

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2018/2019 REPORT NO. **159**

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**  
Cabinet – 13<sup>th</sup> February  
2019

**REPORT OF:**  
Executive Director of  
Place

**Agenda – Part: 1**

**Item: 4**

**Subject: Potential Changes to Waste and Recycling Collections**

**Wards: All**  
**Key Decision No: 4810**

**Cabinet Member consulted: All**

Contact officer and telephone number: Doug Wilkinson 02083792422  
E mail: [doug.wilkinson@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:doug.wilkinson@enfield.gov.uk)

### **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 It is proposed that the Council adopts a revised waste and recycling collection system for kerbside properties with a wheeled bin. The recommended proposal is:
- To collect refuse every fortnight rather than weekly (collections from the property will be made on the alternative week to collections for dry recycling)
  - To collect dry recycling every fortnight rather than weekly (collections from the property will be made on the alternative week to collections for refuse)
  - To provide a new service of a weekly separate food waste collection
  - To introduce a £65 per year charge to collect garden waste from households that opt into the scheme (additional bins per property will be charged at £65 per year)
  - recruitment of 2 additional Recycling Officers
  - recruitment of 2 additional Enforcement Officers
  - To invest £500k in Street Cleaning Services.
- 1.2 The investment of £500k per year into Street Cleaning Services will be a total of £2.2m re-invested in Street Services over the 5-year business plan as set out in table in paragraph 6.1.13.
- 1.3 The total net savings over the 5-year business plan will be £7.5m from Waste Services.
- 1.4 The Council has been clear from the start of this process what the criteria for evaluating the proposals would be. This was also published in the Consultation documents to ensure transparency and fairness. Ongoing funding reductions, unfunded inflationary and demographic cost pressures mean significant savings or increased income is required in 2019/20. In addition, the Council will be required to find around £12 million further savings in 2020/21. Therefore, the primary driver is financial savings, and then conformity with the London Mayor's Environment Strategy and to consider the responses of the Consultation. The Consultation had 5,602 responses.
- 1.5 Financial savings for Proposal 7 were significantly higher when compared to any other proposal or the current collection system, it conforms with the Mayor's Environment Strategy by providing separate food waste collections and has a projected step change in recycling to 49%. Proposal 7 was the least preferred amongst the respondents of the Consultation at 9%. Retaining the current system was the preferred proposal amongst respondents (66%).
- 1.6 Feedback given during the Consultation has been considered and proposed measures that would mitigate against these concerns have been addressed within this report. Any proposed measures will be introduced at the appropriate time and communicated to residents in advance. Some examples of these measures are:

- investing £500k into street cleansing and fly tipping. This is equivalent to 19 additional street sweepers / 57 kilometres of streets swept per day or 114 kilometres of streets litter picked per day
- trialling some garden waste collection points at selected parks across the borough from April 2020 and collecting limited amounts of leaf fall directly from properties from Autumn 2020
- exchange small (140 litre) dry recycling bins and garden waste bins for bigger bins for free during the rollout of that service and a policy to collect as much recycling as a household presents.
- four new full-time posts (2 Sc 6 enforcement and 2 Sc 6 recycling officers) plus an annual communication budget of £100k.

1.7 It is proposed that separate weekly food waste collections and the introduction of a charge for garden waste collections are implemented from November 2019, with the introduction of fortnightly dry recycling collections and fortnightly refuse collections in Spring 2020.

1.8 It is proposed that a clear governance structure will be developed for the project to ensure delivery is progressed and political oversight is maintained. A Strategic Delivery Board will be created with the Cabinet Member for Environment being the chair and other Members included on the board as well as a range of officers. A request has been submitted to other local authorities who have delivered similar changes, to have their senior officers act as critical friends as part of the board.

1.9 Ongoing revenue cost will be £500k reinvestment in street cleansing and £259k additional staff and communications and one-off mobilisation costs of £2.28 million, funded through flexible use of capital receipts to retain maximum savings benefit. When fully implemented the recommended changes will generate an annual gross saving of around £2.8 million and a net saving of £2,040,034 every year thereafter.

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that Cabinet approves:

2.1 The adoption and implementation of Proposal 7 for kerbside properties with a wheeled bin of; fortnightly refuse collections, fortnightly dry recycling collections, a new separate weekly food waste collection and the introduction of a charge of £65 per year for collecting garden waste from properties that opt into the service as set out in this report.

2.2 The creation of a Strategic Delivery Board made up of members and officers (such members to be appointed by the Leader of the Council) to oversee the implementation of the new service arrangements.

2.3 To delegate to the Director of Environment (in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment) the decision to procure, negotiate and award contracts (in accordance with the Council's Procurement Rules) for the vehicles and any works and services as appropriate associated with the implementation of the recommended proposal.

2.4 The one-off mobilisation and capital expenditure, of £2.28 million will be funded by the flexible use of capital receipts and £759K (£500k investment and £259k new posts and communications) will be revenue.

2.6 To delegate to the Director of Environment (in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment) the decision to make operational amendments to any of the proposals as set out in this report.

### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Since 2010 Enfield Council has had to save £178 million because of Government spending cuts and increasing pressure on services.
- 3.2 Local government is facing an extremely challenging financial outlook following a prolonged period of austerity and disproportionate growth in demand for services which is becoming unsustainable. The like-for-like change in public spending with that for local government funding over the decade to 2019-20, shows that core funding from central government to the London Borough of Enfield (LBE) will have fallen by 50% in real terms.
- 3.3 The budget for 2019/20 comes at a time of considerable uncertainty for local government, with the as yet unknown implications of the 2019 Spending Review, the Fair Funding Review, further Business Rates Retention, and Brexit making financial planning extremely difficult.
- 3.4 Ongoing funding reductions and unfunded inflationary and demographic cost pressures means £18 million of savings or increase income is required in 2019/20 and about £12 million further savings for the following year 2020/21.
- 3.5 Currently LBE spends approximately £15.1 million on collecting, treating and disposing of waste and recycling across the borough.
- 3.6 Waste disposal costs are likely to significantly increase and are related to the construction of the new Energy from Waste and Resource Recovery Facility planned at the Eco park in Edmonton. This is being delivered by the North London Waste Authority (NLWA). LBE is the statutory Waste Collection Authority and the NLWA is the statutory Waste Disposal Authority for LBE. Furthermore, the cost of processing dry recyclables has, and is, expected to significantly increase, creating a potential future budget pressure of around £665k per year.
- 3.7 Additionally, the former Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) gave LBE a grant of £2.46 million in 2012/13 to retain weekly collections for waste and recycling which has now ceased (2018/19). The Government does not intend to restart this funding.
- 3.8 LBE has been reviewing a number of areas across the organisation to try to meet the current and future budget gap. As part of this process, officers within waste services have worked with Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd, who are experts in the waste and resources sector and have undertaken waste collection modelling for over 170 authorities, including 40% of English authorities, to identify potential savings that could contribute towards the overall financial gap. Using proven sophisticated modelling software different ways of collecting waste and recycling collections from kerbside properties with a wheeled bin have been considered.
- 3.9 There are approximately 130,000 properties in Enfield; 90,000 of these are kerbside (87,500 of these have wheeled bins and 2,500 bagged). The proposals are for the 87,500 kerbside properties and exclude properties using a bagged collection service (approximately 2,500 households). Communal collections from flats and estates or hard to reach properties such as flats above shops (around 40,000) have also been excluded. A strategy to tackle waste and recycling from these properties is currently being developed between officers in Waste Services and Housing Services as these

property types have different requirements and issues compared to kerbside properties with wheeled bins.

