

Stirling Council

Agenda Item No. 11

Stirling Council

Date of  
Meeting: 30 June 2020

Not Exempt

## Waste Transformation Programme

---

### Purpose & Summary

---

The Waste Transformation Programme aims to deliver a 'Best in Class' Waste Collection Service for the Communities and Customers of Stirling Council.

The purpose of this report is to seek approval to implement and deliver a series of service changes to Waste Services' household collection service.

This would include; extending the collection frequency of both grey and blue bins to four-weekly, the removal of glass collection and the introduction of garden waste charging.

These changes are only feasible through the purchase of comb lift bins to replace the existing diamond lift bins.

This is time critical as the procurement of replacement refuse collection vehicles has to commence immediately as the current lease arrangement ceases in September 2021.

The type of bins used and collection services offered has a direct bearing on the number and type of vehicles to be procured.

### Recommendations

---

Council is asked to approve:

1. the diamond bin replacement project be funded from service efficiencies outlined in this report;
2. an extension of collection frequencies on both residual (grey) and recycling (blue) bins from two-weekly to four-weekly;
3. the removal of glass collection services; and
4. the introduction of a chargeable garden waste service.

### Resource Implications

---

The Replacement of Diamond Bins is the key enabler project for the rest of the Waste Transformation Programme. The proposed Diamond Bin replacement programme is a critical keystone project at the start of a full transformation agenda, which will unlock significant efficiencies and revenue savings.

---

The anticipated annual savings and incomes that can be achieved from the delivery of the projects within the Waste Transformation are:

1. 4 weekly collection frequency for blue and grey bins: (£357,000);
2. Remove current glass collection service: (£217,000);
3. Implementation of garden waste charging: (£552,000) income, before diamond bin loan charges;
4. Total Potential Savings: (£1,126,000) per annum;
5. Comb Bin Loan Charges £204,000; and
6. Net savings: £922,000 per annum.

As agreed at the Council's budget setting meeting on 12 March 2020, given the pressure on the core capital budget the only available route forward for funding the diamond bin replacement is through the use of prudential borrowing.

Although a full procurement exercise is yet to be undertaken, the prudential borrowing for the Diamond Bin Replacement Project is safely estimated to be £2.071M. The Financial Summary table can be seen in Appendix 1 of the report.

At the special meeting of Stirling Council on 12 March the agreed General Services Capital Programme 2020/21 - 2022/23 highlighted:

'Replacement of diamond bins (Grey and Brown) are coming towards the end of life. The change will unlock efficiencies in service delivery. The diamond bin replacement project will be funded from service efficiencies, subject to approval of the Waste Transformation Plan by the Environment and Housing Committee in April.'

The net revenue spend associated with the project and prudential borrowing costs can be accommodated within the total potential savings of £1,126,000 per annum. This level of saving also mitigates the significant overspend pressures currently being experienced by Waste Services.

## Legal & Risk Implications and Mitigation

---

The timetable outlined in this report for the roll out of the service changes is dependent on the Replacement of Diamond Bins. This is the key enabler project for the rest of the Waste Transformation Programme. The supply and roll out of these bins may be impacted by COVID 19 and therefore the dates outlined in the report are indicative at this stage.

With the implementation of the Deposit Return Scheme in 2022, tonnages of plastic, cans and glass beverage containers are likely to fall significantly. There is the potential for the remaining glass bottles and jars to be placed in the blue bins, dependent on the acceptance by contractors of that mix of materials.

With the introduction of a garden waste charging scheme, there are risks surrounding the potential lack of participation in the scheme, potentially impacting on income generation. Based on evidence from other Local Authorities, the Service has estimated there will be a 45% uptake in garden waste permits in the first year.

## 1. Background

---

- 1.1. Stirling Council is only 1 of 2 Local Authorities in Scotland that uses Diamond uplift wheeled bins for household collections of garden waste and residual refuse (brown and grey bins). Stirling Council was an early adopter of the Diamond bins system, introduced over 10 years ago as they were deemed at the time to be a modern European model. However, this system did not gain popular traction in the domestic or commercial market in the UK, resulting in the number of manufacturers and suppliers of Diamond bins gradually diminishing.
- 1.2. In 2016, Waste Services introduced 2 additional household wheeled bins to improve recycling collections (blue and green bins). These services use Comb bins and lifting systems, reflecting current best practice. The two collection systems are not interchangeable, so the vehicles can only collect one type of bin, dependent on the lifting system used. A portion of the fleet has 'rotational' lifts allowing them to be swapped between services, however this has limited benefit as operationally they can only service one type of bin on a day.
- 1.3. The current service set up is leading to significant avoidable costs due to inherent inefficiencies of running two incompatible systems. Additionally, Diamond bins are not well suited to rear end loading vehicles and they are far more likely to fall in the back of the lorry when being emptied, leading to excessive costs of a replacement programme.
- 1.4. Refuse Collection Vehicles (RCVs) require to be customised with specially adapted Diamond Uplift mechanisms and currently there is only 1 manufacturer of these types of lifters. When RCVs are off the road for repairs, MOTs or scheduled servicing, it is not possible to source replacements in Scotland or the UK, which impacts collection service performance. The existing fleet contract runs until September 2021.
- 1.5. Specifically, household collections can become delayed or missed, impacting the management of customer expectations, increasing the burden of complaints and creating pressure on staff across the frontline support services.
- 1.6. Approximately 700 complaints have been received regarding the untimely required replacement of Diamond bins since 2017. Diamond bins are more susceptible to falling into the back of an RCV due to the rotational lifter mechanism. There are approximately 4,800 requests to replace Diamond bins annually, costing £183,000 to purchase and deliver.
- 1.7. Diamond bins are more expensive to purchase than a standard industry comb bin, with only one supplier on the Scotland Excel Framework. Due to the lack of demand there is typically an 8 week delivery time for Diamond.
- 1.8. This lack of responsiveness is problematic as Waste Services finds it difficult to monitor stock level requirements due to the unpredictability of attrition.
- 1.9. The current Waste Service delivery model is expensive when compared with national Local Government benchmarking, and the workforce arrangements are sub optimal.
- 1.10. However, there are also signs of improving results from the use of Webaspx software in collection vehicles and the workforce are responding positively to the new management team, their more open style, and their willingness to listen to and engage with the workforce.

