

Overview & Scrutiny
In-Depth Review Report

Waste Services Review

Planning, Transportation, Economy & Sustainability
Overview & Scrutiny Panel

FINAL REPORT - 18 July 2005

Review Panel Members:

Peter Metcalfe (chair)

Chris Cray

Peter Edwards

Ruth Griffiths

David Hawkins

Caroline Roberts

Stephen Willcox

Report Structure

1. Introduction
2. Context
 - 2.1 Background
 - 2.2 Purpose of the Overview & Scrutiny Review
 - 2.3 Objectives of the Overview & Scrutiny Review
3. Review Method
 - 3.1 Background Briefing
 - 3.2 review Structure
 - 3.3 Zero Waste Workshop
 - 3.4 Correspondence & Submissions
 - 3.5 Public Contributor Meeting
4. Findings & Recommendations
 - PART A: Waste Management, Waste Collections & Recycling
 - 4.1 Education & Awareness Raising
 - 4.2 Enforcement
 - 4.3 Business Waste
 - 4.4 Recycling
 - 4.5 Partnership Working
 - 4.6 Kitchen Waste Collections
 - 4.7 Residual Waste Collections
 - 4.8 Composting
 - PART B: Litter & Street Cleansing
 - 4.9 Partnership Working
 - 4.10 Education and Awareness Raising
 - 4.11 Operational Team Working
 - 4.12 Needs of Different Areas
 - 4.13 Deep Cleaning
 - 4.14 Graffiti
 - 4.15 Enforcement
 - 4.16 Rewards
 - 4.17 Financial Resources
 - 4.18 Litter Reduction Plan
5. List of Appendices
6. Review Structure & Organisation

1. Introduction

The Planning, Transportation, Economy & Sustainability (PTES) Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Panel has undertaken a review of Waste Services managed by Bath & North East Somerset Council, with a view to recommending improvements to the ways in which these services are prioritised, developed and organised in the future.

This report sets out the Panel's approach to the review, its findings and recommendations to the Council Executive.

The report is supported by a number of important appendices which are seen by the panel to also warrant careful attention.

2. Context

2.1 Background

Bath & North East Somerset Council's Waste Services team is responsible for the development and implementation of the Council's Municipal Waste Management strategy, including the procurement and strategic management of waste, recycling & street cleansing services.

The range of services provided includes:

- Weekly green box collection of recyclables
- Mini recycling centres & bring banks
- Fortnightly chargeable organics collection of green waste & cardboard
- Residual refuse collection
- Clinical waste collection
- 3 Household Waste & Recycling Centres
- 2 Waste transfer stations & 1 railhead
- Street cleansing
- Abandoned vehicle removal
- Fly-tipping & graffiti removal
- Public convenience provision
- Waste Awareness, education and campaigning.

A major factor affecting the service is the recent publication of government targets on reducing biodegradable waste to landfill in order to meet the requirements of the EU Landfill Directive. Stretching future targets have been set for all Local Authorities for their performance around waste management and a system of financial penalties has been put in place if landfill diversion targets are not reached, going forwards over the next 15 years to 2020. The cost of waste disposal is also increasing dramatically as landfill tax is rising by £3 per tonne per annum.

The Council faces a significant risk of future fines by Government if the Council does not achieve levels of reduction in the amount of biodegradable waste going to landfill. To address this, a Waste Strategy and action plan is being developed to remodel and develop new services in order to achieve the targets and move further towards the "zero waste" aspiration. Several options are currently being examined in detail in order for the Council to determine the most appropriate means of procuring the delivery of the required services.

Another significant issue facing the authority is that of improvements to management of the urban public realm and in particular consultation on a Litter Reduction Plan which is aimed at providing the basis for future improvements in this area.

Within the context of these developments, officers would also like to take the opportunity to provide updates and feedback on previous scrutiny exercises undertaken by the Panel.

2.2 Purpose of the Overview & Scrutiny Review

The review has been undertaken by the Planning, Transportation, Economy & Sustainability Overview & Scrutiny Panel.