- 3.10 Current kerbside waste and recycling collections from properties with wheeled bins are:
- refuse collected weekly
  - mixed dry recycling collected weekly
  - mixed garden and food waste collected fortnightly (with no charge for collecting garden waste)
- 3.11 A decision was taken by the Cabinet Member for Environment to go out to public consultation on the proposed changes to waste services. Advice was taken from Legal Services to ensure the format and information provided was legal and fair. This included seven proposals and the current service. The information was clear and set out the criteria by which any decisions would be made.

### Consultation

- 3.12 The Public Consultation on the Waste Collection Service (the Consultation) ran for 10 consecutive weeks between 29 October 2018 and 6 January 2019.
- 3.13 The Consultation sought residents' views on the seven proposals and retaining the current collection system. The feedback from the Consultation has been conscientiously considered to help inform the recommendation for change.
- 3.14 The Consultation included information on why LBE was proposing to change the way it provides the waste and recycling collections, details of the proposals, and the criteria that would be used to develop a recommendation and the design of any future services.
- 3.15 An online version and hard copies of the Consultation were made available to residents across the borough. A copy of the Consultation can be found in **Appendix 1** and the Consultation findings and a summary can be found in **Appendix 2**.
- 3.16 A wide range of promotional activity was undertaken to raise awareness of the Consultation across the borough and a copy of the full Marketing Campaign can be found in **Appendix 3**. Proactive monitoring and promotion of the Consultation was undertaken on a weekly basis throughout the 10-week period to ensure it was accessible to all and representative.
- 3.17 The seven proposals plus retaining the current service are shown in table one below along with projected savings and predicted recycling performance levels.

**Table 1: Seven Proposals and Retaining the Current Collection System**

Proposal	Description	Potential Max Recycling Rate %	Projected Gross Savings £
<b>Current collection system</b>	Weekly refuse Weekly dry recycling Fortnightly mixed food and garden (no charge)	40%	Increased costs: £665k MRF £996k separate food Increase disposal

Proposal	Description	Potential Max Recycling Rate %	Projected Savings £	Gross
			costs	
Proposal 1	Weekly refuse Weekly dry Weekly separate food Fortnightly charged garden (£65)	38%	£520k	
Proposal 2	Weekly refuse Fortnightly dry Fortnightly mixed food and garden (no charge)	37%	£97k	
Proposal 3	Weekly refuse Fortnightly dry Weekly separate food Fortnightly charged garden (£65)	35%	£1,073k	
Proposal 4	Fortnightly refuse Weekly dry Fortnightly mixed food and garden (no charge)	48%	£1,028k	
Proposal 5	Fortnightly refuse Weekly dry Weekly separate food Fortnightly charged garden (£65)	50%	£2,012k	
Proposal 6	Fortnightly refuse Fortnightly dry Fortnightly mixed food and garden (no charge)	48%	£1,815k	
Proposal 7	Fortnightly refuse Fortnightly dry Weekly separate food Fortnightly charged garden (£65)	49%	£2,800k	

- 3.18 There was a good response to the Consultation with 5,602 people completing the survey. It must be noted that this equates to around 5.5% of the kerbside properties in the borough or less than 2% of the borough population of around 332,705 people.
- 3.19 The findings of the Consultation were presented to Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 31 January and a hard copy of this presentation with the full details of the responses can be found in the Members Library.
- 3.20 The key findings from the Consultation showed that 97% of respondents thought recycling was important.
- 3.21 The majority of respondents (66%) thought introducing a separate weekly collection for food waste would have a positive impact or no impact on their household. 42% thought introducing fortnightly collections for dry recycling would have a positive impact or no impact on their household. 33% thought introducing fortnightly collections for refuse would have a positive impact or no impact on their household, and 28% thought introducing charged fortnightly collections for garden waste at £65 per year would have a positive or no impact on their household.

- 3.22 When asked directly; do you think it is reasonable to charge for garden waste collections, 25% were not against charging; yes (16%) and not sure (9%). 75% thought it was unreasonable to charge for garden waste.
- 3.23 As part of any service design it is important to understand what negative impacts (perceived or actual) there might be on the service user. This makes it possible to consider whether the impact can be designed out by putting additional measures in place to counter the identified impact such as comprehensive communications or adjusting the original design to mitigate against it.
- 3.24 Those who responded negatively were asked how the change might impact on their household. Respondents were also asked what could be put in place to help manage change. A range of reasons were given as to why they thought one of the proposed changes would have a negative impact on their household, the main themes are set out in table two below. These have been addressed with responses and a range of measures have been proposed to help mitigate against any negative impact. These are set out in the Recommended Proposal section of this report.

**Table 2: Perceived Negative Impact**

Proposed Change	Themes	
Fortnightly refuse	Key themes	Bin size Vermin / smells Litter / fly tipping Health hazard / unhygienic
	Other themes	Nappies Incontinence Missed collections – month of no collections Bank holiday disruption Only one recycling centre Collect a wider range of recycling Council tax already high
Fortnightly Dry Recycling	Key themes	Bin size Discourages recycling Too much packaging from shops Worry about Christmas
	Other themes	Put recycling materials into the refuse bin
Separate Weekly Food Waste	Key themes	Not needed Why separate from garden Vermin / insects Smell Little food waste Health hazard Bin shown too small
	Other themes	None
Charged Fortnightly Garden (@£65 per year)	Key themes	Already paid by Council Tax Don't want to pay Fly tipping Extra car journeys to the tip Disincentive to recycle Street leaves for Council

Proposed Change	Themes	
	Other themes	Impact on street scene Rented properties Seasonal service Alternatives for those that can't pay
What could help manage change		Larger bins More material that could be recycled Reduce Council Tax Another Reuse and Recycling Centre

- 3.25 Respondents were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed that each of the proposals should be adopted or whether the current service should be retained. To summarise the responses to the seven proposals it can generally be said that there was no strong majority for any of the proposals, 66% of respondents preferred to retain the current collections with 46% strongly agreeing and 20% agreeing.

### Benchmarking

- 3.26 Table three below uses WRAP data (2017) and provides an indication of what waste and recycling collection frequencies are present in other councils (391 councils) across the UK, giving a national context.