- 1.11. In addition, the service is fortunate to have a twin-stream recycling system in place, which other Councils are currently seeking investment to convert to, to be compliant with the Household Waste and Recycling Charter.
- 1.12. Furthermore, the historical box recycling system has left a legacy of good public engagement in services, with high quality of materials being collected.

#### **Grey and Blue bin frequency change (four-weekly)**

- 1.13. Stirling Council continues to achieve a high recycling rate, with 54% in 2018. This is indicative of a national drive of waste prevention and improved recycling capture and treatment.
- 1.14. The household waste collection service currently operates a four-bin system and a box. The table below highlights existing and proposed collection frequencies:

Service	Existing Frequency	Proposed Frequency
Residual Waste (Grey Bin)	Fortnightly	Four weekly
Garden and Food Waste (Brown Bin)	Fortnightly	Fortnightly
Plastics, Cans and Cartons (Blue Bin)	Fortnightly	Four weekly
Paper and Cardboard (Green Bin)	Four weekly	Four weekly
Glass bottles and jars (Box)	Four weekly	Included in the Blue Bin collections

- 1.15. Through an internal review of operations, the Service believes the main areas of opportunity to be; reduction of residual waste to landfill, route optimisation, rationalisation of blue and grey bin collection frequencies and removal of glass collections.
- 1.16. Shared industry knowledge from other local authority partners has indicated that extending residual waste collection frequencies has been an effective method in reducing environmental and financial impacts through waste to landfill reduction and operational efficiencies.

#### **Removal of Glass Collections**

- 1.17. On the 13 May 2020 the Scottish Parliament voted in favour of a deposit return scheme for Scotland, meaning that Scotland will soon be the first part of the UK to introduce a deposit return scheme for drinks containers. Deposit Return will be available across all of Scotland from 1 July 2022.
- 1.17.1. With the introduction of the Deposit Return Scheme in 2022, the Service has been undertaking a review of the impacts with external partners, as well as other Local Authorities. The scheme will place a deposit levy on to drinks containers, including all drinks sold in PET plastic, metal and glass. Consumers will reclaim these deposits when returning the containers from any place of purchase. This scheme will likely have direct impacts on material volumes and costs associated with collection and disposal for Stirling Council.

- 
- 1.17.2. A report on the introduction of the Deposit Return Scheme and its implications for Stirling Council will be brought to the Environment & Housing Committee later in 2020.

### **Garden Waste Charging**

- 1.18. The Waste (Scotland) Regulations 2012 introduced a requirement on local authorities to provide householders with collection services for dry recyclable waste and food waste. The collection of garden waste is however not a statutory service that Stirling Council has to provide to householders, and under the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992, local authorities can levy a charge for the collection of garden waste.
- 1.19. Several Scottish Local Authorities have introduced a chargeable garden waste service in the last 3 years, including Angus, Highland, Edinburgh, Perth and Kinross and Aberdeen. From experiences shared by these local authorities, the charging scheme presents an opportunity for income generation.

## **2. Considerations**

---

### **Grey and Blue bin frequency change (four-weekly)**

- 2.1. By moving grey and blue bins to four-weekly collections the Service has identified significant opportunities in achieving its commitments to reducing environmental impact, as well as reducing pressures on the service budget.
- 2.1.1. The key benefits that this will realise will be:
- 2.1.1.1. full refuse collection vehicle fleet flexibility;
  - 2.1.1.2. consistency with national vehicle and bin systems;
  - 2.1.1.3. improved route completion and customer satisfaction; and
  - 2.1.1.4. a reduction in wheeled bin and parts expenditure.
- 2.2. The ability to move on to full optimisation of the collection service, including service frequency changes, which will deliver significant savings and increased recycling participation; and improvement in the Council's net cost of refuse collection indicator which is currently ranked the lowest out of 32 Scottish Local Authorities through the Local Government Benchmarking Framework.
- 2.3. To assess alternative ways of delivering front line collection services, the Service has engaged with Falkirk Council who, in recent years, have moved residual waste collection frequencies to four-weekly. By implementing a similar four-weekly collection model, estimated savings of £357k have been identified for Stirling Council through tonnage reduction and operational savings.
- 2.4. The savings identified can be attributed to both residual and recycling frequency changes. Local Authorities who have extended residual waste frequencies have seen drops in residual waste arisings, reducing overall tonnage. This drop in residual waste tonnage has been either seen as an increase in recycling tonnage or has been prevented.