Against the background of change noted above, the purpose of this review was for Panel Members to undertake a strategic review of the Waste Services operation and the issues affecting waste, recycling and street cleaning in Bath & North East Somerset.

The review contributes to the development of two (of the ten) council improvement priorities, as stated in the Corporate Plan (2003-2007):

- Reducing landfill
- Improving the urban public realm ('liveability')

The review supports policy development by providing the Panel's findings and recommendations on future strategy to the Executive Member for Sustainability and the Environment (Cllr. Gerry Curran) and Waste Services lead officers.

Members have been able to take soundings from a range of consultees through the open public O&S process, and represent these views as findings to support recommendations in this report to the Council Executive. The Executive will be asked to respond and come to decisions on the issues raised.

This method of working is classified as the 'overview' role of Overview and Scrutiny, where the Panel is acting in a pathfinder context to support the Executive in developing policy, formulating plans and making decisions around important community issues.

2.5 Objectives of the Overview & Scrutiny Review

The Overview & Scrutiny Panel defined that the objectives of this Review have been to:

- Understand the issues relating to waste management, recycling & street cleansing (in relation to landfill & urban public realm priorities) as they affect Bath & North East Somerset.
- Undertake public engagement on the issues to inform and widen the debate around the future direction of service provision by the Council.
- Provide the Panel's findings and recommendations on the issues to the Council Executive and Waste Service officers to inform their decisions on implementation of future plans.

Appendix A provides the full Terms of Reference for the review.

3. Review Method

The Overview & Scrutiny Panel used a number of research and fact finding methods to gather information for the Review:

3.1 Background Briefing

At the start of the Review, a background briefing and comprehensive presentations were provided by the Waste Services team to support Panel Members' understanding of the broad range of issues and opportunities relating to Waste Services for Bath & North East Somerset, including:

- the current range of Waste services operations
- updates on related scrutiny exercises previously conducted by the Panel
- current Council plans and policies to address local issues as well as initiatives already under development within existing service plans.
- government policy that regulates the Council's role in providing Waste Services and future opportunities developing nationally and locally through recent changes in Government policy.

Discussions on these topics allowed Members an opportunity to clarify the scope of their review and contributed to the definition by the Panel of their Terms of Reference.

3.2 Review Structure

Following the initial briefings, the Panel identified 2 key areas of the Councils Waste services operations that it wished to review:

- Waste & Recycling Strategy
- Litter & Street Cleansing

These two aspects of the Waste Service were recognised to be operationally quite separate (although they are linked by the same management team) so it was decided at an early stage that they would be treated as 2 separate themes within the overall Review. The clear separation of these issues allowed the Panel to concentrate their investigations and discussions on one theme at a time throughout the course of the Review, including the formulation of the Panel's recommendations, which are separately defined under the 2 themes later in this report.

3.3 Zero Waste Workshop

Members of the Panel were able to attend a one-day 'Zero Waste' workshop in January 2005, organised by Waste Services and their consultants (Eunomia) to identify and prioritise possible initiative to work towards the Council's aspiration of 'zero waste' in the short and medium term.

The workshop was attended by representatives of local organisations with an interest in waste & recycling. Participants, speakers and service officers were able to explore collectively the range of solutions being proposed for reducing waste going to landfill.

Appendix B provides a summary of the workshop.

3.4 Correspondence & Submissions

The Panel considered views expressed in letters and emails from the public and interested organisations. These were received either in response to a direct invitation to organised groups to provide comments, or from individuals as a result of press coverage about the review initiated through press releases. A webpage about the review with an on-line feedback form was created for the review and publicised in a press release.

Appendix C provides the press release and correspondence received by the Panel.

3.5 Public Contributor Meetings

In view of the scale of issues to be considered in each of the two core themes of the review ((1) Waste & Recycling, and; (2) Litter & Street Cleansing) the Panel chose to hold two separate all day public meetings on 16th March & 18th April 2005. The meeting format was similar on both days.

