

**Annex 1**  
**Summary of options to achieve HWRC budget savings.**

	<b>Option</b>	<b>Savings</b>	<b>Considerations</b>
	Business as usual	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level of public acceptability</li> <li>• Savings not achieved</li> <li>• Reprourement likely to add to the financial pressures</li> </ul>
<b>LIMITING SERVICE</b>	Shutting 2 -3 sites	Around <b>£300 - £450k</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived risk of flytipping (although this was not seen when Dean Pit shut)</li> <li>• Increase pressure on remaining sites</li> <li>• Increase journey times (and therefore cost and environmental impact of journey) for residents</li> <li>• Reduced level of public acceptability</li> </ul>
	Shutting all sites but for 2 days/ week	<b>£150k</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase pressure on days when sites are open</li> <li>• Could led to confusion over opening times for residents</li> </ul>
	Reducing opening hours (no late night opening)	<b>£10K</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could increase pressure at weekends as people can no longer visit after work</li> </ul>
	No longer taking residual waste at 3 sites (Recycling and reuse only sites)	<b>£150-250k</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Savings figure depends upon assumptions to where the waste goes</li> <li>• Increases pressure at other HWRCs</li> <li>• Reduced public acceptability – in the past they have said they prefer full service sites</li> <li>• Perceived risk of flytipping</li> </ul>
	Only accepting 'Household' waste	<b>£300k</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only alternative for householders to dispose of rubble, wood, asbestos etc is to hire a skip</li> <li>• Risk of flytipping</li> <li>• Conflict on site as site staff turn residents away</li> </ul>
	Restricting access to Oxfordshire residents	<b>£90k</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would require a member of staff on the site gate at all times – could increase costs</li> <li>• Could increase complaints</li> </ul>

	Option	Savings	Considerations
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbouring authorities may ban Oxfordshire residents meaning they use our sites instead – negating any savings</li> </ul>
<b>CHARGING</b>	Financially self-sufficient sites	<b>N/A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent legislative changes prevent Councils for charging for entry</li> </ul>
	To achieve savings	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent legislative changes prevent Councils for charging for entry</li> </ul>
	For asbestos	<b>£17k</b> (£2/sheet)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk of flytipping</li> <li>Conflict on site as site staff charge residents</li> </ul>
	For DIY waste	<b>£15k</b> (£1 per item)  <b>£30k</b> (£2/ item)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk of flytipping</li> <li>Conflict on site as site staff charge residents</li> </ul>
	Out of county visits	<b>£90k</b>  (charge of £1.50-£3.50/visit)  Unlikely to be realised as people may stop coming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would require a member of staff on the site gate at all times – could increase costs</li> <li>Savings could be negated as Oxfordshire residents start using sites</li> <li>Could increase complaints</li> <li>Query over legality of charging non Oxfordshire residents</li> </ul>
	Passing two sites to the private sector	<b>Around £300k</b>  (residents would be charged/visit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence has shown that these sites cannot generate the income required to keep them open and often close</li> <li>Trialled elsewhere and sites closed</li> </ul>
<b>INCOME GENER</b>	Reuse income	<b>Unknown</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would require capital to ensure correct infrastructure was in place</li> <li>Visits to site may increase as shoppers visit</li> <li>Space for car parking is required</li> </ul>

	Option	Savings	Considerations
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in planning permission would be required to have 'shops' on site</li> <li>• Other related items such as compost, gloves etc could also be sold</li> </ul>
	Trade income	<b>Unknown</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would require capital to ensure correct infrastructure was in place</li> <li>• Requires more space on site</li> <li>• Would require more staff to administer</li> </ul>
	Material income	<b>Unknown at present</b> Cannot be realised until 17/18 when contract reproduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Materials prices fluctuate – savings could turn into pressures in a matter of months</li> <li>• Would require a new contract model likely to cost more</li> </ul>
	Van and Trainer permit reissues	<b>£2k</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administration of payments will add to costs</li> <li>• Would need further legal investigation</li> </ul>
<b>PARTNERING</b>	With neighbouring authorities	<b>N/A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saving only realised if a joint site could be opened replacing other sites</li> </ul>
	With District Councils	<b>£30k</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would need district council to be willing – risk associated with materials price</li> <li>• Difficult to get site cost neutral</li> </ul>
	With private sites	<b>N/A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would need high input of staff time to ensure it was correctly operated and administered</li> <li>• Residents would need to make a number of trips to different sites</li> </ul>
	With the third sector	<b>N/A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many worthy charitable benefits</li> <li>• Cannot calculate any savings to OCC</li> </ul>
<b>OTHER IDEAS</b>	Increase recycling rate	<b>Cannot achieve full £350k saving</b> requires a 84%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waste analysis currently being conducted to see what is possible.</li> <li>• To achieve full £350k saving 7000 tonnes needs to be removed from the residual stream (currently only 6000 tonnes)</li> </ul>

	<b>Option</b>	<b>Savings</b>	<b>Considerations</b>
		recycling rate, 14% above current rates	in residual stream) (discrepancy due to some recycling streams attracting a gate fee)
	Stop green waste credit payments to districts	<b>£500k</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could impact relationship with district/City councils</li> </ul>
	Controlled Waste Regulations	<b>Potential for £150k</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could impact on relationship with City council</li> </ul>
	Minor Works budget	<b>£20k</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced further, increases reliance on developer funding contributions if major works needed</li> </ul>
	Advertising on site	<b>N/A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previously investigated and no interested parties were found</li> </ul>