- 
- 2.5. An important factor of moving residual waste collections to a four-weekly collection is to support households with a change of this kind. The Service would recruit additional support officers to assist with the development and implementation of the changes and to assist in supporting households to reduce waste production and increase recycling rates. A hygiene service would also be implemented for customers who have large families and / or additional hygiene products (e.g. nappies) for disposal, this would be collected every two weeks.

### **Removal of Glass Collection**

- 2.6. With the implementation of the Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) in 2022, collection services will see a notable change in the profile of material. The scheme has been designed to include the return of beverage containers, including plastics, cans and glass. This therefore presents opportunity to rationalise our collections. Through previous monthly collections during festive periods and anecdotal evidence on current blue bin presentation, there is opportunity to reduce collection costs whilst maintaining a high standard of recycling collection.
- 2.7. With glass bottles included in the DRS also, glass collections will become inefficient due to the significant drop in presentation. It is estimated that 90% of glass bottles will be returned to vendors. If feasible and acceptable to the market, the remaining glass would be collected co-mingled in the blue bin. If this is not feasible 'bring sites' would be extended. In removing glass collections, there are also benefits to health and safety for our operational staff due to reduced levels of manual handling.
- 2.8. The savings identified within a frequency change is dependent on the concurrent route review exercise. The route review would involve changing customers' collection days and in some cases may mean de-coupling, where customers may no longer present two containers on the same collection day.
- 2.9. Through the route review, the Service would also look to move areas within the national park away from weekend collections.

### **Garden Waste Charging – The Proposed Scheme**

- 2.10. Stirling Council provides a co-mingled Garden and Food Waste collection. All customers would continue to receive a brown bin for the collection of food waste. With the introduction of a chargeable garden waste service, customers who opt-in to the service would pay an annual charge of £35 for the collection of garden wastes. A permit would then be issued to the customer which would then be adhered to their bin.
- 2.11. For those customers who choose not to pay for the Service they can continue to use the brown bin for the collection of food waste. However, if garden waste is placed in with the food waste the brown bin would not be uplifted. In these circumstances householders would be encouraged to home compost their garden waste or dispose of their garden waste at our Household Waste and Recycling Centre's.
- 2.12. This project will require up front resource in the form of project officers to plan, manage and implement the project by 01 April 2021. A multi-disciplinary group would be required to support the development of the online payment system, communicating to customers and administering the scheme.
- 2.13. Upon a review of other Local Authorities who have introduced a similar charging scheme, the Service estimates there will be a 45% customer uptake in year one. With effective communications, there is strong evidence from other partners that this number could be maintained and improved.

- 
- 2.14. As part of this implementation of the Waste Transformation Programme significant community engagement and communications planning will be undertaken and delivered before, during and after the rollouts.
  - 2.15. Given the current COVID-19 situation the most realistic scenario for project delivery can be seen in Appendix 2. In summary:
    - 2.15.1. Comb lift bin procurement 2020/21;
    - 2.15.2. Roll in of diamond lift bins / roll out of comb lift bins – completion in 2021/22;
    - 2.15.3. 4 weekly collection frequency for blue and grey bins following completion of the bin roll in / roll out in 2021/22;
    - 2.15.4. Implementation of garden waste charging 2020/21; and
    - 2.15.5. Remove current glass collection service following implementation of the Deposit Return Scheme in July 2022.
  - 2.16. The Waste Transformation project implementation is predicated on a decision being made at this Council. If a decision is not reached it will delay the roll out of the comb lift bins and the move to the change in frequency of collection.
  - 2.17. It will also delay the associated fleet replacement programme which will be aligned to pick up only comb bins. Both the changeover to a uniform type of bin across the Stirling Council area and the establishment of a new fleet are high priorities for the service and must align.
  - 2.18. Without the transformation, the waste budget overspend being experienced will persist into 2021/22.

## 3. Implications

---

### **Equalities Impact**

- 3.1. The contents of this report were assessed under the Council's Equality Impact Assessment process and it was determined that an Equality Impact Assessment was required.

### **Fairer Scotland Duty**

- 3.2. The contents of this report were considered in terms of the Fairer Scotland Duty and were determined not to be of strategic importance.

### **Sustainability and Environmental**

- 3.3. Any agreed actions of the Waste and Resources Plan may have direct implications on the Sustainable Growth Agreement.

### **Other Policy Implications**

- 3.4. Waste Services Policy.

### **Consultations**

- 3.5. Community and Workforce consultations are ongoing.

## 4. Background Papers

---

- 4.1. EqlA relevance check.
- 4.2. Waste and Resources Plan.

## 5. Appendices

---

- 5.1. Appendix 1 – Financial Summary Table.
- 5.2. Appendix 2 - Waste Services Timeline.
- 5.3. Appendix 3 – Equality Impact Assessment Form.