The Panel received an introductory presentation from the Head of Leisure & Amenity Services with supporting in-depth briefings from functional managers outlining the current services and potential opportunities for improvement and development. The (then) Executive Member for Waste & Sustainability attended to provide additional comments. The Panel were able to ask questions.

This was followed by an exploration of external perspectives on the issues. Officers of other Local Authorities, acknowledged to have a good track record and service performance made presentations to the panel and discussed issues with members.

The Panel sought the views of local service users, service providers, and community organisations to explore the Council's services from an external perspective.

Appendices D & E provide a full record of both public contributor meetings.

4. Findings & Recommendations

A large amount of information was provided to the Panel in the course of undertaking this review, and given the widespread and numerous sources, the Panel determined to take a thematic approach to reporting its findings, general conclusions and recommendations.

In this section of the report, we have continued to separate the key themes of the review and provide our findings and recommendations under 2 major headings:

PART A: Waste Management, Collections & Recycling

PART B: Litter & Street Cleansing

Under each heading the Panel document a series of findings and on some we provide specific recommendations.

We will be requesting an Executive response to all our recommendations through the O&S Recommendations Tracking Process. Appendix F provides a summary table of those recommendations to be addressed by the Executive.

PART A: Waste Management, Waste Collections & Recycling

In undertaking this Review and in coming to conclusions and recommendations, the Panel would like to recognise the high level of achievement and consistent performance to date by the Waste Services team in the management and delivery of waste and recycling services. Looking ahead, the imposed targets from central Government, which are now facing the authority meant that further enhancements are needed. The Service is well aware of these and has been clear with us throughout the Review on defining various options for service development. We hope that our recommendations will support the development of services to meet the challenges ahead.

4. 1 Education & Awareness Raising

The Panel considered the role of education and awareness raising about recycling issues as an important method of improving the Council's recycling performance.

Recommendations

- 4.1.1 The Panel felt strongly that there should be an emphasis on reducing waste ahead of recycling. Waste reduction is at the root of the problem. The Council does provide some advice on waste minimisation on its website. This includes practical examples of ways that people can reduce their consumption of packaging and re-use items themselves, without the intervention of local authority recycling schemes. The Panel recommend more promotion to encourage these ideas.**

- 4.1.2 The Young should be visited at schools and encouraged to adopt a positive attitude towards waste and recycling issues. Reward and incentive schemes could be made to encourage schools to achieve a recycling target.**
- 4.1.3 Play areas could include 'fun' facilities to encourage children to recycle.**
- 4.1.4 There needs to be engagement with the whole community to get an understanding of the need for as real change of attitude about waste and recycling. Local community leaders (e.g. Parish Councils and Ward Members) could be used as educators and awareness raisers to re-enforce the message in local communities**
- 4.1.5 The costs of undertaking such work should be recognised. A suitable budget needs to be made available for this important aspect of Waste Services work.**

4.2 Enforcement

During its Review, the Panel became aware of examples of 'offences' relating to the wide range of waste collections, recycling schemes or littering, where the Council could take a firmer role of enforcement.

Recommendations

- 4.2.1 Warning should be made to offenders then prosecute if they do not comply. Enforcement needs to be followed through. There currently appears not to be enough resource or follow up by the Council. Put in place an enforcement processes with real penalties.**
- 4.2.2 Action Line should be promoted as a contact point for people to report problems and offences.**
- 4.2.3 Joint working between agencies and partners (e.g. Environment Agency, Rivers Authority, Railtrack) to tackle fly-tipping offenders should be pursued as a priority.**
- 4.2.4 Enforce conditions and rules at recycling sites, e.g. to prevent trade waste tipping and correct segregation of waste.**
- 4.2.5 Although a lack of willingness by individual households to segregate recyclable waste is not an offence, some compulsion may be ultimately required. Households may need to be given incentives by a combination of carrots and sticks.**

4.3 Business Waste

Business (trade, commercial, retail, etc.) waste collection and disposal is outside the remit of the Council's waste operations. Private sector operators provide contract services to business organisations. However, the Panel looked at the issue of business waste to consider what role the Council should play, with regard to its role as custodian of the local environment and any enforcement powers it has.

