collections each year, with nine items accepted over the three collections. After that charges apply. The collection service is outsourced to Serco Integrated Services and the contract runs until 2020. The authority intends to start a commercial waste collection service during 2018/19.

### Current status

- ▶ Charnwood Borough Council negotiated a contract extension with its environmental services provider to follow on from the initial seven year term. The fleet costs had been depreciated over the initial seven year term of the contract allowing for a significant discount throughout the extension period. The savings equate to approximately £500 thousand per annum. The Council appreciates that the fleet costs will need to be built back into the budget once the extension period expires
- ▶ Charnwood introduced a subscription garden waste service in 2006 having not previously provided a free service. Subscribers were allocated a bin upon sign up, with the bin being collected back if the service was cancelled, or the subscriber failed to renew. In the time since the introduction of the service, there had been an increasing disparity between the number of subscribers and the number of bins in circulation as a result of problems retrieving bins from former customers. During 2017/18 the Council introduced a permit sticker system for subscribers. The stickers have resulted in a large increase in the number of subscribers and a net increase in income of approximately £70,000 per annum
- ▶ From April 2017, the Council stopped providing a doorstep collection of textiles. This was done for a number of reasons, including:
  - There were many other methods of recycling clothes and textiles including charity shops, registered doorstep collectors and bring sites
  - The take up of the service wasn't high
  - Misuse of the system resulted in increased contamination as textiles entered the recycling stream
  - The risk that unregistered collectors were taking the clothes on recycling collection day

By ceasing the service, the Council saved approximately £24,000 per annum

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ From the negotiated contract extension with the provider it has left the authority with a clear understanding that it is possible to depreciate RCV's over 10 years going forward thereby allowing for future savings
- ▶ It is essential that subscription services, whatever they maybe for, need to have robust monitoring methods in place to ensure that the service recipients have paid of the service

## Chesterfield Borough Council

### Background

Chesterfield provides an alternate weekly collection to all households, the provided service is as follows: 240 litre bin for general waste; 240 litre bin for mixed garden and food waste; 240 litre bin for comingled recyclables (paper, card, glass, cans, plastics) with an internal caddy for glass. The collection services are provided by Veolia, with a contract end date of November 2018. There are no bring sites. A chargeable commercial waste collection service is provided. A bulky waste collection service is available with varying charges as follows: one item: £15.00, two to five items: £22.90, six to ten items: £30.30, fridges and freezers: £15.00 per unit.

### Current status

- ▶ Trade service: current containers provided for trade waste collection have to be regularly maintained and painted. The authority is currently considering a change in collection containers to minimise maintenance costs; options include a move to galvanised containers
- ▶ Chesterfield worked with Erewash in Derbyshire, to procure wheelie bins for the collection services. Erewash led the procurement and enabled sharing of resources in terms of the procurement process. Chesterfield eventually found a cheaper supplier elsewhere

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ The joint procurement process that was embarked upon, whilst it did not result in a joint procurement by the two authorities, was a useful exercise for Chesterfield and has left them option to considering future joint activities

## Derbyshire County Council

### Background

Derbyshire County Council is a Waste Disposal Authority and, in conjunction with Derby City Council, procures the majority of waste disposal services under contract with Recovery Resources Solutions (Derbyshire) Ltd (RRS), a joint venture between Renewi (formerly Shanks) and Interserve. This contract has an annual value of £34 million. There are nine HWRCs managed under contract (with a requirement to achieve and maintain a recycling/composting rate of 60%), and treatment and disposal is through a new MBT and gasification facility. In addition to the contract with RRS, the Council has a waste management contract with SUEZ Recycling and Recovery UK Ltd for the operation of an integrated HWRC, two in-vessel composters and a waste transfer station, providing organic waste services to four of the eight WCAs. Contracts are also in place with other suppliers for the composting of garden only waste from two WCAs and a separate (zero cost) contract for the recycling and treatment of waste electrical goods. Two of the WCAs make separate arrangements for the composting of their garden and food waste for which the WDA pay recycling credits. The authority leads on a number of campaigns, such as Love Food Hate Waste, home composting and real nappies and is a member of the Derbyshire Waste Partnership.

### Current status

- ▶ Service restructure in April 2017: reduced the Service from 14 FTEs to 10 FTEs. Savings in staffing costs of £123,000 were predominantly made in the waste development/communication team
- ▶ Charges at HWRCs: charges for construction and demolition waste were introduced at Household Waste Recycling Centres in April 2017. A subsequent change in administrative control in May 2017 following the local elections led to the charges being withdrawn. They were forecast to generate approximately £160,000 per annum in income. In the first month of operation there was a 64% drop in rubble tonnages compared to the previous month and a 67% drop compared to the same month in 2016
- ▶ Food waste trial: a small scale (7,000 households) trial (initially six months and extended to 12) in High Peak to issue compostable food bags to households across the Borough to encourage more residents to divert food waste for composting through their garden waste bins, leading to an increase in composting and result in a net saving to the county council on its disposal costs. Until recently residents have been required to put food directly into their green bins but this has had limited success. Some residents in the trial have received compostable food bags whilst others have received an additional caddy. If net waste disposal savings result from the trial the potential savings from the wider roll out of the scheme will be considered

## Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ The public can respond very positively and reasonably to service changes if communicated with openly, effectively and with sufficient advance notice. There was very little negative reaction to the implementation of rubble charges. Public consultation on the proposals was undertaken, a healthy response was received, and it's considered this was an effective method of raising initial awareness and understanding of the issues
- ▶ The importance of explaining the unintended consequences of service changes not being implemented e.g. if charges for non-household waste are not implemented in a worst-case scenario a HWRC site could be closed. It's suggested that many householders would rather pay a small charge for certain waste streams that are generated fairly infrequently rather than a site closing completely



## Erewash Borough Council

### Background

Collection services are currently carried out in-house on an alternate weekly basis for residual and dry recyclables, and a seasonally restricted alternate weekly collection service is provided for garden waste, free of charge. The dry recyclables are collected comingled and residents can present their recycling in any number of green recycling bags provided free of charge by the Council or they can choose to purchase a blue wheeled bin, charged at £26.10 for a 140 litre bin or £28.15 for a 240 litre bin. Currently there are 26,879 blue bins in use that have been purchased by residents, representing over 52% of households. There is currently no food waste collection service. There are weekly bulky, clinical and trade collections available on request; charges apply for bulky and trade. Assisted collections are provided. In terms of working with others, Erewash is a member of the Derbyshire Waste Partnership and has recently been involved in a joint procurement exercise with Chesterfield Borough Council.