---

Author of Report:

Kevin McCormick  
Waste Services Manager

Contact Details:

[mccormicke@stirling.gov.uk](mailto:mccormicke@stirling.gov.uk)  
01786 237 575

---

Approved by:

Bruce Reekie  
Senior Manager – Environment & Place

Date: 15 June 2020

---

Details of Convener(s), Vice Convener(s),  
Portfolio Holder and Depute Portfolio Holder  
consulted on this report:

Councillor Jim Thomson  
Councillor Danny Gibson

---



---

Wards affected:

All

---

Key Priorities:

E - We will create & implement environment and infrastructure improvements; deliver new ownership & delivery methods around energy generation, public transport & internet access, ensuring profits & services work to community, not commercial priorities

---

Key Priority Considerations:

---

Stirling Plan Priority Outcomes:  
(Local Outcomes Improvement Plan)

Prosperous - People are part of a prosperous economy that promotes inclusive growth opportunities across our communities

---

## Appendix 1

## Financial Summary Table

Replace all existing diamond bins with comb bins - using external contractor		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 10	Year 12
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Capital</b>	Capital Purchase	1,775	-	-	-	-
	Internal Staff & Plant	160	-	-	-	-
	Delivery Contractors	137	-	-	-	-
	Prudential Borrowing	(2,071)	-	-	-	-
<b>Net Capital</b>		-	-	-	-	-
<b>Revenue</b>	<b>Household Communications</b>	84	-	-	-	-
	Loan repayment	204	204	204	204	204
<b>Net Revenue</b>		<b>288</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>204</b>
<b>TOTAL CAPITAL &amp; REVENUE</b>		<b>288</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>204</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>		<b>288</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>2,122</b>	<b>2,529</b>



**Waste Service Transformation Timeline**

Project	May-20	Jun-20	Jul-20	Aug-20	Sep-20	Oct-20	Nov-20	Dec-20	Jan-21	Feb-21	Mar-21	Apr-21	May-21	Jun-21	Jul-21	Aug-21	Sep-21	Oct-21	Nov-21	Dec-21	Jan-22	Feb-22	Mar-22	Apr-22	May-22	Jun-22	Jul-22				
<b>Comb bin procurement, rollout &amp; Diamond bin roll-in bins (grey &amp; brown)</b>	Approvals / Planning					Roll Out			Roll Out																						
<b>Blue &amp; Grey collection frequency/capacity change</b>	Pre Project Planning										Go Live																				
<b>New Fleet procurement</b>	Procurement Process					Award	Vehicle Build										Take Delivery														
<b>Kerbside glass service withdrawal</b>	Go Live																														
<b>Garden waste charging</b>	Pre Project Planning										Go Live																				
<b>Full Route Optimisation</b>	Pre Project Planning										Go Live																				



## Appendix 3

**STIRLING COUNCIL: EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM** (June 2014)

The Guidance: **Equality Impact Assessment Toolkit June 2014** should be used when doing an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) and completing this form and a link is provided to this. The term **proposal** used below is intended to include “policy, strategy, service, function, procedure or project.”

**SUMMARY DETAILS**

1. Title of Proposal: SERVICE PBB Ref (if applicable)

Waste Transformation Programme (Introducing a Chargeable Garden Waste Service)	Waste Services	
--	----------------	--

2. Lead and Contact Officer Details.

Lead Officer authorising assessment		Contact Officer/s undertaking assessment	
Title	Senior Manager	Title/s	Service Manager
Name	Bruce Reekie	Name/s	Kevin McCormick

3. Which other Council Services or Partner Agencies are / will be involved in the delivery of this proposal?

Contact Centre, Finance, Communications
---

4. Have they been involved in the Equality Impact Assessment process and if so, how?

No.
-----

5. What is the nature of the proposal? (Tick/complete all that apply)

Review of an existing policy/strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Review of an existing service/function	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reduction in an existing service/function	<input type="checkbox"/>	Removal of an existing service	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduction of a new policy/strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Introduction of new service/function	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other e.g. technical, progress, procedural report	<input type="checkbox"/>		
PBB category e.g. transformational change	<input type="checkbox"/>		

6. For proposals with implications for budgets complete the following:

		(£ 000s)
Current expenditure on activity	In Council area as a whole	
	In/for specific community/ies	
Total anticipated savings or proposed increased spend	In/for Council area as a whole	
	In/ for specific community/ies	
Delivery Timescale and Phasing	Start date for savings/increased spend	April 1 <sup>st</sup> 2021
	End Date for savings/increased spend	
	Savings/increased spend Year 1	(£552k)
	Savings/increased spend Year 2	
	Savings/increased spend Year 3	
	Savings/increased spend Year 4	

## OUTCOMES, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

7. What longer term outcomes is this proposal expected to achieve? Consider (a) the Single Outcome Agreement 2013 – 23, (b) Council Key Priorities 2014, (c) the Council's Equality Outcomes 2014 – 17 and any additional relevant strategies or policies. A link is provided to items (a)-(c).

OUTCOME	SOURCE DOCUMENT
We will create and implement environmental and infrastructure improvements. We will deliver new ownership and delivery methods around energy generation, public transport and internet access, ensuring profits and services work for community, not commercial priorities.	Stirling Council Key Priorities

8. What are the main aims of this proposal? If this proposal revises an existing policy have its aims changed?

This proposal seeks to align to a national move towards charging for garden waste by Local Authorities. The proposal would seek to maintain high levels of food waste recycling capture, reduce operating costs, as well as generating additional income for the service.