Recommendations

- 4.3.1 Waste Services should encourage consultation and dialogue with businesses and trade waste operators over their modes of operations and recycling rates.**
- 4.3.2 Recognise that some businesses are already recycling. Seek out and champion these as good examples.**
- 4.3.3 Consider what incentives the Council can make to encourage businesses to recycle.**
- 4.3.4 For poor performers, the Council has no powers to enforce recycling so it must take an encouragement role.**
- 4.3.5 The Council could develop local regulations (bylaws) to enforce increased standards.**

4.4 Recycling

Panel members explored the variety of ways in which the Council promotes and services recycling, including 'Green Box' collections, recycling centres, and partnership working with local specialist organisations (e.g. SOFA project Genesis Furniture Appeal).

Recommendations

- 4.4.1 Capacity within our recycling centres needs to be increased. There should be more recycling points throughout the district. The Bath site is very busy. There may be a case to have a site south of the city, which would help those living in the countryside.**
- 4.4.2 Partner organisations that promote re-use and repair of old items should be encouraged by the Council. There should be an emphasis on finding further partners for specialist item refurbishment. In addition, the Council could initiate more partnership working between those organisations so that incoming items are better distributed to the most suitable recycler, rather than 'cherry picked' whilst other potential items are refused as can sometimes be the case at present (e.g. during general house clearances).**
- 4.4.3 The number and variety of waste items that can be recycled through the green box scheme is impressive but the Panel**

discussed that there are additional items that could be added (e.g. Tetra cartons). We recommend that the Service should prioritise and resource recycling of heavy materials first (such as kitchen waste – see 4.6 below) then lesser volume/weight items later – taxpayer value is an important consideration in prioritising services.

- 4.4.4 Make sure all houses have (free) green boxes. The service has been operating successfully for some years and turnover in households means that some are not aware / participating in the scheme.**
- 4.4.5 All new housing should be provided with green boxes and possibly a free compost bin.**
- 4.4.6 Promote a greater emphasis on communal recycling facilities in new housing development instead of communal waste bin areas.**
- 4.4.7 Consider longer opening times for Recycling centres, e.g. to allow the working population to access sites in the evening.**

4.5 Partnership Working

The Panel learned that waste & recycling services cannot be provided by the Council in isolation, particular with the ever widening range of items that can be recycled and the specialist skills and infrastructures required for many of the recycling processes.

Recommendations

- 4.5.1 Tonnage of recycling by other agencies (e.g. SOFA Project, Genesis) should be included in total figures of waste diverted from landfill for Bath & North East Somerset. Some of these figures may be small in relation to the overall tonnage but it is important to recognise the important work of Partners working with and/or supported by the Authority.**
- 4.5.2 Appoint Partnership Champions – to promote and develop all recycling processes.**
- 4.5.3 Investigate partnership working with neighbouring Local Authorities, such as Somerset, who are pioneering systems and local partnerships (for example, in dealing with kitchen waste and large scale composting). Benefits will follow.**
- 4.5.4 Sub regional working by a network of Executive Members and waste officers should seek to drive forward cultural change in attitudes towards both domestic and business sector waste and establish a strategy for joint working and the provision of strategic facilities.**

4.6 Kitchen Waste Collections

The Panel learned that household waste can be categorised into different types and considered for suitability of recycling. Currently Bath and North East Somerset collects a wide range of recognised recyclables (including paper, cans, cardboard, glass, etc.). Householders' segregation of these items and subsequent collection by the Council prevents these items being land filled with other residual domestic waste. There are costs to the Council (and hence local Council taxpayers) for landfill calculated on a per tonne basis so any further reduction in landfill could mitigate cost increases for the Council. Waste Services analysis of the current residual waste has shown that the greatest category by weight is 'residual kitchen waste', typically food waste unsuitable for home composting, such as cooked vegetables, meat, & dairy products, which can be composted on a larger scale using contained 'in-vessel' systems.

