

Shaping the Council 2015-16 and beyond: Savings Business Case

Business Case Title	Alternate weekly collection of Household Waste		
Revision No:		Date: 2/1/15	
Lead Director	Mike Heath		
Lead HOS	Mike Heath		
Business Case Author	John Gilford		

Section 1: Summary

Savings Proposal

Amend the frequency of household waste collection (residual and recycling) to an alternate week programme.

Strategic rationale

Within broad guidelines set in legislation (Environmental Protection Act 1990) the Council has discretionary powers to decide locally on arrangements for the segregation, collection and handling of Household Waste, including the collection frequency.

Changing the frequency of collection of residual (i.e. general) waste and recycling waste from weekly to alternate weekly will allow the operational capacity of the collection service to be reduced, delivering significant financial savings, and at the same time encourage greater participation from residents in the proper segregation of recyclates into their respective household bins.

71% of all English local authorities (76% UK wide) collect waste less frequently than the current weekly arrangements operated in Thurrock in 2013/14 and the vast majority have not seen a decline in the recycling levels that they achieve. (source WRAP).

Approximate Cost Savings

Assuming introduction in October 2015 the proposal will realise a saving of £260,000 in 2015/16 and a full-year saving from 2016/17 onwards of £520,000. There is clearly a cost of communications prior to and at the early stages of the launch of the revised service arrangements but these costs have been allowed for within the previously considered proposals for the garden waste collection service.

Timescales

Activity	Timescale
1. Modelling and project development	Feb – June 2015
2. Employee/Trade Union consultations	Feb – April 2015
3. Trial programme	April – October 2015
4. Public awareness campaign – preparation and delivery	April 2015 – September 2015
5. Go-live	October 2015
6. Monitoring and issue resolution	October 15 onwards

Risks /Consequences

1. Reputational damage.
2. Potential for illegal/damaging disposal of waste materials (fly tipping etc).
3. Increase in presentation of side-waste particularly at the Christmas /New Year period.
4. Potential increase in contamination of recycling bins with non-recyclates..

Mitigation

1. Business case supported by robust and reliable data
2. Comprehensive public awareness campaign, supported by enforcement action.
3. Return to sweep system of waste collection rather than existing discrete round (pepper pot) methodology providing greater support flexibility.

Section 2: Finance, savings and costs

Financial summary

General Fund budget 2014-15

	Staff £000s	Premises / Transport £000s	Supplies/ Services £000s	Direct Payments £000s	Third Party Payments £000s	Total Expenditure Gross £000s	Income £000s	Net Expenditure £000s
2014/15	2,865.1	2,466.6	223.3	213.5	6,097.4	11,865.9	-145.6	11,720.2

Staff Related savings

Current number of posts (FTE and headcount)	90 FTE, 90 Headcount	
Number of posts to be deleted (FTE and headcount)	14.4 FTE (inc 2.4 FTE for cover); 12 Headcount	
Amount of salary saving (inc on-costs)	15/16	£ 182.5K
	16/17	£ 365.0K

Non- Staff Related savings

Premises and buildings (inc utilities)		
Transport	Reduction in 4 collection vehicles: 15/16 £ 77.5K 16/17 £ 155.0K	
Supplies and services		
Other (please specify)		

Third Party Related savings/income

Commissioning/contracts		
Charges to the HRA/DSG/PHG (NB can be negative)		
Increase fees & charges		
Grants/additional funding streams		
Other (please specify)		

Benefits – non financial

Costs & Resources to deliver the savings

Direct costs		
Redundancy costs	Not quantified	
Accommodation costs		
Procurement and/or Legal costs		
Other HR costs		
Other (please specify)	Losses on vehicle and plant disposals – Not	

	<p>quantified</p> <p>Public consultation / publicity costs – communication costs should be contained within the provision covering the introduction of a chargeable garden waste collection service.</p> <p>Monitoring / enforcement of bin material segregation - costs should be contained within the provision covering the introduction of a chargeable garden waste collection service.</p>
--	---

Section 3: Impact/Consequences of proposal – not covered in financial section

Impact on Corporate Priorities/objectives/ performance targets/standards

Priority 1. Create a great place for learning and opportunity	
Priority 2. Encourage and promote job creation and economic prosperity	
Priority 3. Build pride, responsibility and respect to create safer communities	
Priority 4. Improve health and well-being	
Priority 5. Protect and promote our clean and green environment	The savings proposals will maintain statutory services.
Well-run organisation - financial & governance; staff; customers	

Impacts on partners

No impact on Partners

Impacts on customers / community and equality/diversity implications

Customers – changes to the provision of kerbside household waste services

Community – negligible impact, waste compliant with statutory requirements

Equality & Diversity – negligible impact, current support for vulnerable clients will be maintained

Has an EqlA been undertaken?

yes Date: Jan 2015

Other impacts/implications

Section 4: Risks and Mitigation

Delivery risks				
Risk Description	Likelihood	Impact	Rating	Management or Mitigating Action
Legal challenge	2	1	2	Minimal chance of success due to nationally accepted arrangement for which the Council has a legal power within EPA 1990
Reputational damage	3	2	6	Communications strategy is a critical element of the work programme

Service risks				
Risk Description	Likelihood	Impact	Rating	Management or Mitigating Action
Illegal/damaging disposal of waste materials (fly tipping etc)	3	2	6	Education and enforcement programme
Increase in presentation of side-waste	2	2	4	Education and enforcement programme
Increase in contamination of recycling bins with non-recyclates.	2	1	2	Education and enforcement programme

For information on the ratings criteria guide, please see <\\Thurdata01\data\THURROCK\EXCHANGE\ROM>

		4	8	12	16
Likelihood	4	4	8	12	16
	3	3	6	9	12
	2	2	4	6	8
	1	1	2	3	4
					Impact

Section 5: Assumptions, Dependencies & Exclusions

Timeframes Assumptions/ Dependencies/Exclusions	Key dates set in Section 1 project plan
Benefits Assumptions/ Dependencies/Exclusions	Successful workforce consultation
Costs Assumptions/ Dependencies/Exclusions	
Other/ General Assumptions/ Dependencies/Exclusions	None applicable

Section 6: Stakeholder Engagement Requirements

		Approximate timelines
Staff/Unions NB. Services should not be undertaken consultation with staff in isolation – all such activity should be co-ordinated through Jackie Hinchliffe	yes	As section 1
Portfolio Holders/Members NB. Services should not be undertaken consultation with staff in isolation – all such activity should be co-ordinated through Directors Board	yes	As section 1
Partners NB. Services should not be undertaken consultation with partners in isolation – all such activity should be co-ordinated through Directors Board	yes	As section 1
Residents/Public NB. Services should not be undertaken consultation with staff in isolation – all such activity should be co-ordinated through Directors Board	yes	As section 1
Other – please specify	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Section 7: Any other comments to support savings proposals