### Current status

- ▶ Erewash was engaged in a joint procurement exercise with Chesterfield Borough Council. This was for the procurement of wheeled bins. Erewash was the lead authority. After the contract award has been made Chesterfield withdrew having found a cheaper supplier elsewhere, however the exercise was positive in that the unit price per bin being paid by Erewash is less than the framework agreement previously used
- ▶ With the recycling service residents are able to make a choice over the container they use; the free bags provided by the authority or if they prefer they can purchase a blue 140 litre or 240 litre wheeled bin. The intention is to make participation as easy and convenient as possible. Just over half of residents have chosen to purchase a bin and sales of blue bins have remained constant year on year; although sales last year were down on previous years. There doesn't appear to be any variation in tonnages collected, it appears to be a purely personal choice based on the most convenient method of storage
- ▶ Around 2,900 customers receive an assisted collection each week which is mainly provided for residual waste and recycling (alternate weeks). This equates to around 150,000 collections or bin lifts per annum. The customer database of assisted collections is reviewed and updated on a weekly basis – this is to ensure that the residents receiving this support remains valid

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ When undertaking joint procurement, must be commitment from all parties. The process can take longer to complete than standard procurement routes so that level of commitment must be maintained. From Erewash's point of view, in this case a single supplier model has proved to be more economically advantageous than a framework agreement
- ▶ Offering the purchase option of blue bins for recycling collections has been successful and does provide a more convenient option for some residents. The fact that residents have to purchase a blue bin has not affected customer satisfaction rates which remain, on average, around 90% for kerbside recycling services
- ▶ Assisted collections are an essential part of the waste collection service provided by Erewash; maintaining an up to date inventory of eligible residents is crucial

## Harborough District Council

### Background

Harborough District council provides an alternate weekly collection to all households, as follows: 180 litre bin for general waste; 240 litre bin for garden waste; 240 litre bin for comingled recyclables. The garden collection is a charged for seasonal service, at £40 for nine months; over 50% of properties have signed up for the service. Bulky waste collections are charged at £33 per three items or 12 sacks. The collection service has been outsourced to FCC Environmental Ltd since 2009; the contract was extended in 2016 for a further seven years. A successful commercial waste operation is in place with approximately 1200 customers and a turnover of £711,000 per year. Members of the Leicestershire Waste Partnership, Harborough is looking at partnership options for commercial waste and enforcement of waste with other authorities.

### Current status

- ▶ Contract extension with FCC: when the contract was extended some changes were made to the services, including: reducing the number of vehicles collecting on the refuse and recycling service overall, using more 32 Tonne RCV's where practically possible; implementing a chargeable green waste collection service; removing the insert from the recycling bin, therefore removing the need for split body RCV's; reducing the frequency of street cleansing in areas where we could without affecting the overall standards, rural roads and main roads. Savings realised were £261,512
- ▶ Service changes: in 2012, a change was made from source separated recycling collection to a co-mingled to increase participation and recycling. The changes were designed to allow the Council to collect more material types, reduce costs on the service collections, change the fleet from 'kerbsiders' to RCV's to allow a more unified approach and wider use of the fleet across the services; and removal of bring sites for the materials collected, generating £29,000 savings. In addition, in 2016 a change was made to the garden waste collection service in that a charge was imposed and in 2016/17 £756,640 in come was generate income and in 2017/18 this increased to £817,760
- ▶ Technological advances: working with FCC a review of what technology was available to make the systems and processes more efficient was undertaken. Whitespace was implemented, which allows tracking of all the collection fleet, 360° cameras were added onto the vehicles and each crew has an in cab system for their specific round. Recorded information is real time and is available to Customer Services and front office, Waste Management Team and Depot Staff, reducing the impact on the back office and resolves most issues quickly with the customer. Whitespace system is also connected to the website allowing residents to view the crews feedback on line and visually see what bins were collected and what are due next collection; as part of channel shift this allows self service for residents without the need to contact someone through the Call Centre or waste team

## Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ Building good working relationships with your contractor is vital; we have worked hard to achieve this, understanding both parties' issues and how we can maximise what is in the contract to mutually benefit all concerned. Having this good working relationship has allowed us to do additional works for other parties, benefiting the Council in terms of retaining staff and providing additional capacity. In addition, the contractor receives additional works where they can utilise their staff and resources and both parties receive income from this
- ▶ Investing in technology and channel shift enables staff to carry out more functions rather than dealing with simple daily tasks. We have been able to work on other projects and increase operational management of the contract due to receiving less telephone calls and e-mails
- ▶ Sharing experiences with other Local Authorities is very important; this can save time and money. "Lessons learnt" from others avoids you making similar mistakes and encourages "best practice"



## High Peak Borough Council

### Background

High Peak BC provides an alternate weekly collection to all households, the provided service is as follows: 240 litre bin for general waste; 240 litre bin for garden and food waste; 240 litre bin for comingled recyclables (paper, card, glass, cans, plastics); Reusable bag for textiles; in addition, a small WEEE collection takes place on any collection day. The collection services are provided by Alliance Environmental Services Ltd (AES) a joint venture company owned by High Peak BC, Staffordshire Moorlands DC and ANSA Environmental Services Ltd. The contractual arrangement is in place until 2032. In addition, a chargeable general waste and comingled recycling service is available to all commercial premises in the High Peak, with flexible collection frequencies and container sizes.