9. Who is most likely to be affected by this proposal? Consider current and potential future service users including people with particular needs, specific geographical communities and current and prospective employees. Provide anticipated numbers affected by the proposal where possible.

This proposal would be optional and made available to all residents in the Local Authority area.

## GATHERING EVIDENCE

10. What evidence has been used to identify the potential impact of this proposal, where did it come from and how it was obtained? Please list all the evidence used. (Examples may include research undertaken at local or national level and service delivery information about service users/customers and levels of satisfaction. Evidence may have been gathered routinely through regular engagement with service users, equality groups and communities; or through engagement specifically undertaken to improve understanding of the impact of this proposal.)

EVIDENCE (Subject/Title)	SOURCE (Where it came from)	COLLECTION METHOD (How it was gathered and when)
Neighbouring Local Authorities	Perth and Kinross, Angus Council & Highland Council	Through direct contact with the authorities and Committee reports.

## ASSESSING IMPACT

11. What potential impact will this proposal have on people in terms of the “needs” of the public sector equality duty i.e. the Council's responsibilities to:

- **eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation**
- **advance equality of opportunity**

• foster good relations - including the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding

Please consider each “need”, assess the impact of the proposal as positive (+), neutral (0), or negative (-) and summarise the reason/s for your response. See guidance for additional information.

EQUALITY DUTY “NEED”	POTENTIAL IMPACT (+) / (0) / (-)	SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RESPONSE
Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation	0	No direct impact
Advance equality of opportunity	0	No direct impact
Fostering good relations	0	No direct impact

12. Will this proposal have a potential impact on people with protected characteristics? A more detailed explanation of these is provided in the guidance. Consider which if any, of the groups below will be affected by the proposal and if the impact will be positive (+), neutral (0), or negative (-). Your response to Question 11 may help you consider the impact of the proposal on people in these particular groups. Please consider each “need”, assess the impact of the proposal and summarise the reason/s for your response.

PROTECTED CHARACTERISTIC GROUP	EQUALITY DUTY NEED			SUMMARY OF REASONS
	Eliminating unlawful treatment (+) / (0) / (-)	Advancing equality of opportunity (+) / (0) / (-)	Fostering good relations (+) / (0) / (-)	
Age (Younger / Older)	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
Disability	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	Pull out and return service would still be offered.
Gender Reassignment	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
Pregnancy and Maternity	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	

Race	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
Religion and Belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sex	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	
Sexual Orientation	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	

### IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES, HOUSEHOLD GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS VULNERABLE TO POVERTY

13. Will this proposal have a positive (+), neutral (0), or negative (-) impact on communities, household groups or individuals with a **higher risk of experiencing poverty**. Guidance is available on those communities, households and individuals with a higher risk of experiencing poverty. Please assess the impact of the proposal and describe those who will be affected.

THOSE AFFECTED	POTENTIAL IMPACT (+) / ( 0 ) / (-)	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT
<b>Geographical Community/ies</b> (Please specify)	- <input type="checkbox"/>	Geographical communities recognised by the Council as experiencing poverty may experience a negative impact. This is due to the charge being introduced or travel costs in transporting garden waste to recycling centres.
<b>Individuals or household groups</b> (Please specify)	- <input type="checkbox"/>	Individuals or household groups recognised by the Council as experiencing poverty may experience a negative impact. This is due to the charge being introduced or travel costs in transporting garden waste to recycling centres.

### OVERALL IMPACT

14. Based on responses to Questions 11, 12 and 13, summarize the **overall** impact of this proposal confirming if this will be positive, neutral, or negative and highlighting any particular groups affected.

Geographical communities, individuals and households recognised by the Council as experiencing poverty may experience a negative impact. This is due to the charge being introduced or travel costs in transporting garden waste to recycling centres.
--

**MITIGATING POTENTIAL NEGATIVE IMPACT**

Based on your response to question 14:

- if this proposal has any potential negative impact you must answer Questions 15 -18
- if this proposal does not have any potential negative impact go directly to Question 19

15. Describe the potential negative impact/s of this proposal, the level of impact anticipated and the number of people likely to be affected. If you are unable to confirm the actual number of people potentially affected please give an indication of the relative scale of this for example as a proportion of current service users. Please see the Guidance for additional information.

Potential negative impact	Level of impact (low-high)	Number of people potentially affected
Financial impact of chargeable service and travel costs.	Medium	Not Known - Uptake of the new service is predicted to be at 45%, this however does not provide indication of the number of residents negatively impacted.

16. Based on your response to Question 15, could this proposal, in its current form, discriminate against people in a protected characteristic group – will it result in their being treated less favourably when compared with others not in a protected characteristic group? Please see the Guidance for additional information. [\\*link](#)

Please answer Yes or No

No.

- If the proposal is considered to have the potential to discriminate against people in a protected characteristic group you should consider modifying it to remove or reduce its potential negative impact
- If the proposal is considered to be discriminatory to the extent that is unlawful it must be rejected or substantially modified

**The resulting modified policy requires to be re-assessed to confirm its impact as per Questions 11, 12, 13 and 14.**

17. Describe in detail the actions taken to remove or modify any identified negative impact of this proposal

For those residents negatively impacted by this proposal, the Service would engage at the earliest stage to assess firstly if those affected require a garden waste collection. This may identify residents who do not need a garden waste collection e.g. flatted properties.

