

LANCASHIRE WASTE EFFICIENCY REVIEW

CEO COMMENTS

Authority	Question 1 OK to proceed with detailed modelling of the suggested County-wide collection scenarios?	Question 2 Would CEOs see them as possible and viable both practically and politically?	Question 3 Are CEOs happy for us to explore these scenarios further to look in greater detail at efficiency savings?
West Lancs	Following Lancashire County Council WDA's decision to carry out a soft marketing exercise of its waste assets to help them develop a longer term waste strategy, continuing with a county-wide modelling of collection scenarios is not considered appropriate at this time	It is not considered that the options available deliver any significant, viable, cost savings and in some instances may require capital expenditure (additional storage receptacles). Also any move towards 3-4 weekly residual collection services would require the introduction of separate food waste collections, which is not a direction we would consider as this time.	We would not support any further work at this time.
Lancaster	We are aware that the County Council are undertaking a 'soft market testing exercise' of their waste disposal assets. As we understand the aim of this is to help develop of longer term strategy for the management of waste. It would we think be preferable to wait for the outcomes of this exercise before we continue with any further detailed modelling.	The option for Lancaster relating to charging for green waste is one we are currently in the process of implementing. The one relating to 3 weekly collection is one that we considered as a possibility up to the point where County decided they could no longer handle food waste with garden waste. Going forward it may still be a possibility but that would hinge on where County get to as per point 1. With regards to the concept of a single service for the whole of Lancashire. Both politically and in practice our view is that based on where the different authorities are it would be very difficult to achieve.	See point 1

		We also find it difficult to see what the advantages of a single charged for garden waste collection service would be in practice.	
Wyre There are still a few discrepancies in the report to be clarified, but this will not make a huge difference to the forecasting. In effect, Wyre or collectively as the County we will not make service changes that would generate sufficient savings to bridge the gap from cost sharing.	In light of the update from LCC officers today on the Soft Marketing Testing of LCC assets and waste to assist in them developing a longer term strategy for the management of waste, I personally feel that continuing the modelling is possibly a little short sighted without clear direction from LCC acknowledging that current processing/disposal methods may require revising if they are to meet the latest modelling proposals.	The options could potentially be financially restrictive as they could potentially require significant capital investment and on-going revenue costs from the districts to introduce new separate food waste collections, which, under the current financial climate would only be possible when the Contract Changes/expires or the service was brought in-house due to potential changes in infrastructure etc. and would in-turn require a formulae to share any savings that LCC could attain from disposal savings, to off-set some of the additional collection costs incurred by Districts. In terms of political will (viability) moving to a 3 or 4 weekly residual collection may not be welcomed either by Elected Members or their constituents.	I would reiterate number 1 and that perhaps LCC should be considering the review findings with their SMT exercise. The report suggest greater savings may be achieved through Districts working together through shared services or joint tendering etc. there would ,however, need to be a strong business case to support such a move.
Rossendale	From our perspective there is not a clear efficiency saving to be derived for Rossendale BC from changes to collection frequencies. Our service is relatively lean already, so to reduce collection frequency would put pressure on the service, with three weekly collections leading to heavier bins requiring a greater number of trips to landfill. We believe that a reduced collection frequency could also lead to additional costs to the	Practically we envisage issues with changes to collection frequencies as highlighted above. Politically, reduction in collection frequencies is likely to be difficult and unwelcomed, as such changes will be seen as a dilution of the quality of the collection service, with the resulting littering and fly-tipping issues, again as mentioned above.	We have a need to uplift our recycling rate and to minimise the amount of waste we collect. Diversion from landfill and material recovery are the areas we would prefer to see a focus on, to see how best we should collect waste in the future, treating the material as a resource [e.g. investigating calorific values of different waste streams] and looking at how this may influence collection methods.

	<p>council in terms of additional littering and fly-tipping resulting from frequency changes.</p> <p>We strongly believe that collection efficiencies can be gained by revisiting the availability and provision of waste transfer points, reducing our travelling time to the Whinney Hill landfill site and lessening costs of repair of vehicles travelling to and traversing landfill.</p> <p>Our service loses efficiency through time spent travelling to and from landfill.</p> <p>Due to the topography of the borough, Rossendale has a number of difficult to access locations for collections which we are reviewing as part of our ongoing collection service review.</p>		Collection frequency may form part of this future strategy but should not be the prime focus.
South Ribble	County-wide collection scenarios should be modelled so that the costs benefits of collaboration can be considered. However, to make this exercise worthwhile it is necessary to have an understanding of what the future processing and disposal facilities will be. Will these remain as they are or be changed in light of the ongoing review of the county disposal facilities?	The savings needed to compensate for cost sharing income will not be achieved alone by the options in the report. Many of the specifications covered contain a degree of pain and political support could be difficult to obtain.	Yes but the comments in number 1 are relevant. Also the ability of districts which have outsourced their waste services to collaborate will be a challenge due to contract expiry dates.
Hyndburn My leader has asked that we make it clear the Hyndburn is not contemplating the introduction of charge for green waste. I would			

therefore be grateful if future iterations of the report reflect this.			
Preston	<p>In principle the Cabinet in Preston is in support of sharing services to reduce costs particularly where this maintains an in house delivery model.</p> <p>However any proposal for a county wide collection service is both complex and a long term proposition. See next column. Given that LCC is looking again at disposal it may be worth revisiting alongside or in response to the outcome of that exercise.</p>	<p>Our view is that a single service proposition for the whole of Lancashire both politically and in practice would be very difficult to achieve. There may be some greater mileage in sub areas of Lancashire but in either case the timescales to achieve it are likely to be 5 to 10 years given the contractual commitments of some authorities. This may be worth exploring to see if the potential benefits i.e. savings outweigh both the long term nature of the proposition and the complexity in practice.</p> <p>The council must focus on measures which can contribute to a balanced budget within the short to medium term and is willing to look with nearest neighbours or others who wish to share or explore how we can reduce costs on this timescale.(covered by the existing report)</p> <p>Preston has introduced the green waste charge.</p> <p>There could be some merit in exploring a standard charge based on a systematic assessment of cost to avert the risk of challenge as differential charges emerge.</p> <p>With regard to lower frequency weekly bin collections we see this as the least politically acceptable in terms of public acceptance.</p>	Yes and informed by the LCC review of disposal assets which may affect the timing.

Pendle	Yes. We feel that the further modelling would be useful as we need as full information as possible particularly as Pendle Option 1 in the report is not very helpful for us.	They may have some viability practically but we feel that it will be very difficult to convince politicians locally that they are the way ahead. However the information gained from the modelling will give a more complete picture on which decisions can be taken.	Yes but we would just like also to restate the point commonly held by districts that the County's disposal costs should be looked at as well. We appreciate they are unlikely to do this but at the very least we should be pressing them to give us early and full indication of their disposal plans post 31 st March 2018.
Fylde	Preferable to wait for the outcomes of the soft market testing exercise, once we have an understanding of future processing and disposal facilities, before we continue with any further detailed modelling	The 3 weekly model was in fact best option modelled for Fylde indicating modest annual savings of £50k after an initial outlay of £189k for containers (excluding vehicles) demonstrating that our current in-house service is already lean and efficient. In terms of political will moving to a 3 or 4 weekly residual collection may not be welcomed either by Members or residents. Although we have more flexibility than some with an in-house service a county wide scheme would require everyone to make the changes at the same time which could lead to a time lag for Fylde where the cost sharing shortfall is not being met	See point 1 - we would not support any further work until future processing/disposal options are known