Some other Councils' have received DEFRA funding to collect kitchen waste, thus making financial savings by diversion from landfill to make compost. They have introduced kitchen waste collections alongside traditional waste and recycling collections. At their contributor meeting in March, the Panel heard from officers at Somerset Council who had introduced a kitchen waste collection scheme, firstly as a trial and latterly as standard service.

Discussions with our own officers considered the viability of such a scheme at Bath & North East Somerset, based on small scale kitchen waste collection trials which we carried out in 2003, and funded through the landfill tax credit scheme. A bid for funding to develop a comprehensive scheme was submitted to the DEFRA challenge fund in 2004. Unfortunately we were unsuccessful with this application, having previously been allocated significant funding by DEFRA to develop our green waste and cardboard collection scheme.

Recommendations

- 4.6.1 A separation and collection scheme for household kitchen waste should be introduced and funding sourced through the 2005/6 budget process. A trial area may be the best way to pilot the scheme.**
- 4.6.2 Collections should be weekly, so as to avoid build-up of waste in people's homes. Ideally, all waste streams should be collected on the same day of the week to avoid confusion by householders.**
- 4.6.3 Publicity information will need to be prepared about the scheme. This should include clear guidelines and continuing education on what can go in.**
- 4.6.4 Ensure that any concerns over health risk and nuisance issues whilst the waste is awaiting collection outdoors (i.e. vermin, rats, mice, flies, smells) are addressed in relation to the scheme.**

4.6.5 The Council should seek a suitable partner for the treatment of the collected kitchen waste and criteria must be that they have appropriate licensed facilities, e.g. in-vessel composting.

4.7 Residual Waste Collections

'Residual waste' is broadly defined as the rubbish that remains after all the recyclable materials have been segregated by householders for recycling or composting through other schemes. The items that remain are therefore collected as 'black bin bag rubbish' and land filled.

The Panel considered the likely effect of kitchen waste collections (discussed above in 4.6) in relation to the amount of residual household waste which would remain to be collected in the traditional black bin bag.

A suggestion put forward by service officers was that, with the many streams of waste being recycled and collected by other means, the amount of residual waste per household would greatly diminish. Furthermore, as the remaining waste would be relatively inert (as food waste would not be present to degrade or smell whilst awaiting collection) and lighter in weight it may be possible to collect residual waste fortnightly, rather than weekly. This reduced level of servicing would generate a cost saving which could be used to help offset the cost of introducing weekly kitchen waste collections.

The Panel explored this issue further with officers and invited contributors from Somerset, who had experience of running such a scheme. Discussions also considered the pros and cons of wheelie bins vs. black bags, and kerbside vs. back door collections for their effects on the overall efficiency of waste collection operations.

Recommendations

- 4.7.1 Fortnightly collections appear to have efficiency benefits but must only be considered in parallel with the introduction of weekly kitchen waste collections. A trial should test the arrangement.**
- 4.7.2 Use of Wheelie bins should be explored where practical to do so. Their impact on restricting the volume of residual waste (and therefore forcing people to think harder about recycling) could be a benefit. Due consideration needs to be given to their appropriateness in certain areas, e.g. terraced housing with limited street frontage, or shared premises and flats.**
- 4.7.3 Less than weekly may not be appropriate for some locations where involvement in recycling rates is poor, e.g. flats, shared premises, but this might be overcome with large communal wheelie-type bins. However, methods to accommodate the wheelie-type bins need to be identified to ensure health, safety and environmental impact are found**