18. Where negative impacts cannot be removed or minimised any further, clearly state your justification for continuing with this proposal.

Several Scottish Local Authorities have introduced a chargeable garden waste service in the last 3 years, with more currently in the planning. As food waste is a statutory duty, the Council will continue to uplift food waste only free of charge in brown bins. The charge leveraged would be for the non-statutory garden waste. For the charge to succeed will require changes to the residual waste frequency or capacity to ensure garden waste is not sent to landfill as an unintended consequence of leveraging a charge.

**MONITORING AND REVIEW**

19. a) How will implementation of this proposal be monitored, how frequently and by whom?  
 b) How will the results of the monitoring be used to develop it in the future?  
 c) What is the timescale for the reviewing the impact of this proposal?

- a) In the first year, this proposal will be closely monitored by Waste Services Management team. An annual review will take place with the re-issue of garden waste permits.
- b) Results will be used to promote the Service in future years
- c) Impacts will be reviewed on an annual basis.

**PUBLISHING RESULTS**

- 20 Please summarise the key findings of the EqIA. **This statement is for publication in the relevant Council report and requires to be authorised and signed by the Lead Officer responsible for the assessment.**

This proposal would see a chargeable service being available to all Council residents who wish a garden waste collection. Potential negative impacts have been identified for those individuals or communities who may be at a higher risk of poverty. The Service would engage with residents at the earliest stages of this proposal to ensure they are provided clear guidance and support prior to implementation and to offset, where possible, any negative impacts. Part of this engagement is to also reassure impacted residents that a food waste collection service will still be provided as part of the brown bin collection service, as well as information and access to Household Waste Recycling Centres.

**AUTHORISATION BY LEAD OFFICER (Head of Service/Service Manager)**

Title	Signature	Date

**STIRLING COUNCIL: EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM** (January 2019)

The Guidance: **Equality Impact Assessment Toolkit June 2014** should be used when doing an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) and completing this form and a link is provided to this. The term **proposal** used below is intended to include “policy, strategy, service, function, procedure or project.”

**SUMMARY DETAILS**

1. Title of Proposal: SERVICE PBB Ref (if applicable)

<b>Waste Transformation (Removal of Kerbside Glass Collection)</b>	<b>Waste Services</b>	
--	-----------------------	--

2. Lead and Contact Officer Details.

Lead Officer authorising assessment		Contact Officer/s undertaking assessment	
Title	Senior Manager (E&P)	Title/s	Service Manager – Waste
Name	Bruce Reekie	Name/s	Kevin McCormick

3. Which other Council Services or Partner Agencies are / will be involved in the delivery of this proposal?

Contact Centre, Communications
--------------------------------

4. Have they been involved in the Equality Impact Assessment process and if so, how?

<b>No.</b>
------------

5. What is the nature of the proposal? (Tick/complete all that apply)

Review of an existing policy/strategy		Review of an existing service/function	
Reduction in an existing service/function		Removal of an existing service	Y
Introduction of a new policy/strategy		Introduction of new service/function	
Other e.g. technical, progress, procedural report			
PBB category e.g. transformational change			

6. For proposals with implications for budgets complete the following:

		(£ 000s)
Current expenditure on activity	In Council area as a whole	
	In/for specific community/ies	
Total anticipated savings or proposed increased spend	In/for Council area as a whole	
	In/ for specific community/ies	
Delivery Timescale and Phasing	Start date for savings/increased spend	April 1 <sup>st</sup> 2021
	End Date for savings/increased spend	
	Savings/increased spend Year 1	(£217k)
	Savings/increased spend Year 2	
	Savings/increased spend Year 3	
	Savings/increased spend Year 4	
	Savings/increased spend Year 5	

## OUTCOMES, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

7. What longer term outcomes is this proposal expected to achieve? Consider (a) the Stirling Plan (Local Outcomes Improvement Plan) 2017 - 27 (b) Council Key Priorities and Considerations 2017 (c) the Council's Equality Outcomes 2017 - 21 and any additional relevant strategies or policies.

OUTCOME	SOURCE DOCUMENT
We will create and implement environmental and infrastructure improvements. We will deliver new ownership and delivery methods around energy generation, public transport and internet access, ensuring profits and services work for community, not commercial priorities.	Stirling Council Key Priorities

8. What are the main aims of this proposal? If this proposal revises an existing policy have its aims changed?

This proposal is being proposed to reduce operating costs by the removal of the kerbside collection service. The proposal is being proposed in preparation for the implementation of the Deposit Return Scheme, which will include glass beverage containers. With a potential for glass tonnages to drop significantly, this proposal provides resilience to this change.

9. Who is most likely to be affected by this proposal? Consider current and potential future service users including people with particular needs, specific geographical communities and current and prospective employees. Provide anticipated numbers affected by the proposal where possible.

This change would be rolled out to all residents in the Local Authority area. With the removal of glass collections, 'bring sites' would be used as an alternative for household glass disposal.

## GATHERING EVIDENCE

10. What evidence has been used to identify the potential impact of this proposal, where did it come from and how it was obtained? Please list all the evidence used. (Examples may include research undertaken at local or national level and service delivery information about service users/customers and levels of satisfaction. Evidence may have been gathered routinely through regular engagement with service users, equality groups and communities; or through engagement specifically undertaken to improve understanding of the impact of this proposal.)