### Current status

- ▶ In August 2017 AES was formed and took over service delivery of the High Peak waste and recycling collection service from Veolia (following a natural contract expiration). During 2018 it is anticipated that AES will also deliver the waste collection service at Staffordshire Moorlands DC, alongside the delivery of street cleansing and horticultural service functions for both Councils. The anticipated savings in year one are approximately £100,000, increasing to £1.215 million by year four
- ▶ In January 2016 the decision was taken to remove the councils network of bring sites. The service had seen a significant fall in collected tonnages since the introduction of a comprehensive kerbside recycling service in 2012 and the sites all suffered from fly tipping and abuse. The impact of this decision was monitored for a period of 12 months and a reduction in fly tipping incidents with no overall loss of recycling tonnage was reported, plus an increase in commercial recycling customers. Savings are approximately £42,000 per year.
- ▶ A review of the Healthcare Waste Policy in operation in Derbyshire was undertaken in 2014 by all partners of the Derbyshire Waste partnership. The review included a re-assessment of all referrals to each local authority, checking that waste was being correctly categorised and refreshing potentially historic collection lists. This review identified many patients across the county that had been referred to us generated offensive waste which doesn't require specialised treatment. In the High Peak tonnages of clinical waste reduced from 12.48 tonnes in 2014/15 to 5.51 tonnes in 2016/17 thus reducing disposal costs for the WDA. In addition, the cost of providing clinical waste collections fell by approximately £3,000 per annum for High Peak

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ Partnership working should be considered at all levels including internal service areas within LA's i.e. waste and street cleansing, working with neighbouring or likeminded authorities or other organisations and across two tier areas i.e. WCA's and WDA's. This will help to generate the biggest efficiencies be they operational or financial
- ▶ Communication is critical – get the right messages across as to why changes are needed, get the message wrong and the aspirations or outcomes will be severely affected
- ▶ Never underestimate the value of remembering to keep elected members involved at key stages, their support is invaluable

## Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

### Background

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council provide an alternate week collection service, as follows: 240 litre bin for residual; 240 litre bin with an inner caddy to separate the paper and card, for dry recyclables; 240 litre bin for garden waste. At present residual and garden waste collections are operated in-house, whilst the recycling collection is outsourced with the contractor retaining all the material. However, following a review of services in 2017, the dry recycling collections are to be brought back in-house, with effect from April 2018. Bring sites will continue to be provided but will be rationalised and fully comingled. Trade waste collections will also be changed to fully co-mingled dry recycling. Bulky waste collections are available priced at £15 for one to three items, £25 for four to five items and £6 for each additional item when there are more than five items.

### Current status

- ▶ Project recycle right – started June 2014. Claim from contractor that contamination was increasing their costs. Partnership by contractor and HBBC to inform residents of what materials could/could not be recycled. Contamination now at 2-5%
- ▶ Introduction of garden waste charge – April 2016. £768 thousand income generated with 73% of previous users subscribing to service
- ▶ Introduction of trade waste service – 2011. £125 thousand profit forecast this year. Will be increasing capacity in 2018. Where most efficient collected alongside household waste

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ Action at kerbside is the most effective way to change peoples recycling behaviour (i.e. rejecting bins that contain incorrect materials)
- ▶ Garden waste charge – moving to an opt out service / DD only will reduce costs
- ▶ Garden waste – switched to bin sticker with name and address printed on by external provider, and utilising rear of label for instructions has reduced costs

## Leicestershire County Council

### Background

Leicestershire County Council manages over 330,000 tonnes of waste each year through a variety of flexible contracts with different suppliers. It has also been changing its approach including increasingly working with partners such as other waste disposal authorities to take advantage of synergies to deliver services in a cost effective manner against the background of austerity and rising cost pressures. The authority is moving to centralise all treatment and recycling and has recently awarded a four year contract to CasePak for processing most of the authority's dry recyclable materials; which will deliver a significant saving. This transformative approach has maintained service provision whilst enabling real term cost reductions in recent years. They also have 14 HWRCs across the county which vary in size and nature and altogether handle over 60,000 tonnes of waste each year. Of those 14 sites, 13 are now managed and operated in-house.

### Current status

- ▶ In 2017/18 the Authority took the operation of 13 HWRCs, one Waste Transfer Station and container haulage in-house at the contract end. This has delivered a saving of £600,000 per annum and provided greater flexibility to undertake future changes. To effect this change, the Authority worked with the outgoing provider to transfer 77 employees to the local authority under TUPE regulations. A fleet of eight hook loaders was purchased and a new Health & Safety Management System was produced and rolled out to all transferring employees. The original configuration of the service prior to insourcing created a favourable environment to make this change; the authority owned all 13 sites, had retained responsibility for the Environmental Permits and had ownership of the compaction equipment and majority of waste containers on each site. One site and Waste Transfer Station continues to operate under a contract with another provider, allowing a level of service resilience

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ Having a full-time project manager was very helpful as it provided additional resource and helped navigate internal systems and processes which were not necessarily geared to easily allow the bulk transfer of nearly 80 staff, so bespoke approaches had to be agreed for several aspects. Staff engagement and communication was valuable and helped reassure staff, however, there were last minute changes which need to be accounted for as the TUPE list is not finalised until 28 days before transfer. There were some on-going issues around the accuracy of information which was challenging. Interim arrangements were put in place for mobile plant, bulk haulage and sale of materials; operationally the transfer was very successful but the work does not stop on the transfer date. You need to allow a further 12 to 18 months to resolve legacy issues and transfer from interim arrangements and ensure that the back office systems are robust and established. Plus allow plenty of time for ordering new vehicles. A closure day at each site was planned for staff induction and training. Challenges were also met in terms of the records and establishing the suitability of all plant and equipment which were difficult to come by and resulted in the need to replace some equipment or do more maintenance than expected. Independent verification of our business case and assumptions was valuable in ensuring savings were kept on track