**Table 3: Waste and Recycling Collections across the UK (WRAP 2017)**

Material Stream	Collection Frequency	Number of Councils	%
<b>Refuse</b>	Weekly or more	72	18%
	* <b>Fortnightly</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>78%</b>
	3-4 weeks	16	4%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Dry recycling</b>	Weekly or more	86	22%
	* <b>Fortnightly</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>76%</b>
	3-4 weeks	8	2%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Garden</b>	Free	104	27%
	* <b>Charged</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>53%</b>
	No service	13	3%
	Mixed with food - free	68	17%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Food</b>	* <b>Weekly</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>41%</b>
	Fortnightly	2	1%
	No collection – mixed with refuse	161	41%
	Mixed with garden waste – free	68	17%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>100%</b>

- 3.27 Out of the 33 London boroughs 13 councils operate a fortnightly refuse collection with a charged garden service (with others currently exploring this option), as set out

in the table below. Seven of these councils operate a less than weekly dry recycling collection compared to a weekly service, and these are highlighted in yellow. The table below also shows the recycling performance increase from making the change from weekly refuse to fortnightly refuse, with a separate weekly food waste collection. The performance ranges from 3.7 percent to 13.5 percent with the average increase being 9.5%. Enfield borough's characteristics are particularly comparable with Croydon and Ealing.

Table 4: Collection Systems with Recycling Performance

London Borough	Recycling Performance %		
	Before	After	Increase %
Bexley	41.6%	50.7%	9.1
Brent	33.4%	42.5%	9.1
Bromley	36.4	49.1	12.7
Camden	26.7%	30.3%	3.7
Croydon	33.5%	44.3%	10.8
Ealing	43.0%	50.7%	7.7
Haringey	25.7%	35.8%	10.1
Harrow	27.6%	39.6%	12.0
Hounslow	Jul -17		n/a
Kingston upon Thames	Oct – 17		n/a
Lewisham	Oct – 17		n/a
Merton	Oct – 18		n/a
Sutton	36.5%	50.0%	13.5%

### Evaluation of Proposals

- 3.28 LBE has been clear from the start of this process what the criteria for evaluating the proposal would be. This was also published in the Consultation documents to ensure transparency and fairness.
- 3.29 The seven proposals, and the current collection system have been considered against the pre-agreed criteria.
- 3.30 The primary driver of the evaluation is the financial savings that can be achieved. The evaluation also takes into account conformity with the Mayor's Environment Strategy, and the responses to the Consultation.
- 3.31 Since 2010 LBE has had to save £178 million because of reductions in revenue support grant. Ongoing funding reductions means a further £18 million of savings or increase income is required in 2019/20. In addition, demands on services have significantly increased.
- 3.32 Table one (provided earlier in this report) sets out the saving that each of the proposals is projected to deliver. These savings have been modelled and tested by Waste Services, Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd and LBE finance service.
- 3.33 Financial Evaluation – If LBE retained the current collection service there is likely to be increased costs for processing dry recycling and refuse disposal. Proposals 1, 2, 3 and 4 project relatively low savings compared to proposals 5, 6 and 7. Proposals 5, 6 and 7 project the highest savings. Given LBE's financial position and the need to set a sustainable budget that continues to ensure the delivery of local services

only proposals 5, 6 and 7 are considered to deliver an adequate saving and therefore meet the financial criterion. The current collection service would actually, in the medium term, increase costs to LBE. Table five below summarises this.

**Table 5: Financial Evaluation**

Proposal	Description	Projected Gross Savings (£)
<b>Current collection system</b>	- Weekly refuse - Weekly dry recycling - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	Increased costs: £665k MRF £996k separate food Increase disposal costs?
<b>Proposal 1</b>	- Weekly refuse - Weekly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	<b>£520k</b>
<b>Proposal 2</b>	- Weekly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	<b>£97k</b>
<b>Proposal 3</b>	- Weekly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	<b>£1,073k</b>
<b>Proposal 4</b>	- Fortnightly refuse - Weekly dry - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	<b>£1,028k</b>
<b>Proposal 5</b>	- Fortnightly refuse - Weekly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	<b>£2,012k</b>
<b>Proposal 6</b>	- Fortnightly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	<b>£1,815k</b>
<b>Proposal 7</b>	- Fortnightly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	<b>£2,800k</b>

3.34 The Mayor's London Environment Strategy (the Strategy) sets out policy direction around waste management for London borough's and includes a minimum level of service provision required for households. The Strategy includes providing a separate food waste collection by 2020 (this is sent for recycling / processing) which if implemented in isolation would cost LBE around £996k per year. The list of the minimum standard required by this Strategy (that is relevant to kerbside properties) is set out below:

- six main dry recycling materials collected (glass, cans, paper, plastic bottles, mixed rigid plastics such as tubs, pots and trays - LBE is already compliant)
- separate food waste collections by 2020
- boroughs are encouraged to consider a range of measures to restrict refuse waste.

3.35 The Strategy also sets a 50% recycling target for local authority collected waste. This is to encourage local authorities to continue striving for high recycling performance.

- 3.36 The Mayor has regulatory powers to ensure that the statutory waste authorities' plans, services and contracts are in general conformity with Mayoral waste strategies and policies. The Mayor has the power to direct a waste collection authority where their waste activities are considered detrimental to the implementation of the municipal waste provisions of the London Environment Strategy. The Mayor also has a role to play in facilitating and supporting good practice.
- 3.37 Evaluation – Conformity with the Mayors Environment Strategy (recycling performance) - retaining the current collection system and proposals 1, 2 and 3 project relatively low recycling rates compared to proposals 4, 5, 6 and 7. Proposals 4, 5, 6 and 7 project a step change in recycling rates and therefore conforms with the Mayors Strategy to encourage local authorities to strive for high recycling performance (circa 50%), and therefore meets this element of the criteria.
- 3.38 Retaining the current collection system and proposals 2, 4 and 6 do not provide a separate food waste collection. Proposals 1, 3, 5 and 7 provide a separate food waste collection and therefore conforms with the Mayors Strategy for local authorities to provide a separate food waste collection and meets this element of the criteria. Table six below summarises the proposals and the current system against the Mayor's Strategy criterion.

**Table 6: Conformity with the Mayors Strategy**

Proposal	Description	Step Change in Recycling	Separate Food Waste Collection
<b>Current collection system</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Weekly refuse</li> <li>- Weekly dry recycling</li> <li>- Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)</li> </ul>	40%	No
<b>Proposal 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Weekly refuse</li> <li>- Weekly dry</li> <li>- Weekly separate food</li> <li>- Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)</li> </ul>	38%	Yes
<b>Proposal 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Weekly refuse</li> <li>- Fortnightly dry</li> <li>- Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)</li> </ul>	37%	No
<b>Proposal 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Weekly refuse</li> <li>- Fortnightly dry</li> <li>- Weekly separate food</li> <li>- Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)</li> </ul>	35%	Yes
<b>Proposal 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fortnightly refuse</li> <li>- Weekly dry</li> <li>- Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)</li> </ul>	48%	No
<b>Proposal 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fortnightly refuse</li> <li>- Weekly dry</li> <li>- Weekly separate food</li> <li>- Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)</li> </ul>	50%	Yes
<b>Proposal 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fortnightly refuse</li> <li>- Fortnightly dry</li> <li>- Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)</li> </ul>	48%	No
<b>Proposal 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fortnightly refuse</li> <li>- Fortnightly dry</li> <li>- Weekly separate food</li> <li>- Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)</li> </ul>	49%	Yes

- 3.39 Evaluation - Consultation Responses -The table below summarises the percentage of consultees who 'strongly agreed' or 'tend to agree' with each proposal. Retention of the current service was the most popular choice followed by proposals 1 and 2.