EVIDENCE (Subject/Title)	SOURCE (Where it came from)	COLLECTION METHOD (How it was gathered and when)

**ASSESSING IMPACT**

11. What potential impact will this proposal have on people in terms of the “needs” of the public sector equality duty i.e. the Council’s responsibilities to:

- **eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation**
- **advance equality of opportunity**
- **foster good relations - including the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding**

Please consider each “need”, assess the impact of the proposal as positive (+), neutral (0), or negative (-) and summarise the reason/s for your response. See guidance for additional information.

<b>EQUALITY DUTY “NEED”</b>	<b>POTENTIAL IMPACT (+) / (0) / (-)</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RESPONSE</b>
Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation	0	
Advance equality of opportunity	0	
Fostering good relations	0	

12. Will this proposal have a potential impact on people with protected characteristics? A more detailed explanation of these is provided in the guidance. Consider which if any, of the groups below will be affected by the proposal and if the impact will be positive (+), neutral (0), or negative (-). Your response to Question 11 may help you consider the impact of the proposal on people in these particular groups. Please consider each “need”, assess the impact of the proposal and summarise the reason/s for your response.

<b>PROTECTED CHARACTERISTIC GROUP</b>	<b>EQUALITY DUTY NEED</b>			<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS</b>
	<b>Eliminating unlawful treatment (+) / (0) / (-)</b>	<b>Advancing equality of opportunity (+) / (0) / (-)</b>	<b>Fostering good relations (+) / (0) / (-)</b>	
Age (Younger / Older)	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> -	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	This proposal may have potential negative impacts on elderly residents who have limited access to alternative disposal facilities (bring sites)
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> -	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	This proposal may have potential negative impacts on elderly residents who have limited access to alternative disposal facilities (bring sites)
Gender Reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	

Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	
Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	
Race	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	
Religion and Belief	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	
Sex	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	
Sexual Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	

### IMPACT ON COMMUNITIES, HOUSEHOLD GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS VULNERABLE TO POVERTY

13. Will this proposal have a positive (+), neutral (0), or negative (-) impact on communities, household groups or individuals with a **higher risk of experiencing poverty**. Guidance is available on those communities, households and individuals with a higher risk of experiencing poverty. Please assess the impact of the proposal and describe those who will be affected.

THOSE AFFECTED	POTENTIAL IMPACT (+) / (0) / (-)	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT
<b>Geographical Community/ies</b> (Please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	
<b>Individuals or household groups</b> (Please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> -	If bring sites for remaining glass containers are introduced, this proposal may have negative impacts on those individuals who have physical disabilities.

### OVERALL IMPACT

14. Based on responses to Questions 11, 12 and 13, summarize the **overall** impact of this proposal confirming if this will be positive, neutral, or negative and highlighting any particular groups affected.

This proposal may have potential negative impacts on those individuals or household groups who have physical disabilities or are elderly. This is due to the distance required to travel to a bring site to dispose of glass material at a bring site.

## MITIGATING POTENTIAL NEGATIVE IMPACT

Based on your response to question 14:

- if this proposal has any potential negative impact you must answer Questions 15 -18
- if this proposal does not have any potential negative impact go directly to Question 19

15. Describe the potential negative impact/s of this proposal, the level of impact anticipated and the number of people likely to be affected. If you are unable to confirm the actual number of people potentially affected please give an indication of the relative scale of this for example as a proportion of current service users. Please see the Guidance for additional information.

Potential negative impact	Level of impact (low-high)	Number of people potentially affected
Transportation of material to a bring site.	Low	Not currently know. It is likely, the number of residents affected by any potential impacts would be reflective of the number of assisted collections performed by the Service currently. This is currently between 4% - 5%.

16 Based on your response to Question 15, could this proposal, in its current form, discriminate against people in a protected characteristic group – will it result in their being treated less favourably when compared with others not in a protected characteristic group? Please see the Guidance for additional information. [\\*link](#)

Please answer Yes or No

No

- If the proposal is considered to have the potential to discriminate against people in a protected characteristic group you should consider modifying it to remove or reduce its potential negative impact
- If the proposal is considered to be discriminatory to the extent that is unlawful it must be rejected or substantially modified

**The resulting modified policy requires to be re–assessed to confirm its impact as per Questions 11, 12, 13 and 14.**

17 Describe in detail the actions taken to remove or modify any identified negative impact of this proposal

The Service would engage at the earliest stage to assist those residents who may be impacted. This would include the promotion of waste minimisation to reduce the amount of glass containers produced by a household.  
If bring sites are introduced, these would be implemented in consultation with community groups to

ensure they are placed in areas which provide best accessibility.

- 18 Where negative impacts cannot be removed or minimised any further, clearly state your justification for continuing with this proposal.

With the implementation of the Deposit Return Scheme, kerbside glass tonnages presented at the kerbside will drop significantly. The Service therefore does not view the current service provision as viable long term through foreseeable inefficiencies in this operation. Glass collections are also non-statutory.

The Service currently collects kerbside glass once every four weeks via a 55 litre box. This method of collection poses health and safety risks, which has been evidenced since its implementation in 2016. Removing this service will reduce the level of risk to our operatives.