- ▶ A key principle was that there should not be any noticeable adverse change to service users in terms of the type and quality of service provided. Following introduction of the insourced service over 3,500 customers were surveyed on-site by an external organisation, with satisfaction levels remaining extremely high at 99% overall
- ▶ Whilst the service has continued to operate to a high standard, the Authority continues to make improvements to internal processes in order to fully integrate the service into the existing organisation. There may still be further savings to be found from modifying the service and looking for synergies and efficiencies going forward



## Lincolnshire County Council

### Background

Lincolnshire County Council provide two HWRCs which are third party owned and operated; the contract includes provision of site, management and staffing, haulage and disposal of some streams. In addition, Lincolnshire County Council own nine additional HWRCs which are staffed under a third party contract. Haulage from all sites is under a single contract, and recycling of most materials is covered by a DPS call-off contract.

Residual waste and kerbside mixed recyclables delivered by WCA's and/or HWRC haulage contractor is taken to one of five Waste Transfer Station's which are all owned, staffed and operated by Lincolnshire County Council. Haulage to treatment and disposal is under two separate contracts – residual waste and mixed recyclables.

In terms of treatment and disposal, residual waste is mostly processed under DBO contract at a single EfW incinerator on the edge of Lincoln; small quantities of residual waste is landfilled. Green waste is composted under a number of contracts with separate operators around the County. Mixed dry recyclables are processed under a single MRF contract which also includes haulage. Road grit is diverted from landfill by processing under a separate contract.

### Current status

- ▶ Diverting waste from landfill: Lincolnshire County Council are expecting to achieve significant savings through diverting residual waste from landfill to their Energy from Waste; owned by Lincolnshire County Council and operated by FCC Environment; the facility is anticipated to save local taxpayers around £30 million compared to landfill, over its 25-year lifespan
- ▶ Reduction to number and opening hours of HWRCs: Lincolnshire County Council have achieved a reduction to number and opening hours of HWRCs; two sites have closed (13 became 11), the hours per day shortened at all remaining sites, and the days per week reduced at all but the main Lincoln site. Savings are recognised to have been realised but the specific figures have proved difficult to quantify

## Melton Borough Council

### Background

Melton Borough Council provides an outsourced alternate weekly collection for residual, dry recyclables and garden waste using 240 litre wheeled bins. The garden waste is an opt in subscription-based service charged at £57 per bin and the take-up of the scheme is around 35% of households. There is currently no food waste collection. Although not currently collected, battery and textiles are planned to be incorporated into kerbside collections, provided the new contract is achieved as expected, from October 2018. Bulky waste is provided as a chargeable service priced at £30.80 for up to five items. There is no trade collection service. Recyclables are processed at a MRF in Aldridge through Biffa, although from October 2018 this is changing to Casepak via Leicestershire County Council.

### Current status

- ▶ Melton Borough Council has operated an outsourced service through Verdant from April 2003 (originally a seven plus seven contract that could extend to 2017, absorbed by 'Greenstar' in 2008, absorbed by current contractor Biffa in 2010. In 2012 the council renegotiated the service and achieved a reduced core cost for the service by around £400,000 by agreeing to change from kerbside sort to co-mingled recycling collections and agreeing an agency agreement with Biffa for them to operate and manage a subscription based green waste collection service
- ▶ The Council extended its contract with Biffa in 2017 for a further 18 months, making this a 15 year six month contract up to September 2018 saving a further £180,000 for offering the extension
- ▶ The council is currently at the end of a competitive dialogue tender process with contract award made known to the preferred bidder but challenge from the runner up still to be resolved. The new Service on offer is little changed from the existing but savings of around £300,000 are likely to be achieved. The only changes are the introduction of digital platform (Whitespace), expected with the commencement of the new service, removal of the bring site service, and batteries and textiles to be added back into kerbside collections

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ Experience has shown through negotiations at various stages that Contractors seem on many occasions to be able to 'find' cost reductions in order to retain or extend contracts
- ▶ Digitisation is being introduced by contractors, so they remain competitive, and can better remotely manage the services they provide, to drive their efficiencies, to fully record and be assured of adequate compliance with ever increasing H&S and HSE requirements
- ▶ Waste contractors have to absorb or consider changes and increasing costs associated with legislation, regulation, wages, fuel and vehicles frequently within the term of a contract, however reduced costs to clients appear achievable. Conversely waste consultant's costs seem to invariably increase over similar time periods. Excessive use of consultants will reduce savings. Working collaboratively with contractors is likely to offer good value

## Newark and Sherwood District Council

### Background

Newark and Sherwood provide an in-house alternate weekly collection service using 240 litre wheeled bins for residual waste and dry recyclables (excluding glass and cartons). A seasonal chargeable garden waste service using 240 litre wheeled bin is in place and a bulky waste collection service is available charged at £12 for first item, £6 for subsequent items, and £12 each for electrical items/whitegoods etc. A trade refuse and trade recycling (recycling only once a week) service is available using 240 litre up to 1100 litre bins at varying collection frequency. In terms of bring sites there are no current contracts, but there are approximately 80 sites across the district, mostly with glass bottles (serviced by GRUK) and textiles (various charities).