**Table 7: Consultation Evaluation**

Proposal	Description	Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Total Agreed
<b>Current collection system</b>	- Weekly refuse - Weekly dry recycling - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	46%	20%	<b>66%</b>
<b>Proposal 1</b>	- Weekly refuse - Weekly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	17%	14%	<b>31%</b>
<b>Proposal 2</b>	- Weekly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	14%	17.5%	<b>31.5%</b>
<b>Proposal 3</b>	- Weekly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	4.5%	8.5%	<b>13%</b>
<b>Proposal 4</b>	- Fortnightly refuse - Weekly dry - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	11%	13%	<b>24%</b>
<b>Proposal 5</b>	- Fortnightly refuse - Weekly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	5%	6%	<b>11%</b>
<b>Proposal 6</b>	- Fortnightly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	7%	7%	<b>14%</b>
<b>Proposal 7</b>	- Fortnightly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	5.5%	3%	<b>8.5%</b>

- 3.40 Table eight brings together how each of the proposals perform in relation to the criteria set out at the start of the Consultation.

**Table 8: Evaluation Criteria**

Proposal	Description	Finance	Mayors Strategy		Consultation	Total
			Food	Recycling		
<b>Current collection system</b>	- Weekly refuse - Weekly dry recycling - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Proposal 1</b>	- Weekly refuse - Weekly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Proposal 2</b>	- Weekly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>0</b>

Proposal	Description	Finance	Mayors Strategy		Consultation	Total
			Food	Recycling		
Proposal 3	- Weekly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	N	Y	N	N	1
Proposal 4	- Fortnightly refuse - Weekly dry - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	N	N	Y	N	1
Proposal 5	- Fortnightly refuse - Weekly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	Y	Y	Y	N	3
Proposal 6	- Fortnightly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Fortnightly mixed food and garden (free)	Y	N	Y	N	2
Proposal 7	- Fortnightly refuse - Fortnightly dry - Weekly separate food - Fortnightly Charged garden (£65)	Y	Y	Y	N	3

3.41 Based on the evaluation of the proposals and the current collection system no proposal or the current system meet all of the criteria. Proposals 5 and 7 meet the majority of the criteria requirements compared to all the other proposals being considered. The key difference between proposal 5 and 7 is that Proposal 7 projects around a further £800k. As financial savings is considered the primary criterion then Proposal 7 best meets the requirements of the set criteria.

### Recommendation Proposal

3.42 It is proposed that the current waste and recycling collection system is replaced with Proposal 7 which consists of:

- fortnightly collections for refuse
- fortnightly collections for dry recycling
- separate weekly collections for food waste
- fortnightly collections for a charged garden waste service (at £65 per year)
- recruitment of 2 additional Recycling Officers
- recruitment of 2 additional Enforcement Officers
- re-investment of £500k in Street Cleaning Services (equivalent to 19 additional street sweepers / 57 kilometres of street sweeping per day or 114 kilometres for streets litter picked per day. Street Services was the popular suggestion to re-invest the £500k from the consultation responses.

3.43 The proposed recommendation has been shared and consulted on with the trade unions: GMB, Unite and Unison. As there are predicted to be no redundancies the trade unions support a gross saving of around £2.8 million delivered by adopting Proposal 7.

- 3.44 The proposal creates new jobs: additional enforcement officers, new recycling officer posts and possible further job creation through the investment £500k such as increases in street cleaning and fly tipping resources, these were welcomed by the trade unions.
- 3.45 It is important to understand what challenges there might be on the service user as highlighted earlier in the Consultation section. Feedback given during the Consultation has been considered and proposed measures that would mitigate against these concerns have been set out in table nine below. Any proposed measures will be introduced at the appropriate time and communicated to residents in advance.

**Table 9: You said, we will**

You said	We will
<p><u>Fly tipping issues</u></p> <p>There was a perception that fly tipping would be a problem as a result of charging for garden waste and / or fortnightly collections for refuse.</p>	<p>There is no correlation between charging for garden waste and / or collecting refuse fortnightly with significant increases in fly tipping.</p> <p>However, it is proposed that through the creation of jobs, additional recycling and enforcement resources will be employed during the mobilisation stage of any change to ensure the service rolls out smoothly and no unforeseen impacts occur such as increased fly tipping. It is also proposed that two permanent recycling officers and two enforcement officers will be employed. Along with a substantial communication budget (£120k for the mobilisation and £100k year-on-year) to help raise awareness of the service and improve engagement with residents. For example, communications and marketing will be developed that raise awareness of what can be recycled and how people can manage their waste better.</p> <p>It is proposed that £500k is invested into street cleansing and fly tipping activities. It is proposed that the investment is used in areas identified of need and is not fixed to specific areas. If this is invested into street cleaning it would equate to 19 additional operatives or an additional 57 kilometres of street sweeping per day or 114 kilometres of streets litter picked per day.</p>
<p><u>Bin size for refuse</u></p> <p>There was a perception that the standard refuse bin would be too small.</p>	<p>Waste Minimisation is an overarching national and international strategy. Reducing the amount of waste households produce is key to achieving this. Composition analysis shows that around 50% of the contents of the average refuse bin could still be recycled, with most of this being food waste.</p> <p>To promote waste minimisation it is proposed that there is no change to the current size of the refuse bin.</p> <p>Instead, through the introduction of a weekly separate food waste collection service, additional capacity will be available to the separate food waste for recycling (46 litres over a two-week period). More than one food caddy can be</p>

You said	We will
	<p>requested if required. New food caddies' and replacements will be free of charge. Additional capacity for dry recycling is proposed as set out later in this table.</p> <p>Restricting the refuse bin and providing additional food waste capacity will encourage more food waste to be recycled weekly.</p> <p>It is proposed that additional recycling officers and a communication budget will support education around how residents can recycle more.</p> <p>In addition to the extra food waste capacity, LBE's existing policy for larger refuse bins means that families of five or more or those with two children in nappies can request a bigger bin (240 litre bin for refuse). It is proposed that the current policy is extended to those households with a disability or health issues e.g. Absorbent Hygiene Products. Each household will be assessed on its own merit, as per existing arrangements. It is proposed that any bigger bin request under the larger bin policy during that service change roll-out would be free of charge.</p> <p>Waste minimisation and improving recycling will play an important role and the proposed new resource and communication budget will be used to support residents to reduce waste and recycle more.</p>
<p><u>Bin size for dry</u></p> <p>Capacity concerns raised</p> <p><u>Fortnightly dry recycling discourages recycling</u></p> <p><u>Worried about too much packaging / internet shopping</u></p> <p><u>Worry about Christmas</u></p>	<p>LBE wants to encourage recycling and will collect as much recycling material as residents wish to put out, therefore it is proposed that households with a smaller dry recycling bin (140 litre) can exchange it for a larger bin (240 litre), free of charge during the service change roll-out. It is also proposed that any additional dry recycling presented is collected on the designated collection day. Dry recyclables can be put out for collection in clear dry bags (available from LBE on request) or as large pieces of cardboard and this includes Christmas collections. Material must be presented in a way that does not cause a litter nuisance and communications will support this messaging.</p> <p>It is proposed that two additional recycling officers and a communication budget (£100k per year) will support education around how residents can recycle more, tips on how to compact recyclables such as squeeze drink bottles to make more space in the bin and waste minimisation e.g. produce less packaging in the first instance.</p>
<p><u>Food caddy bin</u></p> <p>There was a perception that the</p>	<p>Through the introduction of a weekly separate food waste collection service, additional capacity will be available to the separate food waste for recycling (46 litres over a two-week period). More than one food caddy can be requested if</p>

