

**Forest Heath District Council  
St Edmundsbury Borough Council**

**THE WEST SUFFOLK  
WASTE AND STREET  
SCENE SERVICES  
JOINT COMMITTEE**

**17 JUNE 2011**

**REPORT NO**

**C27**

**Report of the Strategic Director (Services) (FHDC)  
and the Corporate Director (Environment and Economy)  
(SEBC)**

**CLEANSING REVIEW – UPDATE**

**Synopsis:**

**This report is an update to report JWC11/041 that the West Suffolk Waste and Street Scene Services Joint Committee considered on 31 March 2011. A comprehensive redesign of our Cleansing Services across Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury is now well underway delivering the first outputs. This report details the progress being made on this project as well as outlining future activities and timescales.**

**Update on the Joint Cleansing Review :**

**1. Current status: Routing**

- 1.1 The project team finished the routing for the Shared Rural Mechanical Channel Sweeper Service across Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury in March. The latter part of this process involved fine tuning the routes in conjunction with the driver of the mechanical sweeper which has helped finalise the route and familiarise the driver with the different areas. Maps and schedules have been printed and distributed to staff at the Mildenhall, Haverhill and Bury St Edmunds depots.
- 1.2 Work has commenced on routing the applied sweeping and litter picking rounds which includes precincts and shop front cleansing. Completion of this work will be carried out within one or two weeks.
- 1.3 Litter and dog bin location data has been loaded into the Routesmart software package used to design and produce the routes and schedules. The first draft routes suggest that more work needs to be done with the crews to establish what the actual collection patterns are now. This is a significant piece of work and will

require a number of different officers to be involved at various stages throughout the process.

- 1.4 Following approval of the Service Level Agreement (SLA) for shared rural mechanical channel sweeping by the West Suffolk Waste and Street Scene Services Joint Committee on the 31 March 2011, the service commenced on 18 April 2011. The first sweeping routes to be swept started from the north of Bury St Edmunds working out towards Icklingham into the Forest Heath District. All routes so far have been completed in the required time frame with no issues.

## **2. Current status: Parish/Town Council consultation**

- 2.1 Members will recall that this workstream will focus on the following key areas during the initial phase of the project:

- (a) Data and information
- (b) Managing Customers
- (c) Policies

- 2.2 Progress has involved scoping sessions with staff and the collation and review of key service area indicators. Key points to note are outlined below with a more detailed overview in Appendix A:

- (a) Data and information
  - (i) Overall, NI 195 results demonstrate street cleanliness performance to be satisfactory and comparable with national trends.
  - (ii) Graffiti and Fly-posting failure rates are low.
  - (iii) Litter failure is relatively low and performance is above the national average.
  - (iv) The consultation with Parish Councils demonstrated high satisfaction rates with street cleansing
  - (v) The Place Survey (2008/2009) indicated above average scores across a range of street scene indicators
  - (vi) Customer complaints correlate with areas of improvement identified through NI195 monitoring.
- (b) Managing customers
  - (i) Improve communication and feedback internally among the key teams
  - (ii) Provide better information to customers about the street cleansing arrangements and expectation.
  - (iii) Implementation and assessment of new streets into the cleansing schedule.
  - (iv) Managing the quality of staff cleaning and understanding.
  - (v) Induction process of new staff.
  - (vi) The management of hot spots needs to be improved.
- (c) Policies
  - (i) There are multiple dimensions to the required approach and a single policy will be insufficient to meet the Code of Practice for Litter and Cleansing (COPLAR).

- (ii) A policy approach based upon COPLAR is required recognising the difference between schedules and reactive cleaning.
  - (iii) COPLAR is a driving force for the current approach to street cleansing.
3. The next steps will involve:
- (a) Integrate the findings with the development of the cleansing schedule.
  - (b) Commence monitoring using the revised NI 195 methodology and extend quality assurance to the work undertaken.
  - (c) Develop a strategy for delivering the COLPAR requirements, linked to a set of SMART policies and targets.
4. An update will be provided at the next Committee detailing progress with the above.

## **5. Staffing and Training**

- 5.1 Revised Job descriptions which were distributed to staff have been signed and returned which will streamline job descriptions from the current four to two. This will help to make recruitment and selection more straightforward.
- 5.2 Issuing the new Orange Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) has commenced with the new joint branding on the front and back and will be phased in as staff require replacements on the current exchange policy.