### Current status

- ▶ Garden waste is delivered working in Partnership with neighbouring authorities (Rushcliffe Borough Council and Mansfield District Council) to service the whole district, as Newark and Sherwood does not have the capacity to service the whole district. For their part in the partnership some capacity was found within current operations to utilise existing vehicles/staff initially then they further expanded the area with an additional vehicle and additional staff. This service is now raising over £100,000 per annum so is expected to become cost neutral in the near future
- ▶ As an authority Newark and Sherwood are moving to 'digital by default' systems to reduce the requirements for manual data entry via the customer service centre. For waste management and street cleansing this has resulted in the development of online booking and payment systems for the collection of excess and electrical goods waste. Customers can also report a variety of routine matters via our website and this information is passed straight to frontline supervisors who can then direct the job to the relevant personnel
- ▶ The same system is now being further developed to manage our trade waste contracts. This includes integration with the council payments and accounting software to facilitate the automation of direct debits and online payments. In addition the authority will be able to issue the associated paperwork via electronic means rather than issuing thousands of paper documents

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ The main lesson learnt is to ensure that existing records are as accurate and up-to date as possible. Run as many error and integrity checks as possible before transporting legacy data into new systems

## North East Derbyshire District Council

### Background

North East Derbyshire District council provides an alternate weekly collection to all households, the provided service is as follows: 240 litre bin for general waste; 240 litre bin for garden and food waste; 240 litre bin for comingled recyclables (paper, card, glass, cans, plastics); reusable hessian bag for paper. A charged for bulky waste collection is available as is a commercial waste collection services.

### Current status

- ▶ North East Derbyshire Council and Bolsover District Council formed a Strategic Alliance in 2011, resulting in sharing of senior and middle management posts, delivering shared efficiency savings of £750,000 (approximately). This also extended to establishing joint Streetscene Services management and administrative arrangements delivering further shared savings of £200,000 (approximately). Services have been jointly reviewed, resulting in harmonised service delivery policies and performance management systems; throughout which, both Councils Members gave full support
- ▶ Specifically, this has enabled the Councils' Parks and Grounds Maintenance Service to improve efficiency and income generation between 2010/11 and 2015/16 by nearly 10% for North East Derbyshire and 700% for Bolsover, the Councils' Waste Collection Service to improve income generation between 2010/11 and 2015/16 by 60% for North East Derbyshire and 20% for Bolsover, and the Councils' Street Cleansing Service to improve income generation between 2010/11 and 2015/16 by 10 times for North East Derbyshire and 500% for Bolsover

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ From the onset, the Councils' Strategic Alliance received full support from leading Members which was essential in providing clear vision, direction and support in achieve outcomes set out above
- ▶ Introduction of 'joint manager roles' greatly assisted in developing the process of joint working and mitigating risks of silo thinking and protectionism. Close working relationships with trade unions were essential in objectively meeting needs of the Councils and staff within the challenging local government landscape
- ▶ To facilitate closer/joint working, it is 'essential' that service delivery policies and performance management (i.e. productivity/work measurement) systems are harmonised to rationalise customer relationship management systems and engender seamless standards of service across partner LA areas

## Northampton Borough Council

### Background

Waste and recycling collections are one element of the environmental service contract that is operated by our contractor Enterprise. The contract, which is a partnership between NBC and DDC, started in June 2011 and is due to expire in June 2018. Residual waste is collected both in sacks and 240 litre wheeled bins. Approximately 65,000 properties have wheeled bins and receive a fortnightly collection of residual waste. Around 22,000 properties still present their residual waste in sacks and receive weekly collections. Flats are on a mixture of sacks, wheeled bins and Eurobins. Garden waste is collected from properties that have wheeled bins on a fortnightly basis and is free of charge. Those properties that present sacks for residual waste collections can book a free green waste collection and are allowed to present up to 10 bags of green waste per collection. Recycling is mainly presented, sorted, in boxes, although some flats receive a commingled recycling collection in Eurobins. Dry recycling collections are made on a weekly basis, using Kerbsider vehicles, with each property placing their recycling out in plastic boxes. There is a black box for glass, a blue box for mixed plastic and cans and a green box for paper and cardboard. Food waste is also collected on a weekly basis, on the same vehicle that collects the dry recycling. Residents place out a 25 litre caddy with their food waste in it.

### Current status / advice to other authorities

- ▶ The contract has been very financially beneficial to the councils and there has been no need for them to look at ways of reducing costs

## Northamptonshire County Council

### Background

Northamptonshire County Council have a number of contracts in place to manage the residual and recyclable waste collected by the districts and boroughs. Treatment and Disposal of Residual Waste (Lot 1 and 3) is contracted to AmeyCespa and expires on 31 March 2020, extendable by up to five years and covers the handling, haulage and treatment of residual waste arising from South Northants and some HWRCs using merchant capacity, and from Corby, Kettering, Wellingborough and East Northants and some HWRCs using merchant capacity. Treatment and Disposal of Residual Waste (Lot 2) is with SUEZ and also runs to 31 March 2020, extendable by up to five years, providing local delivery points, handling, haulage and treatment of residual waste arising from Northampton Borough and Daventry District and some HWRCs using merchant capacity. HWRCs are contracted out to Amey until 31 March 2025, and covers the management of the nine sites, handling and haulage of the waste from the sites, making arrangements for recycling and composting of specific waste streams. Reuse activity at these sites is a sub contract arrangement made by Amey. Arrangements for composting green waste and dry recyclables collected at the kerbside, and treatment of kitchen food waste collected at the kerbside are made by individual districts and boroughs. As a member of the Northamptonshire Waste Partnership the authority has jointly delivered a variety of research projects and hosts the Northamptonshire Waste and Energy Education team, a "not for profit, to complete a variety of waste prevention and minimisation projects in Northamptonshire, and some external Authorities.