You said	We will
<p>new food caddy would be too small</p>	<p>required. New food caddies' and replacements will be free of charge. Additional capacity for dry recycling is proposed as set out in this table.</p> <p>Food liners (a total of 52) will be provided to the relevant households.</p>
<p><u>Charging for garden waste collections is already covered by Council Tax</u></p> <p><u>Don't want to pay</u></p> <p>There was general negativity that respondents did not want to pay for their garden waste to be collected.</p>	<p>The garden waste service is a non-statutory service, which means LBE is not required to provide a service.</p> <p>Currently the service is an opt-out, whereas the proposal assumes an opt-in. This means only those residents who want to dispose of garden waste from their doorstep can subscribe. It is proposed that a second 240 litre bin for garden waste is available on request for £65 per year. It is proposed that 140 litre garden bins can be exchanged for a 240 litre bin free of charge for those that subscribe to the charged garden service during the roll-out of the new service.</p> <p>It is proposed households that generate small amounts of garden waste can take their recycling to Barrowell Green Reuse and Recycling Centre or home compost. To support this, it is proposed that LBE will provide free compost bins which will be available on request.</p> <p>Entry into Barrowell Green Reuse and Recycling Centre will be reviewed to explore improvements that enable pedestrian access.</p> <p>It is proposed that LBE trials for one-year additional garden collection points which will be made available in Spring and in Autumn at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pymmes – Park Lane entrance</li> <li>• Jubilee Park – Galliard Entrance</li> <li>• Albany Park – Conop Road entrance (Tennis courts / Car Park)</li> <li>• Trent Park – Cockfoster Road Entrance – Public car park</li> </ul> <p>It is proposed that Christmas tree collections will remain in parks. Christmas tree collections from properties will also remain in place.</p>
<p><u>Collection of leaves generated by Council trees</u></p> <p>The Consultation identified a very small number of</p>	<p>It is proposed that LBE trials ad-hoc collections for small amounts of leaf fall during the leafing season and review after year one. Residents can contact LBE and arrange a one-off separate collection for leaves during Autumn, maximum three clear bags per property in any one year (provided by LBE).</p>

You said	We will
<p>respondents that do not generate sufficient garden waste to subscribe to the charged scheme but do collect leaves from their property or their street during Autumn. The leaves are from trees that are owned by the Council.</p>	
<p><u>Missed collections and bank holiday collections</u></p> <p>Concerns were raised that if a bin was not collected there would be no collection for a month.</p>	<p>LBE's policy is that any bin not collected due to the collection crew will be collected within one working day. It is proposed that the current policy remains.</p> <p>With the exception of Christmas, bin collections remain unchanged during bank holidays. During the two weeks over Christmas and New Year collections are enhanced and days are changed slightly. These changes are communicated to residents. It is proposed that this policy remains unchanged.</p>
<p><u>Wider range of recycling materials</u></p>	<p>LBE currently collects a wide range of dry recycling materials and is comparable with the other six boroughs in North London. A communication strategy will be developed to support the roll-out of any new service and raise awareness of the materials that can be recycled.</p>
<p><u>Vermin / Smells / Unhygienic</u></p> <p>Concerns were raised around smells, vermin and hygiene with moving to fortnightly collections for refuse and separate food waste collections.</p>	<p>It is proposed that food waste ('smelly waste') will be collected <b>weekly</b> in a 23 litre container. This means food recycling would be collected more frequently compared to the existing arrangements and that there should not be a build-up of 'smelly waste'.</p> <p>In addition, it is proposed that two rolls of 26 caddy liners per year (which is the same as 1 liner per week) are made available to each property affected by the proposed changes for free. It is proposed that LBE trials delivering liners directly to each property in year 1, with the intention to continue delivering directly or making liners available in LBE buildings and libraries in year 2.</p>
<p><u>An additional Reuse and Recycling Centre</u></p>	<p>There is a proposal to build a new Reuse and Recycling Centre in Enfield as part of the construction of the NLWA new Energy from Waste and Resource Recovery Facility planned at the Eco park in Edmonton.</p>

### Implementation

- 3.46 An experienced delivery board already exists for this project. This includes officers with previous experience of service change at LBE and across London. This board will be refreshed to include officers from Procurement, Communications and workforce representatives from the Trade Unions. In addition, a Strategic Delivery Board with clear governance will be created.
- 3.47 The Cabinet Member for Environment being the chair and other Members included on the board as well as a range of relevant officers. A request has been submitted to other local authorities who have already delivered these type of service changes and operate a similar service to have a senior officer act as a critical friend on the board.
- 3.48 It is expected that resident's current collection day will remain unchanged. It is proposed that one-week dry recycling is collected from a property, and the alternative week refuse is collected. Food recycling will be collected every week on the same day as either refuse or dry recycling. For those that subscribe to the service, garden waste will be collected on the same day with either dry recycling or refuse.
- 3.49 It is proposed that charging for fortnightly collections for garden waste will be an annual subscription of £65 per bin from 1 April every year. It is proposed that charging for fortnightly garden waste collections start in November 2019 and that the subscription lasts until 31 March 2021. This effectively means an 18-month subscription period (6-months free) as an introductory offer. Annual (12-month) subscriptions to the service will start from 1 April 2021 onwards.
- 3.50 It is proposed that the service changes are rolled out over a 6-month period. Separate weekly food waste collections and a charged garden service at £65 would be introduced in November 2019 and fortnightly collections for dry recycling and for refuse collections would be introduced in Spring 2020. A proposed timeline is shown in Figure one overleaf.

**Figure 1: Proposed timeline**

	Feb 2019	Mar 2019	Apr 2019	May 2019	Jun 2019	Jul 2019	Aug 2019	Sep 2019	Oct 2019	Nov 2019	Dec 2019	Jan 2020	Feb 2020	Mar 2020	Apr 2020	May 2020	Jun 2020
Decision taken																	
Project Governance – Create Project Delivery Board (to include Cabinet Member/ Members)																	
Procure Food Waste Vehicles																	
Develop ICT System																	
Recruit Implementation Staff																	
Develop Communication and Marketing Strategy and material																	
Introduce new Food Waste Collections																	
Introduce Charged Garden Collections																	
Introduce fortnightly collections for refuse																	
Introduce fortnightly collections for dry recycling – option 7 only																	

- 3.51 It is proposed that ongoing resource is provided to support the changes and includes £100k per year for ongoing communications and 2 Sc6 new permanent

Recycling Officers and 2 Sc6 new Enforcement officers. Table 10 provides a summary of the revenue costs.