## MONITORING AND REVIEW

19. a) How will implementation of this proposal be monitored, how frequently and by whom?  
 b) How will the results of the monitoring be used to develop it in the future?  
 c) What is the timescale for the reviewing the impact of this proposal?

a) The implementation will be monitored by waste services Officers. This will be done by monitoring tonnages presented at bring sites and regular engagement with customers. Health and Safety incident reports related to manual handling will also be monitored after implementation.

b) N/A

c) This would be reviewed on an annual basis

## PUBLISHING RESULTS

- 20 Please summarise the key findings of the EqIA. **This statement is for publication in the relevant Council report and requires to be authorised and signed by the Lead Officer responsible for the assessment.**

This proposal would see the removal of kerbside glass collections from all households in the local authority area. This EQIA has identified potential negative impacts for residents or households who have disabilities or are elderly. This is primarily down to the distance required to travel to a bring site for disposal of remaining glass containers. With the removal of this service, alongside other transformational projects, the Service would place significant efforts into waste awareness and minimisation in line with the waste hierarchy.

The Service also remains open to using the blue bin for the disposal of glass containers, if viable to market conditions. This would mitigate against negative impacts identified in this EQIA. If this method of collection were to be adopted, the Service would maintain an assisted collection service for those who are eligible.

### AUTHORISATION BY LEAD OFFICER (Head of Service/Service Manager)

Title	Signature	Date



4. For proposals with implications for budgets complete the following:

		(£ 000s)
Current expenditure on activity	In Council area as a whole	
	In/for specific community/ies	
Total anticipated savings or proposed increased spend	In/for Council area as a whole	
	In/ for specific community/ies	
	Start date for savings/increased spend	
	End Date for savings/increased spend	
Delivery Timescale and Phasing	Savings/increased spend Year 1	(£357K)
	Savings/increased spend Year 2	
	Savings/increased spend Year 3	
	Savings/increased spend Year 4	
	Savings/increased spend Year 5	

### AIMS & OBJECTIVES

Answering questions 5 - 7 will help you decide whether or not your proposal needs to be accompanied by an EqIA.

5. What longer term outcomes is the proposal expected to achieve?

This proposal is deigned to align the Service with national recycling targets, reduction of waste to landfill and the introduction of the Deposit Return Scheme in 2021. The reduction of frequencies for both streams will provide long term efficiencies and resilience.

6. What are the main aims of this proposal? If this proposal revises an existing policy have its aims changed?

The proposal amends the current Waste policy to extend collection frequencies on both grey and blue bins from two to four-weekly.

7. Who is most likely to be affected by this proposal? Consider current and potential future service users including people with particular needs, specific geographical communities and current and prospective employees.

All Stirling Council residents would be affected.

### POTENTIAL IMPACT

Answering Questions 8 -12 will help you consider the potential impact of the proposal.

8. What potential impact will this proposal have on people in terms of the needs of the public sector equality duty and the Council's responsibilities to:-

- eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- advance equality of opportunity
- foster good relations - including the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding
- See guidance for additional information.

No direct impact

9. Will this proposal have a potential impact on people with “protected characteristics”? Please consider all protected groups listed below. A detailed explanation of these is provided in the guidance.

Group	Impact Yes/No/Unclear	Group	Impact Yes/No/Unclear	Group	Impact Yes/No/Unclear
Age	No				
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No				
Religion and Belief	No				

10 (a) Is this proposal considered to be a strategic decision that will affect how the Council fulfils its purpose over a significant period of time? (see page 11 of the Fairer Scotland Duty Interim Guidance - <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0053/00533417.pdf>) – Please answer **No**

10 (b) If ‘Yes’, what does the evidence suggest about the proposal’s actual or likely impacts on socio economic disadvantage? (see page 5 of the the Fairer Scotland Duty Interim Guidance - <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0053/00533417.pdf>)

No

10 (c) For non-strategic proposals, will this proposal have an impact on communities, household groups or individuals with a higher risk of experiencing poverty? Please answer **Yes/No/Unclear**. Information on communities, households and individuals with a higher risk of experiencing poverty is provided in the guidance.

No

11. Do you already have any evidence that has influenced or shaped this proposal in relation to people in protected characteristic groups or communities, groups or individuals vulnerable to poverty? If so please summarise what this evidence includes.

No.

## DECISION

12. Based on your responses and any evidence you already have, is an EqlA required for this proposal? In making your decision please note:

- if answering **Yes** to any part of either questions 9 or 10 an EqlA is required

- if answering Unclear to any part of questions 9 or 10 you are strongly advised to do an EqIA to allow you to comprehensively assess the impact of the proposal
- if answering No to any part of questions 9 or 10 please justify your response and why you consider an EqIA is not required for this proposal in the box below

**No. This proposal is being designed to accommodate those residents with additional needs e.g. Absorbent Hygiene Products. Additional collections will be made available for residents who request this service. Additional recycling capacity will also be made available for residents who request it.**

13. Who was involved in making this decision?

Service Manager (Waste) / Senior Manager (Environment & Place)

**Authorisation by Lead Officer (Head of Service/Service Manager)**

This decision has been approved by (Director/Head of Service/ Senior Manager – delete as appropriate)

**Name**

**Title**

**Date**