### Current status

- ▶ Contracts for the treatment and disposal of residual waste using merchant capacity in existing facilities have achieved savings estimated in excess of £1 million a year compared to what NCC would have spent if status quo was maintained. Constant and robust contract management and renegotiation achieves on-going savings of the order of an additional £200 thousand per annum
- ▶ Service changes at HWRCs including reduced opening hours across all sites, and the closure of one site achieved savings of £400 thousand per annum. Although this has made the operation of the sites more efficient (same amount of waste and visitors in shorter operational hours) this has made the contract very difficult to performance manage
- ▶ Stronger restrictions and introduction of charges for schedule two waste has achieved savings of approximately £100 thousand per year. However, this was politically difficult to implement

## Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ Take care in making “efficiency savings” via contract renegotiation – often it results in a breakdown of the relationship with the contractor, and/or makes the contract very difficult to manage because any performance issues will inevitably be linked with the changes made to achieve savings. Therefore, when making changes, be very clear how performance will be managed and against what targets following the changes
- ▶ Working in partnership to identify savings can take a lot of resource and put the relationships within the partnership under pressure. It is crucial therefore for authorities to identify early on if savings are realistic and achievable. If they are not, then efforts can be focused on what is within their control and achievable
- ▶ The ongoing challenge of making savings without negatively affecting services and publicising those savings, can mean the authority is always asked to make more. There is a view in Northamptonshire County Council that further savings cannot be achieved without significantly affecting service provision or increasing the risk profile of the service. Publicising achievements can simply perpetuate the perception that more savings can be found whilst both the service and the authority have the view that they are underfunded and a consequence submitted a direct appeal to central government for fairer funding

## North West Leicestershire District Council

### Background

North West Leicestershire District Council operates an in-house alternate weekly collection of refuse, recycling, and garden waste to 43,000 households. Residual waste is collected using 180 litre / 240 litre bins as standard and recyclables are collected via a yellow bag (cardboard), blue bag (paper), and red boxes (dry recyclables). Garden waste is free service using 240 litre bins. There are currently 40 bring sites locations collecting paper and card, and glass. Bulky waste collections are charged at £23 for one to three items plus £5 for each additional item after that. A Commercial refuse and recycling collections is available and currently generating £500,000 income per annum. NWLDC receive recyclable waste from Hinckley and Bosworth BC, offer collections of metal cans from Charnwood, and operate some in ground waste collections on behalf of Melton Borough Council.

### Current status

- ▶ 2011 NWLDC undertook a Waste Services Efficiency Review culminating in: GPS tracking technology to all waste collections vehicles; route optimisation of all rounds resulting in £150,000 savings reducing one recycling round, and one loader on the rural round; zonal collections introduced to help absorb additional housing growth with minimal rounds changes, easy to manage wintry weather events, any missed bin reports dealt with in the same area the next day; review of overtime and working practices saving £100,000 in salaries; and, brought bring site collections in house to reduce operational costs and maximise sales income
- ▶ From 2012–2016 introduced a range of IT and technology changes including: Whitespace waste management software and in cab technology using iPads in domestic waste collection vehicles, resulting in a number of efficiencies from eliminating the need for a multitude of excel spreadsheets, secure storage of round and customer information, real time reporting to provide live info to Customer Services, reduced missed bin rates by 25%. Introduction of material sorting technology comprising conveyor belts, magnets and eddy current separators to maximise the value of plastic bottles, steel cans and aluminium cans. £110,000 of investment was paid back in 1.8 years. Introduced waste management software to the trade waste collections and introduced a range of reporting tools called 'Dashboard' to enable thorough analysis of the business such as location of customers, route optimisation capability. Also, a more flexible payment system including direct debit was introduced. The software resulted in more reliable collections through improved resilience as rounds were loaded in route order and the sat nav feature was enabled. This meant any of the relief drivers could complete the rounds without any issues. Increased trade customers from 750 to 782. 360° cameras were fitted to all waste collection vehicles and footage downloadable over WIFI. The purpose of the cameras were to improve standards of service, reduce costs, and improve safety
- ▶ 2017 – NWLDC bid for and were successfully awarded the contract following waste disposal authority procurement for the treatment and disposal of dry recyclable material. The contract is for a period of seven Years with an option to extend up to 10 years and is worth at £500,000 per year to NWLDC

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ IT projects take longer than anyone seems to expect and requires extra resources at least up to the implementation. Plus someone has to operate the systems going forward. Hire a Waste Apprentice with a proclivity towards computer systems!
- ▶ Route optimisation using the software really does work but needs a lot of resource to create the model and needs the buy in of frontline staff and Supervisors
- ▶ On-board camera technology is one of the best ways to get to the bottom of almost all customer service, conduct, safety, and insurance issues and is 'must have' technology



## Nottinghamshire County Council

### Background

Nottinghamshire County Council provide the treatment and disposal route for residual, recyclable and compostable waste collected by the seven district and borough councils. There is currently a 26 year PFI Contract in place with Veolia (now in the 12th year of the Contract). The authority provides 12 Household Waste Recycling Centres, with community paint reuse schemes operating on four of the Recycling Centre sites. There are five Waste Transfer Stations and one Materials Recovery Facility (MRF). Green waste treatment is sub-contracted to three different sites and currently none of their districts collect food waste. In addition, there is a standalone non-PFI Contract with FCC at Eastcroft Energy from Waste Facility.