- 3.52 The proposed comprehensive communications and engagement campaign will be delivered to keep residents informed about service changes and give guidance on how best to take advantage of the new arrangements. These communication activities will build on the successful promotion of the Consultation which elicited 5,602 responses from across all corners of the borough – the highest response rate recorded for any LBE consultation.
- 3.53 Communications will be delivered through a wide range of channels and activities to reach all service users. All 87,500 households in the borough will be reached through utilising the waste facilities themselves (sticker campaigns on bins, calendars, livery on refuse trucks) as well as leaflet drops and LBE publications. Additional targeted communications will be delivered to hard-to-reach residents and communities through digital and social media campaigns, community newspapers, forums and groups and on-line community networks. An extensive programme of face-to-face engagement activities including door knocking and community events will compliment this comprehensive communications campaign.
- 3.54 This commitment to keeping residents informed and engaged in the waste and recycling collection system will be enabled by significant, long-term investment in dedicated communications resources. These will deliver up-to-date service information, advise and guide residents on the best way to use the new facilities and encourage behaviour change to help support a sustainable service and borough.
- 3.55 Sustainability - The new service will be developed with sustainability in mind, this will include low emission vehicles and will also explore the feasibility of electric vehicles where possible. Project initiatives and proposals will consider any alternatives there may be to reduce vehicle usage. Promotion of recycling and waste minimisation will play an important role in the roll-out of the services changes. This is important as recycling helps protect the environment, it also reduces the need for extracting (mining, quarrying and logging), refining and processing raw materials all of which create substantial air and water pollution. As recycling saves energy it also reduces greenhouse gas emissions, which helps to tackle climate change.
- 3.56 The recommended proposal is likely to see a significant reduction in the amount of green waste being transported around the borough and an increase in composting with free bins being distributed to those households that require them. Composting at home is a more sustainable method of processing the garden waste.

**Table 10: Full Year Projected Savings for Proposal 7**

Gross Projected Savings	£2,799,034
Revenue Growth – staff and comms	£259,000
Revenue Growth – Proposal (Investment into Street Cleaning and Fly Tipping)	£500,000
Projected Annual Net Savings	£2,040,034

- 3.57 The service and financial modelling have been produced by Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd using proven sophisticated software specially designed for the waste and recycling industry. Eunomia have worked with over 170 local authorities nationally to help them make savings and redesign services.

- 3.58 Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd has worked with LBE for several years, consequently they have detailed knowledge of the service, its key cost drivers and the factors that influence those drivers. These metrics have been tested by operational managers and have been used to create a robust and detailed cost model that underpins the savings created by the chosen proposal.
- 3.59 To help support the roll-out of the service changes it is proposed that a one-off mobilisation cost of £2.28 million is allocated (capital receipts). £1.06 million of this is for a dedicated mobilisation team and up to £1.22 million will be for the capital costs of free replacement bigger bins, new food waste caddies and liners.
- 3.60 North London Waste Authority who dispose of refuse, Biffa Waste Services Ltd who is contracted to process LBE's dry recycling, food waste and garden waste once collected, and Suez UK Ltd who operates Barrowell Reuse and Recycling centre are aware of the potential changes and have confirmed they have capacity and resources to manage any impacts that may result from the service change.

#### **4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 The primary driver of the evaluation is the financial savings that can be achieved. The evaluation also takes into account conformity with the Mayor's Environment Strategy, and the responses to the consultation.
- 4.2 Proposals 1 to 6, the current collection system and the recommended proposal have been considered against the pre-agreed criteria. Proposals 1 to 6 and retaining the current collection system least aligned with the set criteria.

#### **5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 LBE has been clear from the start of this process what the criteria for evaluating the proposals would be. This was also published in the Consultation documents to ensure transparency and fairness. These were primarily financial savings, and then conformity with the London Mayor's Environment Strategy and to consider the responses of the Consultation.
- 5.2 Financial savings for Proposal 7 were significantly higher when compared to any other proposal or the current collection system and would make a considerable single contribution to the savings target for 2019/20 and the current budget gap of around £12 million for 2020/21. It conforms with the Mayor's Environment Strategy by providing separate food waste collections and has a projected step change in recycling to 49%. Proposal 7 was the least preferred amongst the respondents of the Consultation at 9%. With the exception of retaining the current system there was no clear majority for any of the proposals.
- 5.3 As part of any service design it is important to understand what challenges there might be on the service user as highlighted earlier in the Consultation section. Feedback given during the Consultation has been considered and proposed measures that would mitigate against these concerns have been set out in the Proposal Section of this report. Any proposed measures will be introduced at the appropriate time and communicated to residents in advance.

## **6. COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **6.1 Financial Implications**

- 6.1.1 The service costs around £15.1m million (2017/18 actual cost) – this total includes NLWA disposal, Waste Operations, Waste client, Civic Amenity Site, Comingled Dry Recycling and Organic Waste costs.
- 6.1.2 LBE has a challenging savings target of £18 million by 2019/20, and a further saving (currently around £12 million will need to be found in 2020/21).
- 6.1.3 In preparation to find savings to contribute to the overall savings target, proposals regarding different collection systems from kerbside properties with wheeled bin(s) have been explored for waste and recycling services.
- 6.1.4 The seven proposals plus retaining the current service were modelled by a Waste specialist company “Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd”, in collaboration with Council officers (Waste Operations, Finance and Fleet). The seven proposals, and the current collection system were considered against the pre-agreed criteria. The primary driver of the evaluation was the financial savings that can be achieved. The evaluation also took into account conformity with the Mayor’s Environment Strategy, and the responses to the Consultation.
- 6.1.5 Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd used purpose-built financial analysis models to determine the level of savings achievable. The savings from the proposals fall into three main categories. Staffing and vehicle costs, treatment costs and income from the uptake in the chargeable garden waste service. Eunomia routinely use this modelling analysis to support private waste contractors (when they bid for local authority contracts) in addition to supporting other local authorities undertaking similar exercises.
- 6.1.6 The vehicle and staffing costs are calculated from the reduced number of ‘vehicle rounds’. The reduction proposed in Proposal 7 has been verified by the operational Head of Waste Services who has nearly 25 years of experience of running waste services both in the public and private sector. The treatment costs are calculated by the diversion of waste streams into the cheaper processing streams. In this respect a conservative diversion rate has been used (by Eunomia) significantly below the 49% recycling rate that this proposal can achieve. The increased recycling rates with this proposal have also been considered by officers within LBE and by NLWA authority officers and they consider them to be realistic. The take up of the chargeable garden waste service has been based upon the average level of take up of similar local authorities (this is calculated using the CIPFA Nearest Neighbour Model). This figure is 27% but a figure of 25% has been used for the financial model. Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd has considerable experience in modelling the uptake of garden waste chargeable services and has done so successfully for other local authorities.
- 6.1.7 The LBE’s finance team has been involved in the project from day one. They have reviewed the financial consequences and outcomes and are satisfied with their

accuracy. The Section 151 Officer is satisfied that a robust process has been followed in the modelling and saving assumptions.