- 4.7.4 Design collection services so that there is a single designated collection day for all waste streams, albeit that some streams will be collected fortnightly.**
- 4.7.5 Extremely clear information will need to be communicated to households about their collection patterns so as to avoid waste being left out for collection in the wrong week.**
- 4.7.6 Refine current waste collection operations to improve efficiency. For example, a system of edge of property collections should be the norm (rather than back door collections) as these would encourage recycling (by reducing the ease by which residual waste can be disposed of) and increase efficiency of collections, saving money to offset new service improvements such as kitchen waste collections.**
- 4.7.7 Torn bin bags with waste spewing out is a common problem, particularly in central areas of the city. The possible use of wheelie bins could help to address this but where these may not be practical, heritage site issues, multi occupancy, etc, explore the idea of hessian sacks used to over-bag black bin bags as a protection against the bags being torn open.**

4.8 Composting

The Panel found that the Council has well developed services and systems for composting green waste, both in relation to home composting (promotion and supply of compost bins and advice) as well as large scale composting of green waste collected or brought to its household waste collection sites. All such composted waste is a diversion from landfill.

Recommendations

- 4.8.1 Home composting must continue to be encouraged as this will reduce volume (and cost) of green waste collection and treatment by the Council.**
- 4.8.2 To widen coverage, explore the provision of composting bins and collection bins as free issue, perhaps at least to pensioners.**
- 4.8.3 Promote the distribution and sale of compost produced by the Council's process**
- 4.8.4 Consider the needs of properties with smaller gardens and target suitable (possibly seasonal) composting services at them.**

PART B: Litter & Street Cleansing

Overall, the Panel found evidence that the Council's litter and street cleansing services are exemplary in many areas, as demonstrated by national performance indicators. However, there are also areas for further development and these are highlighted below:

4.9 Partnership Working

A sense of Civic Pride in the community would encourage people to take a greater ownership and responsibility for the tidiness of their neighbourhoods. The Council needs to have a greater connection with people over the shared role of individuals, neighbourhoods and the local authority in maintaining the public realm. A good example is the Lansdown Litter Watch group, which could be considered as a role model. In time further development of the Area Committee concept, currently on trial in South Bath, may further support this.

The Panel learned that 'Quality Parishes' is an initiative which has the potential to change the role of parish councils, giving them more local ownership and control of local service provisions. This has the potential to further develop the sense of local civic pride by changing the emphasis and local tailoring of services including street cleansing routines, for example, by extending the Parish Sweeper scheme to eligible quality parishes. Although the Council would retain the role of 'Principle Litter Authority', services could be devolved to local people where financially viable.

Recommendations

- 4.9.1 Encourage and engage with the community to take ownership of their neighbourhoods to develop a sense of local civic pride.**
- 4.9.2 Consider the potential impact of Quality Parishes and the opportunities for greater involvement of them in provision of local cleansing services.**

4.10 Education and Awareness Raising

Information from Southampton City Council about their 'Green & Clean' campaign was particularly of interest to the Panel. The campaign was a co-ordinated marketing approach to posters and council vehicle liveries, linked to an enforcement clampdown with media coverage – all aiming to raise public awareness of the problems of littering.

Recommendations

- 4.10.1 Bath & North East Somerset should raise the profile of the litter issue, as Southampton have done, that it is anti-social, costs money to clear up and we will prosecute offenders.**

- 4.10.2 In parallel with our recommendations on education raising on recycling issues (see earlier), Waste Services should engage with schools over littering (around schools is a particular problem) . Educational visits could promote the many varied roles of the council – not just litter and recycling, but road safety too, etc – to promote a wide ranging view of the organisations function.**
- 4.10.3 A fun opportunity to engage with children would be to encourage schools to name a vehicle on the Council fleet, with a view to encouraging involvement and ownership.**

4.11 Operational Team Working

On a previous Review of the Urban Public Realm, the Panel visited the London Borough of Harrow and witnessed an impressive demonstration of their team working culture in cleaning and maintaining public spaces. During this Review we heard from Southampton how they had taken a similar approach.

From what we saw at Harrow, we believe there are motivational benefits and a sense of team purpose to the individual people working in teams. The sociability of work and safety of team members is also improved, plus there are efficiency benefits for the operation.