### Current status

- ▶ Contract negotiation through the Revised Project Plan process (which was entered as a result of planning failure for a contract Energy Recovery Facility): Rufford ERF was the principal facility to be delivered through the Waste PFI Contract and would have diverted the majority of residual waste away from landfill, however the application by Veolia was refused by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. This led the County Council to trigger the contractual Draft Revised Project Plan (DRPP) process, which required Veolia to present an alternative solution to Rufford ERF for the management of residual waste. Alongside the DRPP, the authority worked with Veolia to identify savings that could be delivered through the Contract to ensure that the PFI Contract continues to deliver Best Value for the Council
- ▶ Mansfield and Ashfield variation – the concluding part of the Revised Project Plan which resulted in a variation to the treatment arrangements for residual waste in two of the districts: The PFI Contract did not include the development of a Waste Transfer Station (WTS) to serve the districts of Mansfield and Ashfield because these districts would have delivered their residual waste direct to Rufford ERF. Veolia were not able to identify a cost-effective long-term solution for the disposal of residual waste due to the limited treatment capacity available, at the time of the DRPP. Therefore, the waste continued to be dealt with through a Veolia subcontract to FCC. Veolia identified that beyond 2016/17 there was potential capacity coming online, therefore a new schedule was drafted in to the contract. Veolia submitted a proposal which was worked through/assessed (including creating a financial model to compare against other options) and accepted. The proposal resulted in a new WTS which came online in March 2017. From April 2017 – March 2020, up to 65,000 tonnes of residual waste to be delivered to the WTS, pre-treated (shredded), baled and wrapped to be sent for use as a RDF in Germany. From April 2020 after undergoing pre-treatment at the WTS, RDF will be hauled to and treated at the Scottish and Southern Electricity (SSE) Ferrybridge Multifuel II (FM2) facility.

Unfortunately, in both cases, the figures attached to the savings are not in the public domain

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ Ensure all essential parties within an authority are on board from the very beginning of a Contract variation (e.g. Legal, finance, technical, senior management, Members)
- ▶ Be aware of currency risk in the RDF/SRF export markets when negotiating contracts. This will help to build in financial resilience and allow for any risk to be factored in to service costs etc

## South Northamptonshire Council

### Background

South Northamptonshire Council (SNC) runs an in-house collection system as follows: fortnightly collection of residual using 180 litre/240 litre black bin; fortnightly collection of recycling using 240 litre blue bin; fortnightly collection of garden waste using 240 litre green bin; and, weekly collection of food waste using a 23 litre silver caddy plus 5 litre indoor caddy. In addition, small electricals and household batteries are collected in a carrier bag from the top of the blue bins. This service was added to the kerbside collections at no cost to the Council. In addition to the kerbside services, SNC also runs Farthinghoe Reuse and Recycling Centre which is located between Brackley and Banbury and opened in 2002. The centre was previously run as a Civic Amenity Site by Northamptonshire County Council but it was closed in 1999 due to budget cuts. There was a large amount of local public opposition to this and as a result SNC took the decision to buy the site and reopen it but as a waste collection authority it can only accept waste suitable for reuse and recycling. The site recycles around 1200 tonnes a year and provides an important outlet for people to recycle things that we don't collect at the kerbside and onsite reuse shop is very useful for those on low incomes to purchase second hand furniture. SNC runs a successful and long standing commercial waste and recycling service and are looking to grow this further in the future. Efficiencies have been found within this service in the last two years and where possible it is integrated with the domestic waste collections. A bulky waste collection service is available at a cost of £30 for up to six items; all electricals and metals are recycled. There is a small number of bring sites at the large supermarkets but the authority may consider phasing these out in the future. SNC has had shared service with Cherwell District Council (CDC) for waste, recycling and street cleansing since 2014.

### Current status

- ▶ Shared service with SNC and CDC has allowed efficiencies in staff numbers and allowed resilience for the future: SNC has had shared service with Cherwell District Council for waste, recycling and street cleansing since 2014. This has resulted in significant savings and efficiencies and is part of a longer-term partnership with Cherwell for other services. Most management, supervisor and officer posts are now shared between the two councils and flexible working hours and locations have helped ensure resilience for the future. Working with two different waste disposal authorities has brought its own challenges, and although the service is jointly managed the collection services provided to the residents of both councils is different. This can represent challenges in terms of communications and also means that the recycling rate for CDC is lower than SNC
- ▶ Keeping the collection services in house has produced extremely high satisfaction and good value for money and the Councils are committed to retaining this; over 90% of residents who responded to the 2017 survey are happy with their residual, recycling and food waste collections and this is the highest satisfaction rate of all council services
- ▶ Changing from kerbside sort to co-mingled collections resulted in a 40% increase in the amount collected for recycling. Also changing to a four day collection week has resulted in savings

### Lessons learnt / advice to other authorities

- ▶ Sharing services with other councils results in savings and makes the authorities more resilient for the future
- ▶ Maintaining services in house allows for better service adaptability and customer satisfaction
- ▶ There are challenges in providing a joint service when the collection systems are not the same. Partnerships within the same county/disposal authority and those with the same collection system are likely to be the most efficient



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

Local Authority <sup>10</sup>	Residual		Dry recyclable		Garden			Food	HWRC provision	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged			
<b>Derbyshire</b>										
Derbyshire County Council	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1 8	SUEZ Resource Recovery Solutions
Bolsover District Council	AWC	240l	AWC	240l + hessian bag for paper	AWC	240l	Free	Mixed with garden	n/a	
Charnwood Borough Council	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	No	n/a	Serco Integrated Services
Chesterfield Borough Council	AWC	240l	AWC	240l + internal caddy for glass	AWC	240l	Free	Mixed with garden	n/a	Veolia
Erewash Borough Council	AWC	240l	AWC	240l / 140l / plastic bags	AWC	240l	Free	No	n/a	In-house
High Peak Borough Council	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Free	Mixed with garden	n/a	Outsourced (2032)
North East Derbyshire District Council	AWC	240l	AWC	240l + hessian bag for paper	AWC	240l	Free	Mixed with garden	n/a	

<sup>10</sup> Only includes those WCA/Unitary Authorities who took part in the review

Local Authority <sup>10</sup>	Residual		Dry recyclable		Garden			Food	HWRC provision	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged			
<b>Leicestershire</b>										
Leicestershire County Council	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	13 1	In-house Outsourced
Harborough District Council	AWC	180l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	No	n/a	Outsourced (2023)
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	No	n/a	In-house residual and garden Outsourced recycling (coming in-house April 2018)
Melton Borough Council	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	AWC	240l	Charged	No	n/a	Outsourced
North West Leicestershire District Council	AWC	180l / 240l	AWC	yellow bag for cardboard blue bag for paper red boxes for dry recyclables	AWC	240l	Free	No	n/a	In-house
<b>Lincolnshire</b>										
Lincolnshire County Council	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2 9	Outsourced Inhouse owned / outsourced operated