- 6.1.8 Based on the outcome of the evaluation and Consultation returns, this report proposes the adoption and implementation of the recommended Proposal 7 at kerbside properties with a wheeled bin of fortnightly refuse collections, fortnightly dry recycling collections, a new separate weekly food waste collection and the introduction of a charge of £65 per year for collecting garden waste for properties that opt into the service.
- 6.1.9 It is proposed that charging for fortnightly collections for garden waste will be an annual subscription of £65 per bin from 1 April every year. It is proposed that charging for fortnightly garden waste collections start in November 2019 and that the subscription lasts until 31 March 2021.
- 6.1.10 The recommended proposal assumes a recycling rate of 49% and garden waste charge participation rate of 25%, which is deemed to be prudent and achievable by internal officers and Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd. This is based on benchmarking data against similar authorities with a similar sociodemographic outlook, in context with LBE's current and historic service uptake.
- 6.1.11 In order to achieve the 49% recycling rate, the recommend proposal proposes an investment of £259k per annum (four new full-time posts (2 SC6 enforcement and 2 SC6 recycling officers), plus yearly communication budget of £100k.
- 6.1.12 LBE is also proposing a permanent growth investment of £500k into street cleansing and fly tipping. This is equivalent to 19 additional street sweepers. A Cabinet Member report will be produced to agree the allocation of the £500k investment into street cleansing and fly tipping services.
- 6.1.13 The estimated costs of implementing Proposal 7 are: - ongoing revenue cost will be the proposed £500k reinvestment into street cleansing and fly tipping, £259k additional staff and communications. There will be one-off mobilisation costs of £2.283m, funded through flexible use of capital receipts (see tables below). Officers have taken a prudent approach to mobilisation.

5 Year Business Plan – Savings Profile						
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3 (Full Year Saving)	Year 4	Year 5	Total Over 5 Years
	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	
Garden Waste Charge	-£697,133	-£697,133	-£1,394,266	-£1,394,266	-£1,394,266	-£5,577,064
Residual Waste Disposal		-£1,172,325	-£1,172,325	-£1,172,325	-£1,172,325	-£4,689,300
Food and Garden Waste Treatment		-£115,897	-£115,897	-£115,897	-£115,897	-£463,588
Dry Recycling Treatment		£767,863	£767,863	£767,863	£767,863	£3,071,452
Caddy Replacement		£13,650	£13,650	£13,650	£13,650	£54,600
Staff		-£537,529	-£537,529	-£537,529	-£537,529	-£2,150,116
Vehicles		-£360,530	-£360,530	-£360,530	-£360,530	-£1,442,120
Additional Costs due to Phasing proposal (separate weekly food collection) @ £72.827k per month (5 months effect)	£364,135	£0	£0	£0	£0	£364,135
<b>Net Saving</b>	<b>-£332,998</b>	<b>-£2,101,901</b>	<b>-£2,799,034</b>	<b>-£2,799,034</b>	<b>-£2,799,034</b>	<b>-£10,832,001</b>
Investment of £259k per annum (four new full-time posts (2 SC6 enforcement and 2 SC6 recycling officers), plus yearly communication budget of £100k.	£107,917	£259,000	£259,000	£259,000	£259,000	£1,143,917
<b>Net Saving</b>	<b>-£225,081</b>	<b>-£1,842,901</b>	<b>-£2,540,034</b>	<b>-£2,540,034</b>	<b>-£2,540,034</b>	<b>-£9,688,084</b>
<b>Growth</b>						
The Council is also proposing a permanent investing £500k into street cleansing and fly tipping (£200k in year 1)	£200,000	£500,000	£500,000	£500,000	£500,000	£2,200,000
<b>Net Budget Impact (Saving)</b>	<b>-£25,081</b>	<b>-£1,342,901</b>	<b>-£2,040,034</b>	<b>-£2,040,034</b>	<b>-£2,040,034</b>	<b>-£7,488,084</b>
The Council is also proposing a permanent investing £500k into street cleansing and fly tipping. This is equivalent to 19 additional street sweepers. A report will be produced to agree the allocation of the £500k investment into street cleansing and fly tipping services (subject to discussion with the environment cabinet member).						

<b>Mobilisation One Off Costs</b>			
	2019/20	2020/21	<b>Total</b>
Recycling Engagement Officer (Temp) x 2 scale 6	£23,000	£11,500	<b>£34,500</b>
Enforcement Officer x 1 (temp)	£15,000	£7,500	<b>£22,500</b>
Dedicated Mobilisation Team	£94,545	£35,455	<b>£130,000</b>
Existing Operations Team	£13,357	£3,643	<b>£17,000</b>
Communication Budget	£120,000	£0	<b>£120,000</b>
Caddy Liners	£296,210	£0	<b>£296,210</b>
Plastic recycling bags for leaves and side waste recycling	£0	£580	<b>£580</b>
Proposals	£10,000	£0	<b>£10,000</b>
<b>Mobilisation Cost One-off Revenue Total</b>	<b>£572,113</b>	<b>£58,677</b>	<b>£630,790</b>
ICT	£50,000	£0	<b>£50,000</b>
Purchase and delivery of kitchen caddy, and kerbside caddy, and delivery of liners	£293,125	£0	<b>£293,125</b>
Purchase and exchange of refuse larger bins	£113,750	£0	<b>£113,750</b>
Purchase and exchange of refuse larger bins	£198,188	£198,188	<b>£396,375</b>
Collect garden bins that do not subscribe to service - big bang	£225,944	£0	<b>£225,944</b>
Compost bins give away	£102,961	£51,481	<b>£154,442</b>
Dry Recycling bin exchange and replacement	£198,188	£198,188	<b>£396,375</b>
Garden bin exchange and replacement	£14,500	£7,250	<b>£21,750</b>
<b>Mobilisation Cost One-off Capital Total</b>	<b>£1,196,655</b>	<b>£455,106</b>	<b>£1,651,761</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>£1,768,768</b>	<b>£513,783</b>	<b>£2,282,551</b>

6.1.14 Sensitivity Analysis - this section is Part 2

6.1.15 Retaining the current collection system (do-nothing option) would result in significant cost increases, and savings will need to be found from other LBE services to cover the projected increase in costs. The status quo current costs are projected to rise significantly, and the cost of processing dry recyclables has, and is, expected to significantly increase, creating a potential future budget pressure of around £665k per year. Household waste disposal costs are also likely to significantly increase creating further budget pressures (currently unknown), which will be associated with the replacement or use of third-party facility. An introduction of a separate food waste collection (Mayor's London Environment Strategy) will create an additional cost of £996k.

6.1.16 There are no redundancy implications as result of this proposal, as the staffing reductions will be met by reducing the existing agency staff costs (agency cover). Instead the proposal creates new jobs: 2 Sc6 additional enforcement officers, 2 Sc6 new recycling officer posts and possible further job creation through the investment £500,000 such as increases in street cleaning and fly tipping resources.

6.1.17 A key implication of this proposal is to ensure that payment system is in place to collect the income and record this information for service delivery. This will be one of the key workstreams governed by the Strategic Delivery Board.

