Appendix 'A' - Annex 'C'

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE

Proposals to Meet the 2012/13 and 2013/14 Cash Limits

Environment Directorate – Further Efficiency Savings 2012/13 to 2013/14

		Financia	I Impact
	ENVIRONMENT	2012/13	2013/14
		£m	£m
1)	Efficiency saving:		
	Reduction in number of management posts	0.250	1.000
2)	Efficiency saving:		
	Further efficiency achieved through "One Team" working (Highway Services Review)		1.500
2)			
3)	Efficiency saving Highway maintenance efficiency as a result of recent capital	1.500	1.500
	investment improving the condition of the highway	1.000	1.000
4)	Efficiency saving		
	Reduce highways contingency by 50%	0.420	0.420
5)	Efficiency saving		
	Reduction in training budgets	0.050	0.050
6)	Efficiency saving		
	Reduction in cost of locality working	0.280	0.280
7)	Efficiency saving		
	Reduction in production costs of policy statements	0.100	0.100
	Total of Efficiency Savings for Environment	2.600	4.850

Summary of Service Proposals

	2012/13 £m	2013/14 £m
1. Street Lighting Carbon Reduction	3.950	3.950
2. Companion cards	0.130	0.130
3. Waste Minimisation – Further reduction	0.200	0.200
	4.280	4.280

Summary of Service Charging Proposals

	2012/13 £m	2013/14 £m
1. Waste – Increase trade waste charges	0.040	0.580
	0.580	0.580

Directorate Environment	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
1. Street Lighting Carbon Reduction Programme	£m	£m	£m	£m
Proposal:				
Reduction in the street lighting carbon reduction programme and funding	3.950			
future investment in carbon reduction from the capital programme.				
Impact on Service:				
Lighting will continue to be provided to the same standards and in the same				
locations as currently provided. Lamp replacement/cleaning will continue on				
a five yearly cycle with life expired lamps being replaced with more energy				
efficient solutions.				
State whether full or partial cessation: Full				
Staffing effect: Possible impact but considered minor				
Impact on budget and on service users:				
The Street Lighting Carbon Reduction Programme has been running now for a r				
our carbon emissions and our costs. However most of the quick wins and short				
end of the current financial year. Whilst the continuation of the programme bey			•	
reductions the financial benefits arising from the resulting initiatives would take				erialise. The
continuation of the Programme in its current form is therefore not considered the	most cost ef	fective or viab	le option.	
The carbon reduction programme has not only reduced carbon emissions but h	has resulted i	n the installat	ion of longer	lasting bulbs
which need changing less often, thus reducing the costs of future maintenance.				
to fund the replacement of any life expired lamps with the more expensive ener				
over time, reduce further our carbon emissions without the need for an expensiv			•	
Capital investment in column replecement will also utilize the latest energy officia	ant antiona			
Capital investment in column replacement will also utilise the latest energy efficient				
If there is a future need for investment in this area then individual initiatives will b				
business case setting out the rationale for the investment and demonstrating a ro				l. It is

proposed that in future such investment be considered and funded as part of the capital programme. Within the capital programme for 2012/13 £1.0 million has been earmarked for targeted interventions in street lighting related to carbon reduction.

Risk associated with delivering option:

The Council may face increasing pressure to reduce carbon emissions further once the Government's Carbon Reduction

Commitment takes effect in April 2013. Although not certain this may result in the need for further investment in energy efficiency measures in the future. This risk however will be mitigated to some extent by the ongoing initiatives mentioned above.

Equality Assessment outcomes: None

Impact on any locality issues: None

Any other issues:

None

Directorate Environment	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
2. Companion Cards	£m	£m	£m	£m
Proposal:				
Not to proceed with the introduction of free bus concessions for companions travelling with people with disabilities.	0.130			
Impact on Service:				
It was originally proposed that people qualifying for a companion card would				
be able to take a companion with them free of charge on bus and tram				
services. However, it has proved difficult to arrive at an agreed scheme with				
the bus operators.				
State whether full or partial cessation: Full		_		
Staffing effect: None Impact on budget and on service users:				
The proposal will mean that the budgeted amount of £130k will not be spent implemented.	t. It should b	e noted that t	he scheme h	as not bee
Risk associated with delivering option:				
	nion cards an	d may limit the	eir ability to tra	avel
The proposal will have an impact on those people who would have used compare because a travelling companion will continue to travel at their normal fare.				

Impact on any locality issues:

The proposal will have an impact on those people who would have used companion cards and may limit their ability to travel. This may have greater impacts in some communities due to the distribution of people who might have applied.

Any other issues:

None

Directorate Environment	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
3. Waste Minimisation	£m	£m	£m	£m
Proposal:				
Reduction in waste minimisation activities	0.200			
Impact on Service:				
This will involve the reduction of an amount paid into a Waste Minimisation				
Fund currently held by GRLL for the development and implementation of				
Waste Minimisation and recycling initiatives.				
The effect on the service is that fewer resources will be available to				
implement initiatives. £345,000 will remain available.				
State whether full or partial cessation: Partial				
Staffing effect: None. Service is delivered by contractor and monitored by LCC				
Impact on budget and on service users:				
Budget impact will be a guaranteed saving. It could be argued that costs else				•
and/or less recycling but it is unlikely this change will have any impact in this users.	respect. The	re are no pai	rticular impact	s on service
Risk associated with delivering option:				
There is a risk of decreased productivity of Soft Services elements of PFI contra	act through ha	ving fewer rea	sources availa	ble
Equality Assessment outcomes:				
Equality Assessment outcomes:				
Equality Assessment outcomes: None	cus more on v	vorking with E	District Council	s to ensure
Equality Assessment outcomes: None Impact on any locality issues:	cus more on v	vorking with E	District Counci	s to ensure
Equality Assessment outcomes: None Impact on any locality issues: People are less informed about what to do with waste. We therefore need to for	cus more on v	vorking with E	District Counci	s to ensure

SERVICE CHARGING PROPOSALS

2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
£m	£m	£m	£m
0.040	0.580		
	£m	£m £m	£m £m £m

Impact on budget and on service users:

The impacts on budget will largely be dependent upon the tonnages of commercial waste collected by the District Councils. Any increase in rate may result in less tonnage. District Councils who choose to continue to use the County Council for trade waste disposal are likely to pass on this increase to their trade customers. The County Council will work constructively with the District Councils to identify means whereby the impact of meeting the full costs of trade waste disposal on the viability of collection services can be mitigated.

Risk associated with delivering option:

- There is a slight risk of under achieving the required savings as it is wholly tonnage dependant. Increases in charges may well force customers to find alternative service providers. However, tonnages would need to drop by more than 44% on the current level of 17, 400 tonnes for these savings not to be realised.
- Potential for fly tipping to be attributed to the increased charge.

Equality Assessment outcomes:

None

Impact on any locality issues:

Small businesses will be most affected by significant increase in costs. Potential for fly tipping.

Any other issues:

Currently the cost of dealing with the commercial waste collected by Districts is heavily subsidised by the County Council. This is as a result of the waste network now in use compared to previously where the waste was simply sent to landfill. This is not a cost that should be met by the local tax payer.

The County Council has taken on board the comments of some of the District officers who consider it would be beneficial to have a separate rate that could be applied for the collection of wholly recyclable wastes (i.e. paper/card, glass/cans/plastic bottles). This rate will have to take into account potential changes in markets, and income generated, to be truly reflective of the cost and be competitive. However, it is hoped that by the introduction of a separate more competitive rate for recyclable waste the Districts will develop their collection services in this area.