

Litter Strategy Options Appraisal

Theme: 1 Education and Engagement

Options	Benefits	Risks	Comments
Do nothing	Very limited delivery from within existing resources will save MCC resources.	No cultural change. Littering remains an issue and gets worse. Future costs incurred in clearing litter. Risk of further environmental damage locally and internationally. Harm to Monmouthshire's local economy and tourism businesses. Volunteers will no longer collect litter if MCC does nothing to support their efforts by educating the public.	The risks outweigh the benefits
Fund fully over next five years from new MCC resources	MCC has more control over the outcomes. Volunteer litter pickers feel supported by MCC officers and people take personal responsibility for the litter they produce. Education leads to cultural change that reduces littering behaviour. MCC can be seen to be taking the issue seriously and devoting resources to it.	Resources expended on litter education are not available for other MCC services. Difficult to measure the impact of educational interventions on behaviour. Monmouthshire public disagree that this issue deserves this level of resourcing.	A more modest application of MCC resources would be more fitting for this issue, given the County Council's financial situation.
Fund for the next 3 years with a combination of internal and external funds, selecting the actions that are most likely to a) be effective and b) attract external funding. Review after 3 years.	A balanced approach to education and engagement, working with volunteers and partners to change behaviour, which is more likely to be sustainable in the long term. Promotes local ownership of the issue, which should be more likely to change behaviours.	Difficult to measure the impact of educational interventions on behaviour. Behaviour change is a long term process, and three years is a relatively short time for this to take place.	A combination of funding from external sources, work in partnership with others, and a limited application of MCC resources is the most fitting response to this issue.

Theme 2: Enforcement

Options	Benefits	Risks	Comments
Do nothing	There is limited enforcement carried out at present through PCSOs but no focussed activity across the county.	Other approaches that include the threat of prosecution are undermined.	There is support from the public to prosecute local environment quality offences.
Focus exiting MCC resources on enforcement across MCC	Enforcement is delivered in line with MCC standards and values. Proportional in delivery across the county	Resources are already stretched and enforcement of local environment quality is labour intensive.	Without a dedicated department enforcing it could become piecemeal approach.
Procure external enforcement providers for each town with payment through FPN receipts	Pay for themselves from issuing FPNs, high profile enforcement, delivered in high visibility areas. Not the Council delivering the service	Public backlash, high footfall areas targeted and negative impact on high street, press coverage in other areas have been critical of approach of only targeting high visibility areas	Cost free solution for the council
Procure limited external enforcement (visit the area intermittently) payment through mixture of FPNs and Council contribution	Delivered in high visibility areas, ability to divert to low footfall rural areas, greater input from Council	No permanent presence, no pressure on provider to issue fines, more difficult to manage	May be more acceptable to residents and traders

Theme: 3 Infrastructure

Options	Benefits	Risks	Comments
Do nothing	No capital cost	Declining infrastructure and higher revenue costs Deterioration in visual amenity and knock on impact on local economy Infrastructure not suitable to needs. Loss of support from litter champions and volunteers	Risk outweigh benefits
Full investment in Infrastructure needs funded internally over the five years with commitment to ongoing replacement costs	Improvements in townscapes Reduction in litter Reduction in vermin Reduction in environmental harm caused by litter	No resources for any other areas of Local Environment Quality Causes of litter and therefore littering not resolved	Unrealistic resource commitment that does not resolve the issues
Assessment of infrastructure with targeted renewal and investigation into alternative resourcing for capital investment	Improvements to townscapes but at a slower rate Key issues and blackspots targeted to resolve the biggest issues first Increased community engagement in decisions and ownership of assets.	Potential increase in corporatisation of urban areas if sponsorship model adopted Slower update of infrastructure. Some areas may feel under supported.	Suited to budgetary constraints. Allows for resources for other areas of work, particularly prevention measures in Theme 1 targeting the causes of litter

Theme 4: Service Design

Options	Benefits	Risks	Comments
Continue current balance of activity between town and rural locations	Requires less resource for service redesign and contract renegotiation with town councils	May not be meeting the needs of certain communities	The most straightforward approach but does not attempt to address changes in expectation
Continue current balance of activity between town and rural locations but increase community involvement in how services are delivered	Improved targeting of services Potential for greater involvement in community delivery of services Potential for greater ownership of issues and better outcomes for prevention	Shortage of capacity in department for high levels of community engagement Raising expectation that cannot be delivered due to resource constraints. May impact on delivery while staff time is directed to look for external funding	Challenge to deliver higher community engagement with current resources and will require an increase in external funding to achieve this but is likely to deliver the best outcome.
Increase focus on litter collection particularly in rural areas and strategic road network	Targets some of the most frequent complaints about litter Targets Gateway to Wales issues making the county and country more welcoming	Reduced resources for any other areas. Less resourcing for town and urban areas where higher population density and higher rates of litter May need to renegotiate contracts with Town Councils	Change in status quo will stimulate complaints as services decline in some areas
Increase focus on town centres, events and high visibility locations	Improvements in townscapes Reduction in litter Reduction in vermin Reduction in environmental harm caused by litter	Increased marginalization of rural communities Rural litter black spots will increase impacting on tourism	Change in status quo will stimulate complaints as services decline in some areas

Theme 5: Partnership Working

Options	Benefits	Risks	Comments
Do nothing	Saves Council resources	Unable to support or develop efforts of litter volunteers with equipment and new roles. No additional cleansing of major arterial routes.	
Invest MCC resources fully in 5 year programme of works	Spending in this area is modest, but would help increase activity of volunteers and prevent issues from developing, so should provide a long term saving.	Investment in this area, but not others within this programme of work would raise expectations with volunteers, on which we may not be able to deliver.	
Invest MCC resources and external funds in partnership working to resolve and prevent litter issues.	Enables the development of working relationships with partners and volunteers. Saves MCC funds to spend on other service areas and priorities.	None.	