## **6.2 Legal Implications**

- 6.2.1 The recommendations to implement the proposed changes to waste and recycling services following public consultation are within the Council's powers and duties. The recommendations in this report will help ensure effective implementation of the changes. The Council has a statutory duty under section 45 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to arrange for the collection of waste. Under the Controlled Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2012, it is permissible to charge for the collection of garden waste.
- 6.2.2 In making its decision, and to ensure that the decision-making process is lawful, the Council needs to conscientiously consider the consultation responses. The results and summary are set out at Appendix 2 to this report.
- 6.2.3 As part of these recommendations, an equality impact assessment has been prepared. This will enable decision makers to exercise the Council's duties generally under the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; and advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not and foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. (The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation). Decision-makers must consider the equality impact assessment and must consider how their decision will contribute towards meeting the Council's public sector equality duties, whilst also taking into account other relevant circumstances such as economic and practical considerations.
- 6.2.4 The municipal waste provisions of the London Environment Strategy state a minimum level of service which waste authorities must undertake. The Council also has a duty to undertake waste responsibilities in general conformity with the strategy. The Mayor has the power under s356 of The Greater London Authority Act 1999 to direct the Council if its waste activities are considered detrimental to the implementation of the municipal waste provisions of the London Environment Strategy. Those options that do not provide for separate food waste collection do not enable the Council to move towards the Strategy's aim of separate collection by 2020.
- 6.2.5 Under the Waste (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 it is a requirement that every waste collection Authority have in place separate collections for waste paper, metal, plastic and glass where they are necessary to facilitate or improve recovery and are technically, environmentally and economically practicable (TEEP), unless an Authority could show it was not technically, environmentally or economically practicable to do so.
- 6.2.6 A TEEP Assessment has been undertaken on the Council's current proposed recycling collection service and had concluded that separate collection was not technically, environmentally and economically practicable.

### **6.3 Property Implications**

None

## **7 KEY RISKS**

The key risks arising from the recommendations will be managing reaction from the proposals and managing the implementation of the proposals. This will be mitigated by a comprehensive communications plan and a full Risk Register will be developed by the Board before and throughout the implementation of the proposals.

## **8 IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES – CREATING A LIFETIME OF OPPORTUNITIES IN ENFIELD**

### **8.2 Good homes in well-connected neighbourhoods**

The preferred proposal can contribute to our Corporate Plan outcomes to create and sustain thriving, affordable neighbourhoods by ensuring services are maintained at a level that can meet evidenced need in the borough whilst contributing to savings targets. The ability to maintain a high standard of waste collection to households and preserve the public realm will help continue and enhance the position of LBE as a place to invest and as a great place to live. If implemented and managed correctly, the reconfiguration of services should assist with longer term transformational goals and strategic outcomes for the borough adding value to housing, regeneration and inward investment opportunities.

### **8.3 Sustain strong and healthy communities**

The proposal can contribute positively to our strategic goals of making LBE a healthier and greener place by providing services that can allow people to take greater responsibility for how they manage their waste and encourage recycling, composting and assist with meeting our ambitions for a clean green environment as stated in our Corporate Plan. The proposal should also be able to contribute to wider, identified public health outcomes by contributing to the creation of conditions in the borough where healthy lifestyle and healthy living can be set in the correct context. The proposal ensures that LBE fulfils its obligations outlined within The Mayor's London Environment Strategy and that the delivery model is sustainable for the future.

### **8.4 Build our local economy to create a thriving place**

The new proposals will allow us to work ever more closely with our local business customers to help underpin a strong, ongoing response that can help deliver a strong and competitive local economy and vibrant town centres that benefit all residents. The knowledge that a new, sustainably costed model is in place that can still deliver a level of service that is of the highest standard should contribute to business confidence. The successful implementation of the recommended proposal can also influence our emerging town centre plans and help create context for our new Local Plan. The proposal should also help us approach the delivery of other aspects of environmental works with greater confidence as we know a fundamental tenet

of how we manage the environment has been secured. This should benefit our ambitions as expressed in our Corporate Plan and our ambition to preserve heritage, maintain the quality of our parks and green space and contribute to the delivery of an Enfield that is a place to enjoy from childhood to old age.

## **9 EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

A full EIA can be found in Appendix 4.

## **10 PERFORMANCE AND DATA IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 Recycling Performance will continue to be monitored through quarterly statutory returns and submissions to Waste Data Flow which will allow the Council to assess any positive or negative impact of the change in delivery model in terms of performance. These measures are built into DMT and EMT scorecards to allow constant overview and scrutiny.
- 10.2 The remit of the project delivery board and strategic board will be to regularly monitor the performance and costs reductions delivered by the changes. This in turn will feed into the wider corporate performance monitoring process.
- 10.3 The collection and recording of this data allows benchmarking with neighbouring or statistically similar boroughs to take place

## **11 HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

In accordance with its legal duties as an employer under the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 and other relevant legislation, the Waste Service has risk assessments, control measures and safe methods of working in place to ensure the safety of its employees and the public. As part of the implementation of the proposed service changes, these risk assessments, controls and safe methods of work will be reviewed, revised where needed and implemented to reflect any new risks that are identified.

## **12 HR IMPLICATIONS**

The proposed recommendation has been shared and consulted on with the trade unions: GMB, Unite and Unison. As there are predicted to be no redundancies the trade unions support a gross saving of around £2.8 million delivered by adopting Proposal 7. The proposal creates new jobs: additional enforcement officers, new recycling officer posts and possible further job creation through the investment £500k such as increases in street cleaning and fly tipping resources, these were welcomed by the trade unions.

## **13 PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

- 13.1 Waste and recycling is a widely used and accessible service to all residents in the borough and LBE has a statutory duty to collect waste. The recommended proposal will mean waste is collected differently from current arrangements at kerbside properties that have a wheeled bin. The new

service will be developed with sustainability in mind, this will include low emission vehicles and will also explore the feasibility of electric vehicles where possible. Project initiatives and proposals will consider any alternatives there may be to reduce vehicle usage. Reducing vehicle usage has positive implications for pollution and congestion.

- 13.2 The recommended proposal includes a new weekly collection of food waste which is more frequent compared to existing arrangements. This is a positive change as it will encourage perishable material to be collected more frequently and will contribute towards recycling and composting. This is important as recycling helps protect the environment, it also reduces the need for extracting (mining, quarrying and logging), refining and processing raw materials all of which create substantial air and water pollution. As recycling saves energy it also reduces greenhouse gas emissions, which helps to tackle climate change. Food waste is a national issue and composting would help to mitigate its effects.
- 13.3 There is a commitment to keeping residents informed and engaged in the waste and recycling collection system. This will be enabled by significant, long-term investment in dedicated communications resources. These will deliver up-to-date service information, advise and guide residents on the best way to use the new facilities and encourage behaviour change to help support a sustainable service and borough. This type of communication support will encourage general behaviour change about how much waste is produced such as what food is brought in the first place.
- 13.4 All waste collections have the potential to be abused however there is no evidence that an alternative weekly collection service has any more impact than a weekly collection service.

### **Background Papers**

*Approval to undertake a public consultation for Potential Changes to the Waste & Recycling Collection Services – KD4703*

*Waste Consultation Responses Final*

This page is intentionally left blank