Recommendations

- 4.11.1 Develop plans to reorganise individual lone workers into teams.**
- 4.11.2 The Panel recognise that a one size fits all approach is not appropriate across the district so teams would need to be designed appropriate to the needs of different areas.**
- 4.11.3 Opportunities for breaking down departmental boundaries, e.g. between parks & gardens versus city cleansing operators and possibly community wardens, parking wardens and highways inspectors, should be considered. All employees of the Council, whatever their core service area, can act together to uphold the quality of our public realm, either in reporting or actively resolving problems. Multi-purpose teams that work together in all areas of the public realm, with opportunities for job rotation and personal development would be welcomed. In building such teams, there should be some thought over the range of individual abilities and aspirations of employees within this function as well as a continuing recognition of the diverse local workforce and the wider social responsibility of the Council as an employer within the community.**
- 4.11.4 Teams should be encouraged to develop a team identity and sense of ownership of their ‘patch’. A sense of team spirit and**

brand identity should be created using the recently refreshed corporate branding.

4.11.5 Friendly rivalry and competitiveness between teams could be considered

4.11.6 Good practice team building (such as Harrow BC) needs exploration and a response to the opportunities presented.

4.12 Needs of Different Areas

The Panel considered the need of Waste Services to respond to the differing street cleaning needs of the city versus towns and rural areas. The litter and disruption effects of the night time economy (broken bottles, food litter) are a clearly specialist need in Bath but also increasingly in other town areas. Impact is high and increasing, in line with changes to licensing laws, and Waste Services are not currently tailored for example to provide a thorough clean-up of city and town centres on a Sunday morning after the revelry of the night before.

Recommendations

4.12.1 There are clear linkages between licensing, street cleansing, community safety (community wardens), parking wardens and highways inspector roles of the council. The Panel suggest that these cross council service responsibilities need to be joined up between the relevant Executive members for the general benefit of the public realm.

4.12.2 Consideration should be given to up-rating weekend street cleansing services to match 'demand'.

4.13 Deep Cleaning

The Panel heard about the success of Environmental Action Days to resolve the public realm issues of whole neighbourhoods in a single day via multi-agency working. Similarly road closures with temporary parking bans to facilitate deep cleaning of whole streets had been successful in the past. However, whilst instant results can be obtained, such events are difficult and expensive to arrange.

Recommendations

4.13.1 There is an opportunity for more community working to make Environmental Action Days successful as a kick start event that then engenders some civic pride in the neighbourhood, e.g. by advance liaison and organisation of the Day with community groups such as neighbourhood watch co-ordinators.

- 4.13.2 Standard systems of partnership working with other agencies and council service teams could be developed to make deep cleaning events easier to plan and organise on a regular basis (e.g. support from the Police, Environment Agency, Environmental Health, Parking enforcement on the day).**

4.14 Graffiti

The Panel found evidence that Bath & North East Somerset is recognised as an exemplary authority over Graffiti removal. We have 2x response teams and provide a free service. This costs the Council c. £75k pa (part funded from corporate improvement money and a Local Public Service Agreements (PSA)). The Panel appreciated the quality of this service and that it has made a difference but voiced some concerns over risks when funding runs out in 2 years time.

Recommendations

- 4.14.1 Continuity / replacement funds must be secured for the continuation of the valued graffiti removal service.**

4.15 Enforcement

The Panel considered enforcement in the earlier part of this Review around waste collections and takes a similar stance on enforcement of littering offences.

Recommendations

- 4.15.1 The Panel was surprised that no use is made of CCTV evidence in pursuing littering offences. The Executive should undertake a review of the effectiveness and utilisation of existing CCTV on the enforcement of street littering (and other criminal) offences.**
- 4.15.2 Utilise the local presence of community wardens with cameras to record evidence of offences.**
- 4.15.3 Fast food outlets should have to undertake litter collections, enforced through licensing & planning stipulations (section.106 agreements). This could include the provision of (non business branded) bins.**
- 4.15.4 Recognise the importance of enforcement and prosecution at deterring others from committing offences. Provide financial resources to support enforcement. Link this to a high profile public awareness campaign to demonstrate that the Council does not tolerate littering. Raise the profile of enforcement (publicise prosecutions through press releases to the local**

media). A few high profile days with media coverage of the issue could yield high public awareness and immediate results. The overall aim should be to engage the public in the issues – aim to make litter dropping an unsociable act - and hence develop civic pride.