## **6. Next Stage**

- 6.1 The programme for the coming weeks involves the following tasks;
- (a) Complete routing on applied sweeping and litter picking rounds;
  - (b) Complete routing litter picking and bin emptying routes including precincts and shop front cleansing;
  - (c) Upload identified hotspot areas onto the system that require more intensive cleansing;
  - (d) Commence working on dog and litter bin data, frequencies and routes;
  - (e) Order a new replacement Mechanical Road Sweeper;
  - (f) Finalise a process to deal with parked cars using signs and a letter drop to residents; and
- 6.2 The planned changes from this project have now started to be rolled-out with further changes taking place throughout the year.
- 6.3 Throughout this process, officers are conscious of the significance of this project in terms of project scale, complexity and the fact that it could impact on many residents, businesses, visitors and tourists in Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury. For these reasons, risks will be managed and Members will continue to be regularly updated on progress.

## **Finance/Budget/Resource Implications**

7. The intention of the review is that cleansing services will be delivered at a lower cost to each organisation.

## **Environmental Impact and Sustainability**

8. The aim of the project is to improve the environmental impact of the service and it is anticipated that this can be achieved through reducing vehicle miles and increasing the amount of recycling of waste materials.

## **Policy Compliance/Power**

9. There are likely to be changes to departmental policies and procedures as a result of this review. Any proposed changes that potentially impact on residents or partner organisations will be brought back to members of the West Suffolk Waste and Street Scene Services Joint Committee for approval.

## **Performance Management Implications**

10. Cleansing performance is well measured and reported through National Indicators 195 and 196. Members may be asked to decide on resource limited options in terms of reducing a current level of service in order to reallocate or reduce resources.

## **Legal Implications**

11. Changes to staff contracts and the procurement of vehicles and equipment will be dealt with in full compliance of statutory legislation and local defined procedures.

## **Human Rights Act and Diversity Implications**

12. Currently there are no known human rights and diversity implications as all residents will be offered the same service matched to the type of area that they live in.

## **Crosscutting Implications**

13. There may be crosscutting implications resulting from this project in terms of working with partners or impacting upon them through any changes to our cleansing regime we adopt. These will be monitored and reported to members if it is necessary.

## **Risk Assessment**

14. There is a balance to be struck between maintaining or improving current levels of performance and the cost of our cleansing operations.

## **Council Priorities**

15. **Forest Heath**
  - Community engagement and communication; and
  - Street scene and environment.

## **St Edmundsbury**

- Raise standards and corporate efficiency; and

- Secure a sustainable and attractive environment.

**Recommendations:**

16. It is recommended that Members:

- (1) Note the progress of the project to redesign Cleansing Services;
- (2) Receive regular updates on progress, including a report at the next Committee meeting on 14 October 2011.

**DOCUMENTS ATTACHED**

None

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None

Nigel McCurdy / Sandra Pell  
Strategic Director (Services) / Corporate Director (Economy and Environment)  
10 June 2011

**CONTACT OFFICERS**

Keith Marley / Mark Christie, Forest Heath District Council  
Mark Walsh / Chris Silverwood, St Edmundsbury Borough Council

## APPENDIX A

### 1. NI195 Monitoring and trends

- Used to provide an objective assessment (customer view) of the condition of the local environment in terms of litter, detritus, fly posting and graffiti.
- Based on 900 annual inspections – 300 each from Apr – July (Tranche 1), August – November (Tranche 2) and December – March (Tranche 3)
- Monitors cleanliness against the national standards (COPLAR)
- Overall, NI 195 results demonstrate street cleanliness performance to be satisfactory and comparable with national trends. Key trends over the last three years indicate:
  - Graffiti and Fly-posting failure rates are low.
  - Litter failure is relatively low and performance is above the national average. However, the results demonstrate:
    1. There is a seasonal relationship with litter failure, with the highest percentage of failure occurring between December and March (tranche 3) and the lowest occurring during the August to November monitoring. This trend is consistent across all land use types and over the past three years. This may be related to:
      - a. Vegetation die back in the case of road verges etc causing litter to be more noticeable
      - b. Adverse weather conditions during the winter period (snow and prevailing winds etc) impacting upon operational effectiveness and reducing the amount of cleaning undertaken;
      - c. Diversion of operational resources on other street scene duties e.g. leaf clearance, resulting in delays to the cleansing schedules.
      - d. Focused operational presence during the summer period where footfall is at its highest.
    2. In terms of litter failure and land use type, the highest failure rates are in areas of higher obstruction housing (e.g. terraced housing, alleyways, flats and areas with no or limited off street parking) and main roads. The former is related to footfall, operational effectiveness and access whilst main road failure is due to ease of cleanliness and vegetation die back.
    3. Higher footfall areas such as high streets and retail areas have a lower failure rate, probably related to the relationship between high footfall locations and operational presence.