Local Authority <sup>10</sup>	Residual		Dry recyclable		Garden			Food	HWRC provision	In-house / outsourced
	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Collection frequency	Container	Free or charged			
<b>Northamptonshire</b>										
<b>Northamptonshire County Council</b>									9 sites	Amey (until 31.3.2025)
<b>Northampton Borough Council</b>	AWC / Weekly	240l / sacks	Weekly	black box for glass blue box for mixed plastic and cans green box for paper and cardboard	AWC <i>Note: Properties presenting residual waste in sacks can book a green waste collection</i>	240l	Free	Weekly 25l caddy	n/a	Enterprise/ Amey (due to expire in June 2018)
<b>South Northamptonshire Council</b>	AWC	180l/240l black bin	AWC	240l blue bin	AWC	240l green bin	Free	Weekly 23l silver caddy (5l for indoor storage)	*1 reuse and recycling site	In-house
<b>Nottinghamshire</b>										
<b>Nottinghamshire County Council</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12	Outsourced
<b>Ashfield District Council</b>	AWC	240l	AWC (dry) 8 weekly (glass)	240l x 2	AWC	240l	Free (charged service introduced from April 2018)	No	n/a	In-house
<b>Newark and Sherwood District Council</b>	AWC	240l	AWC	240l (dry recyclables no glass)	AWC	240l	Charged	No	n/a	In-house

## APPENDIX 3: PERFORMANCE DATA 2016/17

Authority	Residual household waste per household (kg/hh)	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting	Percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill	Collected hh waste per person (kg)
Amber Valley Borough Council	561	32.20%	–	372.8
Ashfield District Council	524.3	41.00%	–	390.5
Bassetlaw District Council	651.1	21.10%	–	369.7
Blaby District Council	469.9	47.90%	–	377.7
Bolsover District Council	543.2	42.10%	–	422.9
Boston Borough Council	597	37.60%	–	411.3
Broxtowe Borough Council	497.5	39.90%	–	364.9
Charnwood Borough Council	453.9	48.40%	–	351.6
Chesterfield Borough Council	446.2	46.00%	–	388.3
Corby Borough Council	539	42.60%	–	390.3
Daventry District Council	477.6	51.80%	–	415.7
Derby City Council	614.9	35.30%	33.50%	400
Derbyshire County Council	547.3	48.30%	13.40%	473.3
Derbyshire Dales District Council	333.6	59.80%	–	390.9
East Lindsey District Council	462	45.40%	–	413.2
East Northamptonshire Council	393.7	46.20%	–	313.7
Erewash Borough Council	511.4	42.70%	–	398.8
Gedling Borough Council	546.8	36.70%	–	386.3
Harborough District Council	421.4	53.60%	–	380.5
High Peak Borough Council	437.7	48.10%	–	378.4
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	442	49.40%	–	385.1
Kettering Borough Council	471.4	49.80%	–	411.6

Authority	Residual household waste per household (kg/hh)	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting	Percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill	Collected hh waste per person (kg)
Leicester City Council	547.4	40.70%	32.70%	352.5
Leicestershire County Council	550.5	49.70%	29.90%	459.2
Lincoln City Council	525.4	36.20%	–	376.3
Lincolnshire County Council	561.9	46.70%	4.00%	475.6
Mansfield District Council	586.4	34.60%	–	405.7
Melton Borough Council	480.1	47.70%	–	406.5
Newark and Sherwood District Council	580	31.90%	–	375.9
North East Derbyshire District Council	492.1	46.30%	–	411.1
North Kesteven District Council	511.3	46.10%	–	415.7
North West Leicestershire District Council	524.2	46.70%	–	422.8
Northampton Borough Council	502.4	41.50%	–	362.6
Northamptonshire County Council	554.7	50.20%	12.30%	471.7
Nottingham City Council	588.8	29.80%	8.80%	348
Nottinghamshire County Council	592	44.20%	8.90%	468.2
Oadby and Wigston Borough Council	375.9	48.30%	–	299.4
Rushcliffe Borough Council	468.3	50.40%	–	398.1
Rutland County Council	508.7	59.30%	0.10%	543.1
South Derbyshire District Council	497.9	48.20%	–	397.9
South Holland District Council	561.2	28.30%	–	336.9
South Kesteven District Council	495.4	43.20%	–	388.8
South Northamptonshire District Council	408.8	61.40%	–	444.8
Wellingborough Borough Council	530.4	42.70%	–	407
West Lindsey District Council	496.6	48.90%	–	438.7

Ref: data.gov.uk/dataset/local\_authority\_collected\_waste\_management\_statistics/resource/e2f2cd8e-3ab7-42f3-bc8f-1ca9b48cd7a0

Regional household recycling rates	2016/17	Regional percentage of LA collected waste sent to landfill	2016/17	Regional residual household waste (Kg per household)	2016/17
Eastern	49.4	South West	28.1	North East	613
South West	48.3	North West	25	West Midlands	599
South East	46.2	East Midlands	15	London	579
North West	45.9	Yorkshire and the Humber	14.6	South East	567
East Midlands	45.9	Eastern	14.6	East Midlands	565
Yorkshire and the Humber	42.9	London	12.5	Yorkshire and the Humber	552
West Midlands	41.3	South East	11.7	Eastern	531
North East	35.7	West Midlands	10.8	North West	525
London	33	North East	7.9	South West	514
<b>England</b>	<b>43.7</b>	<b>England</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>England</b>	<b>557</b>



JOINTLY OWNED BY



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