4.16 Rewards

This is the flip-side to enforcement (above).

Recommendations

- 4.16.1 Bath & North East Somerset could run a ‘best kept village / town / ward / road / street’ competition with categories to encourage all different communities to be involved. Aim should be to develop a sense of civic pride. Potentially, the money saved in cleansing could offset the costs of organising and funding prizes.**

4.17 Financial Resources

The Panel wanted to investigate a perception that the litter and street cleansing service was poorly funded and that this was leading to poor performance of the service.

National benchmarking figures show that Bath & North East Somerset do indeed have a lower financial spend per household than the national average. APSE (Association for Public Sector Excellence) Performance Network figures show average spend per household (cleansing) £28 / household. Our cost is c. £18 / household. The Panel noted also that the high tourism demand on these services is not taken account of in these comparisons. It is impressive, therefore, that in other national benchmark comparisons of cleanliness, the Service is rated to be performing well at keeping the public realm clean and tidy.

The Panel were therefore able to draw a healthy conclusion that the service was providing good value for money and that staff are providing an excellent service in tight financial circumstances.

However, performance is not in the top quartile and public perception is that streets and public spaces are not clean enough throughout the whole district – and this reflects on the reputation of the Council as a whole. The Panel consider that some additional funding and learning from other authorities could enhance Bath & North East Somerset’s public realm to a more acceptable level.

Recommendations

- 4.17.1 Benchmark any top quartile authorities that may have similar profiles to ours (e.g. Chester, York, Oxford, Cambridge) and examine what they do for their money and the performance they are achieving. The Executive should engage with those high performing Local Authorities to learn lessons.**
- 4.17.2 Explore opportunities for a Public Service Agreement (PSA round 2 starts in 2007) to attract funding for the public realm – the executive should aim beyond minimum legal street cleaning requirements, with a view to enhance street cleansing with stretch targets.**
- 4.17.3 Another funding initiative that should be considered is the set-up of a ‘Business Improvement District’ to encourage localised groups of businesses to work together with the Council to develop business pride in their area. This is another form of partnership working (discussed earlier).**

4.18 Litter Reduction Plan

A draft Litter Reduction Plan was presented to the Panel during the Review.

Recommendation

- 4.18.1 Include all the above relevant recommendations in the final Litter Reduction Plan.**

5.0 List of Appendices

Appendix A	Terms of Reference for the Overview & Scrutiny Review
Appendix B	Notes of Zero Waste workshop, January 2005
Appendix C	Press release, letters & e-mails,
Appendix D	Public contributor meeting on Waste Management issues, 16 th March 2005. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • statements • presentations • notes of the meeting
Appendix E	Public contributor meeting on Litter & Street Cleansing issues, 18 th April 2005. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • statements • presentations • notes of the meeting
Appendix F	Review recommendations – collated into Executive response table

Appendices are available separately by contacting the Overview & Scrutiny Team, Democratic Services, Guildhall, High Street, Bath, BA1 5AW. Tel: 01225 477329.

6.0 Review Structure & Organisation

O&S Panel:	Planning, Transportation, Economy & Sustainability
Chair:	Peter Metcalfe
Panel Members:	Chris Cray Peter Edwards Ruth Griffiths David Hawkins Caroline Roberts Stephen Willcox
Waste Services Officers:	Matthew Smith, Head of Service Carol Tunnard, Waste Services Manager Trevor Cummings, Client Services Manager
Relevant Director:	Peter Rowntree, Operations Director
O&S Project Manager:	David Langman
O&S Project Support Officer:	Sheila Johnson
O&S Panel Administrators:	Mark Durnford Lisa Walsh Jack Latkovic