4. There is limited data available relating to the source or type of litter, which will impact the strategic and operational approach to adopt.
  5. The incident of failure is specifically related to the main towns.
- Detritus failure exceeds litter failure although performance is above the national average. However, the results demonstrate:
    1. There appears to be no seasonal relationship with detritus failure, with a consistent level of failure throughout the year. This is consistent across all land use types and over the past three years.
    2. In terms of detritus failure and land use type, the highest and most significant failure rates are in the following areas:
      - a. All housing areas (low, medium and high obstruction)
      - b. Industry and warehousing
      - c. Other highways (Formal and informal lay-bys on main and rural roads, certain cycle ways, footpaths, alleyways, rights of way etc.)
    3. Lower failure rates in other land use types are probably related to prioritised operational presence e.g. main retail and commercial areas, main roads etc.
  - There is limited data available relating to the source or type of litter, which will impact on the strategic and operational approach to adopt.
  - The incident of failure is specifically related to the main towns.

## 2. PLACE SURVEY 2008/9

	Percentage of residents who are very or fairly satisfied that their authority has kept the land clear of litter and refuse		Percentage of residents who identify clean streets as something most in need of improvement		Percentage of residents who perceive vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles to be a very or fairly big problem in their local area		Percentage of residents who perceive rubbish or litter lying around to be a very or fairly big problem in their local area		Percentage of residents who perceive abandoned or burnt-out cars to be a very or fairly big problem in their local area	
	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank
<b>SUFFOLK</b>	62%	In the best third	18.20%	In the lowest 20%	24.70%	In the best 25%	26.50%	In the best 20%	5.10%	Average
<b>Waveney District Council</b>	57.70%	Average	22%	Average	27.50%	Average	30.10%	Average	4.80%	Average
<b>Suffolk Coastal District Council</b>	64.70%	In the best 20%	14.70%	In the lowest 10%	18.70%	In the best 5%	21.10%	In the best 5%	1.90%	In the best 5%
<b>St Edmundsbury Borough Council</b>	65%	In the best 20%	16.60%	In the lowest 20%	21.70%	In the best 20%	23.10%	In the best 10%	3.40%	In the best 20%
<b>Mid Suffolk District Council</b>	62.80%	In the best 25%	12.50%	In the lowest 5%	15.40%	In the best 5%	19.80%	In the best 5%	2.50%	In the best 10%
<b>Ipswich Borough Council</b>	61.50%	Average	27.10%	Average	35.20%	In the worst third	34.80%	Average	11%	In the worst 20%
<b>Forest Heath District Council</b>	61.60%	In the best third	18.90%	In the lowest 25%	29.40%	Average	34%	Average	9%	In the worst 20%
<b>Babergh District Council</b>	60.70%	Average	14.10%	In the lowest 5%	25.60%	In the best third	24.40%	In the best 20%	4.40%	In the best third

Monitoring of fly posting



### 3. Policy Options

Issues to consider	Available Information	Required Information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies may vary for spatial/seasonal reasons</li> <li>• Meet corporate policy criteria</li> <li>• Consultation</li> <li>• Diversity Duty</li> <li>• Member approval</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine nature of strategic approach:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Input</li> <li>• Output</li> <li>• Combined</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trunk Road Cleansing</li> <li>• Standard of cleanliness for road side verges (A and B roads)</li> <li>• Managing seasonal impacts:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Snowfall</li> <li>• Leaf fall</li> <li>• Blossom Fall</li> <li>• Mud on road</li> <li>• Severe weather</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Managing intermittent litter issues:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Syringes</li> <li>• Glass</li> <li>• Dead animals</li> <li>• Human waste</li> <li>• S Trolleys</li> <li>• Schools</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Managing Private Land on street cleansing problems</li> <li>• Overall policy regarding service standards and their maintenance – including managing service failure (response times etc for reactive work)</li> <li>• Event Management</li> <li>• Litter bin and dog bin provision (number, type, density)</li> <li>• Planning Application conditions</li> <li>• Charging policy</li> <li>• CNEA / EPA provisions e.g. street litter notices, clearing notices</li> <li>• Planning policy:</li> <li>• Obstructions e.g. on street parking, Street furniture</li> </ul>